EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTE TO THE LATE DAN A. GREENE OF MARTINSVILLE, VA.

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the community of Martinsville, Va., was shocked and saddened recently by the untimely death of a valued and personal friend, Mr. Dan A. Greene. Dan Greene was a man who gave of himself untiringly, unstintingly, and unselfishly for the benefit of others and in the interest of the community and the State in which he lived. His passing has left a void which will be difficult to fill.

On June 22 there appeared in the Martinsville Bulletin an editorial concerning the late Dan Greene, and I insert this in the RECORD:

DAN GREENE WILL LONG BE KNOWN FOR HIS CONTRIBUTIONS TO ALL

To say the least, our community was shocked by the news of the sudden illness and death of Dan A. Greene.

He had lived here since 1940, or for 30 years. Yet he was still a relatively young man when he died of a heart attack at the age of 54 last Friday evening.

Nonetheless, those 54 years were filled with incomparable contributions to his neighbors and friends. And they numbered in the many thousands because his work and concern embraced citizens of all ages and walks of life.

Recognized as a highly successful businessman, Dan A. Greene will be remembered longer, however, as a civic leader whose compassion and interest embraced about every facet of community life.

He was interested in our youth. This was evidenced by his activity in and support of the Boy Scout movement, his original efforts in helping to organize and continued support of baseball programs for youngsters of all ages, and his assistance in the organization of the Martinsville Recreation Association.

He was interested in the needy, as evidenced by his efforts in organizing Christmas Cheer and his subsequent election by its members as a lifetime director.

He was interested in racial harmony and community progress. He was interested in everything that stood to benefit his fellowman; and he was not only generous with his time and leadership but was equally as generous with his financial assistance to every worthwhile civic and community project.

Ebullient and gregarious, he made friends easily and warmed their hearts with his vitality and interest in their personal lives and successes.

He was both the champion of the underdog and an admirer of the qualities possessed by the true champion, whatever his field.

He was a sentimentalist and a sensitive man, particularly when and if he detected what seemed to be an intrusion of injustice, bias and prejudice or oppression and exploitation. But he was a courageous man, too, and worked against all those things with the same sort of fervor and determination that marked all his contributions to his fellowman.

He was not a good loser in that he accepted attacks on or reversals of his principles without a hard fight. He believed any game worth playing was worth winning; any project started, worth completing.

This community will miss Dan Greene—and greatly. But it has profited more than we can relate here for having had him as a citizen and neighbor for the past 30 years; and for that, we are extremely grateful.

To his fine family, The Bulletin expresses its heartfelt sympathy, knowing that we express the sentiments of thousands and thousands of others who are appreciative of the vital part Dan Greene played in giving us a better community.

JUDGE MITCHELL'S ADDRESS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, Maryland Circuit Judge James Mitchell of the Charles County Circuit Court recently gave the commencement address at the Charles County Community College, which was reprinted in a recent issue of the Times Crescent, one of the Charles County newspapers. I will insert Judge Mitchell's address into the RECORD. In my opinion, it is a thoughtful statement by one of my leading constituents about some of the problems facing today's college graduates.

In his address Judge Mitchell states a very reasoned position for today's students working within our system of government which has brought us to this point in history where more and more of our high school graduates are able to receive college educations and where more and more of our people are able to enjoy a higher standard of living. In low-keyed but effective criticism of the radical left, Judge Mitchell "puts down" this element in our society. I commend his address to the Members of this body, for this reason among others.

It was of particular interest to me that Judge Mitchell traced the growth of the Charles County Community College in La Plata, Md., which is in my congressional district. I share Judge Mitchell's enthusiasm in looking forward to the future growth of this college and the program it will offer in the field of waste management and pollution control. I congratulate the administration of the college for the steps it has taken to specialize in this particular field. I also take this opportunity to congratulate the recent graduates of the Charles County Community College and wish them well in their future endeavors.

The address referred to, follows:

JUDGE MITCHELL'S ADDRESS

As I look out upon this campus today there is a strong urge to pinch myself to make sure that I am not dreaming. Within the sound of my voice over this public address system stands the house in which I was born and have always lived.

As a boy in knee pants I have roamed these fields. Looking back upon that far-off day, I see an elderly tenant farmer tilling this land, plodding wearily down the corn rows behind a mule-drawn hand cultivator.

Had I been gifted with Lord Tennyson's power to dip into the future, I would have prophesied that he was ahead of his time. He had a mustache and goatee. His name was Isaac Frederick and he lived in a little house long since fallen into decay. It must have been within a stone's throw of where I stand.

Just across the fence here we had an ice pond and he would lend a hand in filling the ice house when the ice froze to six inches as it did regularly in the bleak winters of that day.

The public road along here followed its present course but the bed of it was clay and the travelers were either on foot, on horse back or in horse drawn vehicles. Later, the Model T came along. They often got stuck in the mud holes and had to be hauled out by Isaac Frederick's mule team.

Yes, the environment was quite different from what we see today, and while there have been changes and improvements, there is one change which I do not place in the category of improvement. In those days we didn't have the beer cans, the milk cartons and the other litter you now see strewn along the way.

Since your distinguished President extended me the invitation, I have been wondering if I could find the words to bridge the generation gap long enough to communicate with you for the brief period of my remarks. Of one thing I am sure—the longer I talk, the wider the gap is likely to become—. Because on this very significant day in the life of each of you, a speech is probably the thing that is of least significance.

I believe I understand the frustrations which disturb the generation to which this graduating class belongs.

You are perturbed because of the many grave and complex problems which plague this nation and the world. And, since impatience is as much a part of youth as bright eyes and ruddy cheeks, you become frustrated when you face the reality that changes in the structure of a society as complex as ours are not accomplished overnight.

Since you were old enough to comprehend danger you have wondered if it is worthwhile to plan for the future, not knowing what hour or day the hydrogen bomb might be unleashed to spell the doom of civilization. You yearn for the opportunity to live your own lives—to do your own thing—which doesn't include fighting a war which you regard as a mistake in our Nation's Foreign Policy.

You are concerned that every week more than a million people are added to the world's population; that 100 million will be added in the U.S. in the next 25 years and you wonder if ways will be found to feed them or to slow this rapid population growth.

You have grown up in an affluent society but you rebel against the anomalies of food surpluses and hungry peoples; of labor shortages and people out of work.

You have grown up in a time of alarming conflict between races and you are perturbed when racial tensions erupt into violence.

You are alarmed by the forecasts of scientists, warning that at the present rate, mankind will so pollute his own environment in the next fifty to one-hundred years that he will no longer survive in it.

These are some of the pressing problems which mankind faces and about which you are concerned. What of their solution?

They will not be solved by those who seek to shout down any voice save their own; those who do not tolerate any idea with which they disagree; those who insist upon complete freedom for their own activities and by the exercise of that freedom, seek to de-

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

stroy the government under which they are assured the widest range of freedom that the citizens of any nation have ever known.

The problems will not be solved by those who use their frustrations as an excuse to "cop out" on Marihuana, LSD, Heroin or any of the other drugs that the weaker members of the younger generation have turned to.

The mistake of the Vietnam War—and history alone will tell us if it is a mistake—will not be corrected by those who bathe selective service files in blood; by those who burn their draft cards, by the draft dodgers who flee to Canada; by the deserters who seek asylum in Sweden, or by those who parade the Viet Cong Flag in our streets.

The solutions to pressing problems will not be forthcoming from the loud and provocative mouthings of the Jerry Rubins, the Abbie Hoffmans, the William Kunstlers, the Stokley Carmichaels, the Rap Browns. Nor will solutions flow from those who accent their protests by hurling bricks and stones, vile epithets and incendiary bombs.

For the radicals of that ilk do not seek to improve our system by working within the rule of law and established authority. Their avowed purpose is to destroy the system by violent disruption of all orderly processes.

I need only cite the Chicago trials, where the defendants and their lawyers, by persistent refusal to abide by the rules of procedure, sought to render their trials impossible and thus to destroy the courts. They knew what they were about. For as Professor Delmar Karlen, of the Institute of Judicial Procedure, warned: "If we don't have control in the courtroom, it is the end of the courts, it is the end of individual liberty, it is the end of government."

The radical revolutionaries of whom I speak aim the main thrust of their attack at the capitalistic system—the system which, despite its imperfections, has produced this college, all colleges, the cars you drive, the planes you fly, the many electrically operated and power-driven gadgets you employ, in fact all the material goods that make life so much easier and more enjoyable than it was in Isaac Frederick's time.

Will the radicals succeed in their purpose to overthrow the establishment? They may unless those in authority draw a firm line and say to them: "This is where the right of free speech, the right of peaceable assembly, the right of protest ends and where anarchy begins."

Just recently, a small band of these hard-core revolutionaries—some estimates place them at no more than fifty—backed up by some two-thousand ill-advised and ill-informed other students going along for the lark, blocked a main artery of travel between the Nation's Capital and Baltimore, protesting, I'm not quite sure what, in an effort to close the University of Maryland.

They were acting in total disregard of the right of the twenty-eight thousand non-protesting students to pursue their education and the right of thousands of motorists to use that highway.

The Governor of this state won the respect of law abiding citizens everywhere when he drew the line and said "the university will stay open and the highway will be cleared if it takes Maryland's entire contingent of ten thousand men in the National Guard to do it."

This may appear to be a strange observation from one in my position, but I am persuaded that the highest court in the land has not shown the same firmness nor awareness of where the right of protest ends and where anarchy begins as Governor Mandel did in dealing with the rioting students at the University of Maryland. Especially is this true of its decision outlawing the Smith Act, which sought to curb the activities of those whose avowed purpose is the overthrow of this government by subversion if possible but by force and violence if necessary.

Certainly, there is much cause for pessimism, but we must never abandon hope. I believe the community colleges will play a large part in training the leaders of tomorrow—leaders who will work within the establishment to find the answers to many of the world's problems.

Here you are not just a number in a strange setting as is the case with the hordes of students on the sprawling university campuses of today. Students at community colleges are for the most part residents of the area. They have not severed their roots from the land of their birth. I think that is a healthy situation.

The Charles County Community College is in the process of finding out how to stop the pollution of our environment through its department of environmental control, a program which has gained national attention and places this college in the forefront of those colleges and universities offering action programs to help solve the problems of the environment.

The basic program is a two year course leading to an associate-in-arts degree and trains technicians in the field of waste management and pollution control. Surrounding this basic core curriculum are a variety of courses which are aimed at providing training for specific skills needed for coping with the problems of air and water and other environmental concerns.

This program alone is expected eventually to brng one to two thousand students each year to the Charles County Community College.

This fall, I am told, the college will be offering seven fully accredited occupational programs and approximately forty percent of the students from an estimated enrollment of twelve hundred will be enrolled in one of these programs. They include Secretarial Science, Electronics, Data Processing, Drafting, Teacher Aides and Law Enforcement, in addition to the Pollution Abatement Program.

The Charles County Community College in the two short years it has spent on this campus has stepped into the future with its educational and vocational training programs. And this is so because of the leadership of this college is far from average in background, approach to education and ability to get things done.

Isaac Frederick belongs to the past. His mule, the tools that he used, the buildings he occupied have long since vanished from the scene. But these things remain—this land that he tilled, the clean water that runs over and beneath it, the pure air that flows above it. What this college is doing in training and research will play an important part in preserving and protecting those God-given natural resources for future generations.

When I reflect upon the changes that have taken place in the last half century, the human mind cannot begin to imagine what the next fifty years will bring. But I am convinced that we stand at the threshold of a vast new world of discovery which, almost assuredly will include life on other planets.

If you but work within the system that has brought us to this point in history, bending it to fit today's needs but not destroying it, you will find the solutions to the present problems which frustrate so many members of the college age generation. You will outstrip the forces of the destructive revolutionaries.

I appreciate this opportunity to bequeath to you the future of mankind. And when I look into the faces of this graduating class I am reassured that the future is in good hands.

MAKING THE SAFE STREETS ACT WORK: AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL CHALLENGE

HON. L. H. FOUNTAIN

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. FOUNTAIN. Mr. Speaker, title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 established the Federal Government's first comprehensive grant-in-aid program for assisting State and local governments in their law enforcement and criminal justice administration efforts. A major new feature of this legislation was its provision for Federal block grants to States, a portion of which the States had to "pass through" to cities, counties and multi-jurisdictional units.

At its June 12 meeting at the western White House, the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, on which Congresswoman DWYER and I have been privileged to serve since its inception, as two of the three House Members—Congressman ULLMAN being the third—met to consider the first 22 months' operation of the Safe Streets Act. In its recommendations, the Commission urged Congress to retain the block grant device, but that some changes be made in the act to streamline Federal administration and to improve State and local planning and performance. Three of the Commission's proposals are basically consistent with certain provisions of H.R. 17825—the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act—modifying the "troika" arrangement for administering the act by naming one of the three-member Law Enforcement Assistance Administration as Director of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance and by establishing a clear superior-subordinate relationship between the Director and his associates: requiring that no State comprehensive plan will be approved, unless LEAA finds that it provides for the allocation of an adequate share of assistance for dealing with the law enforcement needs of high crime areas; and authorizing LEAA to waive the ceiling on grants for personnel compensation.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the background portions of the Commission's report "Making the Safe Streets Act Work: An Intergovernmental Challenge" along with a list of its recommendations:

MAKING THE SAFE STREETS ACT WORK: AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL CHALLENGE

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act will be two years old on June 19. One of the most controversial measures considered by Congress in the 1960s, it has been marked by virulent debate at every step of its implementation. Now Congress has the Act before it again, with a variety of proposals to change it significantly.

Title I of the Act sets up the first comprehensive Federal grant program for assisting State and local law enforcement and criminal justice administration. It does so through block grants to the States with a required pass-through to localities. Funds were awarded in a two-step procedure—first for

planning and then for action programs. Federal responsibilities are handled through the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Much of the debate has been over the desirability of channelling Federal funds through the States on a broad program basis versus direct Federal-local grants on a project-by-project basis that by-passes the States. The Commission study focuses on these intergovernmental problems and issues in administering the Act. It is based on responses of 48 States to a comprehensive questionnaire. Great care was taken to assure an objective study by involving groups representative of all points of view in developing the questionnaire.

The Safe Streets Act has dramatically increased overall Federal spending for crime prevention and control in the past two years. It nearly doubled between fiscal 1969 and fiscal 1971. But States and local governments still provide the overwhelming bulk of the money. During the fiscal year that ends June 30, 1971, the Federal Government is expected to spend $1,257 million on crime prevention and control. But this is only about one-third of what the 50 States, 43 largest cities and 55 largest counties spent on law enforcement and criminal justice in fiscal 1968.

Although a major intent of the legislation is to stimulate a comprehensive approach to criminal justice, early planning and action on the program has focused primarily on law enforcement. The study reveals heavy accent on police in the 1969 plans, although somewhat greater attention apparently has been given to courts and corrections in 1970 plans. Similarly, as of early 1970, 45 percent of the action funds had been used for police programs with large amounts going to purchase equipment and for communications systems and training. Relatively insignificant dollar amounts were awarded for upgrading courts, prosecution and corrections, according to the survey.

In answer to these criticisms, the report notes that the program is still in its early stages. There was little time to gear up for a truly comprehensive approach initially, it points out. The law enforcement interests were organized at State and local levels, and able to get the funds and use them immediately. A balanced, interrelated program will take more time.

That the Safe Streets program got underway in a hurry is also documented in the study. The legislation required the States to set up a State Planning Agency within six months of the measure's enactment to devise a plan, to receive block grants and disburse subgrants. Otherwise, the Federal government could deal directly with localities. Every State complied within the time limits. Each State received at least $100,000 to enable a minimum planning effort. Additional planning awards were made based on population. As a consequence, the largest States received less total funds per capita than many smaller States with lower crime rates. Although a bone of contention this is in part due to the relatively modest amounts involved—$19 million the first year.

The State Planning Agencies (SPAs) have two components: a supervisory board of elected and appointed state and local officials and citizens-at-large, and a day-to-day professional staff. The Commission study finds that some supervisory boards are dominated by functional officials and appear to be inadequately representative of elected local government policy-makers and the citizens-at-large. This can be attributed, in part, to the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA) guidelines, which specify eight categories of officials that *must* be represented on the boards. The average supervisory board has 23 members. On the average, one-third represent elected local government policy makers and executives and the citizens. These officials also tend to have somewhat lower average attendance rates than functionaries. However, the number of supervisory board meetings varied widely among the States during the period studied.

As to the professional staff, charges have been leveled that the States were using Federal Safe Streets money to build a new law enforcement and criminal justice bureaucracy. The Commission Study finds that this is not true at the State level. The average size of a State Planning Agency professional staff is 9.3. This does not include regional or areawide staffs. Forty-five States use regional bodies to help administer the Act at the substate level. Many of these districts have been assigned a wide range of planning, administrative and fiscal responsibilities. There are no reliable figures on the size of the professional staff at the regional level. But there have been charges that the regions are State-imposed entities which are unrepresentative of their constituent local governments.

The Act requires States to pass through 40 percent of the planning grants to individual localities and regional units. As of December 31, 1969, 16 States had awarded more than the 40 percent, but 14 had awarded less.

Most of the controversy since the Act's adoption has revolved around the handling of action grants: $24.5 million in fiscal 1969 and $179.4 million in fiscal 1970. These funds were allocated to the States strictly according to population. The States were required to pass through 75 percent.

The study shows that 17 of the 48 States reporting, passed through more than the required 75 percent of action funds; only two passed through less. Forty-two of the States retained funds at the State level for programs they considered to be of direct benefit to local jurisdictions. Thirteen States charged all or part of the cost to the localities' share of funds retained at State level; but thirty-six States charged all or part of these programs to the State share of the action grants.

Of the action subgrants going to cities, municipalities of over 25,000 population received 86 percent of the funds. And urban counties (over 25,000 population) received 83 percent of the action money going to counties. However, cities under 25,000 population constituted 66 percent of the total number of municipal subgrantees. Their average subgrants amounted to $1,959. Small counties (under 25,000 population) made up half the subgrantees in the county category, with an average subgrant of $2,447. This proliferation of small subgrants has led to the charge that the States are employing a buck-shot approach and are spending subgrants too thinly rather than targeting the money on where the problems are.

Crime rate, local portion of total State-local police expenditures and total local police outlays have been proposed by some as measures of law enforcement assistance need and effort. The study uses the money passed through to the five largest cities (25,000 or more) in each of 45 States to assess how they fared. Five States passed through more to these jurisdiction than they would have received if crime rate were the basis for allocation and another seven States passed through a roughly proportional amount. Using these jurisdictions' portion of total State-local police expenditures as a test, 12 States passed through more and 12 others a commensurate amount. And using total local police outlays, seven States distributed more and 10 a comparable amount. However, *no general consensus* exists as to the reliability of any one or combination of these factors as a gauge of State responsiveness to urban crime reduction needs or of local anti-crime effort.

The Act requires that for Federal planning money, recipient jurisdictions provide at least 10 cents for every Federal 90 cents. Every 60 cents in Federal action grants are to be matched by 40 cents. Other matching requirements are 75–25 for organized crime and riot control programs, and 50–50 for construction projects. One measure of a State's concern with solving local problems is the extent to which it is willing to put up its own money to cover part of the non-Federal share, in other words, to "buy-in." Cash contributions are not required by the Act, however, only State technical assistance and services. As of February 28, 22 States had made a cash or in-kind contribution to help match passed-through funds, most of it for planning. However, the total amounted to only $776,906 for 20 States. Two States "bought in" to planning and action programs across the board. Thirty-four States are assuming 75 percent or more of combined State-local corrections expenditures and 16 States account for 25 percent or more of total State-local police outlays. It is also pointed out that the amount of financial involvement may be small because of 1969 Federal action funds were not awarded to the States until the end of the fiscal year, after some legislatures had adjourned.

Various reports making charges and countercharges have come out since the enactment of this controversial legislation. To obtain the greatest objectivity, the Commission staff worked closely with groups of varying opinions throughout the course of the study. They included: the Council of State Governments, International City Management Association, National Association of Counties, National Governors' Conference, National League of Cities, and U.S. Conference of Mayors, as well as the U.S. Bureau of the Budget and the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. Of course, the findings and conclusions are solely the work of the Commission staff.

RECOMMENDATIONS ADOPTED BY THE ADVISORY COMMISSION ON INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

RECOMMENDATION 1. MODIFYING LEAA'S ADMINISTRATIVE STRUCTURE

The Commission recommends that Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 be amended to create the position of Director of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance who, acting under the general authority of the Attorney General, would be responsible for administering the Act. He shall be one of the three-man Law Enforcement Assistance Administration. The Commission further recommends that the Director be appointed by the President with due regard to his fitness, knowledge, and experience to perform the duties of the chief administrator of the LEAA.

RECOMMENDATION 2. DISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS BY THE STATES: RETAINING THE BLOCK GRANT

The Commission strongly believes that, although there are presently some gaps in State performance under Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 in responding to the special needs of high crime urban and suburban areas, the block grant represents a significant device for achieving greater cooperation and coordination of criminal justice efforts between the States and their political subdivisions. The Commission therefore recommends that the block grant approach embodied in the Act be retained and that States make further improvements in their operations under it.

RECOMMENDATION 3. MAINTAINING THE PRESENT SUBGRANT SYSTEM

The Commission recommends that no changes be made in Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to funnel additional Federal funds into high crime urban and suburban areas, except for an amendment providing that no State comprehensive law enforcement plan shall be approved unless the LEAA finds that the

plan provides for the allocation of an adequate share of assistance to deal with law enforcement problems in areas of high crime incidence.

RECOMMENDATION 4. STRENGTHENING ALL COMPONENTS OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

The Commission recommends that no changes be made in Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to require or encourage a greater channeling of Federal funds to court and corrections related projects, since modifications of this type would constitute an infringement on State and local discretion under the block grant approach contained in the Act. At the same time, the Commission urges that State comprehensive law enforcement plans should give greater attention to improving all components of the criminal justice systems.

RECOMMENDATION 5. RETAINING REGIONAL DISTRICTS

The Commission recommends that States retain and strengthen their regional law enforcement planning districts.

RECOMMENDATION 6. AUTHORIZING WAIVER OF THE PERSONNEL COMPENSATION LIMIT

The Commission recommends that the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration be authorized to waive the ceiling on grants for personnel compensation contained in Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968.*

RECOMMENDATION 7. MAINTAINING PRESENT REPRESENTATION REQUIREMENTS FOR SPA'S

The Commission recommends retention of the present provisions of Title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, and of related program guidelines, providing for balanced representation of interests on the supervisory boards of State law enforcement planning agencies.

CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR'S SCHOLARS REJECT AWARD

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have placed inserts in the RECORD for the purpose of underscoring the fact that our best and brightest young people are being antagonized by our distorted priorities.

Recently I received a letter from two recent high school graduates in my district. These girls were chosen to be Governor's scholars because of their outstanding scholastic achievement. However, they felt they could not in good conscience accept an award from Gov. Ronald Reagan, whose hostility toward education is no secret.

Let us hope that Ronald Reagan's policies of today will not be Richard Nixon's policies tomorrow.

I include the letter to which I referred be inserted in the RECORD at this point:

JUNE 19, 1970.

Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: Upon graduation from high school this June, we were notified that we were among the high school seniors chosen as California Governor's Scholars. We received certificates to that affect, signed by Ronald Reagan.

In view of the Reagan Administration's policies toward education, we consider it ironic, and not a little hypocritical, that the Governor should undertake to commend students for high scholastic achievement. (On the other hand, his recognition of such students may be more thoughtful and logical than we know—perhaps the Governor realizes that obtaining a thorough, relevant education has become increasingly difficult in this state since he took office. Perhaps that fact weighs on his conscience although, truthfully, we see no evidence of this.)

We question the validity of the determination of such achievement. We are fortunate to have attended school in one of the best-financed districts of the state. Yet even here we see the budget cuts and harmful program alterations that Reagan policies require. We wonder how many students in less prosperous districts, with potentials equal to or greater than ours, will never be recognized either as Governor's Scholars or simply as people with something extra to contribute to society.

Each of us will be attending a campus of the University of California this fall. In the meantime, we would greatly appreciate your returning the enclosed certificates to our Governor. Please convey to him our thanks, but tell him that we decline his recognition. It is no honor to be named a Reagan Scholar.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

ELAINE KASIMATIS,
Davis, Calif.
KARIN VONABRAMS,
Davis, Calif.

CAN LAW SURVIVE?

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, Richard J. Farrell, the vice president and general counsel of Standard Oil Co., Indiana, recently delivered a notable address before the school of law convocation of Washburn University, Topeka, Kans.

In this address, entitled "Can Law Survive?" Mr. Farrell emphasizes what the real nature of the law is. He also makes the telling point, that if law does not survive, "it is difficult to think of any other worthwhile legacies that will."

I commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues:

CAN LAW SURVIVE?

(Richard J. Farrell)

Since this gathering takes place on "Law Day," and since I am by profession a lawyer, I suppose it would be understandable if I were to enter a strong plea for "Law and Order."

This is a very popular subject with most of our population at the moment, and for understandable reasons. With reported crimes of every sort on the path of a statistical skyrocket; with the police in disfavor among the young, the black community, the intellectuals, and the drug users; with our most precious civil rights trampled without regard by radicals of both left and right; and with the courts themselves clogged with backlogs which threaten to stretch out as long as the earthly lives of many of the parties involved, there is a strong temptation to conclude that the needed social prescription is a strong dose of simplistic law and order imposed by force.

Certainly, something is needed. Since our legal system is a major clearinghouse for society's complaints, it is disconcerting to find it is not functioning as well as we would like. At the very least, we ought to be able to reach the point in our courts at which the interval between a charge of criminal action or the filing of a civil complaint and the time it is adjudicated is not so long that those involved have difficulty in recalling just how the whole thing came about.

However, instead of taking up even a short amount of time here today with an examination of the strengths and weaknesses of our present judicial system—which does have a long and honorable history—I would like instead to offer a few observations about the nature of law in its much broader sense and the need to understand it. President Edward H. Levi of the University of Chicago and former Dean of its Law School, has defined the function of law in these words:

"Law . . . is not primarily a social science describing how some institutions operate. It is not primarily a tool for determining how transactions will turn out or for predicting what courts will do. These are important services but they are subsidiary to law's major commitment. The important point is that law has a commitment and this shapes its role and measures its success.

"This commitment has often been stated. It is general. It is not the less purposeful on that account. It is to develop concepts, and to maintain and operate procedures which enable a sovereign community to be governed by rule for the common good, the attainment of human values, and to make that rule effective."

For the benefit of anyone who may think the subject of these comments—"Can Law Survive?"—is unduly pessimistic in tone, let me assure you it is not. The prestigious Association of the Bar of the City of New York, for example, is currently holding a two-day symposium on the question: "Is Law Dead?" While I have some admitted concern over the health of the patient, I haven't yet gone so far as to entertain the idea we already have a corpse on our hands.

It takes no particular ingenuity or intellect to find defects in any of the products of mankind—from herbicides to religions. When it comes to anything as complex as the social systems which hold us together, the grounds for complaint are nearly as varied as the inhabitants.

Given human nature—and I think we have to take it at least until some Orwellian future—there are always going to be dissidents in any group—from the nursery school to the Supreme Court. In many fields of endeavor, we have relied on dissidents from accepted wisdom to provide the breakthrough to new ground, and they have provided crucial leadership on the long journey which has led us down from the trees and up to the moon.

Within the limits of the historical legacy of the Western world, the annals are full of dissidents whose convictions later led to canonization—in arts and letters, in music, in science and medicine, and in law and politics. This happened because time proved their once-heretical ideas to be at least better than what had preceded.

For the most part theirs has been an honorable tradition of dissent. It was generally marked by a determination to improve on the state of man's affairs, as seen by the dissenters. Among other things, it produced this country—with all its faults, along with such interesting innovations as mass education, television, and atomic energy.

However, the right of dissent is being employed today on such a scale and in a manner as to threaten to bring down the whole social structure. A great deal of the current furor in this country appears basically anarchistic in its inspiration, and among the many other luxuries we cannot afford at this stage in our development is a widespread state of anarchism. I use the term as it is

most commonly understood to mean a terroristic resistance to government and social order. Given the complexity of modern, urban society, the last thing we can tolerate are people willing to destroy what is in order to see what might follow—if indeed they have such long-range curiosity.

The "new left" which preaches such a doctrine, is really offering nothing very new. Anarchists go back at least as far as Ancient Greece—which obliged us with the concept, as she did so many others. Philosophically, they have long cherished the ideal of a society without government. In its place according to their credo, we would substitute free agreements among those concerned. This noble idea did not catch on even in the relatively simple city-states of Athens or Sparta, where in theory it could at least have been tried. Its application in the 20th Century would result in absolute chaos, at least in the industrialized nations.

Nevertheless, the dream has persisted. The anarchist movement probably reached its peak in the West when its followers—dissatisfied with the lack of satisfactory agreements on their own terms—assassinated a Tsar of Russia (Alexander II), a President of France (Carnot), an Empress of Austria (Elizabeth) and a President of the United States (McKinley)—all within less than 20 years, between 1881 and 1901. However, governments also tend to persist, even if you eliminate the titular head, although anarchists went around throwing a great number of bombs against objects of their displeasure right up to World War I, when the fashion declined.

As we all know from looking at our newspapers, bombing is back in vogue. Bombs are placed in schools, in offices, in government buildings and places of public assembly almost daily. The idea of employing violence as an appropriate weapon against the ideological enemy is back in fashion. We have a daily log in this country of the spread of the notion that the only way to get things done is to take force into your own hands.

The infection has spread alarmingly. Students whose demands are not met speedily enough respond by imprisoning deans, burning libraries, and destroying professorial files representing the work of a lifetime. Urban blacks who are fed up with conditions in the ghetto shoot guns at firemen who have come to put out a blaze which menaces the neighborhood. Public school teachers unhappy with the terms of their contracts simply close down the schools, and similar actions are taken by every group from postmen to air traffic controllers. Laboriously-negotiated labor contracts are rejected out of hand by the union membership. Environmental crusaders advocate destruction of public utilities. The list is almost endless, and there is no point in pursuing it.

In nearly every case I have cited, there is a legitimate core of grievance. In nearly every case, society's response has been tardy, if not downright apathetic. Yet there has to be some middle ground between frustration and violent action, and this is what we badly need to find. The exact location of this middle ground will vary according to the legitimacy and scale of the grievance, but I don't think any of us should be deluded into thinking that actions which may help to dramatize a problem thereby solve it. Not so.

The war in Vietnam is still going on, poverty and the slums are still with us, blacks and whites are still far from agreement, many people are still underpaid by reasonable standards, and women are still accorded second-class citizenship—or so increasing numbers of them assert. I don't see a single one of these problems which is really susceptible to a violent solution.

The anarchistic alternative is particularly objectionable in a democracy which provides means for the redress of grievances at the ballot box and in the courtroom. That the system may not work with the dispatch or with the results that some of the more impatient may desire does not mean that we can afford to see it abandoned.

The preservation of basic social systems—and social values—is a condition precedent to civilization. The case cannot be put more tellingly than by Kenneth Clark, who in his recent book, "Civilization: A Personal View", said:

"At this point, I reveal myself in my true colors, as a stick-in-the-mud. I hold a number of beliefs that have been repudiated by the liveliest intellects of our time. I believe order is better than chaos, creation better than destruction. I prefer gentleness to violence, forgiveness to vendetta. On the whole I think that knowledge is preferable to ignorance, and I am sure that human sympathy is more valuable than ideology. I believe that in spite of the recent triumphs of science, men haven't changed much in the last two thousand years; and in consequence we must still try to learn from history. History is ourselves. I also hold one or two beliefs that are more difficult to put shortly. For example, I believe in courtesy, the ritual by which we avoid hurting other people's feelings by satisfying our own egos. And I think we should remember that we are part of a great whole, which for convenience we call nature. All living things are our brothers and sisters. Above all, I believe in the God-given genius of certain individuals, and I value a society that makes their existence possible."

We were fortunate to have some of those geniuses as founders of the republic. They were admitted revolutionaries. They were hardly anarchists—nor does it appear they would have subscribed to the notion that life is merely a long, subjective "happening." They handed down to us a system of moral and political principles—of self-evident truths and inalienable rights, as they saw them—which have served us well but are now in clear jeopardy.

The difficulty is that there has to be general belief in the principles and acceptance of the rules which stem from them. This is certainly the case with the functioning of law within our civilization. The necessity for voluntary participation in its processes and submission to its decisions is a sine-qua-non if such hard-won protections as those in the Bill of Rights are going to be preserved for a posterity which is going to need them as much as we.

Once people begin seeking their objectives by force or by deliberate flouting of the rules, the very essence of the system is subverted no matter what the moral or ethical justification may be said to be. This is precisely what is going on around us and at an alarming rate. If we are indeed to abandon principles and systems, we will simultaneously have abandoned the one rational hope we have for the future.

There is ample evidence of the social damage that can be done when this delicate compact is violated. Some of the examples I have noted produced piles of stinking garbage in the cities, arson and looting, undelivered mail, closed schools, and transportation paralysis as a few of the recent fruits.

One of the unanswered questions before us is how far is this process going to go? The defense tactics of the "Conspiracy 7" trial in Chicago threatened the entire concept of procedural due process which has served to protect our civil rights—both individual and collective—for so long. I think it is fairly obvious that if deliberate defiance of established procedures were to become the norm, none of us would have any particular rights worth mentioning.

Or let us take some of the more active crusaders to save the environment. While a straight line may be the shortest path between two points in plane geometry, this is not necessarily the case in a society. Anti-pollution zealots who are convinced, for example, that the way to cut down air pollution is to force offending public utilities to shut down might reflect on the horrors of life in a large city without power—even temporarily.

Events on our campuses also suggest the heavy price involved in the use of the tactics of force and violence. The combination of physical destruction and "non-negotiable" demands for costly new programs and privileges side by side with equally "non-negotiable" demands to take in more students while abolishing fees place some obvious strains on the unfortunate institutions—not to mention the teachers who want to teach and the students who want to learn. But the gravest penalty is, again, the abandonment of reason—whose preservation and encouragement is supposed to be the college or university's purpose in existing to begin with.

Just the day before yesterday, the New York Times said this editorially:

"If the campuses are to be permitted to function as staging areas for violence, the academic community jeopardizes its fundamental role as freedom's protector; to impair academic freedom, whether through internal coercion or external repression, is to shut off civil liberties at the source.

"The defense of freedom required vigilance against all forms of violence, coercion or repression. The safeguard of the people's legitimate powers is the rule of law under the Bill of Rights. No government nor any dissident group, can defy that rule or abridge those rights without being guilty of the ultimate and intolerable subversion of the American ideal and the democratic reality."

The most likely outcome of the continued use of the tactics of violence will be to provoke the traditional response of other societies in the past—namely repression. There comes a point when majorities tire of the complaints of minorities, particularly when the pressing of these complaints threatens the whole structure—and the historical reaction has been to get rid of the troublemakers at whatever cost. In the process, hard-won personal rights and freedoms have evaporated like dew in the summer sunshine.

We may be drifting close to the breaking point already, but we cannot afford to see that sorry day arrive. Many of us may have doubts about certain aspects of our heritage. This is admittedly an imperfect world. But, by the test of history and a look at the rest of the world, our heritage comprises some fundamental strengths which outnumber its deficiencies, and are worth building on. I am reminded of Winston Churchill, who once described the British Parliamentary system as the worst conceivable form of government—except for all the others.

And so I feel about the role of law and the rule of law as I have discussed it today. None of society's problems can be solved without the efforts of men of good will operating within the process of law as effective rules for the common good are evolved—and this requires the rational efforts of the universities, business, the church, legislatures, the executive and the courts. Law in this sense must survive. If it cannot, it is difficult to think of any other worthwhile legacies that will.

THE DECISION THAT CONCEIVED A NATION

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, one of the most patriotic pro-American national

organizations is the DAR—Daughters of the American Revolution. In our land today, their dedication and love of country shine out like a beacon.

Among their many contributions to loyalty and understanding of our constitutional Government, are their efforts to instill in our youth the history of our country and a desire to keep our people free.

Recently in Bulloch County, Ga., the Archibald Bulloch Chapter of the DAR conducted a countywide contest on the Declaration of Independence among seventh-grade students.

The first-place silver medal was awarded to Miss Donna DeLoch, a student at Statesboro Junior High School, and daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Harold DeLoach. Miss DeLoach's essay on the Declaration of Independence was entitled, "The Decision that Conceived a Nation."

With the Fourth of July—the 194th anniversary of our freedom—about to be celebrated, I feel that Miss DeLoach's essay will prove of particular interest to our fellow Members and I insert it following my remarks:

[From the Bulloch Herald and Times, Feb. 12, 1970]

THE DECISION THAT CONCEIVED A NATION

(By Donna DeLoach)

If Thomas Jefferson had put his thoughts to words prior to writing the Declaration of Independence, they might have sounded like this:

March 21,* in the year of Our Lord, 1776. In my mind there is a great debate, should we continue war or not? War, a horrible thing may give us our rights, but then again, if Britain wins we would be under even tighter reins than before! Even though we are fighting, should we fight for Independence? Risk the lives of many colonists, for a lost cause, or is it lost? There is no way to know whether we will be successful, but should we postpone war in hopes that we will regain our rights? No, we as Englishmen are entitled to the rights of the Magna Carta, yet the King will not give us our rights now so why should we believe that he will at some future date? There is always the chance that we will be crushed! If we should break free from England, would the nation we form be able to face the responsibilities of these modern times? Would we wither away like so many nations before us? The farther I think into this debate, the more difficult the decision becomes!

April 30,* in the year of Our Lord, 1776.

Today at the Raleigh Tavern, I came across Patrick Henry, a strong believer in freedom. He feels that we should break away from England entirely! He says that war is the only answer! He also feels that polite petitions will do no good; that only a tyrant will take away a peoples' dearly won freedom! He adds that we as colonists of England are entitled to English rights, even if we are separated by a tremendous sea! War is the only answer!

Even though Henry has great influence many are undecided like myself. Which is right? War with only a chance of our rights, or peace with little or no chance for our natural rights?

I feel that this question must be answeed soon, but how can such an important decision be made quickly? Too quick a decision may be fatal for the colonists, but too late a decision could also be fatal for the nation! If we give in to Britain could we be reduced to slaves? I am now all the more puzzled. Which should we strive for—total Independence, or better relations with England?

May 1,* in the year of Our Lord 1776.

Today I suddenly came across George Washington, a very respected figure in the House. He feels that this war is not in the best interest of our colonies. Yet he also feels that His Majesty ought to do something about these unfair taxes. Since the Stamp Act was finally passed, there has been talk of rebellion, yet Washington disagrees. He feels that war is senseless; that rebellion is senseless; that the King was mislead by his ministers and that we should try to patch up things with England! But, should we? Will it really help? It could bring disaster, but it may help. Which is right?

I must not let others decide for me!

June 6, 1776* in the year of Our Lord 1776.

War Breaking away from England seems inevitable. If war must persist I will do all in my power to free the colonies from the unjust rule of Great Britain! Even though I think war is tragic, I must help our striving colonists! We must win! Even though I'm undecided about the wisdom of this war I know we must have liberty! Liberty is precious beyond all means! I feel that unless we act quickly it may be too late, for in another score years we may be common slaves. Our ancestors have worked hard for our freedom, we can't let one tyrant destroy our rights. We must break loose from Britain's tight rein!

July 2,* in the year of Our Lord 1776

The Continental Congress declares Independence! John Hancock the head of the Continental Congress appointed Benjamin Franklin, me, along with several others to a committee to write up the document of Independence. The entire committee agreed that I should be in charge of writing so great a document. This is a great honor, but also a great responsibility. How can I find the words for so great a document? I have been under such a strain. Am I the person to author such a paper?

July 4*, in the year of Our Lord 1776.

At last it is finished! I worked day and night, without stopping to sup or rest. Even though I used little reference I knew what I'd write, for the right of liberty is for all!

At first I was uncertain of the preamble of so great a document, but at the Assembly the words stood out daring and bold:

"When in the Course of human Events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the Political bands which have connected them with another . . ."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Monsell, Helen; Tom Jefferson Boy of Colonial Days; Bobbs; New York; 1939 Wibberly, Leonard; Thomas Jefferson Young Man From the Piedmont; Ariel Books; New York; 1963.

*These dates are entirely fictitious since the exact dates were unknown to my points of reference.

THEY ARE FINALLY THINKING

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues and the other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a thought-provoking editorial written by Richard Higgen in the Lake Lillian Crier in our Minnesota Sixth Congressional District.

Editor Higgen writes his thoughts of high school graduation. He commends our youth for thinking but he also tells of their impatience, of their frustration because they feel cut off, because there are no new worlds for them to conquer.

But there is much to be done, he says. The character of man has hardly been scratched. The conquest of inner man is the most challenging one today. It provides challenges enough for many generations.

Mr. Speaker, I insert Editor Higgin's editorial in this issue of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

THEY ARE FINALLY THINKING

(By Richard Higgin)

Suddenly the thought burst upon many minds Friday night during commencement exercises at Cosmos High School: "Our children are thinking—they're finally thinking!"

To some it was a cause for rejoicing; some were outraged; while others were so surprised they couldn't understand what was happening.

For years many of us have wished that the youth of our nation would begin thinking, become concerned with their world and take an active part in shaping it.

Suddenly, we realize that our wish has come true, and we're terrified—they're so inexperienced, so impatient, so often misinformed, so often deceived by those who would use them for their own unscrupulous purposes!

To make matters worse, we realize suddenly that while the youth have awakened, many of us have fallen asleep. Lulled into immobility by putting all our trust in a false god—big brother government, which we now realize enslaves us in the end rather than freeing us.

While the speeches Friday night featured frustration and pessimism, they, nonetheless, expressed a desire to "break down the walls" separating the generations, to wake up to our present problems, and work together, intelligently, to solve them.

This may have been noble rhetoric only, but I sincerely doubt it. Today's kids are scared. They feel cut off, even betrayed. With proper guidance they could be a tremendous force in straightening out this country, rather than destroying it as many currently seem intent to do. As Craig Thomas said, "We can be a powerful people with your experience and our enthusiasm."

It's true! But first we must awaken ourselve from the apathy into which we've fallen and regain our right of individual integrity and destiny.

Many youth today are impatient. They fail to realize that the degree of civilization we have attained was reached only through thousands of years of sacrifice and struggle—they expect everything to become perfect overnight. Thus, through pushing too hard, too fast, they could destroy everything—the good along with the bad.

But, couple their enthusiasm and energy with our experience and understanding and we could have a force beautiful to behold. But, first we have to get up off our can.

Youth often feel frustrated today because they feel they cannot improve their economic and technical situation significantly. They already have everything. What's the use?

They're wrong, and you and I must help them realize that the greatest frontiers, the greatest challenges still lie ahead.

Yes, we're an affluent society. Yes, we're rapidly conquering outer space. But that great frontier of inner space has hardly been touched. I mean the heart and soul—the character if you please—of man has barely been scratched. The conquest of the inner man is the most challenging one today. It provides challenge enough for many generations.

The blueprint has already been provided by God. It is outlined in great detail in a dusty old book, which is called the Bible.

The field is white unto the harvest. Let us unite hands across the generations and conquer this frontier.

HIGHWAY SENTIMENT STRONGLY FAVORABLE ACCORDING TO NATIONAL POLL OF EDITORS

HON. JOHN C. KLUCZYNSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. KLUCZYNSKI. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues an article from Federation Reporter—issue date: July 2, 1970, published by the Highway Users Federation for Safety and Mobility, Washington, D.C.

The article follows:

HIGHWAY SENTIMENT STRONGLY FAVORABLE ACCORDING TO NATIONAL POLL OF EDITORS

Attitudes toward highway transportation across the country remain strongly favorable, according to the nation's newspaper editors. This was borne out by a recent coast-to-coast survey of nearly 600 daily and weekly newspaper editors conducted by the Highway Users Federation.

Preliminary findings of the survey have just been analyzed and are reported here for the first time.

Generally, the results show that despite the well-publicized anti-highway propaganda being generated by vocal citizens' groups, the favorable attitudes of most city councils and state legislatures toward highways remain unaffected, as do most highway projects. Moreover, by an almost two to one margin, responding editors believe that citizens do not favor diversion of the Highway Trust Fund to pay for development of other transportation modes.

The survey conducted by the Federation's News Department, was launched in early June and was accompanied by a letter to editors noting that the U.S. Congress this year will make a number of important decisions regarding the nation's highway program, particularly the future of the Federal Highway Trust Fund due to expire in 1972.

Stressed in the letter was the Federation's concern that Congress might base its decisions on experiences in Washington, D.C. where a 10-year dispute over a local freeway program has left many people with mixed emotions about highways in general. This, the Federation's letter stated, would be "shortsighted and hardly indicative of national attitudes toward highways." Thus, the editors were asked to help in developing a national composite on certain key highway issues.

Editors were asked to answer five questions on an enclosed postal card and to return it unsigned, without identifying the newspaper. Within 10 days time a 25 percent response was recorded.

The first question asked "Do you feel there is growing anti-highway sentiment in your city?" To this, over 65 percent of the responding editors answered "No" while only 35 percent said "Yes."

The second part of the question concerned any possible anti-highway sentiment in the editor's state. Exactly 69 percent of the responding editors said they did not think anti-highway sentiment was growing, while 31 percent said they thought it was.

The second question concerned the influence of citizens' groups: "Are the activities of any anti-highway group adversely affecting a highway program in your city?" To this question nearly 80 percent of the responding editors answered "No." Only 20 percent felt there was some negative influence on highway programs caused by citizen group pressure.

Part two of the question applied to the editor's state. In this case, 75 percent of those responding indicated "no effect" while some 25 percent saw evidence of adverse pressures.

Question three asked, "Do you think anti-highway attitudes in other cities or states influence the highway situation in your own community?" Approximately 70 percent of the responding indicated no external influence; 30 percent thought there was some.

In response to question four, "What do you feel is the general attitude toward highways in your city council?" 88 percent of the responding editors said "favorable," while only 12 percent thought attitudes were not favorable.

Part two of the question concerned highway attitudes in the editor's state legislature. An overpowering 92 percent of the responding editors felt there was a favorable attitude; only eight percent felt there was not.

The final question centered on the key issue of the Highway Trust Fund: "Do you believe the citizens of your community would favor diversion of the Federal Highway Trust Fund to pay for other modes, such as rapid rail transit?"

To this question, nearly 65 percent of the responding editors said they did not think the people in the communities would favor diversion. Approximately 35 percent of the respondents took the opposite view.

According to J. C. Martin, manager of the Federation News Department, "While this survey is not a scientific one in the classic sense, it does give a strong indication that most of the nation away from Washington, D.C. and the crowded northeast quadrant feel that highways and highway transportation are still important. In a quick way, this was what we were trying to prove. We hope that key officials and legislators will be equally impressed with the results."

BULLETS THAT WOULD NOT HIT OUR BOYS

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, I am astonished—more than that, I am ashamed—to hear some of my colleagues crying that the Cambodian operation was a failure, that it was not worthwhile.

Have they studied the list of enemy military supplies that our forces seized in those sanctuaries? Do they understand what the capture of these weapons and munitions means?

Let me cite just a few examples.

Our forces seized 14,762,167 machine-gun and rifle rounds. That means 14,762,167 bullets that cannot be fired at American men in South Vietnam.

We seized 199,552 antiaircraft rounds. That means 199,552 shots that will not be fired at U.S. aircraft.

We seized 68,539 mortar rounds, 45,283 rocket rounds, 29,185 recoilless rifle rounds, and 62,022 grenades. That adds up to more than 200,000 big blasts that cannot go slamming into U.S. installations in South Vietnam.

What I have listed is really only a part of the story. There is much, much more.

Can any of my colleagues really look an American serviceman or any member of that man's family straight in the eye and say that the capture of these munitions was not worthwhile? I say that no man who cares about the security of our fighting men can say that when he fully grasps the importance of what was achieved in Cambodia.

THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE U.S. ARMY—ESSAY BY CAPT. JOSEPH B. EZHAYA

HON. MARGARET CHASE SMITH

OF MAINE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mrs. SMITH of Maine. Mr. President, Capt. Joseph B. Ezhaya, judge advocate officer of Army Headquarters V Corps, a native of Waterville, Maine, and graduate of the University of Maine Law School, won the first prize in the "Future Role of the U.S. Army" best-essay contest, sponsored by the Berlin chapter of the Association of the U.S. Army.

Maine is proud of Captain Ezhaya in his achievement and I commend it to the attention of the Senators and insert it in the RECORD:

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

THE FUTURE ROLE OF THE U.S. ARMY

The United States Army's role in the future will not change. The role will continue to be, primarily, the protection of our country against all enemies, both foreign and domestic. No other American institution can better perform that mission of protection than the Army. In performing her mission the Army has proven to be an efficient and flexible tool in serving her country. The mutual trust between the Constitutional Leader of the Army, the President, and the armed forces has proven the underlying strength of our democratic institutions. It is safe to say never has an Army so powerful, been so loyal; never has an Army so professional, been so humble.

Yet our "troubled times" will find an additional role placed on the Army in the future. This role will be crucial to harmonizing the divergent forces presently in our society. These forces, now deprecating existing American institutions, must learn to function within the democratic system, more responsive to law and order. The Army has the means to harness the energies of these forces along the democratic path. The Army is an educator of men as well as a trainer of soldiers. When the civilian executive authority wants the American people to follow the example of their Army in preserving the integrity of democratic principles, the Army must show the American people that the Army is what the President of the United States will represent the Army to be. The Army must be prepared to show that cultural integration of the races is possible on a broad scale; the Army must be prepared to show the benefits and promise inherent in cultural integration between the races. Preparations for such a showing will be an integral part of the future role of the Army.

It is interesting to note that the Army has already begun to culturally integrate. Physical integration took place years before any other American institution, and its success is a foregone conclusion. But the level of cultural integration in the future will

have to go beyond the level of providing merchandise and facilities to encourage black cultural expression. There is a need for a channeled and inspired program of attitude broadening and spiritual influence that can inspire a breakdown of prejudice and a realization of the ideal democratic way of life.

The Army as a moral teacher is a dubious role for soldiers, but ironically never has such a moral lesson been required in order to preserve and protect the society the American Army is sworn to protect. Right now, a significant contribution to protect the society is to have a culturally integrated Army. Such an accomplishment to be achieved by the Army in the foreseeable future will be vital to the stability of our American institutions.

The authoritarian make-up of the Army, ironically, is what makes the Army the only American institution that can discipline prejudice at all levels. With that power or tool available to it, the Army can develop an atmosphere to broaden men's minds and attitudes. The negative approach is discipline; the positive approach is leadership.

The Army's contribution of leaders to the American Establishment is unbelievable. These men, now Army veterans, have known responsibility in the service of their country while in uniform, and subsequently these men take into their respective businesses, professions, universities and homes the attitudes and values cultivated in them while in the Army. Thus, if in the future there can be a thorough exposure of the men to cultural integration while in the Army, those millions of men, over the years, will contribute to cultural integration throughout America and her institutional structures.

Admittedly, to suggest that cultural integration of the races can be done on so broad a scale by the Army borders on the naive, because integration on such a scale is an heretofore unachieved ideal. Before looking at the benefits to the society that would come from being the first society to accomplish the impossible dream, let us look at the alternative to something less than total commitment to cultural integration of the races. Witness how the racial issues has disorganized every other institution in American society to some degree. Universities and schools have been hard hit; churches have not been immune, and some local governments are facing chronic crises. An America experiencing such torment is a fact. The Army does not have an easy time now, but the Army is far better organized and immune from wholesale threat.

Positively speaking how can the Army carry out its mission to achieve massive cultural integration of the races? The first step may have already been accomplished. The Commander-in-Chief and the Army seem totally committed to filling the need for cultural integration. It remains for the Army to call upon the best minds in America, both white and black, to focus on the problem of eliminating prejudice and broadening men's attitudes. The psychologist, the sociologist, the clergy and the white and black individuals involved, all have contributions to make. The Army has experience in broadening men's attitudes and channeling their energies. The Army that has trained pacification teams to win friends and influence people for foreign governments can train American soldiers to accept fellow American soldiers in brotherhood. A possible tool may be the one used by psychologists known as sensitivity training. This method has served to provide a mellowing of hostile groups. Further exposure to this training produces a change in attitude and understanding of problems that did not exist before. The group therapy of this nature can be further tailored to meet Army requirements for cultural integration.

The marriage of the computer and psychology in a new human behavior science known as cybernetics is a possible tool not available before. American ingenuity can produce the mechanism required to do the job. The defense establishment has provided the world with ingenious devices as a result of military needs. Could not the most significant contribution sponsored by military need be yet to be made in the field of human behavior?

There is much the Army has recognized that it can do with its present resources. The Army's exhortation to commanders at all levels to achieve more contact with the men in racial matters is a credit. The chain of command needs more support in this respect, however. NCO's who could be specialists at identifying racial problems and being able to solve them on an individual basis should be trained. Such training would be in addition to their regular duties, and could consist of such training as the sensitivity training mentioned earlier. Chaplains, special services officers trained in community organizing have contributions to make in this area when it is known it is expected of them.

The practical advantages of a culturally integrated Army is that men will live what they have been taught to believe, fighting for something they know is unique and valuable. Besides, no one likes racial unrest. The Army is an attractive profession for minority groups because of equal opportunity and de jure equal treatment. A positive cultural integration program is consistent with the aspirations of these minority group members who have devoted their adult lives to pursuing military careers.

In the last analysis, the Army's future role must always be the protection of the nation. Yet the political temper of these times has molded a unique future role for the Army. As a wise man once noted, the past is the window through which we see our future. That can be taken two ways in the context suggested here. One way is that the Army, now threatened by racial discord like every other institution, is paralyzed to act in a positive and creative manner. The other way that the epigram can be applied in this context is that the Army as the first institution to show the American society that physical integration can be done, can now be the first institution to show the American society that cultural integration of the races can be done, and in doing so the Army will have made a significant contribution to the protection of our country against her present ugliest enemy, racial prejudice.

MAINE'S LOSS, TEXAS' GAIN

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, an article contained in the Galveston Daily News came to my attention recently which concerns the thought-provoking words and impressive deeds of Capt. Albert R. Philbrick, a native of Auburn, Maine, who currently resides in Galveston with his wife and five children as the executive officer of the Texas Maritime Academy.

Captain Philbrick was a member of the Maine Maritime Academy staff between the years 1958 and 1967 and, during that time, distinguished himself by his work in the school's academic and developmental programs.

The Daily News article evinces that he is continuing his impressive work in his still relatively new position. I congratulate Captain Philbrick in behalf of his many friends in Maine, and I insert the News article in today's RECORD, in recognition of his accomplishments and continuing dedication to the merchant marine:

CAPT. ALBERT R. PHILBRICK

An extroverted Maine man who cancels out the conception of the dour, closed-mouth Down-Easter by his exuberance. Al Philbrick sees a strong future for the American maritime industry—and for the Texas Maritime Academy.

But it's going to take some image-changing.

"Right now, everybody's really knocking the industry and with this attitude, I hardly blame the people inland for not caring much about it."

Capt. A. R. Philbrick, a native of Auburn, Maine, now executive officer of the Texas Maritime Academy and master of the academy's training ship, the Texas Clipper, which left Saturday on its annual training cruise, is working on that image change.

And he considers he's getting some excellent help in the character of the TMA cadets as they meet the world on the cruise.

On another level, he is vice president for student ports of the Propeller Club of the United States. There are 18 of the student organizations in the country, primarily in schools of foreign commerce, mechanical engineering or naval architecture.

"One of the aims I have is to try and convince the national organization next year in Seattle to broaden the base of the requirements for student ports," he said.

"It should take in oceanography and the ocean sciences . . . this sort of thing.

But even under the present set-up, Philbrick feels the student ports—including the TMA club—are aiding the industry as well as giving the club members a chance to meet the people in the industry.

The membership of the student ports is around 3,000.

On the high school side, the national Propeller Club sponsors an annual essay contest on some phase of the merchant marine, with national winners receiving trips abroad on American ships. Capt. Philbrick noted that this year, Ball High School produced a winner, Joseph Castiglioni, who will make a trip to South America.

The long-standing problem of the maritime industry in making itself known to the interior of the nation is one the industry must solve itself, Philbrick said.

"There's going to have to be a concerted effort by this industry to pool its resources—its financial resources—to the point where it can saturate the United States with an overall, efficient program of selling.

"The Propellor Club is proposing this for next year—trying to raise funds for a publicity campaign for American merchant ships. It was kicked around over at Mobile at the National Board of Governors meeting in April."

The identity problem exists even in Maine, he said, recognized generally as a maritime state. "In the potato raising areas and the farming areas, they just don't care whether anyone goes to sea or not . . ."

Capt. Philbrick sees a need, too, for the industry to change its own attitudes:

"A lot of people for years have bemoaned the condition of the American merchant marine and I feel we don't have to. Why keep kicking it to death?

"Why not put our efforts behind it and try to build it? Why don't we turn it around and talk well of it and put our efforts together to build it?"

"If you consider the raw materials that this country must import even to exist, let alone our exporting the finished products,

shipping is essential—and it should be done on American bottoms, because we then control our own import costs.

"If some great power were ever able to saturate the shipping lanes with its own ships, it would control the rates, lowering them first to drive everybody out of business and then coming back and raising them when there's a monopoly."

Capt. Philbrick, born Feb. 6, 1930, graduated from high school at the age of 17 and entered the Maine Maritime Academy. He got his license and graduated at the age of 20 and went to sea with Farrell Lines.

"I sailed all the ports in West Africa for about 15 months and then went to South Africa. In September of 1951. I got my second mate's license."

He got his chief mate's license in December, 1952, after shipping with Farrell to Sweden, Ireland and Germany for a year.

He was called into the Navy in 1953, serving as operations officer and navigator on the USS Graffias, a refrigeration ship carrying out under-way replenishment to the Seventh Fleet off Korea and Formosa.

In August, 1953, he was married and he came ashore with the Navy in Berkeley, Calif. On discharge, he moved to Philadelphia.

"A friend of mine owned a uniform business and wanted me to go in with him, so I did. I invested a few dollars and lost it.

"The business is still operating, but without me. I just couldn't stay away—I had to get on the ships again. I called Farrell Lines one Monday morning, at 7:30 p.m. Tuesday, I was on my way to Africa.

He stayed with Farrell for a year and a half and then in 1958, went to the Maine academy to teach, where he stayed until he came to Texas in 1967.

"I've worked with these young men now since 1958 and it's very interesting work—more interesting on the ship, because most of the boys are rather inexperienced and some strange things happen.

"We were leaving Marseilles one time and when we took departure at the breakwater, we had hard left rudder on the ship. There were shoals about a mile ahead of us and two ships were coming at us.

"The command came to go back to midships and the rudder wouldn't answer.

"Some cadet had inadvertently pulled a pin in the steering engine room that connects the steering engine to the rudder. He didn't know what he was doing—when you secure in port, which he had done, you always pull that pin so nobody can fiddle around and break anything, so when we left, he was told to secure for sailing and he just secured it like when he came in.

"Needless to say, it was rather hectic."

The development of a man "from really a greenhorn into a finished product" is a point of pride with Philbrick—as are the calls from graduates who pull into port.

"These men always seem to drop back around the school, here and at Maine. In fact, many of the boys I taught at Maine sail with Lykes Brothers and I never know at what hour of the night or morning they'll give me a call when they get off a ship just to say hello. I don't mind it."

TMA is growing at a rate of 20 per cent per year, but is still the smallest of the state academies, Philbrick said.

Each of the five state academies has a different organization in the educational system. New York State Maritime College is part of the New York state university system, Massachusetts has recently come under the University of Massachusetts system, Maine is independent with no connection to the state university or university system and California also is independent.

"Frankly, from my own experience, I believe our particular arrangement with A&M is very valuable.

"And as we develop, I think A&M will find it advantageous to have kept us all this time. We're going to attract with a specialty like this, and if we ever develop courses in naval architecture and ocean engineering, we will broaden our base considerably."

The academy is now developing a new academic program, he said, one that would allow it to branch out into other areas and other majors.

It is the only maritime academy on the Gulf Coast and Philbrick doesn't expect another one to develop. Discussions were held in Florida several years ago, he said, and Puerto Rico is talking about it now, but that would be in the distant future.

A standard topic of conversation about academies concerns the graduates and whether they go to sea or go to work ashore, which critics see as a waste of their training.

The criticisms don't worry Philbrick.

"If we prepare the young men in such a manner that industry recruits them and the shipping companies cannot keep them at sea, then it appears to me we're doing a better job than we're supposed to do.

"All of ours at TMA have gone to sea for some time—or in the Navy—and then some have come ashore, but it's a free country and if a person is financing his way through school and if the shipping companies can't challenge them . . . I think I would follow that track to a shore job.

Philbrick added he felt a recent statement by Robert Blackwell, deputy maritime administrator, calling for more management training in the academies, was belated.

"This has been coming, although years ago they did not get management-type courses in academy curriculum. We've built several in here such as courses in economics and history.

"I think years ago the shore-based people in the industry came from colleges and universities such as Boston, Columbia, Wharton in Philadelphia and Georgetown, that had courses in management—but they had family connections and worked in this way.

"Today, these academy graduates are being taken off the ships at a relatively young age and brought ashore and the shipping companies have management training programs. They've found that the young men who've been to sea have vast knowledge of what is going on out there and that this knowledge helps them ashore and makes for smoother operation of the companies."

Capt. Philbrick, 186 students and 40 crew members left Saturday for the Texas Clipper's sixth training cruise, vital part of the TMA curriculum. The mechanics of planning this summer's cruise was a little more complicated than usual, with changes in the itinerary.

The cruise plans are made up in September of each year for the next summer to give TMA officials time to get out publicity and get diplomatic clearance through the state department.

The first change this year originated with a request from the American Embassy in Copenhagen, where the Clipper was scheduled to call, to change plans to go instead to Aalborg for a July 4 celebration.

"I'd never heard of Aalborg, but found out that this is the 58th anniversary of the Rebild-Jutland Society, founded by Danish-Americans back on the old sod. They purchased acreage in Rebild Park outside of Rebild and have quite a celebration. The Danish royal family attends and thousands of Americans.

"Last year, I believe there were 50,000 persons at the site.

"They asked us to participate. I don't really know what this means, except that I've met with the Danish consul in Houston and so far it looks pretty good."

To give a touch of Texas to the American flavor of the park, which boasts a replica of Lincoln's log cabin, the cadets will present a set of longhorn—and if that's too close to the traditional rivalry between A&M and the University of Texas. Aalborg is also where they will get their log for the Aggie bonfire, held each year before the Thanksgiving Day game.

"We've been assured by the Danish government they'll get us the biggest log they can find. The problem will be getting it from Galveston to College Station."

After that change we settled, another request came in—asking the seagoing Aggies to participate in the 350th anniversary of the sailing of the Mayflower in Plymouth, England.

The original plans had called for a stop in Southhampton, but the change was made.

In both places, Capt. Philbrick will be the emissary of Mayor Edward Schreiber of Galveston and Mayor Louie Welch of Houston.

And the TMA band will perform.

"Last year was the first year we've had a band on here. It had about 20 pieces and this year we'll have 25. They don't make the Block T yet, but they play the Aggie War Hymn real well . . ."

Texas Maritime Academy begins its move to the Mitchell Campus on Pelican Island next year with the berthing of the Texas Clipper at its new pier when she returns from the training cruise.

The move, Capt. Philbrick feels, will help the school, at least in its identity among Galvestonians.

"When we get our own campus and new building and when people know we're there, then it will start to develop and people will take more of an interest in it.

"Actually, we've had a lot of local people interested in the academy. I just don't think we're able to get out enough publicity on our own."

Philbrick, his wife and five daughters enjoy Galveston. He said, The daughters are in school at Island School. Weis Junior High and Ball High, giving him the usual commuter chores of a family man each morning, except during the summers at sea.

A CLEAR AND FULL DISCOURSE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, much has already been said about President Nixon's report on Cambodia—the success he reported, the policy he reaffirmed, the future course he outlined. Now I would like to make just one general point.

What impressed me most about the President's report was the fact that it was such a clear and full discourse on the whole subject.

He laid out the record of the past. He reviewed basic policy. He gave a complete picture of the background of his decision to send our forces into Cambodia. He outlined the options that were open to him. He described the military operations. He pointed the course for the future.

I cannot see how anyone—in the United States or elsewhere in the world—could read the President's report and be left in doubt about U.S. policy or U.S. intentions. I urge everyone who is reached by my words to read that report.

I must add that this full and clear elucidation of this most important area of operations and policy is characteristic of our President. For—whether one agrees with his policy or not—it must

be recognized that he is a master at explaining exactly what he intends to do, what he is doing and what he has done. I, for one, thank him and honor him for this candor, this precision, this service to the people.

WORTHAM AND RICE UNIVERSITY—A MERGER OF EXCELLENCE

HON. JACK BROOKS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Speaker, Gus Sessions Wortham is a great Texan and a great American. He is a man of vast business acumen—he is also a great humanitarian.

Houston, Tex., has benefited in many ways from the efforts of Gus Wortham. In his community and throughout Texas, his championing of worthwhile causes is renowned. However, all of America benefits from his favorite undertaking—service to Rice University and its students.

Over the last three decades of his life, this great American with his widespread business interests has reserved a major portion of his time, efforts, and talents to the service of this outstanding institution.

The 1970 spring edition of the Rice University Review recounts the story of the Rice-Wortham love affair. I include this article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

WORTHAM

Gus Sessions Wortham and Rice Institute were both born in 1891. To carry the coincidence still further, the man and the school started their lives' work in the same year: Rice opened to its inaugural freshman class in 1912. That year Wortham took his first close look at the insurance business which was to be his career.

The founding of Rice through its 1891 charter and the birth of Wortham on February 18 of that year in Mexia, Texas, would attain special significance for the man and the institution many years later.

For example:

"Without Wortham there would not be a Rice Stadium," says George R. Brown, former Chairman of the University's Board of Governors.

"Without Wortham, the Rice endowment would not have embarked upon its dynamic growth," says another prominent Houstonian.

Wortham himself shrugs it all off, "I became part of a team when I joined the Rice Board of Governors. We did things together."

Quick to give credit to others for achievements known to be his very own, Wortham tries to play down his personal contribution to the growth and development of Rice. Part of this reticence is probably due to his initial and, for him, decisive view of Rice.

And that view has been shaped largely by Wortham's first and enduring impression of Dr. Edgar Odell Lovett, the University's founding President.

"I am convinced," Wortham says slowly, deliberately, "that the Rice Institute finally opened by Dr. Lovett by far outstripped even the vision of Mr. Rice, the founder of the school."

Wortham arrived in Houston on January 1, 1915 to start with his father in the insurance business. The firm was known as John L. Wortham and Son. (It is still in business today under that name but there is no longer any financial connection with Wortham.)

Like most Houstonians of that day, he was very much aware of the new Rice Institute that had begun to flourish along the upper reaches of Main Street.

His first thoughts about the school never changed: "Dr. Lovett kept striving for the type of quality that would stand the test of national and international scrutiny. This had been clear to me even before I came to Houston, mostly through the history of the opening ceremonies at Rice. I was deeply moved by the reputation and the stature of scholars from all over the world who had come to Houston to attend the opening of the school. It was the scope of this 1912 Academic Festival that played an important part in shaping and setting the image of Rice."

In due course Wortham was among a select group of Houstonians to receive personal invitations from Dr. Lovett to come out to the campus for a variety of events and lectures. Required dress: sack suit. (Wortham today recalls that dress requirement with nostalgic chuckle.)

With three years at the University of Texas in Austin behind him, the Rice campus and its polyglot faculty held considerable attraction for Wortham. His faith in Rice grew apace with the community it was serving. And finally, when John L. Wortham and Son could afford to hire its very first employee the job went to a Rice graduate.

Wortham readily concedes that it took him several years to decide what he wanted to do. Early in his days at the University of Texas he felt, in turn, that he should become either an engineer or a lawyer.

To help him decide, his father suggested he spend a year on a ranch in West Texas. The son agreed that would be a good idea. Wortham had always liked the land. The year he spent on the West Texas ranch only deepened this affection.

It was also from his father that Wortham inherited an eye and judgment for politics: the elder Wortham had served, successively, as business manager for the Texas Prison System, Texas Secretary of State and member of the Railroad Commission. (Today a life-size oil portrait of his father faces Gus Wortham across his office on the 13th floor of the American General skyscraper on Allen Parkway.)

Because of this background, deepened still further by a pioneer Southern heritage, Wortham acquired an early and sustained affinity for politics although he has never sought public office. (His maternal grandfather, G. A. Sessions hailed from Alabama and was one of the pioneer settlers of Central Texas. He was a substantial land owner and planter—and served on the committee that drafted the Texas state constitution.)

"I've always been around politics," says Wortham. "As a matter of fact I like politics. I think it is important for business people to take an interest in politics and government and find out how it all works."

His only service as a state official in Austin—to be described below—was "purely educational and to learn all I could about the insurance business."

Basically, however, the elder Wortham was a businessman rather than a politician—and probably the most ideal father any boy or young man could ever wish to look up to.

"You did what he wanted you to do because of your deep affection for him," Wortham recalls. "He had a great ability to get you to do it without ever telling you outright. I can't recall that he ever actually told me to do anything—and that includes my year on that ranch in West Texas."

When Wortham emerged from that year he had decided on the insurance business as his field. His father had, in effect, given him time to "find himself."

In the light of his own experience, Wortham has always been patient with young people who were undecided regarding their careers. Some of them occasionally ask for his advice.

"I always tell these young people to decide on something they really want to do," he says. "If they feel they have made a mistake they should change careers quickly and get into something else—something they really do like."

Once Wortham had decided that the insurance business was to be his field, he embarked upon a thorough study of it. He joined the Texas Fire Rating Board in 1912 and remained with this state agency for more than two years, until 1915.

That year John L. Wortham and Son came into being. The father sold a business he had at the time in Lubbock and joined his son in Houston. The elder Wortham had been primarily interested in the land business, but now it was the son who began to influence the father. It was the son's idea to enter the insurance business—and the father was all for it.

"He was ready to do anything I wanted to do," says Wortham. "He wanted to do anything that would help me. He shared my enthusiasm for the insurance business. It suited him because he knew a lot of people and people liked him."

Thus, the father-son team was properly launched. Wortham vividly remembers the very first insurance policy he ever sold on behalf of John L. Wortham and Son. It covered the household furnishings of Judge John C. Williams, a longtime friend of the Wortham family.

"The premium on that policy was $12," Wortham says. "We made 15 percent of that which means that John L. Wortham and Son netted a total of $1.80 from my first sale."

The reaction of the elder Wortham to his son's first sale was gentle and restrained, "My goodness, son, I don't see how we're going to make a living at this business."

However, father and son prospered.

In 1917 Wortham enlisted in the Air Service of the U.S. Army which, in effect, was the Aviation Section of the Signal Corps. He went to France with his unit in the spring of 1918 after taking a course in aerial gunnery. On arrival in Europe he became an aerial gunnery instructor. He had been commissioned a second lieutenant before leaving the United States. He was made commanding officer of the 800th Aerial Squadron. When the war ended, Wortham noticed unspoken questions in the eyes of the men under his command: would a mere second lieutenant possess enough diplomatic skill to get them home with the speed and efficiency they all so ardently desired?

Their skepticism was somewhat justified. Most other units of their size were headed by experienced captains. On the other hand, Wortham was probably the only second lieutenant in command of any U.S. squadron at that or any other time. However, diplomatically mature beyond his military rank, Wortham sensed keenly that his ability was being seriously questioned by the men who depended upon him and his judgment. Far from resenting their attitude, he worked feverishly at expediting the unit's repatriation, earning the gratitude of all the men in the squadron.

On December 23, 1918, the official *Fly Paper* of the A.E.F. Air Service in France published Wortham's picture along with a brief sketch of his military career but ending on this promising note:

"In civil life he is associated with his father, John L. Wortham, in the insurance business and plans to return to it at the earliest possible moment."

And Wortham returned and rejoined his father in 1919.

He brought along sharp and succinct memories of various machine guns and what

one could do with them from those capricious early flying machines. Most of all, however, he brought along the respect of the men of his squadron, the men he had safely seen home despite their doubts.

It was after his return to Houston that Wortham's visits to the Rice campus became more frequent.

Across the distance of years, nothing is left of the occasional conversations between the young businessman and the founding President of Rice. Clearly, Dr. Lovett captured his respect beyond that due to an internationally known scholar and actual creator of a brand new university along one of America's more recent frontiers.

"Dr. Lovett's presence radiated a sense of dignity," says Wortham. "His mere presence always suggested the certainty that he was in full command of the situation. He never left anyone in doubt—despite great personal modesty—that he was running the Rice Institute."

By 1924 Wortham had become convinced that he and his father should start an insurance company of their own. They seriously discussed plans for such an undertaking, but the elder Wortham died in 1924, leaving the fulfillment of that dream to his son who founded the American Great Insurance Company in 1926. That year, Wortham married Lyndall Finley. They have two daughters and five grandchildren. Since 1926 American General has grown into a highly diversified concern which offers its clients a wide variety of financial and investment services. Wortham is Chairman of the Board of American General—the most important of his numerous corporate posts and directorships.

In 1934 Wortham started the first of two successive terms as President of the Houston Chamber of Commerce.

Wortham's success with American General did not escape the sharp eyes of Houston's civic leaders. They cautiously measured the man's potential as a driving force for the community's progress.

Among these leaders were George R. Brown and the late Harry Hanszen. Both realized that four senior members of the Rice Board of Governors were slated to retire. The four had to be replaced by men attuned to the postwar vision of an America, a Texas—and a Rice Institute—that had just emerged from the gravest conflict in the history of man.

The year was 1946.

The reorganization of the Board of Governors largely fell on Brown's shoulders.

Why did he think of Wortham?

"I knew his capabilities," Brown says. "I knew he would be a big asset to the Rice Board."

As head of American General, Wortham had handled the responsibilities of managing and expanding the portfolio of his own enterprise to secure growing returns for his shareholders and heightened security for his policyholders.

Could such a busy man be persuaded to put his talents to work for the Rice endowment?

There was only one way to find out.

Brown and Hanszen paid Wortham a visit at very short notice. Brown asked the totally unprepared Wortham to become a Rice Governor.

In Wortham's own mind, surprise at the invitation wrestled with the high honor he felt was being bestowed upon him.

"Everything happened very suddenly," Wortham recalls. "There weren't even any rumors around town that some Governors were retiring and were to be replaced. In retrospect I felt that the surprise element in the approach to me and the other new Governors simply had to be there. After all, Brown was looking for people with certain qualifications to serve Rice. If news of his search had leaked out, he might have been subjected to all sorts of pressures from people who felt they had equally qualified candidates for the Rice board. I think it was part of Brown's job to remain free from these pressures and select the men according to their qualifications."

And that's exactly what Brown did.

Even across a distance of almost a quarter of a century, Wortham still can savor that 1946 hour of honor and surprise at being invited to join the Rice Board of Governors.

"To be asked to become a Rice Governor was—and remains—one of the great honors to be bestowed in this community," he says.

However, there was another trait of Rice and its Board that made a deep impression on Wortham: "A new leadership was clearly reshaping the Board. Certain changes had to be made, but all of this was achieved with dignity and with abiding respect for the past. The retiring Governors never lost the admiration and respect of the new members. There was respect and appreciation of established tradition. To my mind, this attitude of respect has always been the hallmark of Rice and in my view the University has never lost it."

In this environment of mutual respect, Wortham carefully surveyed the state of the Rice endowment. On completion of his study he was convinced that fundamental changes were needed to align the management of Rice's endowment with the very philosophy that had paid such handsome dividends to the shareholders of American General. In its basics, this was quite simple.

"Inflation has always been a way of life," says Wortham. "Of course, there have been deflationary periods that have interrupted the over-all inflationary drives. However, deflationary periods don't last very long, historically speaking. When they end, the inflationary spiral resumes."

On reviewing the holdings of the Rice endowment, Wortham found that changes were needed from the dominance of fixed-income securities, such as bonds, and low yield mortgage. None of these, in Wortham's financial judgment, would stand the inflationary tests that he demanded from the portfolio at American General. He was determined not to do less for Rice, its students and its faculty than he had been doing for more than 20 years for the people who had invested their confidence, trust and money into shares and insurance policies of American General.

"It was quite clear to me from the outset that the endowment of Rice needed to expand toward more flexible securities, like common stocks—securities that could be expected to rise, hopefully, faster even than the spiral of inflation," says Worthham. "In general, it was essential to reduce Rice's holdings of fixed-income securities to a few government bonds and some high yield local mortgages. There actually had been some rather old mortgages at yields of only 3% and based on 20% to 25% of actual value of the mortgaged real estate. In this area, it is imperative that one understands the previous policies of the Board of Governors. These were very cautious men of the highest civic caliber who took the trust placed in them very seriously. And all of them recalled that there had been quite a number of foreclosures during the deepest days of the Great Depression. Obviously, none of them wanted to see Rice mortgages foreclosed at financial loss to the school. However, during the immediate postwar era attractive local mortgages became available and it was indeed possible to negotiate yields somewhat above the going rate. If the borrowers raised an eyebrow we were always able to tell them they were doing it for Rice and this usually reconciled them to the higher cost of their mortgages."

His position in the insurance industry allowed Wortham to spot attractive buying opportunities in the shares of certain insurance companies. George Brown, through his intimate knowledge of the gas pipeline world, assisted with growth-bound suggestions in that particular area.

"Harry Wiess of Humble, Harry Hanszen, an independent oilman and John Ivy, a highly-talented geologist, were also on the Board and had the interest of Rice at heart," says Wortham. "These men helped secure for Rice certain oil properties and a number of oil equities at very low prices. All of them helped meet the challenge of making the school's endowment more productive."

In the end, Worthman proved a logical and most rewarding choice as Chairman of the Rice Board's Finance Committee. He also served as Vice Chairman of the Board.

Rice and the world around it were growing rapidly in the aftermath of World War II. The need and logic of expanding faculty and student enrollment had been anticipated by President Lovett. The time, then, had come to put the life of reality into dreams.

One of these dreams came in a variety of hues that draped themselves around the aging stadium within easy sound of Main Street. Should it be enlarged, renovated, completely done over?

That dream, it turned out, was somewhat small for Rice. What the school needed was a brand-new football stadium—a facility to serve this one sport exclusively and to be the most modern installation of its type in the country.

Dreams have price tags.

The Rice Governors savored this particular dream. They liked it—but they couldn't think of a way to meet that price tag.

One day, late in 1949, George Brown and Wortham were discussing the stadium dream over lunch at the Houston Club.

Wasn't there any way at all the money could be raised to give Rice this unique facility?

Wortham, the man whose financial acumen had helped build one of the nation's best-run insurance and investment complexes, felt challenged.

"Why not sell seat options for such a new football stadium?" Wortham suggested across the luncheon table. "The town loves Rice and its team. We could sell 20-year options for say, $100 per seat, payable in advance. That option would give the purchaser the right to buy tickets for that same seat for the next 20 years. I think that would go a long way toward financing the new stadium . . ."

A wonderful idea—but would it work? Would there be enough people in Houston to pick up these options in exchange for hundred-dollar bills?

"We could not be sure," recalls George Brown. "But we were sitting amidst a large luncheon crowd and there was a quick and easy way to find out whether Wortham's idea would work. We simply turned around and asked several people at nearby tables whether they would buy seat options at that price, if offered. Each man we asked said he'd be happy to purchase an option as soon as it could be made available. You might say we took our own little opinion poll right there that day in the Houston Club. Wortham's idea had made the stadium feasible."

What if Wortham hadn't come through?

"That's very simple," muses Brown. "Without Wortham there would not be a Rice Stadium."

Since Wortham had produced the option idea, Brown and the other Rice Governors decided unanimously that he should also put the idea into reality and they made him Chairman of the Stadium Option Drive.

The rest, of course, is Rice history.

However, Wortham's success with the seat options had been preceded by his 1947 feat on behalf of the struggling Houston Symphony. At that time he had chosen to broaden the base of the orchestra's support as a logical means to give Houstonians a stake in one of their major cultural assets. Newspaper editorials commended his efforts and applauded his success. As the $100,000 sym-

phony campaign got under way, Wortham told an interviewer of his philosophy: "The Symphony could pay its own way—if tickets were scaled high enough. This would defeat the purpose of the Symphony Orchestra. It is not for the few but the many, and the higher you place the tickets, the more you cater to the few."

The man who only a year earlier had joined the Rice Board related his work for the symphony to children and young people in general through the campaign and in his conversation with his 1947 interviewer. He mentioned the orchestra's summer concerts in the parks at no cost to the public and staged for the enjoyment of the entire family. He was particularly anxious that "youngsters come along and get an early start in the appreciation of fine music, expertly played . . ."

When it was all over, Wortham—according to the Houston Chronicle—had succeeded in garnering 1,373 pledges in his 1947 drive for the symphony compared with less than 300 the previous year.

Young people, including Rice students, returned Wortham's untiring interest in their future.

In December, 1955, the *Thresher*, in its series of "Men Behind Rice," devoted an article to Wortham's business and civic career. It reported also on Wortham's view of Rice: "The importance of the humanities seems to be a pet subject with Mr. Wortham; he likes to see people in all fields of study become familiar with them. The faculty is of utmost importance to him as it is the means of attaining and maintaining his aim for Rice—continued better quality. . . ."

Wortham's success as a Rice Trustee and in other areas of high civic leadership and responsibility are no mystery to those who have known him long and well. A Houstonian who has worked with Wortham for decades and has watched him at close range sums it up like this: "It takes a convincing case to get Wortham interested in any civic or philanthropic endeavour. However, once he commits himself to a cause, an idea or—as in the case of Rice—a school, he goes all out. He wants to succeed not for his own sake but for the cause, the idea or the institution. During his years on the Rice Board, be it as Chairman of the Finance Committee, as Vice Chairman of the Board or as Chairman of the Seat Option Drive for the new stadium, he totally and without reservatoin identified himself with the school. In my book, that makes him one of the finest civic leaders in Texas."

Upon reaching 70 in 1961, Wortham became a Trustee Emeritus. On January 31, 1962, the Rice Board passed a resolution in appreciation of his service to the school "and for his contributions to the development of those ideals of scholarship and enterprise to which this University is dedicated."

On March 29, 1967, Wortham again was the subject of a resolution of appreciation by the Board. This time he had earned Rice's thanks for a significant personal gift of securities—and his recommendations to the Board to purchase for the University's portfolio certain stocks that brought "a capital gain in excess of one million dollars to the Endowment fund. . . ."

In the spring of 1970, H. Malcolm Lovett, Chairman of the Rice Board of Governors and son of the University's founding President, reviewed Wortham's contribution to the school in these terms:

"Not many institutions of higher learning in America today have among their recent guiding members and present friends and patrons individuals who were on hand at their beginning. Rice University is one of the more fortunate institutions in that respect. One of the more active members of that group has been Gus Sessions Wortham. He is among the unique few who recall the opening of Rice Institute, knew many of its original trustees and the legends of the plans and purposes of the Founder, and has followed and nurtured its development over the years. He knows that from its beginning Rice was intended to be, as he says 'A jewel among educational institutions whose sparkling lights should never dim or falter regardless of the variations in human experience'. He believes his words implicitly, and has done a lot to assure that our University will attain and maintain that eminence.

Serving as an active Trustee and Chairman of its Finance Committee for 15 years Gus Wortham helped chart the course of the modern Rice with a clear eye toward the goals originally set and an unfailing restraint against straying too far from those goals. He does indeed recall the 'sack suit' days of Rice and, lest our youth of today misconstrue that recollection of his, I hasten to say those words have no relation at all to Sad Sack. Rice University has not had sad sack days and this has been due in no small measure, to the wisdom, sound judgment and leadership of Gus Wortham as he participated with his associates on the Board in the handling of its affairs. Men and women of Rice Hall, and Will Forever Hail, Gus Wortham."

YOUTH LEADS POLAND INTO NEW ECONOMICS

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, sooner or later Eastern Europe must come to the realization that people cannot be insulated from knowledge of the world beyond their borders.

Recent reports from Poland indicate that it is tending more and more toward a market economy and trade with the West. Half of the population of Poland's 32 million has been born since World War II. These young people are a dynamic force for change. They want a share in what the world has to offer, and they are agitating for changes in the old order.

Mr. Speaker, I call to my colleagues' attention an article which appeared recently in Chicago Today that discusses the persistent attractiveness of the capitalist idea of supply and demand.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

YOUTH LEADS POLAND INTO NEW ECONOMICS

(By Clyde A. Farnsworth)

WARSAW.—As Poland moves toward closer relations with West Germany, the Poles, having recovered from the devastation left by World War II, are entering a new phase of economic development.

Forces are at work in Poland as in other countries of Eastern Europe, to shape a less cumbersome economic machine and to provide higher standards of living.

Poland wants long-term credits to buy West German technology, and she may well get them as relations with Chancellor Willy Brandt's Socialist-led government improve.

The economic changes have been only slight so far. They have not eased the frustrations of a people still being called on to make sacrifices a quarter of a century after the war.

Among the internal forces for modernization are the youthful masses, which feel the shortcomings of the leaden economic structure most acutely. More than half of the population of 32 million have been born since the war. Forty-eight per cent of the membership of the Communist party are age 40 or under.

From the industrial complexes and research institutes, young technocrats complain about production bottlenecks and suggest ways to eliminate them.

When a customer asks for a mousetrap in a hardware store, he is told none are left. In fact it is virtually impossible to buy a mousetrap in Warsaw. Tape records are hard to get too. There are no cars that a worker can afford to buy.

So far the planners have been unable to mesh the social system with a consumer society. There are reforms but no commitments to the disciplines of a market economy.

Altho the emphasis is on specialization and efficiency, the economy is still production-oriented. It is raw output that counts in meeting goals and collecting bonuses—not actual sales.

External pressures may force a speedier rate of change. East Germany, Hungary and Czechoslovakia have higher standards of industrial efficiency. A sign of pending reform may be found in Poland's tentative overtures toward Brandt and in intense bidding for West German technology and industrial credits.

While Poland appears to be building a more liberal society, the economic malaise runs deep, especially among workers. Plant absenteeism is high and is commented on almost daily in the press.

A common saying explains much about worker indifference: "Whether you work, or whether you don't, you're sure of your monthly pay."

Average pay is 2,500 zlotvs a month, a little over $60 at the official tourist rate of exchange. Most workers have outside income. Wives also work.

While the American worker may make $400 a month and save $100, the Polish worker, according to another adage, makes 2,500 zlotys a month and saves 5,000. Deposits in the savings banks are up 12 billion zlotys in less than a year, to 88 billion [over 2 billion dollars].

A woman shivers for half an hour in the taxi queue in front of a snowbank. The snow is cleared far more effectively than in New York, but there is a shortage of taxis.

There are more cars in Warsaw than in Rome, but it will be many years yet, a planning official said, before Polish workers can afford cars. Only the privileged can import a car.

Cars are evidently a sore subject, for a well-worn joke has been making the rounds here. An American worker is shown thru a Polish factory. Told that the plant and equipment belong to the workers, he asks who owns the one car out front.

That, he is informed, is the manager's. A Polish worker then visits an American factory. Told that the plant and equipment belong to the capitalists, he asks who owns the hundreds of cars in the parking lot. He is informed that they belong to the workers.

The joke may be apposite, but Polish officials contend that it is unfair to judge their country by American or even western European standards.

While not denying indifference on the part of workers, bottlenecks in production and shortages of consumer goods, the officials, in a series of interviews, recall that Poland was an economic ruin in 1945.

Six million people, including three million Jews, had been killed or were missing. Sixty-six per cent of the industrial establishment was destroyed or seriously damaged. Forty per cent of all buildings were leveled; in Warsaw the figure was 85 per cent. Thirty-eight per cent of the national wealth had been wiped out.

Huge strides have been made since the war, transforming this ravaged society into an industrial power, the officials report. Production has increased six and a half times from 1950 to 1968, rising at an average rate of 8 to 9 per cent a year, higher than in any western country except Japan. A predominantly agricultural economy has been transformed into a predominantly industrial economy.

In a first generation industrial society, the officials maintain, one cannot expect workers to adapt to plant conditions the way they do in the west. The lathe worker or shop girl was probably born on the farm.

The urban population has doubled to 16 million people since the war, putting strains on all resources.

Why should resources be used to build a small car when there is still a critical housing shortage? the officials ask, noting that resources must be allocated to meet social needs.

Jan Glowezyk, editor of Zycie Gospodarcze, the economic journal, puts the thinking in these terms:

"We have had to smash the old economic structure and replace it with a new one. There was a great earthquake. Millions of people moved from one place to another. This process continues. We have jumped from illiteracy to electronics. We manufacture light bulbs and television tubes at the same time.

"If we had to rely on the traditional market forces, this process would take a million years."

"Ask yourself what it means to create new branches of culture and industry, especially if you cannot rely on external sources of captial."

He termed it paradoxical that Western countries were "trying to take us into a market economy" without explaining that the market economy had long since disappeared in the west where "enormous economic power is wielded by the state, capitalist monopolies and conglomerates."

NOW IT IS TIME TO NEGOTIATE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's report on Cambodia was impressive for a number of reasons—for the success it reported, for its clarity and completeness, for its range and depth.

But the part of it that impressed me most was when he came to this sentence: "To the leaders of Hanoi, I say the time has come to negotiate."

Here was the turning point. The President had done precisely what he said he would do in Cambodia. The enemy had been struck a heavy blow—in loss of weapons, munitions, food, facilities, and manpower—and in loss of sanctuaries. The United States has no desire to go on and inflict further damage. Now is the time to negotiate.

The President's logic in leading up to that point is impeccable. His stress on negotiation is clear reaffirmation of the U.S. policy to seek a negotiated peace, not a military victory. He renewed all of our previous proposals for a political solution. Now it is time for North Vietnam to react to the President's initiative.

In President Nixon's words:

We would hope that Hanoi would ponder seriously its choice, considering both the promise of an honorable peace and the costs of continued war.

DO YOU REMEMBER?

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, as we approach the anniversary of our independence as a nation, I believe it is appropriate that we be reminded of what our flag stands for. Accordingly, I include the article which appeared in Eagles magazine of May 1970, entitled "Do you Remember?" It speaks for itself.

The article follows:

DO YOU REMEMBER?

Hello! Remember me? Some call me Old Glory, others call me Stars and Stripes. I have also been referred to as the Star Spangled Banner. But whatever they call me, I am your flag of the United States of America. There is something that has been bothering me, so I thought that I might talk it over with you.

I remember some time ago—I think it was a Memorial Day—people were lined up on both sides of the street to watch the parade. A high school band was behind me and naturally I was leading the parade. When your daddy saw me coming along waving in the breeze, he immediately removed his hat and placed it against his left shoulder so that his hand was directly over his heart.

And you—I remember you. Standing there as straight as a soldier, you didn't have any hat but you were giving the right salute. They taught you in school to place your hand over your heart. Remember little sister? Not to be outdone she was saluting same as you. I was very proud as I came down your street. There were some soldiers home on leave and they were standing at attention giving the military salute.

Now, I may sound as if I am a little conceited. Well, I am. I have a right to be. I represent the United States of America.

What has happened? I'm still the same old flag. Oh, I have a couple more stars added since you were a boy. A lot more stars added since the beginning of this country. A lot more blood has been shed since that Memorial Day so long ago.

But now I don't feel as proud as I used to feel. When I come down your street, some people just stand there with their hands in their pockets and give me a small glance and then look away. Then I see children running around and shouting. They don't seem to know who I am.

Is it a sin to be patriotic any more? Have some people forgotten what I stand for? Have they forgotten all the battlefields where men fought and died to keep this nation free? When you salute me you are actually saluting them.

Take a look at the Memorial Honor Rolls some time. Look at the names of those who never came back. Some of them were friends or relatives of yours. That's whom you are saluting. Not me.

Well, it won't be long until I'll be coming down your street again. So, when you see me, stand straight, place your hand over your heart and you'll really see me waving back—my salute to you. And then I'll know that you remember.

INTERIM REPORT ON THE BANKRUPTCY OF PENN CENTRAL

HON. WRIGHT PATMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, today the Banking and Currency Committee issued a preliminary report on data it has gathered on the involvement of the commercial banking industry in the bankruptcy of the Penn Central Transportation Co.

The interim report is just the beginning of a detailed investigation of this aspect of the collapse of this huge corporation. The committee will issue a fuller report later as the study progresses.

The material gathered to date indicates an extensive relationship between the commercial banking industry and the railroad. Mr. Speaker, I place in the RECORD a copy of this preliminary staff study and a memorandum transmitting it to members of the Banking and Currency Committee:

MEMORANDUM

To Members of the Banking and Currency Committee.

From Wright Patman, Chairman.

Subject Staff Report on Penn Central Bankruptcy.

Attached is a preliminary analysis of the data available on the involvement of the commercial banking industry in the operations and bankruptcy of the Penn Central Transportation Company. The questions raised in this document are extremely serious not only for the current Penn Central case, but for the entire U.S. economy.

As the staff report indicates, the investigation is just beginning and we are gathering a great deal of additional information from sources both inside and outside the Federal Government. Penn Central officials have been cooperative in furnishing information and they will be asked to produce additional data. Some background data is reproduced in the staff memorandum but other material obtained by the staff will be kept confidential until the Committee has a chance to meet and discuss the investigation in detail.

The Banking and Currency Committee, of course, was brought into the Penn Central issue by the Administration's desire to use the Defense Production Act as a vehicle to bail out the corporation and its creditors. The Administration's maneuvers and the bankruptcy which followed have left the Committee with a mass of unanswered questions concerning the involvement of the banking industry which comes under our immediate jurisdiction.

The role of the banks in the operation and bankruptcy of this $7 billion dollar corporation is massive. This fact is already established. There remain basic questions concerning the propriety of this involvement and whether or not the banks' role was within the bounds of banking laws and prudent banking practices. The case also raises basic questions as to whether there are adequate safeguards in existing banking laws and regulations and whether or not the Federal bank regulatory agencies have made any attempt to carry out their supervisory role in the case.

The operations of the Penn Central conglomerate and the heavy involvement of the banking community is strikingly similar to the tragic holding company scandals of the 1920's and early 1930's. The evidence that I

have seen to date and the talks I have had with Administration and Penn Central officials raise some of the most serious questions that have been presented in my 32 years on the Banking and Currency Committee. I am fearful that we have allowed similar situations to develop in other areas of the economy, and, if this is the case, this Committee has a duty to investigate this case thoroughly and to take whatever steps are necessary to protect the public, the corporate stockholders and the economy generally.

In this regard, I trust that we will have the full cooperation of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Federal Reserve Board and the Attorney General. This is a highly serious matter and it cannot be treated or regarded as a partisan issue. I am convinced that the Republicans as well as the Democrats on this Committee are deeply concerned and are determined that the Committee carry out its functions fully.

It is my intention to call the Committee together as early as possible to discuss the investigation in detail and to take other steps necessary to meet our responsibility in this area.

STAFF MEMORANDUM

Subject: The Involvement of Banks and other Financial Institutions in the Bankruptcy of the Penn Central Transportation Company.

On Monday, June 22, Chairman Wright Patman instructed the staff of the Banking and Currency Committee to begin a preliminary investigation into the involvement of commercial banks and other financial institutions in the operation of the Penn Central Transportation Company, its parent holding company, and its subsidiaries.

The investigation is now underway and this memorandum and the attached documents are intended as an interim report in keeping with the urgency of the issues involved.

Preliminary investigation reveals heavy involvement by banking institutions in nearly every one of Penn Central's operations. Every aspect of the issues involved in the collapse of the corporation appears to lead back to some banking institutions.

The staff is still making efforts to determine the full extent of bank involvement in the operations of the corporation. Three obvious areas of bank involvement are:

1. The control of huge blocks of stock in the corporation by the trust departments of large commercial banks.

2. Massive interlocks between the board of directors of the corporation and major commercial banks.

3. Extremely heavy lines of credit, involving everything from commercial paper to traditional bank loans, by major commercial banks, many of which maintain interlocking directorates with Penn Central and which control huge blocks of Penn Central's stock.

The staff has gathered its preliminary data from various sources both in and outside of the Federal Government. In addition to written documents, evidence has also been gathered through interviews with officials of the Penn Central Transportation Company, the Treasury Department officials, and financial and railroad experts.

Involvement of financial institutions with Penn Central

The Pennsylvania Railroad Company had no less than 17 interlocking directorships with major banking institutions in New York, Philadelphia and Pittsburgh at the time of a 1968 study conducted by the Domestic Finance Subcommittee of the House Banking and Currency Committee. These interlocks involved 16 different Pennsylvania Railroad board members on the boards of 8 different banks. At that time the Pennsylvania Railroad Company had 24 board members (Table 3). After the merger in 1968, banking interlocks remained high on the new Penn Central Company board.

As of April, 1970, the board had 14 interlocks involving 11 board members with 12 commercial banks on its 14-member board. The board of the Penn Central Transportation Company, which manages the railroad, had 19 interlocks involving 16 board members with 14 commercial banks on its 23-member board. (Table 3). Since the public disclosure of the financial difficulties of Penn Central, there has been much movement in the membership of the corporation's board of directors, apparently in the belated recognition of the highly questionable interlocks.

The Railroad Annual Report Form A ending December 31, 1968, filed with the Interstate Commerce Commission, reveals the powerful role and the degree of control exercised by commercial banks.

This report lists the 31 largest stockholders in the Penn Central Railway, also indicating who was entitled to vote that stock. This reveals that as of the end of 1968, 17 of the 31 largest stockholders were commercial banks, presumably holding the stock through their trust departments for the benefit of others. Together, these commercial banks held, with right to vote, 22.1 percent of all the common stock outstanding. Among the other leading stockholders were five brokerage houses and investment companies, and one foreign bank (Credit Suisse). Two of the 31 largest stockholders included a foundation and a profit sharing plan that might also have their investments managed by commercial banks. The 31 largest stockholders together held 31.8 percent. (Table 4).

The largst single holder of Penn Central stock as of December 31, 1968, was the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company with 849,275 shares. This represented 3.4 percent of the total number of shares outstanding. Morgan also had two directors on the board of Penn Central at that time. (Table 4).

Holders of Penn Central debt

Interstate Commerce Commission records also indicate that many of these same banking institutions had large debt holdings of various kinds in the Penn Central railroad. For example, Railroad Form A for 1969 indicates that the Morgan Guaranty Trust Company, in addition to its trust department stockholdings and its interlocking directorships, had, as of December 31, 1969, approximately $7 million in conditional sales agreements with the Penn Central, and held loans and notes of approximately $84 million. Similarly, Chemical Bank of New York had $19.5 million in conditional sales agreements, and First National City Bank of New York held a total of $386 million in Penn Central debt. First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Company, which had in early 1970 three interlocking directorships with the Penn Central Company, had at the end of 1969, according to ICC records, $18 million of conditional sales agreement debt with the Penn Central Railroad.

Girard Trust Company, which had one interlocking directorship with Penn Central in early 1970 had, at the end of 1969, more than $49 million worth of Penn Central conditional sales agreement debt. Bankers Trust Company of New York was in a similar position, having two interlocking directorships and $26 million of Penn Central debt. Provident National Bank of Philadelphia also had two interlocking directorships and $57 million in Penn Central debt. Other examples of similar relationships are shown in tables 4 and 6.

The staff is exploring means of determining as fully as possible the actual beneficial owners of the Penn Central's stock.

The staff is also obtaining additional information concerning the various debt instruments of Penn Central to determine fully who owned the debt at the time the corporation filed bankruptcy. The ICC has been requested to provide this data and has agreed to comply.

Copies of these letters to the ICC are appended.

Basic questions raised by preliminary data

1. What sort of stock trading did the trust departments of these banks do as the fortunes of the Penn Central declined and the Penn Central directors were made ever more aware of its precarious financial situation?

2. What sort of trading has transpired in the various debt instruments issued by Penn Central? There have been suggestions that some of the large commercial banks disposed of blocks of debt instruments in recent weeks. Was it to trust and pension funds which the banks manage? Was it to corporate treasuries with which the banks do substantial banking business? On what basis were these debt instruments brokered? Why did the banks get rid of these large amounts of paper? Were the banks using inside information through their directorships to protect themselevs at the expense of others to whom they owed a fiduciary responsibility?

3. How could a director of the railroad who was also an officer of a commercial bank honor his fiduciary responsibility to the stockholders of the Penn Central, and at the same time honor his fiduciary responsibility to the commercial bank managing large blocks of Penn Central stock for the benefit of beneficiaries while also honoring his fiduciary responsibility to the stockholders of commercial banks which had large lines of credit out to the Penn Central?

4. Records filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission as well as interviews with railroad and Treasury officials confirmed the fact that commercial banks, in order to protect the interest of their banks as lenders, insisted that valuable property owned by some of the non-railroad subsidiaries be used as the security for loans to the railroad company. Which interests were directors of Penn Central representing in negotiating such loan agreements when they were also connected with the banking institutions lending money to the railroad? What role did these directors play in the management of the Penn Central which led to its ultimate bankruptcy? Was it ever possible for these men to act objectively without violating their fiduciary responsibility to at least one of the several parties they were supposed to be representing?

5. There is some evidence that large sales of Penn Central stock were made in the last several months on the basis of insider information obtained by some officers and directors of the Penn Central. This, too, should be thoroughly investigated.

6. In addition, th~re was at least one member of the Penn Central board who, through his company, had a large stock investment in the Penn Central. This board member is an officer of a corporation controlling transportation competitors of the Penn Central. What role did he play in making policy decisions either favorably or adversely affecting railroad or his own company's interests?

7. A recent press story indicates that the University of Pennsylvania endowment fund sold 90,000 shares of Penn Central stock in late May on the advice of its investment committee chairman, Howard Butcher 3rd, a leading Philadelphia investment banker. Mr. Butcher served on the board of the Pennsylvania Railroad until 1968 when he left to avoid a possible conflict of interest.

The staff lists the foregoing questions as some of the basic areas where questions have occurred in the preliminary analysis of data. As the investigation continues, it is possible that additional questions will be raised and that the scope of the investigation will be broadened as a result of these new discoveries.

PROPOSED $200 MILLION LOAN GUARANTY UNDER SECTION 301 OF THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950

On June 19, the Defense Department formally announced that it was withdrawing plans of the Nixon Administration to guarantee a $200 million loan under the Defense Production Act of 1950. Until that time, the Committee had planned a full-scale investigation into the use of the Act for this purpose. Now that the Administration has withdrawn its plans, the question of the Defense Production Act becomes moot.

However, the negotiations involving the proposed Defense Production Act guarantee concern most of the major financial institutions which have been so intimately tied to the Penn Central Company. Some of the loan documents submitted to the Government in connection with the Defense Production Act guarantee are revealing and must be an integral part of a complete investigation of the involvement of the banks with Penn Central.

Through the cooperation of the Penn Central Transportation Company, the Committee has obtained important data concerning the proposed Defense Production Act guarantees. The Committee through its chairman, has requested a full accounting from the Defense Department and other officials in the executive branch. It appears that officials of various departments in the executive branch carried out long negotiations with the railroad and its creditors and are in possession of a great deal of information that has not yet been furnished the Congress.

These meetings between Administration officials and the 74 banks took place prior to any notification to the Congress. Appended is a list of these banks.

BACKGROUND ON THE ASSETS OF PENN CENTRAL

The various assets of the Penn Central Company are complex and obviously involve holdings in virtually every part of the nation. The following are excerpts drawn from a preliminary Securities and Exchange prospectus by the Pennsylvania Company, a subsidiary of the Penn Central Transportation Company dated May 12, 1970.

This prospectus reveals the following information about the Penn Central conglomerate.

The Penn Central Company (Penn Central)—the parent of the Penn Central holding company complex—controls the Penn Central Transportation Company (Railroad) as a wholly owned subsidiary, and the Pennsylvania Company (Pennco) has all of its common stock owned by the Penn Central Transportation Company (Railroad).

The assets of the Penn Central holding company complex in round numbers are as follows:

	Billion
Penn Central Co. (consolidated)	$7.0
Penn Central Transportation Co. (railroad)	4.6
Pennsylvania Co. (exclusive of railroad)	2.0

Most of the income earning assets of the Penn Central holding company are held in the "third-tier" Pennsylvania Company. This company is, in its own right, a diversified holding company. The prospectus indicates most significantly, that "all of the outstanding common stock of the Pennsylvania Company . . . is pledged to secure up to $300 million of loans to Railroad (Penn Central Transportation Company) by a group of banks under a Credit Agreement dated as of April 1, 1969 . . . Under the Credit Agreement, outstanding notes may be declared immediately due and payable . . ." in effect when any of the obligations of the Railroad or other companies to which the banks have made loans cannot be paid when due.

Therefore, even though the Penn Central Holding Company has substantial income earning assets, they would appear to be frozen by this Credit Agreement. This Agreement must also be analyzed by the staff.

The principal assets of the Pennsylvania Company include holdings in two real estate companies, the Arvida Corporation and Great Southwest Corporation; the Buckeye Pipe Line Company, and holdings in Norfolk and Western Railway Company and other railroads.

Arvida owns approximately 35,000 acres in Florida. Arvida's primary activity is that of land development, construction, and sale of condominium apartments, sales of land to developers and operation of the Boca Raton Hotel and Club.

The Great Southwest Corporation is also a land development company specializing in industrial, commercial, residential, and recreational properties, including amusement parks. Directly and indirectly, this corporation controls or has options on more than 325,000 acres of land in Los Angeles, San Francisco, San Diego, and the Lake Tahoe area in California; Dallas and Fort Worth, Texas; Atlanta, Georgia; and Hawaii. Recently, Great Southwest acquired the Nation's second largest individual manufacturer of mobile homes and another company which develops, builds, and operates multi-family dwellings in Texas and Nevada.

Great Southwest also owns the Macco Land Development Company, which owns a gigantic industrial park in Texas and a home manufacturing operation.

In addition, Great Southwest owns the I.C. Deal Company or Dallas, a multi-family home builder, and the Scientific Control Corporation, a computer hardware company.

The Buckeye Pipe Line Company, the 13th largest pipeline system in the United States and the 8th largest in terms of barrels of crude oil and refined products received into the system, operates a 7,000 mile pipeline system in Indiana, New York, Pennsylvania, Michigan, Ohio, Florida, Illinois, and Washington.

In May of 1970, negotiations were in progress between the Pennsylvania Transportation Company (Railroad) to sell to the Pennsylvania Company the Manor Real Estate Company, a land development company and coal mining company which operates in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, New Jersey, and Maryland; the Clearfield Bituminous Coal Corporation, with acreage in Pennsylvania, Ohio, and West Virginia; and the Despatch Shops, Inc., which is in the business of acquiring land and property which it leases to the Penn Central Transportation Company.

Despatch Shops, through its wholly owned subsidiary, Realty Hotels, Inc., operates the Barclay, Biltmore, Commodore, and Roosevelt Hotel, owned by the Penn Central Transportation Company in the Grand Central Terminal area of New York.

The Pennsylvania Company also owns approximately 23 percent of the Norfolk and Western Railroad Company, which must be divested under an ICC order by October 15, 1974.

Also, the Pennsylvania Company holds a substantial portion (35 percent) of Philadelphia, Baltimore, and Washington Railroad, which is operated by the Penn Central Transportation Company under a 999-year lease.

The above discussion concerns itself exclusively with the holdings of the Penn Central Company. In attempting to understand the entire Penn Central conglomerate complex, the fact should not be overlooked that the Penn Central Transportation Company (Railroad) controls directly or indirectly a fantastic number of companies.

These companies are of every type and variety and include:

More than 75 transportation companies primarily engaged in railroad, trucking, and pipeline activities.

More than 75 non-transportation companies, including real estate development companies, water companies, apartment houses, golf clubs, manufacturing companies, and an advertising company.

Part of the real estate holdings mentioned in the paragraph above which the Railroad Company owns in whole or in part include the Waldorf Astoria Hotel in New York, the Pan Am Building in New York, the Graybar Building in New York, and some 15 other Park Avenue and Lexington Avenue properties.

The foregoing information concerning the holdings of the Penn Central Transportation Company has been taken from the Railroad's filings to the ICC for 1969.

TABLE 1.—BASIC FINANCIAL STATISTICS OF PENN CENTRAL CO.

[In millions]

	Penn Central Co. (consolidated)	Penn Central Transportation Co. (railroad)	Penn Central Co. (exclusive of railroad)
Total assets	[1] 6.850	[1] 4.597	1.983
Revenues for year	[1] 2.253	[1] 1.789	464
Long-term debt:			
(a) Due within 1 year	[1] .228	[1] .106	
(b) Due after 1 year	[1][2] 2.412	[1][2] 1.586	
Total	[1] 2.640	[1] 1.692	952
Breakdown of long-term debt:			
(a) Mortgage bonds	1.174	636	
(b) Miscellaneous obligations	[3] 506	[3] 443	
(c) Equipment trusts and conditional sales agreements	673	560	
Breakdown of long-term debt:—Continued			
(d) Collateral trusts	125	53	
(e) Real estate loans	149		
(f) Various unsecured loans	13		
Total	2,640	1,692	
Current liabilities (short-term debt): notes payable	148	[3] 102	46
Interest and debt expense	137	97	40
Earnings (loss):			
(a) From ordinary operation	4.4	(56)	60.4
(b) Ext. loss	(126)	(126)	
Net	(122)	182	60.4

[1] In billions.
[2] Includes $100,000,000 of commercial paper notes and $50,000,000 of Eurodollar credits (Swiss francs).
[3] Includes $84,000,000 of commercial paper.

Sources: 1969 annual report of Penn Central; May 12, 1970 prospectus of Pennsylvania company filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission.

TABLE 3

Penn-Central Company board of directors with financial institution interlocks—As shown in May 12, 1970 Prospectus filed with Securities & Exchange Commission.

Stuart T. Saunders, Chairman of the Board, Chase Manhattan Bank and holding company; First National Exchange Bank of Virginia; Philadelphia Saving Fund Society; First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Company and holding co.

Paul A. Gorman, President, Bankers Trust Company and holding company.

David C. Bevan, Chairman of the Finance Committee, Provident National Bank, Philadelphia.

Louis W. Cabot, Chairman, Cabot Corporation, New England Merchants National Bank; Suffolk Franklin Savings Bank.

John T. Dorrance, Jr., Chairman of the Board, Campbell Soup Company, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company and holding company.

Otto N. Frenzel, Chairman of the Board, Merchants National Bank & Trust Company, Merchants National Bank and Trust Co., Indianapolis.

E. Clayton Gengras, Chairman of the Board, Security Insurance Group (no financial institution interlock listed).

Edward J. Hanley, Chairman of the Board, Allegheny Ludlum Steel Corporation (no financial institution interlock listed).

Franklin J. Lunding, Chairman of the Finance Committee, Jewel Companies, Inc. (no financial institution interlock listed).

Walter A. Marting, President, Hanna Mining Company, Bankers Trust Company and holding company, National City Bank, Cleveland.

Thomas L. Perkins, Counsel, Perkins, Daniels & McCormack, Morgan Guaranty Trust Company and holding company.

Alfred E. Perlman, Vice Chairman of the Board. Marine Midland Grace Trust Company.

R. Stewart Rauch, Jr., President, The Philadelphia Saving Fund Society, Philadelphia Saving Fund Society, Girard Trust Bank.

John M. Seabrook, Chairman of the Board and President, International Utilities Corporation, Provident National Bank.

In addition to the 14 directors making up the board of the Penn-Central Company, the Penn-Central Transportation Company has nine other members of its board. As of December, 1969 they are:

William L. Day, Chairman, First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Company, First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co. and holding company, Philadelphia Saving Fund Society.

R. Walter Graham, Jr., Management of Personal Investments, Baltimore, Md. (no financial institution interlock listed).

Gaylord P. Harnwell, President, University of Pennsylvania, First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Co. (Who's Who in America).

Fred M. Kirby, Chairman of the Board, Alleghany Corporation, Alleghany Corporation.

Seymour H. Knox, Chairman of the Board, Marine Midland Trust Co. of Western New York, Marine Midland Trust Co. and holding company.

Robert S. Odell, President, Allied Properties, Wells Fargo Bank.

R. George Rincliffe, Chairman of the Board, Philadelphia Electric Company, Philadelphia National Bank, Philadelphia Saving Fund Society.

Carlos J. Routh, Vice Chairman of the Board, Pittston Company (no financial institution interlock listed).

Daniel E. Taylor, Management of Personal Affairs, West Palm Beach, Fla. (no financial institution interlock listed).

TABLE 4.—FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS INTERLOCKING RELATIONSHIPS WITH PENN CENTRAL STOCK, DIRECTORSHIPS, AND DEBT

Name of financial institution holding stock [1] (1)	Number of shares held and voted [2] (2)	Percent of shares outstanding (3)	Director interlock [3] (4)	Debt held [4] (5)
Morgan Guaranty Trust Co., New York, N.Y. (4 nominees).	849,275	3.4	John T. Dorrance, Jr., Thomas L. Perkins.	$90,972,937
Chemical Bank New York Trust Co., New York, N.Y. (2 nominees).	721,119	3.0		19,531,303
Bank of New York, New York, N.Y.	522,632	2.2		
Bank of Delaware, Wilmington, Del.	500,000	2.1		
Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, New York, N.Y.	498,401	2.1		
Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co., New York, N.Y.	469,439	1.9		13,195,620
Chase Manhattan Bank, New York, N.Y.	436,669	1.8	Stuart T. Saunders	7,832,500
Northwestern National Bank, Minneapolis, Minn.	320,000	1.3		
Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust, Chicago, Ill.	305,600	1.2		78,748
Butcher & Sherrerd, Philadelphia, Pa.	301,072	1.2		
Helene Fuld Health Foundation, Trenton, N.J.	282,300	1.1		
Bache & Co., New York, N.Y	259,750	1.0		
State Street Bank & Trust Co., Boston, Mass.	225,350	.9		
Thrift Plan—Penn Central Co	211,172	0.8		
First National Bank, Minneapolis, Minn.	200,000	.8		
Alleghany Corp., New York, N.Y	196,195	.8	Fred M. Kirby	
Cyrus J. Lawrence & Sons, New York, N.Y.	186,898	.7		
Credit Suisse, New York, N.Y	184,176	.7		
Loeb, Rhoades & Co., New York, N.Y.	163,988	.7		
National Shawmut Bank, Boston, Mass.	141,100	.6		$2,385,000
Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis, New York, N.Y.	135,682	.6		
Irving Trust Co., New York, N.Y	134,499	.5		6,964,612
Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Co., Boston, Mass.	128,500	.5		
Pittsburgh National Bank, Pittsburgh, Pa	127,953	.5		
First National City Bank, New York, N.Y	125,802	.5		386,611,095
United States Trust Co., New York, N.Y	120,086	.5		
Brown Bros., Harriman Co., New York, N.Y	109,508	.4		

[1] The commercial banks held their shares of Penn Central stock through bank nominees. Below is a listing of the nominees and the banks controlling each:

Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.—Carson & Co.; Reing & Co.; Kelly & Co.; Genoy & Co. Chemical Bank—C. A. England & Co.; J. C. Orr & Co. Bank of New York—Lerche & Co. Bank of Delaware—Carothers & Clark. Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co.—Sigler & Co. Chase Manhattan Bank—Kane & Co. Northwestern National Bank—Perc & Co. Continental Illinois Bank & Trust Co.—Trude & Co. State Street Bank & Trust Co.—Harwood & Co. First National Bank, Minneapolis, Minn.—Var & Co. National Shawmut Bank, Boston, Mass.—Chetco. Irving Trust Co.—Pert & Co. Boston Safe Deposit & Trust Co.—Pratt & Co. Pittsburgh National Bank—Elm & Co. First National City Bank—King & Co. United States Trust Co.—Atwell & Co.

[2] Railway Annual Report Form A 1968, as of Dec. 31, 1968, p. 108.

[3] As of Dec. 31, 1969.

[4] As of Dec. 31, 1969.

109. VOTING POWERS AND ELECTIONS

1. State the par value of each share of stock: Common, $10 per share; first preferred, $—— per share; second preferred, $—— per share; debenture stock, $—— per share.

2. State whether or not each share of stock has the right to one vote; if not, give full particulars in a footnote Yes.

3. Are voting rights proportional to holdings? Yes If not, state in a footnote the relation between holdings and corresponding voting rights.

4. Are voting rights attached to any securities other than stock No If so, name in a footnote each security, other than stock, to which voting rights are attached (as of the close of the year), and state in detail the relation between holdings and corresponding voting rights, stating whether voting rights are actual or contingent, and if contingent showing the contingency.

5. Has any class or issue of securities any special privileges in the election of directors, trustees, or managers, or in the determination of corporate action by any method? No If so, describe fully in a footnote each such class or issue and give a succinct statement showing clearly the character and extent of such privileges.

6. Give the date of the latest closing of the stock book prior to the actual filing of this report, and state the purpose of such closing. Stock Book not closed.

7. State the total voting power of all security holders of the respondent at the date of such closing, if within one year of the date of such filing; if not, state as of the close of the year. 24,085,413 votes, as of December 31, 1968

8. State the total number of stockholders of record, as of the date shown in answer to inquiry No. 7. 118,756 stockholders.

9. Give the names of the thirty security holders of the respondent who, at the date of the latest closing of the stock book or compilation of list of stockholders of the respondents (if within 1 year prior to the actual filing of this report), had the highest voting powers in the respondent, showing for each his address, the number of votes which he would have had a right to cast on that date had a meeting then been in order, and the classification of the number of votes to which he was entitled, with respect to securities held by him, such securities being classified as common stock, second preferred stock, first preferred stock, and other securities, stating in a footnote the names of such other securities (if any). If any such holder held in trust, give (in a footnote) the particulars of the trust. In the case of voting trust agreements give, as supplemental information on page 202, the names and addresses of the thirty largest holders of the voting trust certificates and the amount of their individual holdings. *If the stock book was not closed or the list of stockholders compiled within such year, show such thirty security holders as of the close of the year.*

Line No.	Name of security holder	Address of security holder	Number of votes to which security holder was entitled	Number of votes, classified with respect to securities: Stocks: Common	Stocks: Preferred: Second	Stocks: Preferred: First	Other securities with voting power
	(a)	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)	(g)
	Alleghany Corp	New York, N.Y	196,195	196,195			
1	C. A. England & Co	do	558,743	558,743	2.3		
2	Lerche & Co	do	522,632	522,632	2.2		
3	Carothers & Clark	Wilmington, Del	500,000	500,000	2.1		
4	Merrill Lynch, Pierce, Fenner & Smith, Inc	New York, N.Y	498,401	498,401	2.1		
5	Sigler & Co	do	469,439	469,439	1.9		
6	Kane & Co	do	436,669	436,669	1.8		
7	Carson & Co	do	424,820	424,820	1.7		
8	Perc & Co	Minneapolis, Minn	320,000	320,000	1.3		
9	Trude & Co	Chicago, Ill	305,600	305,600	1.2		
10	Butcher & Sherrerd	Philadelphia, Pa	301,072	301,072	1.2		
11	Helene Fuld Health Foundation	Trenton, N.J	282,300	282,300	1.1		
12	Bache & Co	New York, N.Y	259,750	259,750	1.0		
13	Harwood & Co	Boston, Mass	225,350	225,350	.9		
14	Thrift Plan-Penn Central Co	Philadelphia, Pa	211,172	211,172	.8		
15	Var & Co	Minneapolis, Minn	200,000	200,000	.8		
16	Cyrus J. Lawrence & Sons	New York, N.Y	186,898	186,898	.7		
17	Credit Suisse	do	184,176	184,176	.7		
18	Reing & Co	do	182,600	182,600	.7		
19	Loeb, Rhoades & Co	do	163,988	163,988	.7		
20	J. C. Orr & Co	do	162,376	162,376	.7		
21	Chetco	Boston, Mass	141,100	141,100	.6		
22	Paine, Webber, Jackson & Curtis	New York, N.Y	135,682	135,682	.6		
23	Pert & Co	do	134,499	134,499	.5		
24	Pratt & Co	Boston, Mass	128,500	128,500	.5		
25	Elm & Co	Pittsburgh, Pa	127,953	127,953	.5		
26	King & Co	New York, N.Y	125,802	125,802	.5		
27	Kelly & Co	do	121,911	121,911	.5		
28	Atwell & Co	do	120,086	120,086	.5		
29	Genoy & Co	do	119,944	119,944	.5		
30	Brown Bros., Harriman & Co	do	109,508	109,508	.4		

10. State the total number of votes cast at the latest general meeting for the election of directors of the respondent, 18,083,861 votes cast.
11. Give the date of such meeting. May 7, 1968.
12. Give the place of such meeting. Philadelphia, Pa.

TABLE 5.—PENN-CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION CO. MAJOR HOLDERS OF OUTSTANDING DEBT AT DEC. 31, 1969

Name of holder of debt	Miscellaneous obligation	Conditional sale agreements	Current liability loans and notes payable
First National City Bank, New York, N.Y	$280,441,554	$106,169,541	
Fidelity Bank, Philadelphia, Pa		64,879,916	
Provident National Bank		57,074,895	
Girard Trust Bank		49,408,188	
Bankers Trust Co		26,063,106	
Mellon National Bank		25,865,944	
Chemical Bank		19,531,303	
First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust Co		18,004,766	
Central Pennsylvania National Bank	2,660,000	12,000,000	
Philadelphia National Bank		12,480,000	
Berliner Bank		10,000,000	
Chase Manhattan Bank		7,832,500	
Trenton Trust Co		7,329,982	
Morgan Guaranty Trust Co		6,992,957	$83,980,000
Irving Trust Co		6,964,612	
Northern Trust Co		5,700,000	
Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co		$5,695,620	$7,500,000
National Bank of Detroit	$1,097,393	4,614,530	
General Electric Co		2,118,664	
Cleveland Trust Co		1,814,740	5,000,000
General Motors Corp		1,613,386	
Central National Bank, Cleveland		1,581,654	
Second National Bank, New Haven	557,937	1,434,375	
Indiana National Bank	23,686	1,113,483	
Marine Midland Trust Co. of New York	557,937	525,714	
Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co		78,748	
Eurodollar Credit	50,000,000		
Commercial Paper Notes	100,000,000		
First National Bank of Chicago	1,877,872		
United Fruit Co	372,372		
National Shawmut Bank, Boston	2,385,000		
Manor Real Estate	1,960,173		

Source: Report Form A, submitted to the Interstate Commerce Commission.

TABLE 6.—INTERLOCKING RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN COMMERCIAL BANKS AND PENN-CENTRAL—DIRECTORSHIPS AND DEBT HELD AS OF DEC. 31, 1969.

Name of financial institution	Director interlock	Debt held
Bankers Trust Co. New York, N.Y	Paul Gorman, Walter A. Marting	$26,063,106
First Pennsylvania Banking and Trust Co., Philadelphia, Pa.	Stuart T. Saunders, Gaylord P. Harnwell, William L. Day.	18,004,766
Provident National Bank, Philadelphia Pa.	David C. Bevan, John M. Seabrook	57,074,895
Marine Midland Grace Trust Co. of West New York.	Alfred E. Perlman, Seymour H. Knox	$1,083,651
Girard Trust Bank, Philadelphia, Pa	R. Stewart Rauch, Jr	49,408,188
Phadelphia National Bank, Philadelphia, Pa.	R. George Rincliffe	12,480,000

DOCUMENTS RELATING TO LOAN GUARANTEE UNDER THE DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT

Attached are copies of the applications for a loan guarantee under the Defense Production Act filed by the First National City Bank on June 2 and June 17, 1970.

1. The first application is dated June 2, 1970, filed by First National City Bank on behalf of itself and 73 other banking institutions. The amount of this guarantee was publicly announced as $200 million. However, the attached loan application is for $225 million and the staff does not have information at this time to explain the discrepancy.

2. The application dated June 16, 1970, was for an interim loan of between $25 to $50 million, with a maturity date of June 29, 1970. This loan agreement was obviously made to alleviate any short-term capital problems until the full loan agreement was approved. The banks connected with this loan application were:

First National City Bank.

Chemical Bank.

Continental Illinois National Bank and Trust Company of Chicago.

Irving Trust Company.

Manufacturers Hanover Trust Company.

Mellon National Bank and Trust Company.

Morgan Guaranty Trust Company of New York.

The Chase Manhattan Bank (National Association).

The First National Bank of Chicago.

APPLICATION BY FINANCING INSTITUTION TO FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK, FISCAL AGENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR GUARANTEE OF LOAN, PURSUANT TO EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 10480 DATED AUG. 14, 1953

JUNE 2, 1970.

1. Financing Institution:

Name: First National City Bank, on behalf of itself and other banking institutions.*

Location: 399 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10022.

2. Applicant for loan:

*No commitment for loans has been authorized by First National City Bank or any other Participant. However, a group of Participants is in the process of being formed.

Name: Penn Central Transportation Company.

Location: 1344 Transportation Center, 6 Penn Center Plaza, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104.

Business: Rail transportation—see also 1969 Report to Stockholders of parent company, Penn Central Company, Attachment IV to Rider B hereto.

3. Amount of loan applied for: $225,000,000. Revolving Credit, and term loan deemed sufficient on basis of present forecast for balance of 1970; as to 1971 see Attachment II to Rider B hereto.

4. Percentage of loan to be guaranteed: 100%.

5. (a) Rate of interest to be charged borrower: Prime rate of Financing Institution (presently 8% per annum) as the same shall be from time to time during the term of the loan.

(b) Basis on which interest will be computed: 365 days.

(c) Rate of commitment fee, if any: ½ of 1% per annum on unused balance. For schedule of anticipated drawdown of funds, see Rider B hereto.

(d) Maturity date of proposed loan: December 31, 1976.

(e) Other terms and conditions of loan: Funds may be used only for purposes set forth in Rider B hereto. Loan to be evidenced by Credit Agreement, without notes, which Agreement will include financial and other covenants as well as other terms, all to be agreed upon by the Financing Institution, the Participants, the Applicant and the Guarantor.

6. (a) Description of collateral: Accounts Receivable and Unbilled Revenues.

(b) Personal or corporate guarantors, if any: None.

7. Defense products or services to be supplied by applicant for loan: See Rider A furnished by applicant.

8. Purposes for which funds will be used: See Rider B furnished by applicant.

NOTE.—No commitment for loans has been authorized by First National City Bank or any other Participant. However, a group of Participants is in the process of being formed.

9. (a) Please supply the following information with respect to every prime contract held by the borrower, whether to be financed by the V loan, or not. (It is important that all of the following details be furnished.)

(1) Unit of Government with which the prime contract is held: Inapplicable.

(b) Please supply the following information with respect to every subcontract held by the borrower, whether to be financed by the V loan, or not. (It is important that all of the following details be furnished.)

(1) Name and address of concern issuing subcontract and signatory: Inapplicable.

10. General statement by financing institution with respect to the ability of the applicant for the loan to perform the above contracts; the general character, reputation, and capability of the applicant; normal type and volume of production; and any other information which the financing institution would ordinarily take into account in considering a loan to the applicant, including a brief summary of its experience with the applicant's account.

As indicated in Rider A to this Application, the Applicant is faced with immediate cash needs which cannot be met without loans. Provided it can obtain the financing as set forth in Attachment I to Rider B hereto, Applicant will be able to sustain operations pending the completion of longer range financial and business plans. Such plans, if effectively implemented, should enable Applicant to provide adequate transportation service, as it and its predecessor companies have done in the past. Until recently the Financing Institution's experience with the Applicant's account has been satisfactory. In view of the facts discussed in the Attachments referred to, the Financing Institution, after consultation with proposed Participants, believes it is impossible to provide the Applicant with its needed funds without Government Guarantee.

11. Statement of the current amount of salary and all other remuneration being paid to each officer or partner, or to the proprietor, of the applicant for the loan, and to each key employee receiving comparable compensation and similar data for each of the last three fiscal years.

See Form A Reports to Interstate Commerce Commission annexed hereto as Attachment V to Rider B hereto.

12. Number of employees of applicant for the loan: 95,595, as of May 15, 1970 (Information furnished by Applicant).

13. Number of employees of affiliated concerns under common ownership or control: Approximately 20,000 additional employees (Information furnished by Applicant).

14. List of all corporate affiliates of the applicant for the loan, including their names and the financial interests of the applicant for the loan in each of them or of any of them in such applicant.

See Rider C furnished by Applicant.

15. Statement of ownership of the applicant and if a subsidiary of another company, the ownership of the latter. (Attach separate schedule, if necessary.)

All stock of Applicant is owned by Penn Central Company, a publicly-owned corporation with over 100,000 shareholders.

16. If a substantial portion of the capital stock of the applicant for the loan or of the financing institution is controlled by the other, or a substantial portion of the stock of both is controlled by some interests, or if there are any officers or directors common to both, a brief description of each such relationship. (Attach separate schedule.) None.

17. The applicant for the loan herein referred to has been advised that financing institution is applying for this guarantee in the amount and subject to the terms herein indicated.

(Two copies each of the following financial statements of the applicant for the loan should accompany this application: (a) balance sheet and profit and loss statement for the last fiscal year prepared and certified by an independent public accountant (including his comments, if any), and similar financial data for the two previous years: (b) latest available interim balance sheet and profit and loss statement of the current fiscal year. If audit reports are not available, then corresponding statements should be submitted, certified by an authorized officer, partner, or the proprietor, of the loan applicant as truly and fully setting forth the financial condition and operating results of such applicant. Two copies each of recent financial statement of each guarantor (if any) should also be submitted. In addition, this application should be accompanied by three copies of a cash forecast.) See Attachments to Rider B hereto.)

FIRST CITY NATIONAL BANK,
PATRICK F. BOWDITCH,
Vice President.

FEDERAL RESERVE BANK
OF NEW YORK,
New York, N.Y., June 17, 1970.

Attention Mr. E. Ralph Massey
Chief, Discount Operations Section.
BOARD OF GOVERNORS OF THE FEDERAL RESERVE SYSTEM,
Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: We enclose two copies of an application dated June 16, 1970 for the issuance to First National City Bank, New York, New York, on behalf of itself and a group of participating banks in process of being formed, of a V-Loan Guarantee Agreement pursuant to Regulation V, to cover 100% of a revolving credit that would provide, under certain conditions, for advances up to an aggregate amount of $50 million to be made available to Penn Central Transportation Company, Philadelphia Pennsylvania. Advances under this proposed interim credit would be payable on demand but not earlier than June 29, 1970.

Very truly yours,

H. H. REUSS,
Manager, Credit and Discount Department.

APPLICATION BY FINANCING INSTITUTION TO FEDERAL RESERVE BANK OF NEW YORK, FISCAL AGENT OF THE UNITED STATES FOR GUARANTEE OF LOAN, PURSUANT TO EXECUTIVE ORDER NO. 10480 DATED AUG. 14, 1953

JUNE 16, 1970.

1. Financing Institution:

Name First National City Bank, on behalf of itself and other banking institutions.*

Location 399 Park Avenue, New York, New York 10022

2. Applicant for loan:

Name Penn Central Transportation Company 1344 Transportation Center, 6 Penn Center Plaza

Location Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Business Rail transportation—see also 1969 Report to Stockholders of parent company, Penn Central Company, Attachment IV to Rider B to Application by Financing Institution dated June 2, 1970 ("Prior Application")

3. Amount of loan applied for: $25 to 50 million ☒ Revolving Credit

4. Percentage of loan to be guaranteed: 100%.

5. (a) Rate of interest to be charged borrower: Prime rate of Financing Institution (presently 8% per annum) as the same shall change from time to time during the term of the loan.

(b) Basis on which interest will be computed: ☐ 360 days ☒ 365 days

(c) Rate of commitment fee, if any: ½ of 1% per annum on unused balance.

(d) Maturity date of proposed loan: upon demand, but not earlier than June 29, 1970.

(e) Other terms and conditions of loan: Loan to be evidenced by Loan Agreement, without notes, which Agreement will include financial as well as other terms, all to be agreed upon by the Financing Institution, the Participants, the Applicant and the Guarantor.

6. (a) Description of collateral: Stocks of certain affiliated companies with an aggregate net worth allocable to Borrower of $87,100,000.

(b) Personal or corporate guarantors, if any: None.

7. Defense products or services to be supplied by applicant for loan: See Rider A to Prior Application furnished by Applicant.

8. Purposes for which funds will be used: See Rider B to Prior Application furnished by Applicant.

See response to Item 10 of Prior Application.

11. Statement of the current amount of salary and all other remuneration being paid to each officer or partner, or to the proprietor, of the applicant for the loan, and to each key employee receiving comparable compensation and similar data for each of the last three fiscal years.

See Form A Reports to Interstate Commerce Commission annexed as Attachment V to Rider B to Prior Application.

12. Number of employees of applicant for the loan:

95,595, as of May 15, 1970 (Information furnished by Applicant).

---

* No commitment for loans has been authorized by First National City Bank or any other Participant. However, a group of Participants is in the process of being formed.

13. Number of employees of affiliated concerns under common ownership or control:

Approximately 20,000 additional employees (Information furnished by Applicant).

14. List of all corporate affiliates of the applicant for the loan, including their names and the financial interests of the applicant for the loan in each of them or of any of them in such applicant.

See Rider C to Prior Application furnished by Applicant.

15. Statement of ownership of the applicant and if a subsidiary of another company, the ownership of the latter. (Attached separate schedule, if necessary.)

All stock of Applicant is owned by Penn Central Company, a publicly-owned corporation with over 100,000 shareholders.

16. If a substantial portion of the capital stock of the applicant for the loan or of the financing institution is controlled by the other, or a substantial portion of the stock of both is controlled by the same interests, or if there are any officers or directors common to both, a brief description of each such relationship. (Attach separate schedule.)

None.

17. The applicant for the loan herein referred to has been advised that financing institution is applying for this guarantee in the amount and subject to the terms herein indicated.

(Two copies each of the following financial statements of the applicant for the loan should accompany this application: (a) balance sheet and profit and loss statement for the last fiscal year prepared and certified by an independent public accountant (including his comments, if any), and similar financial data for the two previous years; (b) latest available interim balance sheet and profit and loss statement of the current fiscal year. If audit reports are not available, then corresponding statements should be submitted, certified by an authorized officer, partner, or the proprietor of the loan applicant as truly and fully setting forth the financial condition and operating results of such applicant. Two copies each of recent financial statement of each guarantor (if any) should also be submitted. In addition, this application should be accompanied by three copies of a cash forecast.) See Attachments to Rider B to Prior Application.)

FIRST NATIONAL CITY BANK,
By PATRICK F. BOWDITCH,
Vice President.

LIST OF 74 BANKS THAT WERE INVOLVED IN PROPOSED $200 MILLION DPA GUARANTY

INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY PENN CENTRAL TRANSPORTATION COMPANY OFFICIALS

Banks

First National City Bank—N.Y.
Morgan Guaranty Trust Co.—N.Y.
Mellon National Bank—Pittsburgh, Pa.
Chase Manhattan Bank—N.Y.
Marine-Midland of Western New York—Buffalo, N.Y.
Irving Trust Co.—N.Y.
Manufacturers Hanover Trust Co.—N.Y.
Bankers Trust Co.—N.Y.
Chemical Bank—N.Y.
Continental Illinois National Bank & Trust Co. of Chicago—Chicago, Ill.
The First National Bank of Chicago—Chicago, Ill.
United California Bank—Los Angeles, Calif.
Crocker-Citizens National Bank—San Francisco, Calif.
Bank of America—San Francisco, Calif.
First National State Bank of N.J.—Newark, N.J.
Franklin National Bank—N.Y.
Maryland National Bank—Baltimore, Md.
National Bank of Detroit—Detroit, Mich.
The Northern Trust Co.—Chicago, Ill.
Industrial National Bank of Rhode Island—Providence, R.I.
National Newark & Essex Bank—Newark, N.J.
Old Kent Bank & Trust Co.—Grand Rapids, Mich.
The Connecticut Bank & Trust Co.—Hartford, Conn.
Republic National Bank of Dallas—Dallas, Texas
The National Shawmut Bank—Boston, Mass.
American Fletcher National Bank & Trust Co.—Indianapolis, Ind.
American Security & Trust Co.—Washington, D.C.
Bank of Montreal—New York Agency
First National Bank in St. Louis, St. Louis, Mo.
First Wisconsin National Bank—Milwaukee, Wisc.
Hartford National Bank & Trust Co.—Hartford, Conn.
Industrial Valley Bank & Trust Co.—Philadelphia, Pa.
Mercantile Trust Co., N.A.—St. Louis, Mo.
Rhode Island Hospital Trust Co.—Providence, R.I.
State Bank of Albany—Albany, N.Y.
Western Pennsylvania National Bank—Pittsburgh, Pa.
The Connecticut National Bank—Bridgeport, Conn.
The Union National Bank of Pittsburgh—Pittsburgh, Pa.
Mercantile Safe Deposit Trust Co.—Baltimore, Md.
Union Trust Co.—Stamford, Conn.
The Indiana National Bank—Indianapolis, Ind.
American Bank & Trust Co. of Pa.—Reading, Pa.
Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce—N.Y.
Central National Bank—Cleveland, Ohio
Citizens Fidelity Bank & Trust Co.—Louisville, Ky.
City National Bank of Detroit—Detroit, Mich.
First & Merchants National Bank—Richmond, Va.
First Jersey National Bank—Jersey City, N.J.
First National Bank of Akron—Akron, Ohio
The National Bank of Washington—Washington, D.C.
The Ohio National Bank—Columbus, Ohio.
The Toledo Trust Co.—Toledo, Ohio.
Harris Trust—Chicago, Ill.
The First National Bank of Cinn.—Cincinnati, Ohio.
Cleveland Trust Co.—Cleveland, Ohio.
The Huntington National Bank—Columbus, Ohio.
National City Bank—Cleveland, Ohio.
Winters National Bank & Trust Co.—Dayton, Ohio.
National Central Bank—Harrisburg, Pa.
Brown Bros. Harriman & Co.—Philadelphia, Pa.
First National Bank of Miami—Miami, Fla.
Lincoln National Bank & Trust Co.—Ft. Wayne, Ind.
South Jersey National Bank—Camden, N.J.
Fidelity Union Trust Co.—Newark, N.J.
Manufacturers & Traders Trust Co.—Buffalo, N.Y.
Lincoln Rochester Trust Co.—Rochester, N.Y.
The Central Trust Co.—Cincinnati, Ohio.
First National Bank of Maryland—Baltimore, Md.
Central Penn National Bank—Philadelphia, Pa.
Pittsburgh National Bank—Pittsburgh, Pa.
Marine Midland Grace Trust Co. of New York—N.Y.
Girard Trust—Philadelphia, Pa.
Fidelity Trust—Philadelphia, Pa.
National Boulevard—Chicago, Ill.

JUNE 19, 1970.

Hon. GEORGE M. STAFFORD,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: This is to request from the Interstate Commerce Commission certain information concerning the Penn-Central Transportation Company for use in preparation for a hearing to be held by the House Banking and Currency Committee next week.

Please supply me with a list of holders of record and amounts of mortgage bonds, collateral trust and equipment trust certificates as of December 31, 1969; commercial paper holders as of the latest possible date in 1970; and all debt transactions subsequent to January 1, 1970.

Your cooperation in furnishing this information as soon as possible will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

JUNE 22, 1970.

Hon. GEORGE M. STAFFORD,
Chairman, Interstate Commerce Commission, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CHAIRMAN STAFFORD: This is to request that the Interstate Commerce Commission obtain certain information concerning the Penn Central Transportation Company.

Please supply me with a list of all holders of record and amounts of all debt obligations of the subject company outstanding at June 22, 1970. The listing should include all holders of (1) bank loans, (2) mortgage bonds, (3) collateral trusts, (4) equipment trust certificates, (5) conditional sales agreements, (6) short-term loans and notes, (7) commercial paper, and (7) miscellaneous obligations.

Your cooperation in furnishing this information as soon as possible will be very much appreciated.

Sincerely yours,
WRIGHT PATMAN,
Chairman.

EDUCATOR GIVES SAGE ADVICE TO CLEAR CREEK HIGH GRADUATES

HON. BOB CASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. CASEY. Mr. Speaker, a friend recently sent me the press report of the speech given by Dr. Lloyd R. Ferguson, superintendent of the Clear Creek Schools, to his high school graduates.

Because I believe the wisdom of his message deserves the attention of my colleagues, and the American people, I include it in the RECORD:

GRADUATES TOLD LOOK TO ELDERS

CLEAR LAKE.—Dr. Lloyd R. Ferguson, Superintendent of the Clear Creek Schools, delivered the following message to the 1970 Clear Creek High School graduating class.

"Young ladies and gentlemen of the graduating class, lift your eyes to the group in front of you and you will see representatives of some of the most remarkable people ever to inhabit the earth, namely, your parents and grand-parents, the two generations immediately preceding your own.

"For these are the people who, within five or six decades, have increased life expectancy by a third, have more than doubled per capita output. These are the people who, building thousands of high schools and colleges, at a

cost of billions, have made higher education, once a privilege of the fortunate few, now available to many millions.

"These are the people who established the United Nations, who defeated Hitler, contained Stalin and made Krushchev back down. These are the people who, after spending billions in prosecuting the war, gave billions more not only to their friends, but even to their former enemies so that the world would not plunge into a devastating depression.

"These are the people who soared outward into interplanetary space and downward into the atom, releasing for man's use, for the good of all, the prime energy of the universe.

"And while doing all this, they produced a great literature and an exciting architecture; indeed, they stimulated extraordinary experimentation and creativity in all the arts.

"I welcome you into this world, into the world of mature, responsible men and women, the world in which, in less time than you imagine, you will be making the shaping decisions, though I must warn you that certain brats now in the first grade, then will blame you for all the mistakes we have made, for all the mistakes indeed, that anyone has made since the old Stone Age.

"As full contributing members of society, each of you will have your share, but only your share, in shaping its future course. And you will exert this influence not by obstructing traffic and screaming, but by working.

"There is much to be done, much to be corrected, much to be carried forward, in the words of your song, there is a place for you, in the world of work into which you're stepping. May your step, too, like Armstrong's be a giant step for the good of all mankind."

"TRAIL OF TEARS" DRAMA BEGINS SECOND SEASON

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, last Friday evening the second season of an outdoor drama, "The Trail of Tears," opened in Tahlequah, Okla., to well-earned applause and critical acclaim.

"The Trail of Tears" played to 25,000 people last summer, and all indications are that many, many more than that will have the good fortune to see this musical drama this season.

The drama is a production of the Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma. It is performed in a beautiful amphitheater at Tsa-La-Gi, an authentic reproduction of a Cherokee village.

"The Trail of Tears" tells the tragic story of the removal of this great Indian tribe from the Southeastern States to Arkansas and then to Oklahoma in the 1830's, the story of the tribe's tragic involvement in the Civil War and later redevelopment into a strong people in Oklahoma, and the Cherokees' hopes for the future.

In a review of the opening night performance, John Denton of the Daily Oklahoman calls the production a "dramatic tour-de-force" and states that "no other outdoor drama in America does what the 'Trail of Tears' does so well." I strongly support Mr. Denton's assessment.

It is my urgent hope that many Americans who are driving across the United States this summer will make plans to go to Tahlequah, Okla., and see this forceful dramatic presentation of one of this Nation's most shameful periods, the years of forced removal of the eastern Indians.

Those who do also will see a living illustration of the work one great Indian tribe is doing for its people. In addition to Tsa-La-Gi and its amphitheater and Cherokee village, the Cherokees have an excellent restaurant and a fast-growing industrial park. The entire development has been brought about, under enlightened Cherokee leadership, to provide job opportunities for Cherokee people, and it works.

Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma is proud of the achievements of its great Indian tribes. I hope many visitors see this fine example at Tsa-La-Gi.

RADICAL PRELUDE TO KENT STATE TRAGEDY

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the June 15 issue of the Canton Repository carried an informative column by the nationally syndicated writer, Victor Riesel, concerning the tragedy at Kent State. In contrast to some segment of the press, Mr. Riesel took the time and trouble to review the recent happenings at KSU prior to the fatal shootings. In his research he found that the House Internal Security Committee had held hearings on SDS involvement at KSU in 1969 and that this campus had been far from a sleepy, serene institution, free from radical involvement in the recent past as some members of the press had reported. Some of the material appearing in the June 15 Riesel column was gleaned from the committee's hearings and has been available to members of the press for a number of months. Perhaps this explains Mr. Riesel's high standing in the journalistic world compared to some other members of that profession.

I include at this point the above-mentioned column by Victor Riesel which appeared in the June 15 issue of the Canton Repository, Canton, Ohio.

ROBBINS, NOW DEAD, DREW BLUEPRINT FOR "REBELLION"—LIQUID CRYSTAL INSTITUTE MADE KSU PRIME TARGET FOR SDS

(By Victor Riesel)

WASHINGTON.—So hark you now to the revolutionary cry of relevancy. It is all there in the still unreported 2,000-page investigatory report on the four Kent State University fatal shootings. The document now rests heavily on President Nixon's desk.

Relevancy is not the monopoly of the "multiversity" revolutionary. It is much of the reporter's craft. Thus the disintegrated New York West 11th Street bomb factory, which blew itself into fashionable bits on March 6, is significant.

For there is documentary evidence that Bernadine Dohrn, leader of the Boston section (dual national headquarters of the National SDS) said: "The third person who was killed there in the New York bombmaking brownstone center—VR was Terry Robbins, who led the first rebellion at Kent State less than two years ago."

Relevancy then forces the inquirer to trace Terry Robbins back to the site of the tragic Kent State Four. The late comrade Robbins indeed did use Kent State U. as his revolutionary field. He "worked" the campus as one of the Cleveland-Columbus Regional SDS activists. He was part and co-director of the drive to radicalize the campus.

Thus he was co-author of one revolutionary tract—"The War Is on at Kent State"—and on his own wrote, "Organizers' Manual for the Spring Offensive." At Kent State, of course.

He had much to say about activating the students but few of his lines are as relevant as this section: "During the course of the struggle it will probably be necessary and helpful to carry out a series of escalating 'mini' actions to help build consciousness and dramatize the issue. Beginning with guerrilla theater actions in dorms we can escalate to disrupting classes, street marches, quick assaults on buildings, etc., before moving to the major confrontation of the struggle."

Earlier he wrote calling for "dorm and classroom organizing, taking the issues and the demands directly to the people, speaking in dorms, setting up dorm cadres, agitating in relevant classes about the militarization and imperialism, film festivals. The regional office in Cleveland has many films relating to militarization, Hanoi 3, weapons, pigs, Columbia Revolt, the Black Panthers, etc. "People can use this in dorms and classes and also arrange a one-night film festival—using four or five films, political raps, guerrilla theater, etc."

These are merely some of the cadre directives written by one of the three SDSers who blew themselves to bits while making bombs in New York. Thus it is not irrelevant for the FBI Civil Rights Division agents to inquire at Kent State U. whether reports they had of one or two instructors teaching Molotov cocktail-making and street tactics were true. The FBI men, following instruction made mandatory under the civil rights statutes, attempted to question at least one professor. He refused to answer. So the agents questioned some students. The relevant answer was affirmative. Yes, there had been secret miniclasses in bomb making.

Thus, it was all there. The activists, the SDS leaders' oratory calling for the use of guns on the campus. The exhortations that the university be burned down. The steady visits by Columbus-Cleveland, Ohio, SDS region organizers. The long series of rap gatherings (skull sessions). And the statement by the university's president, Robert I. White, on June 24, 1969.

He said, "It became quite clear in the winter of 1968—VR that the university would be a target for planned disruptions by a relatively small group during the spring quarter . . ."

Thus it is relevant to observe that, while to the rest of America Kent State was an obscure, bucolic school, the SDS made it one of their basic concentration objectives.

Why?

There are many reasons. Not the least of which is the effort to smash the university's militarily valuable Liquid Crystal Institute—one of only two in the U.S.

There is evidence that this institute is internationally famed. The Soviet Union, for example, long has had great curiosity over this experimentation center in liquid crystals which change vivid colors—so sensitive are they—at the slightest, most infinitesimal change in nearby heat. Thus troops can detect the presence of nearby men (possibly waiting in ambush or some distant unseen campfire.)

These liquid crystal chemical substances

have been used in many fields including warfare, medicine, electronics and aerospace. Crystals have been used in wind tunnel tests, cancer diagnosis and for nondestructive testing in electronics.

And it is relevant that the Soviet Union's Academy of Science recently invited the Liquid Crystal Institute founder and director, Dr. Glenn H. Brown, to visit several research institutes and academic institutions in the USSR.

The Soviet invitation gives Dr. Brown the privilege of visiting any Soviet academic or research institution he chooses—just so long as he comes. This, indeed, is an unusual privilege. The words used by officials at the National Science Foundation here cite this as a "highly unusual" privilege.

Prof. Brown organized the first "International Conference on Liquid Crystals" in 1965.

And it was held at Kent State.

In 1968 he ran a second such conference. He now chairs a committee to run a third conference in West Berlin this summer.

So, you may not have known the value of liquid crystals. But the SDS did. The Soviet Union did. And, of course, our own military did.

None of this will soften the torture of the parents of the youngsters whose blood grimly pockmarked the campus for some tragic hours. But it is highly relevant to learn who cried for blood and why Kent State University was and is such a prize, warranting the fiery attention of the SDS's leading nihilists.

COMMENCEMENT ADDRESS BY HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, my good friend and colleague, the Honorable WILLIAM D. FORD, of Michigan, was the commencement speaker June 7, for the Westfield State College, in my congressional district, and was presented with an honorary degree of doctor of humane letters.

This was the first honorary degree ever conferred by Westfield State College, an institution of which I am personally very proud and with which I have had close ties for a number of years.

Congressman FORD spoke to upwards of 4,000 persons in the Springfield Auditorium, in the city of Springfield. Following his address, he was presented with the degree by Westfield's president, Dr. Leonard J. Savignano, who made the following citation:

The Honorable William D. Ford, House of Representatives, United States Congress, was first elected in 1964 from the new 15th Congressional District of the State of Michigan, reelected in 1966 and in 1968.

In 1965, Congressman Ford was appointed to the House Committee on Education and Labor and in 1967 to the Post Office and Civil Service Committee of the House. As a member of the Education and Labor Committee, Congressman Ford co-authored the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, the International Education Act, and legislation liberalizing requirements for Federal funds in federally impacted areas. He has participated in the writing and passage of all the legislation in the areas of Education, Labor, Manpower Training and Poverty adopted by the Congress in the past five years.

Congressman Ford serves as Chairman of the Domestic Study Group's Task Force on Education and Manpower. Congressman Ford is a recognized expert on the problems of schools operated for dependents of Americans stationed abroad.

In view of this outstanding contribution to education and the welfare of those in education, the Board of Trustees of the State Colleges in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has authorized me, the President of Westfield State College, to confer the honorary degree of Doctor of Humane Letters on the Honorable William D. Ford, House of Representatives, United States Congress.

After accepting the degree, Congressman FORD gave a truly outstanding commencement address, the text of which follows:

ADDRESS OF HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

As I thought over what I might say to you here today, my mind went back over the commencement speeches that I have been compelled to listen to.

All of you, the graduates, your families, your friends, the faculty, and the honored guests are, just as I have been, the captive audience for the commencement speaker. The commencement speaker is as much a part of the tradition and ritual of an occasion like this as the cap and gown, although not necessarily as colorful.

The traditional form of commencement address has always been filled with glowing cliches about hordes of untried young people about to experience the great glory of emergence into the real world.

That real world is generally described as a "great, wide, wonderful world," bursting with opportunities for wealth and fame, and ready and waiting for those of you who are now possessed of the magic sheepskin.

Always a part of the commencement speech are the ominous references to the grave and serious problems yet to be solved. In the commencement speeches I was forced to listen to, these generally fell into the category of preventing or curing wars and depressions.

Somehow, however, the commencement speeches I heard while sitting in the same seat that the graduates here today occupy, tended to leave the impression with us that we weren't really expected to have much impact on the great problems of the day nor really expected to find their solution by anything we might do in a direct or personal way.

The impression was rather left that by simply entering the so-called mainstream of life with a new college degree or degrees and all of the rights, privileges and duties pertaining thereto, and by following the most direct road toward individual fame and fortune in our chosen field or profession, we would be doing all that anyone expected.

I am afraid that too many of us who sat in the audience were willing to accept the idea that we were individually impotent in terms of our impact on the so-called "system" and the condition of our country and the world.

Sadly enough, the so-called silent majority still seems to believe this.

For me, or for anyone else, to stand on a platform like this and suggest to the graduates sitting out here in front that you are about to have your eyes opened to the real world for the first time by the simple magic of this ceremony or any of my remarks would be a gratuitous insult to you individually and as a representative group of the bright young Americans of this generation, a group of which I believe you to be a typical sample. Some will try to tell you that you are different from other people on campuses across the country. But I have visited many of those campuses and I can assure you that you are not different.

The young people of America represented by those on the campuses of this country are already showing more concern for our country and its future than any group that has gone before them.

It is only being realistic to expect that that part of our population upon whom the burden of a prolonged war in Indo-China and the unsigned peace treaties of World War II and Korea falls most directly must surely feel the imperatives of a real world.

You will embark upon your careers or continue your educations after today in a world that scarcely remembers peace and a country less at peace with itself and its people than at any time since the Civil War. If you stop to think about it, one-half of Americans alive today never lived one day of their lives when our armed men were not facing a hostile enemy across a foreign border.

The world and our country do not face today's massive and awesome problems because no one in America has cared or because no one in America has tried, or no one in America has sacrificed, or even that no one in America has succeeded in meeting his challenge.

The tragedy is that more of us have not cared or tried or sacrificed to build a society that fulfills the famous American Dream.

Some young people in this country are trying to escape any risk of failure by saying "the system won't work, so why try." This statement is most often heard from people who have not made any real and sustained effort to make the system work or to change it for the better.

But this is not a new rationalization—it is the same excuse that far too many people have used on the other side of the so-called generation gap separating them from the young people graduating here today.

The free riders in America who are unwilling to risk a failure or failures on the route to ultimate success in solving the problems and in meeting the challenges of our time offer the same old refrain and it is not the exclusive music of any age, race, creed, color, or economic group within our country.

Every segment of our society has within it those who sing this sad song because they seek to escape responsibility by "turning off and dropping out."

The bigot who will not listen or try to understand someone because he is too old or too young is no different than the bigot who cannot hear someone who is black or poor or attends the wrong church.

I do not intend here today to attempt to catalogue the problems facing the American society. I do assert that there is no segment of the American populace, young or old, rich or poor, black or white, North or South, city or rural, which has the right to withdraw its support from the established processes of the society.

If we are to move people to respect and strengthen the legal and judicial processes as well as the ballot, who will provide the leadership?

Those who are graduating today are facing a world with broader challenges and opportunity than ever before and with better equipment than any who have stood in their place before. And I would therefore be answering my question of who by saying "you."

Former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, John Gardner said in a recent speech which, unfortunately, he was not able to deliver to the group for whom it was intended:

". . . while each of us pursues his selfish interest and comforts himself by blaming others, the nation disintegrates.

"This is a time for the highest order of patriotism. This is a time to ask what it is we stand for as a people. It is a time to examine our founding documents and to reflect on what we tell each other are the American virtues. It is a time to search our hearts.

"It is very, very easy for leaders to appeal to the prejudice and fear and anger that is

in us. It is easy for leaders to speak to the selfishness that is in us, to tell us that nothing in this country need be changed and to find villains who may be blamed for our troubles."

"But there is in us as Americans," former Secretary Gardner went on, "something better than fear and anger and prejudice, something better than selfishness, something better than the lazy, comfortable inclination to blame others."

He went on to conclude that we as a people must move vigorously to solve our most crucial problems and to heal the spirit of the nation. And he suggested some very simple ground rules which I commend to you.

We must face our problems honestly. Young people are saying "knock off the hypocrisy."

We must be willing to commit resources to solve our problems.

If we mean what we say about issues such as pollution and health then we must put more money into these areas.

We must reject those who commit acts of violence or coercion.

And we must reject violence as justification for more violence.

We must reject leaders who appeal to our fears and anger and prejudice. We must reject an America where we are divided into minorities.

And finally he said:

We must recognize that each of us must give up something to save the nation. We must not ask only the young, the poor, and the sick to bear costs of lost resources.

These are sober and challenging words from an intelligent and sensitive man who has had a unique opportunity to observe first-hand and close-up the dynamics of American Society.

As I look at you here today and realize that some of you will shortly be in classrooms teaching, I am reminded that the experts still tell us that it takes 25 years for a new or innovative idea to find its way from the school of education to application in the classroom. That is a weakness of the system that has been identified by experts in the field for many years but seems to defy all efforts at its solution. I hope that there are those here who have some ideas about how to eliminate that terrible generation gap.

More than ever before, the educators in this country must assert themselves as an important part of the leadership of this country. Those who would move the Congress on war should take a lesson from the lobbying efforts of educators which last year helped us to add $1 billion to the Administration budget for education.

This assertion must come in the form of more direct participation in the processes I have been talking about, and particularly in the political processes of our country.

You have been equipped with the special tools that those processes sorely need.

I for one am pleased to see the educators of America emerging from their shells and from the ivory towers of educational institutions to become an active and potent force in the politics that shape the policies of our country.

The students graduating here today are part of a group that will be remembered by thinking people as a generation of students who did not wait for the completion of school to begin expressing their deep concern for their country and the directions in which it moves.

This concern has been expressed in many positive ways. I have sensed in my talks during recent weeks with many young people who have come to Washington a new resolve on the part of the person privileged to have a college education to use that education to rework and improve the institutions of our country.

There have been some painful confrontations between the young people of this country and those they view as part of an unresponsive establishment.

The graduates of 1970 will not be remembered as champion gold fish swallowers, panty raiders or telephone booth stuffers. It remains to be seen whether thoughtful historians will record them as honestly concerned citizens who awakened this nation and its leaders to the destruction of man's environment and who fought to eradicate war, poverty, ignorance, prejudice and violence—or will deal more harshly with them.

However, unless we leave here with a resolve to lead Americans toward judging each other by what is in their minds and in their hearts rather than by whether they wear long hair or hard hats, the historians will not deal very kindly with any of us who stood by while lawlessnes, reaction and repression replace reason and an attempt at understanding.

It has been said that the hope for the future for any nation is in its young people and if that be true then I do not fear for the future of America.

This college, its faculty and its student body, have already demonstrated a modern understanding of the role of the educated and the educator in meeting the challenges I have suggested. My first contact with your institution came about as a result of the opportunity I have had as a member of the Education and Labor Committee to work in the field of international education.

I need not tell you how much we as a nation, now thrust into the reluctant role of a world leader, need to build upon our meager reservoir of international education and international educational contacts.

This institution has been an active participant in programs that do equip Americans to provide us with the leadership in education and government that we so badly need in this field.

Many of you will go directly into your chosen profession as educators and many others will be going on to do advanced work in the areas of specialization you have selected.

On the basis of what I have been able to observe both in this country and abroad as a member of the Education and Labor Committee of the U.S. House of Representatives, I firmly believe that there has never been a better or more exciting time to be entering the field of education.

Those of you who have chosen to devote your own future to the process we call education have, in my opinion, an unparalleled opportunity to work for an America at peace with the world and at peace with itself.

In closing, I would like to quote something Thomas Wolfe said thirty years ago that sets forth the challenge which all Americans and especially those who are teachers have a great opportunity to meet:

"To every man his chance, to every man his shining golden opportunity—to every man the right to live, to work, to be himself, and to become whatever thing his manhood and his vision can combine to make him—this is the promise of America." (Thomas Wolfe, "You Can't Go Home Again.")

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF SOMALI INDEPENDENCE

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the African Subcommittee of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I wish to extend my congratulations to the people and Government of the Somali Democratic Republic on the occasion of the 10th anniversary of Somali independence this July 1. During the past decade, Somalia has witnessed progress in various fields of development. I believe that, backed by the united efforts of the Somali people, this development will continue at an accelerated pace over the next 10 years.

The Government in Somalia has actively promoted a very encouraging development in the Horn of Africa—a policy of detente with her neighbors. This policy has permitted the people of the area to live in peace and enabled their governments to emphasize economic development. Somalia is to be further congratulated for continuing this wise course of action.

THE AMERICAN AUTOMOBILE ASSOCIATION: PAVING THE WAY FOR MORE HIGHWAYS

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on several occasions I have criticized the manner in which the American Automobile Association purports to speak for the entire American motoring public, particularly in support of highway legislation. An article in the June issue of the Washingtonian magazine confirms many of my worst suspicions about the procedures of the AAA, and sheds new light on its activities and organization. The article, "How the AAA Uses Its Members To Pave the Way for More Freeways," by Richard Hébert, follows:

HOW THE AAA USES ITS MEMBERS TO PAVE THE WAY FOR MORE FREEWAYS

(By Richard Hébert)

"This thing's a forerunner of what's going to be happening all over the country."—Glenn T. Lashley, AAA Annapolis, March 12, 1970.

In the basement of the Maryland Inn, at several tables pushed into T-formation, a dozen men filled themselves with biscuits, bacon, and eggs. Behind the head of the T, a massive fireplace was crowded with the artifacts of an earlier, agrarian era—great cooking pots and ladles. The men had faces chipped and hardened by the rural outdoors. They were of a mind traceable to the time when rugged individuals blazed their own trails across the continent—wherever they pleased.

The men came from the Williams Construction Company, the Highway Supply Corporation, the Maryland Petroleum Association, the Maryland Asphalt Association, the Maryland Highway Contractors Association, the Maryland Motor Truck Association, the Maryland Farm Bureau, the Highway Users Federation for Safety and Mobility, and every man's faithful mechanic in times of need, the American Automobile Association. Assembled was the Maryland highway lobby.

On the morning of March 12, they met for breakfast in Annapolis to plan their assault on the Maryland General Assembly. Malcolm Rodman, a public relations man representing the Maryland Auto Club, an AAA affiliate, served as chairman of the strategy breakfast. "We're not going to charm them into killing it," he warned. "We've got to threaten them."

The "it" was Governor Marvin Mandel's legislation to create a single Department of Transportation, pooling all transportation programs and resources into one office that could take "balanced transportation" out of lip service and put it into practice.

The highwaymen were alarmed. The governor was making a frontal assault on the highway trust fund, which automatically had funneled gasoline and other highway-user taxes into the construction and care of highways, free from the meddling of elected officials.

"We should let the organizations that have the broadest base testify first," Rodman said, "the ones that represent the consumers. After that, we can get to those who have more specialized appeals." Heads nodded. The AAA had the look of broad public support. Its man in Washington, Glenn T. Lashley, would be first up when the highwaymen had their inning before the House Ways and Means and Senate Finance committees.

Lashley is a tall, high-powered man who dropped out of George Washington University Law School in 1947 and worked his way up the AAA ladder. He has a large ego and a crisp and confident voice, like that of a car salesman or insurance agent. He is director of public relations for the AAA division that encompasses the District of Columbia and its Virginia and Maryland suburbs. He opened his presentation to the joint committee by announcing his broad base of support: "I am here representing more than 200,000 AAA members in the State of Maryland."

When he finished, Senator Meyer Emanuel, Jr., of Prince George's County rose from his seat near the rear of the House chamber. Emanuel had emerged as Lashley's most vocal critic-in-residence on the AAA's Suburban Maryland Advisory Board. He had denounced Lashley in a letter which said he and two other members of the Advisory Board—Maryland legislator Pauline Menes and former Congressman Carlton Sickles—were "dismayed and angered . . . sick and tired . . . thoroughly disgusted . . . thoroughly incensed" by the AAA's blindness to the fact that "freeways and more freeways and automobiles and more automobiles are not the answer to the problems of the country today."

On the House floor, Emanuel poured out his sentiments anew, concluding: "Is my fifteen or twenty bucks going into this? Prove what you say—that you represent two hundred thousand members."

"I believe I do a better job than you do in reading the opinions of your constituents in Prince George's, Senator," Lashley retorted. "We asked the AAA members how they felt. A tremendous majority of seventy-four percent expressed opposition to the diversification of highway monies to other purposes."

Lashley's poll had been printed in *American Motorist*, a magazine he edits and distributes to AAA households in the D.C. division. Thus, only members in Montgomery and Prince Georges counties, not the statewide Maryland membership Lashley claimed to represent, saw it. Of the 1,229 responses—4 percent of the suburban Maryland membership—71 percent said they would support a constitutional amendment to prohibit diversion of highway money "into the general fund" (not a transportation fund as proposed by Governor Mandel) 25 percent opposed such a prohibition, and 4 percent said they didn't know.

Senator Emanuel did not contest Lashley's arithmetic, but another legislator challenged his logic. Delegate J. William Hinkle of Baltimore County, floor manager of the legislation, leaned back in his seat, clasped his hands behind his head, creased his face with a wry grin, and looking toward the ceiling asked Lashley: Do you think only parents of school children should pay school-support taxes? Doesn't all of society benefit from better schools? As a motorist wouldn't you benefit from mass transit that reduced auto congestion and air pollution?

Lashley agreed on all points, his voice now muted. He looked worried for the first time that day.

The other lobbyists made their presentations in the rhetoric of the public interest. Then Secretary of State Blair Lee, author of the legislation, returned for rebuttal and singled out the AAA. "Everyone's a car driver now," he said. "There are fewer smokers and drinkers than there are drivers, but their taxes go into the general fund." He said he, like Emanuel, wondered just who Lashley represented. "If Mr. Lashley is speaking for two hundred thousand people, he should strike my wife's name off that list and make it one hundred ninety-one thousand, nine hundred and ninety-nine."

There were more trips to Annapolis for Lashley during March, and a heavy flow of telegrams, letters, and press releases explaining the trust fund battle to his board members and to legislators. One release claimed the highway lobby had scored telling blows at the March 12 hearing.

Despite the trips, the chats in the statehouse foyer, and the mail, Governor Mandel's transportation package was adopted into law on March 30. The General Assembly had not heeded the implied threats that the AAA's 200,000 voters would rise up in wrath against it if it dared tamper with the highway trust fund. The highway lobby had suffered a rare defeat.

"Every time a member digs down in his pocket for his dues dollar, he votes for me."—Glenn T. Lashley, AAA Annapolis, March 18, 1970.

Lobbyists do not operate comfortably in public; they prefer private persuasion. For public appearances, the highway lobby needs the AAA to bear witness that the voice of the highway lobby is really the voice of the people. The AAA usually obliges. Thus, the 12,163,726 Americans who paid their AAA dues this year find themselves unwitting parties to such scenes as took place March 12 in Annapolis.

The typical AAA member is not the type to allow such easy use of his name. According to a recent survey, the AAA member is wealthier, owns more cars, is better traveled, and is presumably better educated and more widely read than most Americans.

Under the mantle of these 12 million affluent but apparently acquiescent souls, the AAA devotes the full measure of its energies to the business of the highway lobby—building more and more freeways to be coagulated with more and more gasoline-burning cars that will then demand more and more freeways, ad infinitum. To maintain unfettered freedom to build freeways, the lobby must protect with unwavering vigilance its fattest calf—the trust fund.

In the AAA's 1970 booklet of "Policies and Resolutions," warnings against "diversion" of highway dollars abound. They appear under every conceivable heading.

While AAA policies do pay lip service to public transportation, that is as far as they go. AAA insists that motorists' taxes not be diverted to transit or even to transit-serving roads or parking lots, and AAA vigorously opposes all actions which tend to "compel the public to use any one means of transportation through unreasonable restrictions or the imposition of tolls upon another form." Significance can be read into the fact that this thinly veiled call for unbridled highway expansion comes under the policy book's "Urban Public Transportation" heading.

While even the Automobile Manufacturers Association and the Automobile Dealers Association have testified in favor of Federal aid for mass transit, the AAA has not seen fit to carry lip service that far. When Senator Harrison Williams (D-N.J.) introduced legislation to create an urban mass transit trust fund out of the one percent automobile excise tax, which does not go into the highway fund, AAA national headquarters sent chief lobbyist John de Lorenzi to plead that Congress not "compound the injury" of an "unjust" tax on cars by giving it to transit.

Such policies and actions propelled Senator Emanuel into his role as the AAA's rebel-in-residence. He wrote Lashley: "You are still back in the early nineteen hundreds. . . You have not come up with anything new, at least since I have been a member—and that is about thirty years."

The rebellion is spreading to other AAA homes. In Ohio, letters in the March 1970 issue of the club publication attacked the AAA's endorsement of a freeway through a Cleveland park: "The dinosaur-age policy of your organization—the public be damned, any freeway is better than no freeway—needs re-appraisal by your people. . . . You do not reflect the thinking of the majority of your members. . . . Without doubt, those that would benefit most from the sprawling concrete maze are not your members, but the auto companies, construction unions, oil companies and other self-interest groups."

The only recourse available to such AAA members is to tear up their membership cards, as one woman did at the March 12 hearings in Annapolis, and to sacrifice the benefits that first lured them into the AAA fold.

Other auto clubs are giving AAA competition by providing some of the same benefits, but they have not grown to anything resembling the size of the sixty-eight-year-old AAA. The two largest and most direct competitors are the auto clubs of Allstate Insurance and American Oil Company. They provide services similar to those of the AAA, including free towing and road service, insurance, bail-bond protection, and travel information, but their memberships are confined largely to their customers. Gulf Oil Corporation also has a club, but its major services are low-cost insurance and travel-guide information; it does not provide free road service.

A spokesman for American Oil's club said his office received an accelerated flow of requests for membership after January 1969, when AAA raised its dues from $18 to $20. Both American and Allstate charge $15 annual dues.

The local AAA lost its biggest chunk of membership in 1963 during one of the angriest escalations of the ten-year war between subways and freeways. In October 1962, *American Motorist* claimed a circulation of 157,776; by October 1963 it had dropped to 137,443.

During that year, the local AAA sent one top official after another to Congressional and District hearings to condemn the National Capital Transportation Agency's proposal that the freeway system be cut back and restudied.

It was at this time, too, that AAA lobbyist Washington I. Cleveland became the nemesis of local freeway fighters. He played the highway lobby's musical chairs game with such relish that he forgot at times exactly which hat he was wearing.

He had been instrumental in organizing the local unit of the highway lobby's umbrella agency, the Highway Users Conference, and was its secretary-treasurer in 1963 when he mailed out an appeal for "substantial contributions" to help "an all-out public relations program" to combat NCTA. He signed the letter, on AAA stationery, with his Highway Users Conference title. A subsequent letter, on Highway Users Conference stationery, displayed the address and telephone number of the AAA.

In September 1963, the boundaries of the highway lobby blurred further. The "D.C.

Committee for Balanced Transportation" letterhead also used the AAA's address and telephone number, with the Highway Users Conference telephone extension. The letter described the committee as a "group of independent citizens" selling tickets to a $100-a-plate dinner for D.C. Transit's O. Roy Chalk, with proceeds to be "used to help effect the completion of the already approved D.C. freeway and bridge system." Cleveland was listed as secretary-treasurer of the "Committee for Balanced Transportation."

Cleveland did not limit his activism to the highway lobby. He became a member of the Committee of 100 on the Federal City, which was then emerging as an antifreeway force, and won a seat on its Roads Subcommittee. Attorney Peter Craig, chairman of the Roads Subcommittee, recalls that Cleveland was vehemently against every policy that opposed freeway construction until his conflict of interest became so obvious he was removed from the subcommittee.

Cleveland persisted, employing every tactic available to stop the Committee of 100 from adopting a stance that might throw a roadblock in the freeway path. With parliamentary quibbling, filibuster, and whatever else was at hand, his disruptive strategy caused a series of pitched power battles within the citizens movement.

At a D.C. Highway Department hearing, after the Committee of 100 had registered its opposition to the Three Sisters Bridge, Cleveland was summoned as if by prearrangement to present what he said was a minority report of the Committee of 100. The following January, the Committee of 100 answered by not sending him a dues statement for membership renewal.

At about this time, Cleveland also was retired from the AAA. The association had earlier adopted a policy of mandatory retirement at age sixty-five, but had allowed those over that age to be retained on an annual basis by their boards. For several years Cleveland had been the beneficiary of that retainer policy, but in 1964, he was retired with ceremonial pomp. Into his lobbying shoes stepped Glenn T. Lashley.

Lashley had worked his way up the ladder to manager of the National Pedestrian Program at AAA national headquarters and was then transferred into the D.C. division offices to supervise four previously separate activities: publication of *American Motorist*, lobbying, public relations, and traffic safety. The heads of these units were veterans of long service, and as each retired, he was not replaced. Instead, Lashley assumed the duties and broadened his direct influence over local AAA affairs. "It was like on-the-job training for me," he recalls. "I was picking their brains."

At the same time Lashley was centralizing the four activities in his office, the local AAA needed an image overhaul. Membership was dropping, freeways were increasingly unpopular, and the AAA's eye was getting blacker. In mid-1965, Lashley's three advisory boards presented a peace pipe to subway planners in the form of a shovel and the advice, "Stop talking and start digging." Lashley never fails to mention the occasion when asked how far his club's endorsement of public transit really goes.

In 1967, the AAA again heard dissident voices when Lashley used his magazine to attack two appointments to the U.S. Department of Transportation—Cleveland's relentless Committee of 100 opponent Peter Craig, and another Committee of 100 member, Paul Sitton. Again, the key issue was Three Sisters Bridge.

Lashley also filled Cleveland's slot in the musical chairs game: as a registered lobbyist with Congress and the legislatures of Virginia and Maryland, as an executive committee member of the local Highway Users Conference, and as a member of the Road Gang, the semisecret luncheon club that gives its members inside tips on the activities of transportation policy-makers. The Road Gang, as revealed by Washington writer Mrs. Helen Leavitt in her recent book *Superhighway-Superhoax*, includes 240 men from the inner ring of those who make and use highway policy for profit.

Lashley isn't the lone AAA voice in that circle. Others have included J. N. Robertson, D.C. highway director for twenty-five years, treasurer of the powerful American Road Builders Association, and a member of the AAA District Advisory Board; the late Richard W. Tupper, the AAA's associate director of Public Affairs until his death in January; and W. L. Robinson, director of the AAA's department of Traffic Engineering and Safety until his recent retirement. AAA Advisory Board member Charles D. Curtiss, former Bureau of Public Roads commissioner, received the Road Gang's 1968 award for "outstanding contributions to the advancement of highway transportation in the public interest."

"My board can't fire me. That's why I can afford to talk to my board member [Senator Emanuel] the way I did."—Glenn T. Lashley, AAA Annapolis, March 18, 1970.

So much job security is built into the AAA's self-perpetuating structure that employees control policy, both at the local and national levels.

The AAA is a federation of 235 clubs throughout the United States and Canada. It describes itself as a "not-for-profit" organization, thus earning no profits on which to pay income taxes. It does, however, pay property tax on its $928,833 headquarters building at 1712 G Street, Northwest, a block from the White House compound. Its first-half 1970 tax payment was $14,396.91.

The AAA's national board of directors consists of 103 men selected from the boards and executive staffs of the member clubs. They are elected at the annual convention by local club delegates, but the recommendations of the national board's nominating committee are almost always accepted without opposition. Oldtimers recall only once—"sometime back in the early 1940's"—when a nominee of the nominating committee was opposed from the floor.

Eight of the national board members represent clubs of the Canadian Automobile Association. Of the ninety-five U.S. board members, close to half are AAA employees and many others represent banks and savings and loan institutions, which make most of the nation's auto loans; companies which supply components to auto manufacturers; the insurance and construction industries; truckers; and automobile dealers.

California, where automobility is a religion, has seventeen national directors, five of them AAA employees. By contrast, the more transit-oriented state of New York has six on the national board, Illinois only three. In Ohio, where AAA members are protesting against freeways, four of the ten national directors are salaried employees of AAA. Michigan, with its automobile empire intact, has twelve directors.

Of the 235 clubs, 224 are independent, free to determine their own structures, dues levels, and policies. These independent clubs are required only to maintain standards of service and to contribute twenty-five cents per member to the national treasury.

The remaining eleven clubs are strays. Because they could not afford to meet AAA service standards on their own, they were made "divisions" of the national office, which appoints their staffs, collects their dues, and pays their bills. Because it is based here in the national headquarters city, the District of Columbia AAA is one of these divisions. Its staff is part of the national staff and serves at the pleasure of the national executive vice president, George F. Kachlein, Jr. Says Lashley, "I don't have a set budget. I just see what needs to be done and pry loose the money to do it."

Because his is not an independent club, Lashley does not have a local board of directors, as other clubs have. Instead he has advisory boards for the District, the Maryland suburbs, and the Virgina suburbs. These advisors serve by appointment of the national president, Harry Holt of Stockton, California. The advisory boards "usually lean on the staff" to suggest nominees, and the national president in turn appoints whomever the advisory boards recommend, according to Lashley.

One observer describes the advisory boards as "a bunch of elderly citizens they prop up with lunch." Senator Emanuel is slightly less harsh. Frequently, he says, the advisors act as rubber stamps for policy recommendations of staff members who come prepared with fully researched presentations. "I almost had the feeling I was sitting there like a puppet lending credence to their philosophy," he says.

Lashley acknowledges that "by and large, the board will say, 'Well, you're the professional staff,' " and approve his policy recommendations. He has never had a proposal rejected.

The AAA staff also controls policy at the national level. In 1968, the national staff, including the staffs of the eleven divisions, numbered 600. The operating chief is Kachlein, a well-known figure among highway enthusiasts on Capitol Hill and at the Department of Transportation for his frequent "informational" visits and his own appearances before Congressional committees.

Under Kachlein's direction, the staff suggests policy changes to the appropriate standing committees of the national board. All but one of these sixteen committees are under the domination of salaried staff; eleven are composed entirely of staff, including the Audit and Budget Committee, Long Range Planning Committee, and Special Committee on Urban Transportation. Four committees, including the important Highway Committee, are mostly staff members. Only one committee, the Finance and Investment Committee, has no staff members; one of its members is James F. Willett of the American Security and Trust Company, the AAA's national treasurer.

Once reviewed by standing committees, suggestions are rejected or passed on to a Policy Committee, which makes its recommendations to the annual convention.

At the national convention, the vote of each club is assigned according to its size. The local units send their board chairmen and top staff personnel, not the rank and file. The AAA employees, armed with full-time research and preparation and a dedication to preserve the status quo that hired them, are in command.

Can the rank and file attend a convention? Only if chosen as delegates by their local clubs. Most members don't ask because they don't consider the AAA a political entity that demands such attention. To the rank and file, the club is simply a service agency that sells road service, insurance, tour guidance, and bail-bond protection.

When an opponent of traditional AAA policy does squeeze into a convention, as did Emanuel the year he was Maryland Advisory Board chairman, he finds himself a "minority of one."

When Peter Craig sought to turn the local AAA from its opposition to the Congressionally imposed five-year "freeze" on District freeway construction, he asked for a copy of "the AAA by-laws or other organic documents that would indicate its authority to take positions and lobby on matters of this kind." Washington Cleveland told him, "We

just don't give out our own by-laws, even on request from AAA members."

Seeking information about AAA finances is even more frustrating. When asked for a statement of club finances, John de Lorenzi, national director of public and government relations, said, "No, there's nothing like that available." How could an AAA member learn how his dollar was being spent? "At the annual meeting. There's a review at the annual meeting." There was nothing in writing? "Not that I can think of offhand."

Arthur I. Cooper, director of finances and control, said, "We don't make that available to the general public. It's considered privileged information."

At the local level, Lashley promised to obtain the financial data but finally said, "There's not a thing I can do about that." He did obtain the "annual proceedings," but they did not contain any financial information. The booklet, "Activities and Progress," contained the annual reports of nine standing committees. Committees that deal with financial matters were excluded. The annual reports did contain ample discussion, however, of the AAA's philosophy concerning the need for continued expansion of the highway program and protection of its sources of revenue.

Based on its count of twenty-five cents for each of 12,163,726 members, the national AAA operates with $3,040,931 annually. The AAA also has other sources of revenue and has been expanding into a broad range of activities. Its subsidiary, Regional Services Corporation, has been selling tires to sixty AAA clubs which in turn sell them to their road service outlets "with a built-in profit to the station of $10 per tire."

Now the AAA is testing sales of special car batteries as well, and in December, it added a film developing service. The AAA also acts as insurance agents, selling accident and other insurance in addition to the basic death or dismemberment coverage members receive, as travel agents, through its World Wide Travel Bureau which recently moved from New York to the Washington headquarters building, and as ticket agents, distributing tickets to such events as ball games and concerts.

The District division has about 224,000 members in 145,000 households, of which about 80 percent renew annually. Despite the 20 percent dropout rate. Lashley says his D.C. division records a monthly net increase in membership of 1,000. Dues are $20, with an additional $5 fee for new members. Thus, dues bring between $4.6 and $4.9 million a year to the D.C. division. How this and other money is spent, even advisory board members don't know.

What about AAA's retirement funds? What banks have them? What salaries and fringe benefits do AAA executives receive? Most importantly, how much does AAA spend on its lobbyists and their activities? The AAA declines to give answers.

The AAA evidently is prospering, well enough to move its D.C. division offices out of headquarters and into plush suites in the high-rise North Building at Wheaton Plaza.

Lashley insists AAA is "beholden to no organization." He cites consumer-protection articles frequently printed in his magazine. In September 1969, the magazine admitted that fuel was wasted in the automobile engine, but advised that fuel-savers "are a completely unnecessary expense and, in many cases, totally ineffective," because "if a device existed which would effectively increase the miles per gallon ratio as claimed, automobile manufacturers would install them as either standard or optional equipment." Similarly typical were remarks in the March 1970 issue which extolled the automobile industry's progress in curbing air pollution caused by cars.

National AAA policy states: "No new legislation should be enacted making compulsory the installation of anti-pollution devices on motor vehicles until sufficient tests prove that the benefits to be derived will justify the cost to the motoring public." Its policy in support of auto safety devices is similarly backhanded.

Also used to buttress AAA's contention of independence is its impassioned fight to keep trucks from growing larger. When truckers asked Virginia to allow "double-bottoms" on its highways, Lashley's office cranked out 10,000 flyers and 25,000 bumper stickers for statewide distribution. A two-page spread in the *American Motorist* was sent to every member of the state legislature, and allies in the Virginia legislature offered five bills to raise truckers' taxes, thus keeping truckers busy fighting taxes. The AAA won that round.

It also won in Congress when legislation was introduced to abolish truck limitations on Interstate highways, but seasoned observers of highway politics on the Hill are unimpressed by the internal rupture in the highway lobby.

When such a rupture occurs, it usually heals quickly. The truckers and the automotive interests know they need each other because they both need highways—and all of them need the mantle of broad public support the AAA casts over their activities.

The AAA's members foot the bill but have not a thing to say about how their names are used or how their AAA dollars are spent. The AAA is really its staff and the vested interest groups it serves, not its members.

WHO'S WHO IN AAA

The area AAA division is run by the national headquarters, with advisory boards in the District, suburban Maryland, and northern Virginia.

The suburban Maryland board includes securities broker Robert M. Hanson as chairman and Delegate Pauline Menes as vice chairman, plus state Senators Emanuel, Margaret Schweinhaut, and Louise Gore, Congressman Gilbert Gude, and former Congressman Carlton Sickles. Also members are civil engineer Fred W. Tuemmler; architect Theodore Cromar; John R. Graff, assistant vice president of Suburban Trust Company; attorney Robert A. Wallace; Sam Eig, president of the Georgian Motel; James A. Buchanan, IV, construction contractor; Charles H. Graham, a telephone company executive; John A. Scheibel, a member of the Maryland-National Capital Park and Planning Commission; and Maxwell Scrimgeour, a realtor.

The Northern Virginia Advisory Board has ten members. Chairman is employee relations consultant Ralph Yow, Jr., who also is a director of two insurance companies. Vice-chairman is construction contractor W. Alvord Sherman, Sr. Other members include auto dealer Harry W. Bendall of Alexandria; Thomas E. Sebrell III, president of First & Citizens National Bank of Alexandria; realtors Omer L. Hirst and Edwin Lynch; W. P. Ames, Jr., treasurer of Murphy and Ames, Inc., a builders supply company; attorney L. Lee Bean of Arlington; S. Cooper Dawson, president of Penn Daw Hotel Corporation; and Mrs. Walter J. Crater of Falls Church.

The District Advisory Board is chaired by the formidable General Louis W. Prentiss, the Army Corps of Engineers commander who served as Engineer-Commissioner of the District until 1956, and then became executive secretary of the American Road Builders Association until retirement in 1968. His son works for the D.C. Highway Department. Vice chairman is Adelbert W. Lee, a realtor who advertises himself as a "qualified appraiser in condemnation suits." Among the other sixteen advisors are Daniel W. Bell, former president of American Security and Trust; Francis G. Addison, Jr., vice president of the Union Trust Company; J. N. Robertson, treasurer of the American Road Builders Association; P. Y. K. Howat, president of Howat Concrete Company; trucker Francis J. Kane; building contractor J. Slater Davidson, Jr.; U.S. Senate Chaplain Dr. Frederick Brown Harris; C. D. Curtiss, the Road Gang award recipient who was Bureau of Public Roads commissioner until 1957 when he moved to the American Road Builders Association as special assistant to its newly arrived executive secretary, General Prentiss; attorney Renah F. Camalier; retired Deputy Police Chief William J. Liverman; Msgr. Thomas W. Lyons; school board member Mrs. Gloria Roberts; Colonel West A. Hamilton of Hamilton Printing; Clark G. Diamond of Sealtest Foods; Stephen R. Woodzell, president of Potomac Electric Power Company; and Irving C. Root, a city planning consultant. The chairmen of the suburban Maryland and Virginia boards are also members of the D.C. board.

RIDE IN THE DESERT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Ray McHugh, Washington Bureau chief of the Copley Press, recently made an on-the-spot inspection tour of the Israel side of the Suez Canal and analyzed his impressions of the Sinai Peninsula and the Suez Canal battleline in an article in the Wednesday, May 27 Elgin, Ill., Daily Courier-News. In view of the growing belligerence of Egyptian President Nasser and growing Soviet involvement in the Middle East, I believe this article is quite timely:

RIDE IN THE DESERT

(By Ray McHugh)

KANTARA, SUEZ CANAL.—The flak jackets and British-type helmets make the 100-degree heat even more oppressive. Flies and desert gnats hover in swarms, darting in for attacks. The white sand clings to clothing and seeps inside to chafe the skin.

But a reporter quickly forgets his discomfort as his driver begins the last five-mile dash to the Suez Canal and the safety of Israeli fortifications.

The oil-stained sand dunes on both sides of the Russian-built one and one-half lane black asphalt road have been beaten back by countless tanks, half-tracks and other armored vehicles. Both sides of the road are littered with the debris of war.

Some of the burned out, rusting hulks of trucks and tanks are mute reminders of the Egyptian retreat down this road in 1967. A wrecked armored car and a self-propelled gun that lies twisted and broken, however, bear the star of David insignia and are evidence that some Egyptian shells in recent weeks have found their mark.

The driver slows as a Patton tank lumbers across the road ahead, changing position, and one becomes aware of miles of telephone line and barbed wire tossed into jumbled tangles by long-ranging Egyptian shells that may have been seeking the six-inch-thick black cables that carry water and gasoline to Kantara.

"Hang on" shouts the driver and he wrenches the wheel first to one side, then the other to avoid fresh shell holes in the road, but never easing the pressure on the accelerator.

A line of low green trees comes into view and as it grows one makes out a cluster of pink stucco building ahead.

The trees mark the eastern edge of the Suez Canal, whose sluggish green waters were once the lifeline of the British empire and the Middle East oil industry. Today they are

the front line between Israel and Egypt in a steadily worsening conflict that seems to defy solution.

Kantaran which means "bridge" in Arabic, is the key communications point on the northern reaches of the canal. It lies halfway between Port Said on the Mediterranean and Ismalia and it is a door that President Gamal Abdel Nasser must open if he ever hopes to retake the Sinai Desert and march on Tel Aviv. It was the base for Britain's World War I conquest of Palestine.

The simple fact of the Sinai is roads. No military defense or offenses can ignore them, and from the Egyptian side of the canal any attempt to reclaim this vast desert and push again to the threshold of Israel must be concentrated on Kantara, Ismalia and Suez to the south.

Infantry assaults, supported by armor, are out of the question in the desert and northern marshlands near the Mediterranean and there is no evidence that the Soviets are ready to give Nasser the ships, equipment and training necessary for a leapfrog amphibious campaign across the Mediterranean shore.

The full division of Egyptians confronting the small Israeli garrison at Kantara, however, has bridging equipment and some amphibian tanks should the order come to attempt a crossing in force.

"If I were them, I would not attempt it," said an Israeli colonel in command of this northern sector, "but then the Egyptians often are illogical."

Kantara is one point of the apex of a triangle that runs straight north like an arrow up the canal to Port Said, east along the Mediterranean to the luxurious date palm forests of El Arrish where Napoleon once landed almost 200 years ago, then southwest back to Kantara—or what is left of it.

Inside this triangle is a maze of marshland, bitter salt lakes and shifting sand. South of the El Arrish-Kantara Road is an ocean of sand dunes, some 50 feet high, marked only by the quickly erased tracks of a wandering bedouin and his camel.

"There is simply no way back across the desert, except by this road," said the colonel.

The road which continues for 250 kilometers to the kibbutz on the edge of the Gaza Strip where Samson wrecked the Philistines' temple and later met Lelilah is still strewn with the wreckage of the 1967 Egyptian debacle—burned-out tanks and trucks, bullet-riddled villages and the of a thousand tanks and armored vehicles.

Arab children play in the wreckage and their mothers and older sisters patiently search along the highways for pomegranates while men sit in small clusters, sharing old stories, or work in small detachments, sweeping and shoveling last night's sand off the asphalt. At intervals, American-built snowplows are parked in shelters, ready to clear the road in the event of a severe sandstorm.

With the exception of El Arrish, most of the villages in the occupied Sinai seem virtually deserted. No attempt has been made to repair the damages of 1967. El Arrish is swollen by refugees from Kantara. The Israelis evacuated the civilian population from the canal almost immediately after their 1967 victory.

An American visiting this strange, out-of-the-way corner of the world is struck by the dimensions of the Arab-Israeli confrontation.

If it is true that Nasser has gathered huge forces along the canal, it seems equally true that Israel is relying on a much smaller, but well-honed, highly mobile defense, backed by U.S.-built Hawk antiaircraft missiles that sit almost nonchalantly by the roadside, pointing west, northwest and southwest.

No vistors sees the full scope of the Israeli military effort, but the network of supply bases, communications centers, support roads and repair depots indicates a strong defense in depth. Defense Minister Moshe Dayan and Chief of Staff Bar Lev are apparently confident that Israeli air superiority combined with well-protected strong points along the canal would provide the precious hours needed to call up reserves and regulars from Israel to meet any full-scale offensive.

Eventually, the introduction of Russian pilots over the canal and the Sinai could force a change in this strategy, but Israel's forces today appear designed to punish any Egyptian forays across the canal while also providing the support structure for greatly expanded forces, if they are needed.

MEDICAL CARE AT VA HOSPITALS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent days the Veterans' Administration system of medical care for our veterans has come under attack. I have been deeply concerned that these misleading and distorted attacks will discourage the brave men now in military service and cause them to fear the treatment they will receive should they need hospitalization after returning home. Let me say they should have no fear. It has been my experience that the VA hospitals throughout the country are ranked as among the finest in the land and are proficient centers of care.

Our own VA hospital in Manchester is one that we can be proud of and through personal knowledge, I know that it offers splendid care to our sick and disabled veterans.

The Manchester Union Leader recently published a letter from the mother of two veterans that tells the story of the care her sons received in still another of our VA hospitals. Her letter tells, better than any words of mine, of the fine care that is given in the VA hospital in White River Junction, Vt.

Mr. Speaker, I am inserting this letter from this brave mother and the comment of the editor of the Manchester Union Leader in the RECORD at this time that we may help to counter some of the unwarranted charges concerning veterans' hospitals that have caused such concern throughout the Nation:

TRIBUTE TO VA HOSPITAL IN WHITE RIVER JUNCTION

Addressed to William Loeb: I am a mother of three Marines, who served in the Pacific during WWII. It made my blood boil to read the recent article in "Life" magazine on the VA Hospitals.

Two of our sons each lost a leg and have required surgery and care several times in the past years—one time as recently as this spring. They have been patients at the VA Hospital in White River Junction, Vt. There just are not enough beautiful words, to express our praise of this hospital.

As one enters the hospital, the waiting room is very attractive. There is always a beautiful floral arrangement. Here patients, who are ambulatory, may visit with their families. Children are not allowed in the wards or rooms—so it means a lot to patients, to be able to see the children.

The hospital is the epitome of cleanliness. The care of the patients is wonderful. The doctors, nurses, corpsmen and aids are so kind to the patients and also to the relatives and friends who visit them.

The food is excellent. The patients are given printed menus, the day before, they may choose what they wish to eat the following day. I think this eliminates a lot of waste. Naturally, all patients do not care for the same foods.

Most of the rooms and wards have television sets, as does the recreation rooms. This hospital has occupational therapy, where one may learn to make leather goods, jewelry, etc. I have seen some beautiful work done by patients. It certainly helps to while away the hours that they are confined and gives their morale a boost to make a beautiful handbag for their wife, say, on Mothers Day.

The one thing that gave me the most comfort was when I phoned the hospital to find out the condition of our son following surgery. I didn't receive the usual "as well as could be expected." I was connected with a doctor who gave me a true and complete report. This means a lot to the family, especially when the distance to the hospital is great and the roads icy.

If such conditions do exist as pictured in "Life" magazine, I think such hospitals need a new administrator.

I say, "Thank God for the VA Hospital in White River Jct., Vt."

I feel the government is doing all in its power to give the returning veterans the very best of care and the benefits of the latest in medical and surgical techniques.

EDITORS: (Mother of two wounded veterans)—Having had many contacts with the VA hospital in White River Junction, we concur most emphatically with the judgment expresed above . . . and to think, the Government, a few years ago, was talking about closing this hospital down!

CONGRESSMAN ROSENTHAL FOR THE CONSUMER

HON. JOSEPH P. ADDABBO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. ADDABBO. Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to cosponsor legislation introduced by our colleague from New York, the Honorable BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL, to create a Cabinet position for Consumer Affairs, as an independent agency to act as a watchdog over consumer problems and a guardian of consumer rights. Through the untiring efforts of my colleague from Queens, Congressman ROSENTHAL, and others, these issues have moved into the forefront of public attention and have provoked debate and editorial comment across the country.

I call to the attention of my colleagues a recent editorial which appeared in the June 22, 1970, issue of the Long Island Press on the subject of consumer legislation. I am placing the text of the editorial in the RECORD at this time in order to add to this constructive debate.

STRONG MEDICINE IS NEEDED

A timely report prepared for the National Commission on Product Safety has confirmed criticism of federal regulatory agencies long voiced by consumer groups.

In such areas as automobiles, flammable fabrics and toys, these agencies have not grappled with urgent problems of product safety, according to the report written by Howard A. Jeffront, former chief counsel for

the National Highway Safety Bureau, and three associates. If this official negligence continues, the panel found, "the agencies will serve mainly to insulate resistant industry from legitimate complaints."

The report said there is no easy way to align such agencies as the Food and Drug Administration and the Commerce Department squarely on the side of the consumer, where they belong. The answer is adequate funding and staffing and consumer representation in the regulatory process.

These findings buttress a bill to create three consumer agencies, including a 12-member advisory council to keep the White House and the protective agencies posted on the effectiveness of laws and federal programs. This is a compromise between Rep. Benjamin S. Rosenthal, Jackson Heights Democrat, its chief architect, and the administration, which wants to keep the Office of Consumer Affairs a permanent White House agency and create a consumer protection agency in the Justice Department. The compromise bill would maintain the White House office but create an independent protection agency in which consumers would be adequately represented.

The bill, described by Rep. Rosenthal as "the first balance wheel inserted into the market place in 50 years," may not provide all the answers to the problem of consumer protection—but it is at least a departure from regulatory agencies that fail to regulate and protective agencies that fail to protect.

CAMBODIA

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the President has stated that he had pulled all U.S. troops out of Cambodia and that the Cambodian operation has been a "success."

I have been opposed to our invasion of Cambodia since the President announced that U.S. troops would be sent into that neutral country on April 30. Nothing has happened since that time to change my opinion.

Robert Keatley in an article in today's Wall Street Journal entitled "Nixon to Claim Success for Raids, But Critics Dubious About Gains," has articulated the questions that I and many of my colleagues have raised about the rationale behind the Cambodian decision and the validity of the claims of "victory" which have emanated so frequently from the administration.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that our invasion of Cambodia has merely served to widen the Vietnam war and to embroil us in a longer, more costly, and more divisive Indochinese conflict.

Keatley writes:

The Cambodian raids were supposed to ease pressures in South Vietnam—not create another client state for the U.S. to bankroll. But some fear the latter is happening, with the U.S. drifting into deeper commitments to Cambodia's Premier Lon Nol day by day.

Economic and military aid schemes are being planned, too; a $50 million program for the fiscal year beginning tomorrow is likely (up from 7.9 million in the year ending today).

Keatley also questions whether the Lon Nol regime can survive for very long and describes Communist expansion into southern Laos and into northern Cambodia—an expansion that will give the Communists "new supply routes and base areas."

One of the President's reasons for sending troops into Cambodia was that success of the Vietnamization program would be enhanced by clearing out enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia.

In fact, by diverting thousands of American troops into Cambodia for the past 60 days and by sanctioning the continuation of the presence of South Vietnamese troops in Cambodia, we may very well have weakened our military posture in Vietnam and prolonged our stay there. Keatley states:

Communist military activity has increased since April 20 (except for the Saigon area) and is running at higher rates than during 1970's early months. Saigon's army has done badly in some defense battles, such as recent engagements in the mountain resort of Dalat and farther north near the demilitarized zone, while the invasion has diverted senior Vietnamese commanders from local security programs at home. In South Vietnam generally, American-South Vietnamese pressure on the Communists has eased, allowing them to move about more freely.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I believe that all Americans should consider seriously the ramifications of our actions in Cambodia, and I hope that never again will we be so foolish as to undertake such a hopeless mission.

The article follows:

CAMBODIAN PAYOFF: NIXON TO CLAIM SUCCESS FOR RAIDS, BUT CRITICS DUBIOUS ABOUT GAINS

(By Robert Keatley)

WASHINGTON.—"Cambodia can be described by one word: Victory!"

That's the loyal assessment of Gen. Leonard Chapman, the rather thoughtful Marine Corps commandant and a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, who are the senior military advisers to President Nixon.

It's certainly a judgment that will be repeated today when Mr. Nixon releases his summary of the controversial Cambodian invasion, which has just ended (for 30,000 American ground troops at least; some South Vietnamese remain). In addition, the Chief Executive will surely emphasize this opinion during tomorrow night's special television interview, when he will spend an hour answering somewhat critical questions from three newsmen.

But "victory" is not the verdict of many other Administration officials, including some of those best-informed about Asia. They believe the pluses and minuses of the Cambodian venture roughly cancel each other. Some claim the costly invasion has done no permanent damage to Hanoi's war strategy and hinders U.S. efforts to end its involvement in Indochina. They see few direct war gains within South Vietnam due to the incursion and worry that intensified political opposition at home may hinder Mr. Nixon's ability to continue an orderly disengagement there.

"It's the same old story of the war," complains one official. "When we total the gains and subtract the losses, there isn't much left."

DRIFTING INTO COMMITMENTS

The Cambodian raids were supposed to ease pressures in South Vietnam, not create another client state for the U.S. to bankroll. But some fear the latter is happening, with the U.S. drifting into deeper commitments to Cambodia's Premier Lon Nol day by day.

Those who take this view note that both Defense Secretary Melvin Laird and Secretary of State William Rogers now concede that continuing American air strikes, ostensibly to interdict enemy supply lines, will in fact give the Cambodian army combat support at times. Also, an American ambassador will soon be assigned to Phnom Penh, the capital, upgrading the U.S. mission there. Economic and military aid schemes are being planned, too; a $50 million program for the fiscal year beginning tomorrow is likely (up from $7.9 million in the year ending today).

The U.S. military attache's staff in Phnom Penh, now totaling 17, is growing; it may soon become a small advisory and training unit for Lon Nol's ragtag army. Washington is encouraging and will probably finance both Thai and South Vietnamese troops if they enter Cambodia to fight the Communists.

Complicating U.S. involvement in Cambodia is the fact that Communist forces now control the northern half of the country and are operating elsewhere there. Cambodia's general assembly, in a recent secret session, discussed voting no confidence in Lon Nol, a move that would shatter the fragile political situation in Phnom Penh. The assembly settled for a watchdog committee, headed by the premier's sharpest critic, which is supposed to insure that Lon Nol fulfills pledges that brought him into power, such as fighting Communists and corruption.

"U.S. policy hasn't allowed for the fact that Lon Nol may not survive very long," says an Asia expert.

Besides fanning out in Cambodia, the Communists have extended their control in southern Laos since American troops entered Cambodia April 20. Taken together, these moves give them new supply routes and base areas. Moreover, experts say the enemy will regain partial use of lost sanctuaries as the Americans and South Vietnamese leave Cambodia. There the Communists can dig up still-hidden supply caches; according to some informed estimates, at least two-thirds of their supplies remain safely in place.

That, of course, is not the picture Mr. Nixon will paint today. His lengthy white paper will undoubtedly claim unqualified successes for the joint American-South Vietnamese raids into enemy base areas.

TROOP WITHDRAWALS

Indications are that Mr. Nixon will say vital enemy sanctuaries along the Cambodian border have been destroyed and supply routes severed, with Hanoi no longer able to use them freely. He will presumably conclude that this achievement has seriously set back Communist commanders as they try to disrupt the South Vietnamese government's programs in the countryside. As evidence, the President may cite a sharp drop in Red activity around Saigon since the raids in Cambodia began.

His white paper will be replete with statistics. It's said the account will recall past totals of supplies captured in operations in South Vietnam; figures from the Cambodian raids will top these by wide margins. Incomplete compilations already list 23,300 weapons, 13.9 million bullets and 44,000 rocket rounds captured, among other things.

The paper will also promise that announced troop withdrawals can proceed on schedule, with 50,000 more men leaving South Vietnam by Oct. 15 and another 100,000 by May 1. Mr. Nixon may hint at moving even faster if events warrant it, though he probably won't make any firm promises at this time. House Minority Leader Gerald Ford of Michigan suggested Sunday that Mr. Nixon may increase the Oct. 15 number to 70,000 due to U.S. successes in Cambodia.

And there is a good chance the President may unveil an attention-getting peace offensive. One item may be appointment of a prestigious ambassador to the Paris peace talks in place of Philip Habib, the able career diplomat now in charge there (Mr. Habib

may soon become ambassador to either Thailand or Cambodia). More sweeping could be a dramatic proposal for a cease-fire, while Hanoi and Washington work out arrangements for ending the war completely. (Some officials expecting such a proposal believe Hanoi would flatly reject it, because it would require North Vietnam to react from what Mr. Nixon paints as a position of weakness.)

All in all, today's pronouncement will seek to show that a tenacious enemy has been punished, the net cost to the U.S. has been small and the war situation is vastly improved. It will also stress that peace, not military victory, is the main objective, and that neither wider war nor new U.S. commitments have developed since April 20.

But it will all add up to an incomplete, and in some ways deceptive, account of what the invasion has accomplished, the critics maintain.

These critics, far from wanting a pell-mell pullout, believe the U.S. can and should honor its promise to help create a Saigon regime that has a good chance of overcoming Communist opposition at home. But they think White House planners ordered the Cambodian raids without clear ideas of how the attacks would help achieve U.S. objectives.

IMPACT ON VIETNAM

To start with, the Cambodian incursions haven't seriously upset enemy operations within South Vietnam—and many officials stress the war must be decided there, not in some neighboring nation. Communist military activity has increased since April 20 (except for the Saigon area) and is running at higher rates than during 1970's early months. Saigon's army has done badly in some defensive battles, such as recent engagements in the mountain resort of Dalat and farther north near the demilitarized zone, while the invasion has diverted senior Vietnamese commanders from local security programs at home. In South Vietnam generally, American-South Vietnamese pressure on the Communists has eased, allowing them to move about more freely.

In addition, the Cambodian raids have not permanently disrupted the enemy's overall supply program, some officials say. Despite heavy rains and air raids, the Communists have kept open their main lines leading into southern Laos and northern Cambodia, and they are pouring 50 tons daily into new supply caches; last rainy season the Reds didn't keep these lines in operation.

Back on April 20, Mr. Nixon said the U.S. was attacking the enemy's Central Office for South Vietnam (COSVN), which he called "the headquarters for the entire Communist military operation in South Vietnam." He hasn't mentioned it since and probably won't today, for good reason.

SHORT-LIVED GAIN

The only military headquarters actually overrun by allied troops was that of the Reds' Military Subregion II, responsible for the countryside near Saigon. Senior officers were killed and captured, equipment seized and forces routed; the sharp drop in enemy attacks in the Saigon area is a direct result. But a recent intelligence report reaching here informed the White House that Subregion II has a new headquarters and is restored to "combat effectiveness." Presumably, enemy activity near Saigon will pick up again to match increases throughout the rest of South Vietnam.

If it does, this means Hanoi's basic battle plan hasn't been seriously damaged by the Cambodian raids. And the political uproar they caused in the U.S. could well reinforce North Vietnam's belief that it can outwait the Americans, who will be forced to go home someday. Hanoi's units within South Vietnam remain able to carry on low-level guerrilla warfare and apparently will have adequate, though certainly not excessive, supplies.

Perhaps more important, Saigon apparently has no specific plans for exploiting any morale or military gains resulting from the raids into Cambodia. While President Thieu is increasingly optimistic about victory, reports from Saigon say, some of his senior generals are grumbling about lack of plans for any military follow-through.

American forces apparently aren't gearing up for intensified operations against the Communists within South Vietnam. "There aren't plans for doing so—even though Gen. Abrams understands this need very well," says an informed source here.

MOVING INTO LAOS

However, there is some talk in the bureaucracy here about what to do next. To date it must be rated more of a possibility than a probability, but some officials are contemplating ground attacks by U.S. allies into Laos to try to cut off the Ho Chi Minh Trail leading South from Hanoi. It's reported this highly tentative talk focuses on the possibility inserting Thai troops from the west and South Vietnamenese soldiers from the east, presumably with much American combat support but no U.S. ground forces.

"Attacks on Communist forces on southern Laos and near the DMZ could be very profitable," argues one official.

President Nixon has repeatedly warned Hanoi he will act decisively if the enemy doesn't cool the combat and talk peace, and he may have this move in mind. But many who know the rugged Laotian terrain insist no available forces could satisfactorily do the job of cutting off the trail, and the fear of fresh political dissent at home might rule out the venture.

As an alternative to some big offensive against this crucial supply route, Washington might settle for a resumption of small-scale ground raids conducted against the trail in the past.

Some analysts find this possibility disturbing, however. "It is policy by increment," says one, meaning that the U.S. is deciding things case-by-case rather than following a broad master plan with well-defined objectives. These worriers feel that President Nixon and his senior foreign-affairs adviser, Henry Kissinger, may have forgotten their views to substitute sound planning for the chaotic policy-making of recent years.

RED CHINA'S ROLE

Some officials have still another worry: Communist China. They say U.S. policies seem to be giving China opportunities for making inexpensive gestures that could upset the political atmosphere of Southeast Asia without compensating gains for the non-Communist side.

Peking isn't likely to send troops into Indochina as long as North Vietnam itself isn't invaded, most analysts agree. But if U.S.-backed Thai "volunteers" enter Cambodia, Chairman Mao's men may announce plans to organize Chinese "volunteers" to fight back either in Cambodia or in Thailand itself—where a small-scale Communist insurgent movement is run by Peking, not Hanoi.

It's unlikely that any such Chinese volunteers would actually be sent south, but the political repercussion in Bangkok nevertheless would be great. The threat of a Chinese invasion could frighten the Thais out of the war or at least cause considerably panic—without a single Peking soldier leaving home.

In addition, China now has roughly 15,000 troops and engineers in northern Laos, up from only 6,000 last October; they are building a road, supposedly at the request of the Laotian government. Bangkok sees it as an invasion route to Thailand; if the Chinese should push the road further south, that, too, would upset Thai confidence.

"All the Chinese would have to do is go half-way to the Thai border, stop and build a basketball court," says one analyst, "but it would do the trick."

NEW RECOGNITION SIGNALS ARE NEEDED IN AMERICAN POLITICS THESE DAYS

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, I recommend the column by John P. Roche which ran in the Washington Post on June 25. While written in a light vein, it contains a significant message which is well worth noting. The column follows:

[From the Washington Post, June 25, 1970]

NEW RECOGNITION SIGNALS NEEDED IN AMERICAN POLITICS THESE DAYS

(By John P. Roche)

Life these days is pretty complicated. From the mail that comes in, it seems that one thing we desperately need in American politics are some new recognition signals—the equivalent of I.F.F. (Identification: Friend or Foe) radar. For example, a reader writes: "The other night I accidentally turned on a radio program and heard someone bitterly denouncing 'Kosher Nationalism' and 'Jew imperialism.' I thought the American Nazis had seized the station, but it turned out to be a Black Panther at a leftwing rally."

Another correspondent, equally perplexed, noted that he was reading an article vigorously defending the power of the President to engage in hostilities without a formal declaration of war by Congress. He assumed it was written by Sen. John Tower of Texas but discovered at the conclusion that in fact the author was Sen. William Fulbright of Arkansas—in an earlier manifestation.

Obviously something has to be done to get our contemporary categories sorted out. In every historical period there are litmus tests designed to separate the sheep from the goats. Right after World War II, for instance, we had a lot of Communist problems in the liberal movement. Disciplined Party caucuses tried to infiltrate and capture various liberal organizations. If one started accusing the C.P. of colonization, he was immediately denounced as a "Red baiter" and, later, a "McCarthyite."

It became essential to force the infiltrators to identify themselves. For this purpose anti-communist liberals devised an amendment which, in one form or another, could be used in virtually all situations. The Party faction in a group would introduce, say, a motion condemning loyalty oaths for teachers. We would introduce a simple amendment, a preamble stating: "While we disapprove of teachers who accept totalitarian discipline from either the right or the left" . . . The condemnation of loyalty oaths would follow. Although they were crazy not to roll with the punch, the Communists were under orders that any attack on the Soviet Union had to be opposed. The vote on this one invariably provided a hard head-count. It differentiated the cadres from the confused fellow travelers.

In 1948, when Henry Wallace provided the Communists with a sacrificial offering, one could always turn a Progressive Party meeting inside out by moving that the group support "self-determination for Macedonia." Most Progressive Party supporters were innocents who asked for it. They were always baffled when their Communist ideological guardians went up in smoke about the Macedonians, not realizing that "self-determination for Macedonia" was a "vicious Trotskyist, Bukharinite, anti-socialist slogan"—that is, Tito was behind it!

There are some recognition signals around today, but they tend to be fairly esoteric. You

can, for instance, instantly fragment a New Left youth meeting by advocating "spontaneity." This sends the orthodox Communists up one wall, the orthodox Trotskyites up another, the Castro-Maoites up a third, and the authentic crazies up still a fourth. Or, suggest that American Negroes are an "oppressed colonial people awaiting national liberation," and watch the fun.

But these are inadequate for our needs. Our basic problem is how to tell a "radical" from a "reactionary," and the old standards are clearly obsolete. I would welcome suggestions (to save time, send them directly to me at Brandeis University, Waltham, Mass. 02154) from readers with the hope that some time in the near future a column can be used to set out the best proposals. After all, when you are not sure whether you are listening to a Nazi or a Panther, something urgent must be done.

HARMFUL CHEMICALS

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would appreciate the opportunity of calling to our colleagues' attention a most interesting letter written by Thomas Whiteside to the editor of the New Yorker magazine, and containing an examination of several household items which may be hazardous to the public health.

The letter, entitled "Department of Amplification," is a follow-up to Mr. Whiteside's New Yorker articles earlier this year about the dangerous fetus-deforming herbicide 2,4,5-T, which has been utilized extensively as a defoliant in Vietnam and as a weed killer here in the United States.

This and other polychlorinated phenolic compounds are so potentially dangerous and attempts by public agencies to restrict their distribution and use so feeble, his argument goes, that uses of such chemicals should be fully suspended until it has been clearly shown "through the necessary chemical, biological, and environmental testing" that their employment is not in fact a public health hazard.

The Whiteside argument is cogent. The gentleman's letter follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AMPLIFICATION,
New York, N.Y., June 7, 1970.

The EDITORS,
The New Yorker

DEAR SIRS: In the issues of February 7th and March 14th of this year, I presented in *The New Yorker* some of the mounting evidence regarding the dangerous teratogenic, or fetus-deforming, effects of the herbicide 2,4,5-T, which has been used in huge amounts over the past decade as a defoliant in Vietnam and as a weed killer here at home. What seemed particularly alarming, as I reported, was the seemingly unavoidable presence in 2,4,5-T of a highly toxic and teratogenic contaminant belonging to a group known commonly as dioxins. I also pointed out the reluctance of the government, despite its apparent awareness of the dangers, to eliminate or drastically restrict the use of this herbicide.

On April 15th the Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Jesse L. Steinseld, appeared before a Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan, that was investigating the safety of 2,4,5-T and announced, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a number of measures that were being taken to limit the use of 2,4,5-T in this country. These measures included the immediate suspension of the Department of Agriculture's registrations of liquid formulations of 2,4,5-T used around the home and of all formulations used for killing vegetation around lakes, ponds, and irrigation ditches. The Surgeon General also announced that the Department of Agriculture was about to cancel its registrations of non-liquid formulations of 2,4,5-T for use around the home and on food crops, including corn, barley, oats, rice rye, apples, and blueberries. On the same day Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard announced the immediate suspension of the use of 2,4,5-T in Vietnam.

Against a background of evidence accumulated since 1966 that 2,4,5-T, or material with which it is ordinarily contaminated to some degree, exerts a fetus-deforming effect on the offspring of experimental animals, and a background, too, of extraordinary reluctance on the part of the government agencies, including the office of President Nixon's own Science Adviser, Dr. Lee DuBridge, to inform the public in a forthright manner about the potential hazards of 2,4,5-T to human health, the statement by the Surgeon General appeared to signal clear and unequivocal action at last against the widespread use of 2,4,5-T. Federal law requires that all pesticides and herbicides be registered with the Department of Agriculture before they can be marketed in interstate commerce, and the conclusion that citizens could reasonably be expected to draw from the Surgeon General's statement was that cancellation and suspension of these registrations had put an immediate stop to the sale and use of 2,4,5-T here.

That conclusion, I regret to say, is not justified. The word "cancellation," which has such an air of finality about it, and which seems to signify drastic action, is really one of the weaker words in the federal-regulatory lexicon—far weaker than the word "suspension," which the Department of Agriculture has applied to its action on the registrations of liquid formulations of 2,4,5-T used around the home and around lakes, ponds, and irrigation ditches. To illustrate one of the powerful distinctions implicit in this upsidedown bureaucratic language, when the Department of Agriculture *suspends* the registration of a product for certain uses, the suspension takes force immediately, and under federal law shipments of the product in interstate commerce must stop; in effect, the flow of the product from manufacturer to ultimate user is immediately pinched off at a point reasonably close to the source of supply. When the Department of Agriculture *cancels* the registration of a product for certain uses, however, the movement of the product in interstate commerce is brought to no such automatic halt. A company given a cancellation order is told that after thirty days it can no longer ship its product across state lines, but the company has the right to appeal the order, and if it does appeal, this action has the effect of staying the order. During the lengthy process of appeal, the company can continue to produce, ship, and sell the cancelled product. A company whose product's registration is suspended has no such recourse.

Approximately six weeks after the Surgeon General's announcement concerning 2,4,5-T, I stopped in at several garden stores in the New York area. I found that a number of 2,4,5-T formulations—weed killers, poison-ivy sprays, and lawn food—were still on sale. Since the Surgeon General had cited as one of the primary reasons for federal actions against 2,4,5-T the government's wish to afford "maximum protection to women in the childbearing years" by preventing them from being exposed to the herbicide, this state of affairs startled me, particularly since May and June are the months of maximum use of herbicides. The disturbing fact is that the Department of Agriculture has no power to compel manufacturers to recall from retail stores products whose registration for certain uses the Department has either cancelled *or* suspended. There is no federal law against a retailer's selling such a product or against a customer's buying it. The law does provide that stocks of it can be seized by Department of Agriculture inspectors. However, the number of retail establishments selling herbicidal formulations for home use runs into the scores of thousands, whereas the number of retail-store inspectors employed by the Department of Agriculture, I recently discovered, is exactly thirty-two. On a practical level, then, the power of the Department of Agriculture to prevent the retail sale of such products is almost nonexistent. Furthermore, not only is it legal under federal law for a homeowner to buy a products whose registration for certain uses has been officially cancelled or suspended but it is legal for him to use it and use it in any way he pleases. Without breaking any federal law, he can dump concentrations of 2,4,5-T on his lawn in such a way that some of it enters his or his neighbors' water supplies.

Similarly, a farmer can continue to use 2,4,5-T on his crops without breaking any federal law even though that use has been the subject of a Department of Agriculture cancellation order. The only risk he faces is that of seizure by Food and Drug Administration inspectors of any of his crops shipped in interstate commerce that are found to have detectable amounts of 2,4,5-T residue on them. The risk isn't a very great one, since these inspections take place at retail outlets—supermarkets, and so on—where F.D.A. inspectors collect samples of foodstuff and send them back to the F.D.A. for analysis, which takes time. The bureaucratic machinery is creaky, and if any detectable residue of 2,4,5-T is found on the foodstuff—say, blueberries that the farmer has sprayed with 2,4,5-T—the chances are that by the time the Department is ready to seize the stock of blueberries in the store (which after all, is probably only one of many stores to which berries from this batch have been shipped) the blueberries have been bought and eaten. In any event, only the blueberries can be found guilty—not the farmer or the shipper. And the farmer can go right on using 2,4,5-T as he pleases, because the cancellation powers and suspension powers of the Department of Agriculture apply not to the basic chemical compound of 2,4,5-T as such but only to the formally registered *uses* for which it is intended. In effect, this means that there is federal control only over the wording of labels on the cans, bottles, or drums of these chemicals. It is true that the Department has asked manufacturers of 2,4,5-T products whose registration for certain uses have been cancelled or suspended to recall the products from retailers, but this will have to be done strictly on a voluntary basis if it is done at all. Even if it actually is done, and the products are back in the manufacturers' hands, the recall does not mean that the 2,4,5-T will be destroyed. For the most part, it means merely that the 2,4,5-T formulation will be relabelled, with the cancelled uses deleted, and sold over again in the same form, and even in the same containers. And since the label on the container has no binding force on the purchaser, there is no guarantee at all that 2,4,5-T will not continue to be applied in ways that the public might reasonably suppose to have been stopped dead by the government.

Further examination reveals that the measures against the use of 2,4,5-T that appear to be so sweeping actually apply to about

ten per cent of the total amount of 2,4,5-T used in this country—that is, only a 2,4,5-T used around homes, gardens, and aquatic areas and on food crops. And since 2,4,5-T products are still being sold freely in garden-supply stores, I estimate that so far the cancellation and suspension orders have affected no more than two or three per cent of the total amount. About ninety per cent, in any case, is used for the control of woody plants in such areas as rangeland and pastureland and along railroad and electric line rights-of-way. These uses remain unaffected by the new federal orders because the Departments of Agriculture, H.E.W., and the Interior agreed that in such areas, many of which are remote from dense population, 2,4,5-T does not constitute an imminent hazard to women of children-bearing age.

I believe that this conclusion deserves reexamination As studies with experimental animals have shown, 2,4,5-T is a fetus-deforming agent both in its relatively pure form, which has so far been formulated only under laboratory-test conditions, and in the form in which it is ordinarily sold to users. Because certain factors are apparently impossible to eliminate in its production, the latter form is a contaminated one, the contaminants being present in amounts that have up to now been considered tolerable. The name of the principal contaminant in 2,4,5-T is symmetrical 2,3,6,7-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin, and it has been found to be both extremely toxic and, in certain tests on living creatures, teratogenic. In tests on chick embryos, this form of dioxin, in a pure state, has the capacity to deform embryos at levels of a trillionth of a gram per kilogram of the egg—a level only one-millionth as great as that required to achieve a comparable effect in chick-embryo experiments with the notorious teratogen thalidomide. And in tests involving a mixture of dioxins in which the symmetrical tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin predominated, conducted by the Food and Drug Administration on pregnant hamsters, a dosage of 9.1 millionths of a gram per day (for five days) per kilogram of the mother's body weight produced an incidence of eighty-two per cent mortality and eighty-two per cent abnormality among live offspring.

Dioxins are also known to have untoward effects on human beings. In factories where 2,4,5-T is produced, the dioxin appears as a contaminant in an intermediate stage of the manufacturing process, and some of it remains in the finished product. In 1964, workers in a Midland, Michigan, factory of the Dow Chemical Company, one of the largest producers of 2,4,5-T, contracted an illness through exposure to the dioxin contaminant. The symptoms of this illness were described as follows by Dr. Julius E. Johnon, a vice-president of the Dow Chemical and its director of research and development, in testimony he gave in mid-April before the Senate subcommittee investigating 2,4,5-T.

The most sensitive toxic reaction observed in humans to this impurity [the tetra dioxin] was manifested by a condition known as chloracne, a skin disorder mostly prevalent on the face, neck and back. It is similar in appearance to severe acne often suffered by teenagers.

The way Dr. Johnson described chloracne before the Senate subcommittee, it does not sound like a very serious condition. However, the way he described it before the subcommittee is not quite the way Dr. Benjamin Holder, the director of the medical department at Dow's Midland Division, had described it two months earlier during a meeting with government chemists. According to a memorandum originating in one of the regulatory agencies involved, Dr. Holder said that about sixty people had contacted the disease at the Dow plant, and that its onset had been slow—four to six weeks. The memorandum continued:

Early symptoms [according to Dr. Holder] include fatigue, lassitude and depression, and early signs include the appearance of comedones on the face and body . . . and weight loss. . . . Severe exposure results in effects involving internal organs and nervous system disorder (polyneuritis). . . . Dr. Holder discussed the examination and treatment of exposed workers. He said that six months were required for marked recovery to begin, and complete recovery required up to several years.

According to a paper published in a German scientific journal a year before the Dow people made these observations, the symptoms of chloracne associated with the intermediate stage of manufacture of 2,4,5-T include mental depression, reduced power of recall and concentration, disturbed sleep, irritability, reduced libido, and impotence. And another scientific paper, so far unpublished, on an outbreak of chloracne that occurred in another 2,4,5-T factory (not a Dow factory) in the United States, describes the continued existence of serious mental disturbance among affected workers some six years afterward. The reason I emphasize the presence and the extremely hazardous nature of the dioxin contaminant in 2,4,5-T is that while the Dow people claim that 2,4,5-T is readily decomposable in soil and by the action of sunlight after it has been applied, neither they nor anyone else has ever shown that the dioxin contaminant, as distinct from a theoretically pure 2,4,5-T, is biologically degradable; that is, that it does not persist in the environment or accumulate in animal tissue. On the contrary, the characteristics of dioxin-related chloracne poisoning, far from resembling those of the transient acne of teenagers, includes effects that are surely indicative of a serious toxic influence that is stubbornly persistent in the human body and its central nervous system. And, according to Dr. Jacqueline Verrett, of the Food and Drug Administration (Dr. Verrett's chick-embryo studies contributed to the discovery that the cyclamates widely used as sugar substitutes were carcinogenic substances), studies of the effects of dioxins on chicks and small mammals indicate that dioxin may very well accumulate in animal tissue more or less as DDT does—the difference being that dioxin is infinitely more toxic.

In the absence of positive proof that dioxin is not persistent and cumulative, the continued virtually unrestricted spraying of 2,4,5-T on pastureland and rangeland seems to me to constitute a serious potential hazard to human health. In spite of manufacturers' claims, there appears to be no evidence that the dioxin contaminant does not persist in the sprayed area long after the 2,4,5-T itself has broken down. The amounts of dioxin that would thus remain would, admittedly, be very small in relation to the amount of 2,4,5-T originally laid down—the Dow people, for example, claim that the dioxin content of their 2,4,5-T is less than one part per million—but the potency of dioxin is so extreme that a serious question arises whether traces of dioxin remain on sprayed pastureland and may be ingested by beef cattle, dairy cows, and sheep, with the result that dioxin builds up in the tissues of these livestock and enters the human food chain through meat or milk. The relentlessness of the cumulative process involving DDT and other pesticides is well known by now, when human milk contains more DDT than federal law permits in cow's milk crossing state lines, and when virtually every sample of drinking water tested throughout the country by the Environmental Control Administration has contained traces of pesticide. The only precaution recommended by the Department of Agriculture against possible contamination of dairy cattle feeding on pastureland sprayed with 2,4,5-T is that the land not be grazed for seven days after a spraying. Since the Department's own calculations of the persistence of 2,4,5-T—calculations that take no account whatever of the persistence of the dioxin contaminant—are that 2,4,5-T takes about five months to break down in soil, these precautionary measures as they relate to grass growing from the soil or water holes on its surface hardly seem adequate for the ultimate protection of the public against a herbicide that has been demonstrated to be a serious potential health hazard even in a laboratory-purified form. As for precautions against the ingestion of dioxin, there simply aren't any, because as far as federal regulations are concerned dioxin does not exist. In the case of grazing beef cattle, the Department of Agriculture does not recommend withholding the land from use for as much as a day after a 2,4,5-T spraying. In Texas alone, more than a million acres of rangeland and pastureland are being sprayed with 2,4,5-T this year; probably at least a quarter of a million head of cattle will graze on that sprayed land; and the cattle will produce something like a hundred and fifty million pounds of meat that will be sold to Americans as edible—all in the absence of a solitary meaningful restriction imposed by the federal government on either the spraying or the grazing, and also in the absence of a solitary scientific study, either by industry or by any government agency, concerning the stability, the persistence, and the cumulative capacity of the dioxin contaminant in the bodies of living creatures.

Next year, the total area sprayed with 2,4,5-T throughout the country may well be greatly increased rather than decreased. The use of herbicides in this country has been increasing at a considerably greater rate than that of pesticides, and it is only because military priorities for defoliation programs in Vietnam cut the available supply of 2,4,5-T quite drastically that this country has been spared the much more extensive use of 2,4,5-T on rangeland and pastureland. In Vietnam, a total of about forty million pounds of 2,4,5-T has been dropped on the countryside. The suspension, under public pressure, of the use of 2,4,5-T there will probably bring about the release in the coming year of huge amounts of it in the domestic market, and a logical target of chemical-company salesmen for disposal of the surplus would be the cattle industry and the United States Forest Service.

Also, to my knowledge, no proper investigation has ever been made of the possibility that, quite aside from the dioxin already present in 2,4,5-T sprayed on vegetation, *further* amounts of dioxin may be created, and released into the environment, through the breakdown process of 2,4,5-T as it is affected by sunlight and by heat. Heat strong enough to create new dioxin can occur under conditions that are not highly unusual. Brush that has been killed, whether by 2,4,5-T or other means, is certainly a fire hazard, especially in a hot, dry climate, such as that of Texas, where so much 2,4,5-T spraying is going on, and a brush fire over a large sprayed area containing 2,4,5-T residues could conceivably guarantee considerable quantities of dioxin and release it into the atmosphere.

It seems most likely that the hazards of pollution of the environment by dioxins extend far beyond the use of 2,4,5-T. This herbicide is only one of many products derived from polychlorinated phenolic compounds that contain dioxins or are the precursors of dioxins. These products range from pesticides to deodorants. It appears that when any chlorophenol is heated sufficiently it can be converted into a dioxin This fact raises questions about the release of dioxins into the environment merely through the burning of many commonly used products. For example, one of the polychlorinated

phenolic compounds, pentachlorophenol, is widely used as a fungicide and as an antibacterial preparation. It is used in preserving wood and in controlling slime in the manufacture of paper. In 1968, more than twenty-seven million pounds of pentachlorophenol and its salts were used in the United States to preserve wood. Since the fate of most timber is to be burned sooner or later, and since it is reported that when five grams of pentachlorophenol is heated at a temperature of three hundred degrees for twelve hours it is capable of generating one and a half grams of octachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin, the possibility that considerable amounts of dioxin will be released into the atmosphere from wood treated with this preservative presents a potential health hazard of very alarming dimensions. The same thing may be said of the burning of paper that has been treated with pentachlorophenol. Aside from any hazard created by burning, the extreme toxicity of pentachlorophenol was discussed some years ago in an article in the *British Medical Journal* on some sawmill workers in Borneo who handled wet timbers that had been freshly treated with a solution of sodium pentachlorophenate, a salt of pentachlorophenol. The people involved, who are described in a Monsanto Chemical Company manual on pentachlorophenol as "nine undernourished, scantily clothed native workers," were not wearing protective garments—a circumstance that the Monsanto manual calls a "complete violation of safety precautions for handling Penta [a Monsanto trade name] materials." They died as a result of handling the timbers.

Pentachlorophenol is used in a wide variety of products, including paints and shampoos. It is put in laundry starches as a preservative, and it has been used in other laundry products. The extreme hazards posed by the injudicious use of this chemical, which is buried in so many consumer products, can be perceived in a scientific paper that appeared in the *Journal of Pediatrics* last August, entitled "Pentachlorophenol Poisoning in a Nursery for Newborn Infants." The paper describes the cases of nine infants between six and fourteen days old who were all born in a small hospital for unmarried mothers in St. Louis and who were all admitted to St. Louis Children's Hospital with a severe form of an unusual and undiagnosed illness marked by excessive sweating, increased heart rate, respiratory difficulty, and enlargement of the liver. Two of the infants died shortly after being admitted to Children's Hospital; the rest were given blood transfusions and other treatment and survived. The cause of the poisoning was traced to an antimicrobial laundry neutralizer that had been used in excessive amounts in the laundry of the hospital where the children were born. The neutralizer contained sodium pentachlorophenate, and traces of pentacholorphenol that remained in diapers and other clothing after laundering had penetrated the skins of the infants and entered their systems. The insidious nature of pentachlorophenol can be illustrated further by the fact that after the use of the rinse was discontinued, traces of pentachlorophenol continued to be found in the blood of newborn children and of expectant mothers. It turned out that although the infants were no longer directly exposed to pentachlorophenol, the mothers-to-be had continued to use linens that had been rinsed with it. There is speculation that the pentacholorphenol traces in the linens used by the expectant mothers became absorbed into their systems and crossed the placental barrier into the systems of the unborn babies.

Such facts led me to become curious about other commonly used products that contain polychlorinated phenolic compounds. One of these is the household disinfectant Lysol, which contains a chlorophenol compound. Another polychlorinated phenolic compound that is widely used in hexachlorophene. The basic material for hexachlorophene originates in 2,4,5-trichlorophenol, which is also the precursor of 2,4,5-T in the manufacture of the herbicide. Hexachlorophene is very widely used as an antibacterial agent, and is an ingredient of toilet soaps, of skin lotions for babies, and of cleaning powders used for washing diapers and infants' laundry. It is used in deodorant creams and sprays, and it is a principal active ingredient of pHisoHex, a sudsing antibacterial agent for the skin that is universally used in hospitals and widely used in homes. (In hospitals, it is used in scrubbing up before surgery.)

A relatively small number of people appear to be sensitive to such hexachlorophene preparations when they are applied to the skin, but the undoubted benefits of the preparations are generally considered to far outweigh this known disadvantage. Manufacturers of soap claim that hexachlorophene does not readily penetrate the natural barrier of the human skin. However, it may be another matter when hexachlorophene preparations are used where the natural skin barrier has been broken down. In 1965, at the Shriners' Burns Institute, a hospital in Galveston, affiliated with the University of Texas, that is devoted to the treatment of severe burns, nine children had their wounds cleansed with a three-per-cent solution of hexachlorophene in detergent in preparation for skin grafts. Six of the children soon developed generalized convulsions. To determine the cause of the convulsions, a study was subsequently made in which hexachlorophene was sprinkled into skin incisions in rats. All the rats died.

More recently, Dr. Verrett has made studies of the effects of hexachlorophene on chick embryos, and her observations concerning one of her experiments have led her to conclude that hexachlorophene is so toxic that when it is injected into the embryos in a concentration of half a milligram per kilogram of egg it kills sixty per cent of the embryos. In another study, in which hexachlorophene was injected into the eggs at this same concentration, Dr. Verrett found signs of teratogenicity—including a significant incidence of cleft palate, eye and beak defects, and an incidence of leg deformations and edemas, or body-fluid swellings—similar to the teratogenic effects she had found in comparable chick-embryo studies of 2,4,5-T, of the dioxin contaminant, and of 2,4,5-trichlorophenol.

Hexachlorophene has been manufactured for commercial purposes for about thirty years, and last year between two and three million pounds was produced in this country; much larger quantities are expected to be available in 1970, again because of the suspension of the use of 2,4,5-T in Vietnam. The Food and Drug Administration places no restrictions on the use of hexachlorophene in such consumer products as toilet soap and deodorants. Yet, as far as I can determine, not one single series of formal tests has ever been completed either by any corporation or by any government agency to determine whether this chemical is teratogenic, whether it causes mutations, or whether it produces cancer in experimental animals. Regardless of this lack of data, the Department of Agriculture permits the use of hexachlorophene in certain pesticides used on farm produce. It is sprayed on certain fruits and vegetables to cut down bacterial action that might encourage spoilage. Its use is permitted in quite high concentrations in water drunk by livestock, as a means of preventing liver flukes in cattle. If it is effective against liver flukes in cattle, it presumably penetrates to the liver, and since beef and calf's liver winds up on the dinner table, one wonders about other ways in which hexachlorophene might possibly be ingested by humans. One route might be through drinking water. With the huge amounts of hexachlorophene used in soaps and such consumer products, regardless of whether, as soap manufacturers claim, very little of the hexachlorophene is absorbed into the human body through the skin, the hexaclorophene that remains outside the skin is for the most part drained away in waste water. Since much waste water in this country is reused, after treatment, as drinking water, it seems reasonable to question whether traces of hexachlorophene are ingested by human beings in this way.

Both the ubiquity of polychlorinated phenolic compounds in the environment and their apparent ability to accumulate in the systems of living creatures are suggested by the contamination caused by a group of polychlorinated phenolic compounds known as polychlorinated biphenyls, or, more commonly, PCBs. These materials, which are known to be highly toxic, and are potential sources of dioxins in themselves, are used for a wide variety of purposes. They are used in rubber products and insulating materials, in paper coatings, in brake linings, in asphalt tiles and other asphalt compounds, in paints and varnishes, in inks for high-speed presses, in waxes, and also in pesticides. In this country, PCBs are manufactured by the Monsanto Chemical Company under the trade name Aroclors. According to a recent article by Dr. Robert Risebrough, of the Institute of Marine Resources of the University of California at Berkeley, in the magazine *Environment*, PCBs have been found in North American peregrine falcons in amounts as great as 1,980 parts per million parts of body fat, and in Sweden, in the fat of the white-tailed eagle in the amount of 17,000 parts per million. Traces of PCBs have been discovered in fish in Lake Michigan, and it may therefore be assumed that PCBs have found their way into the human food chain. In tests of samples of mothers' milk from Los Angeles and Berkeley that were analyzed late in 1968 by Dr. James Enderson, of Colorado College, every sample tested contained traces of PCBs.

Of the polychlorinated phenolic herbicides used in the United States, the most widely used is 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid, or 2,4-D. In 1968, approximately fifty-seven million pounds of 2,4-D was used in this country, in compounds that ranged from agricultural sprays to lawn foods and preparations for removing dandelions. As far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, 2,4-D may be sprayed on virtually any crop or area—with minor restrictions as to intervals before harvesting, and so on. Last year, probably fifty-seven million acres of agricultural land was sprayed with it, and probably more than a million pounds of it was used on turf alone. Over the past ten years, close to half a billion pounds of 2,4-D has been laid down on vegetation in this country, and today every garden store is full of compounds containing it; about a hundred and seventy-five companies produce 2,4-D preparations, and the chemical appears in somewhere between five hundred and eight hundred products currently in use. In spite of the Department of Agriculture's almost completely permissive attitude toward the use of 2,4-D, this herbicide has never been proved to be non-hazardous to public health. Last year, 2,4-D was characterized in a report by the Bionetics Research Laboratories, in Bethesda, Maryland—the original discoverer of the teratogenic qualities of 2,4,5-T—as "potentially dangerous" and "needing further study." Recently, a screening study conducted by Dr. Verrett on the effects of purified 2,4-D on chick embryos showed the 2,4-D to have teratogenic effects. And preliminary observations in a study, also made within the F.D.A., of the effects of commercially produced 2,4-D given orally at high dosage levels to pregnant hamsters are said to show an incidence of birth abnormalities, including skeletal abnormalities, higher than that in studies of the effects of purified 2,4,5-T given to preg-

nant hamsters at comparable dosage levels. But the Department of Agriculture has made no move either to warn the public of these ominous findings or to restrict 2,4-D's registered uses.

The potential hazards of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D were further underlined this spring by a report concerning the fate of a herd of six hundred reindeer on government rangeland near Lulea, in northern Sweden, which had been sprayed last July with a mixture of one part 2,4,5-T and two parts 2,4-D at the rate of a little less than two pounds per acre. A few weeks after the animals had eaten large amounts of sprayed foliage, a hundred of them died and another hundred and fifty disappeared—the presumption being that many of the missing ones also succumbed. Among the surviving animals, forty females had miscarriages. Analysis of the reindeer carcasses by the National Swedish Veterinary Institute showed significant residues of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T in their kidneys and livers. In view of this report, the almost complete lack of restrictions by our Department of Agriculture on the use of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D on rangeland and pastureland seems particularly disturbing.

The acute effects on human beings of high dosages of PCBs are evident from a series of outbreaks of poisoning, traced to cooking oil extracted from rice hulls, that occurred two years ago in western Japan, in which at least ten thousand people were affected. The outbreaks involved both an abnormal incidence of miscarriages and stillbirths among women in the affected population and abnormally dark skin pigmentation in infants. The victims of the poisoning showed the classic symptoms of chloracne, and in several very serious cases they also showed symptoms of jaundice and other liver damage. Polychlorinated phenolic compounds are known to be used in Japan as herbicides on paddy fields, and the causative agent of the poisoning was identified as a PCB. Yet our Department of Agriculture permits the use of PCBs as additives in between thirty and forty registered pesticide products and has taken no action to protect the public against the dangers of these additives.

It seems to me clear from all this that the whole family of polychlorinated phenolic compounds is one that scientifically speaking, consistently produces very bad news. In spite of this, the federal agencies charged with regulating the use of such substances to protect public health have taken virtually no effective steps either to investigate the harmful potential of these compounds or to protect the public from such possible harm. The Department of Agriculture, which has jurisdiction over the pesticidal and other non-drug uses of all sterilizing, disinfecting, germicidal, and antibacterial chemicals sold in this country—and most of the polychlorinated phenols are in one or more of these categories—has not, during all the years in which it has permitted the use of these substances, completed one laboratory study of dioxin contamination or of dioxin generation by any polychlorinated phenol. After almost a quarter of a century during which the Department has authorized the virtually unrestricted use of a herbicidal agent as powerful as 2,4,5-T, and in the face of well-established facts about the alarming teratogenicity both of 2,4,5-T and of its dioxin contaminant, none of the scientists employed by the Department have completed a single working experiment on the prevalence and generation of dioxins. Although they have gone so far as to draw up a list of seventeen polychlorinated phenolic compounds that they believe should be studied, they do not know, at the time this is written, even how many formulations of these compounds are on the market, what quantities of them are being sold, and what uses they are being put to. I became aware of this when, before writing this letter, I called the Pesticides Regulation Division of the Department of Agriculture and asked for a list of registered products containing polychlorinated phenolic compounds. According to the assistant director of the Pesticides Regulation Division, the Department has no such list and no list of formulators in whose names the products have been registered, nor has it a list of the uses to which the compounds in interstate commerce are being put. No one had ever before asked for such a list, he said, and the only way the Department could compile one for me would be my making a manual search through files containing some fifty thousand pesticidal-product registrations—which would, of course, be very expensive and complicated.

Clearly, in the polychlorinated phenolic compounds, we are confronted with substances in our environment that, even though we may be exposed to any of them in almost undetectable quantities, cumulatively and collectively pose frightening potential hazards to public health and involve the serious question of possible effects on the unborn. Considering the striking contrast between the urgency of the problems and the apparent inability of federal regulatory agencies to take prompt action to protect the public against these hazards, it seems to me that a drastic change in methods is essential. The existing pattern of inertia is attributable to a complex set of circumstances that includes inadequate statutory authority to deal with potentially hazardous products on the necessary environmental scale—all the way from their creation in factories, through their movement in interstate commerce, to their use and their eventual disposal or decomposition. A second factor is the very inadequate funding by Congress of the regulatory agencies. The Food and Drug Administration, for example, is supposed properly to regulate various activities of businesses that gross some three hundred *billion* dollars a year on an annual departmental budget of sixty million dollars, while the Department of Agriculture, as I have pointed out, has those thirty-two retail-store inspectors to cover the whole country. These conditions account, in part, for the passive attitude that agencies often take toward the industries they are supposed to regulate. Once a product has been registered as acceptable for use in interstate commerce, it tends to acquire such status that if subsequent questions arise about its safety, the burden of proof concerning this is really placed upon the federal regulatory agency rather than on the producer of the product. Since the agency too often does not have adequate facilities, money, or manpower to offer such proof, general foot-dragging or tired surrender to industry pressure by the agency people is naturally encouraged. It seems to me grossly improper that doubts raised about the safety of complex chemical substances put out by large companies for extensive public use should be so often resolved by federal regulatory agencies in favor of the welfare of these companies rather than of the welfare of the public. It does appear to me that in the case of the present uses of 2,4,5-T, 2,4-D, and other polychlorinated phenolic herbicide or pesticide compounds, such doubts can best be resolved by simply imposing a full suspension of all uses of these chemicals until it has been shown, as clearly as science can demonstrate through the necessary chemical, biological, and environmental testing, that the employment of these substances or their contaminants or breakdown products will not be hazardous to public health.

Sincerely,

THOMAS WHITESIDE.

EDUCATION FOR THE 1970'S

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in the course of the hearings of the General Subcommittee on Education about the needs of elementary and secondary schools for the decade of the 1970's, I continue to be impressed with the variety of self-help programs in education that are taking place in many of our schools.

In Nanuet, N.Y., for example, two teachers devised a new alphabet combining pictures and letters that has produced astonishing results in the 6 years it has been in operation. So successful has this "Alpha One" project been that more than 1,100 schools in 31 States have now converted to the system.

At Boston High School, boys and girls who would have become dropouts are participating in a work-study program that enables them to work part time during the school year and full time during the summer months. The generous cooperation of several businesses in the Boston area have prompted the success of this program. It does not deal with tens of thousands of youngsters, but perhaps because it is willing to save the individual few it is worthy of our regard and notice.

Mr. Speaker, I call these interesting articles to the attention of my colleagues today to indicate the specific efforts that are being taken at the local school and school district level to meet some of our worst education problems without waiting for guidance from Washington. I salute these communities and these enterprising educators for their foresight and creativity.

Mr. Speaker, the articles follow:

LITTLE KIDS, BIG WORDS

(By Herbert Kupferberg)

NANUET, N.Y.—Six-year-old schoolchildren in Nanuet, N.Y., a village 20 miles north of New York City, can spell such words as "fantastic," "convention" and "anthropomorphic," and toss off such definitions as "When somebody likes to fight, he's pugnacious," or "When you step on a piece of chalk you pulverize it."

The first-graders owe this astonishing ability to spell and understand words to a new way to teach reading invented by two teachers at Nanuet's Highview Elementary School, Elayne Reiss and Rita Friedman. The school has been using the system, called Alpha One, for six years with such success that it is now spreading far and fast across the U.S.

NEW YORK GOES FOR IT

During the school year that just ended, some 1100 schools in 31 states converted to Alpha One. Next September, more will introduce it, with the New York City system putting it into 300 schools. Educators are particularly excited because Alpha One seems to work equally well for slow children as for bright, and in inner-core urban neighborhoods as in well-to-do suburbs.

Says Lawrence Finkel, principal of P.S. 115 in the racially mixed Washington Heights area of Manhattan: "It's the single most creative piece of school teaching I've seen introduced in all my years in the system."

What's the secret? Alpha One works by appealing to young children's sense of fantasy and imagination. It also represents a return to the old "phonics" method of teaching reading by "sounding out" words.

This method was abandoned years ago in favor of the "look-see" method, in which pupils were expected to recognize words whole. "Look-see," with its stories about Dick and Jane and Spot the dog, has long been branded as a failure by many educators, notably in a book called *Why Johnny Can't Read* by Rudolf Flesch. There's a popular joke in academic circles about a teacher who backed her car into a garage wall and said: "Look, look, look. See, see, see. Damn, damn, damn."

Elayne Reiss says she found the prevailing reading instruction method was "making failures of children at the age of 6.

"You just couldn't get total involvement," says the petite, auburn-haired teacher, who has two daughters aged 14 and 11. "You could see by their eyes that the kids weren't with it. There was no sign of the joy of reading, no excitement, no delight."

PHONICS CAN BE FUN

Working with Rita Friedman, her reading coordinator, Elayne decided that the way to teach reading was to put fun into phonics. So she turned the whole alphabet into a world of "letter-people," with each of the 26 letters given human qualities.

Thus, instead of learning their ABC's by rote, the first-graders are introduced immediately to such personages as Little Miss A, who is always sneezing "A-choo"; Little Miss O, who is extremely Obstinate; and Mr. Q, who is so Quiet that he can't make a sound unless the Understanding Miss U is by his side.

In this system all the vowels are girls and all the consonants boys, and Elayne and Rita have devised a series of stories, poems and games, designed to show how the "letter-people" work together to form syllables and words. "The children learn the rules of word formation," says an enthusiastic Nanuet teacher, Mrs. Anita Fay, "but they don't know them as rules but as people in a story."

Alpha One utilizes multimedia techniques in its approach to learning, with brightly colored cards and placards, film-strips, slates, phonograph recordings, and even a puppet theater which the pupils operate themselves. When letters work in combinations like CH or TH the children call them "squooshes," and when words don't follow normal rules they're labeled "runaway" words. The aim is to instill a sense of adventure and enthusiasm in youngsters as they learn, and to capitalize on their natural curiosity about big words.

NOTHING TOO HARD

Elayne Reiss says the method enables children to attack and decode words of almost any length or degree of difficulty. A skeptical PARADE observer stood in the rear of a classroom and listened to eager pupils spell "panacea" and "obnoxious" as easily as most first-graders spell "cat." The children also deciphered a newspaper that was handed to them without too much difficulty, although their pronunciation wasn't always perfect. And they broke up long words into syllables at the blackboard, putting each part of the word into an appropriate box.

Elayne says that after school the kids are encouraged to go home and read anything they want, including the unabridged dictionary, rather than being given old-fashioned primers.

"Some parents were dubious when we started," she says. "They wanted to know where the kids' books were. But we want them to select their own. This opens up the whole world of reading, of learning, to them. They can read in the first grade things they wouldn't usually tackle until the fourth or fifth."

CHILDREN HELP OUT

Elayne and Rita both think that Alpha One, which is now being published by a company called New Dimensions in Education, works because it was developed within an elementary school classroom rather than on the university level.

"This wasn't created by professors," says Elayne, "but really by the children themselves, using their own minds and logic. They helped bring about Mr. Horrible Hair, Mr. Noisy Nose, Mr. Cotton Candy and all the others."

The two teachers also feel that the uses of Alpha One may extend beyond mere reading. "For too many young children, school means frustration and defeat," says Elayne. "I think this method with its excitement, fun, and high level of interest builds security and introduces them to the world of 'I can.'"

Adds Harry Abt, principal of the Nanuet school, who has backed the new system since the two teachers came to him with it: "I don't know whether it's all Alpha One or not, but since we've had the system going here, psychological referrals are way down and our general behavior pattern is a lot better. Its benefits are universal."

THEY STAY IN SCHOOL: BUILT-IN GUARANTEE OF PART-TIME EMPLOYMENT ENCOURAGES STUDENTS AT BOSTON HIGH

(By Dorothea Kahn Jaffe)

BOSTON.—Vacation work is hard to find this summer. But Tom, Ann, and some 420 other boys and girls in the inner-city school known as Boston High School had no trouble finding jobs when school closed.

Boston High, a special school for dropouts and near dropouts, has a built-in employment system. All through the school year, students hold part-time jobs with such concerns as Filene's department store, First National Bank of Boston, and John Hancock Mutual Life Insurance Company, as well as with smaller businesses. Then when vacation time comes, there's no job hunting. The boys and girls continue in their school-year jobs full-time, but still under close school supervision.

In the case of a few whose jobs are seasonal, the school takes the responsibility of finding them other employment for the summer.

What this kind of school-related employment means to a student is told by Tom Nelson (not his real name).

The tall, serious youth said he was about to drop out of high school when he heard about the work program.

"I was pretty bored," he said. "I was missing a lot of classes . . . spending most of my time just hanging around with the kids. I was going to quit when one of my teachers told me about Boston High School."

Tom signed up for regular classes in the morning and was hired as an afternoon messenger for First National Bank of Boston. Now school became alive for Tom. He saw the relation of its courses to the business world.

ATTENDANCE PICKS UP

Classes were small. He had a close and friendly relationship with the teacher who was responsible for coordinating his studies with his job.

Before entering Boston High, Tom was in the habit of attending school only when he felt in the mood. But now in his new school he rarely missed a class. He was absent only 10 days last school year.

Tom's bank supervisor was so impressed by the interest the boy showed in bank operation and by his acceptance of responsibility that he recommended him for promotion. Tom moved up by several steps to the International Money Transfer Department.

He found this job interesting, but he began thinking about his future.

"I noticed that in our bank the college graduates get the most interesting jobs," said Tom. "I figured I'd better go to college. And I've just found out I made it. I've been accepted at Northeastern University.

Tom will continue with the bank during the summer and continue in his job while studying business administration under Northeastern's work-study program.

16 CHILDREN IN FAMILY

Ann Ellsworth, another Boston High School student, is working full time this summer at her office job in the United Shoe Machinery Corporation plant.

Ann said she could not stay in school if she did not have a full-time summer job to help her through next year. She is one of 16 children in a family that came to Boston from South Carolina a few years ago.

A shy, gentle girl with ambition to be a teacher, she was greatly disturbed by conditions in the large inner-city high school she attended. Protests, fighting, continual disturbance: She was failing when she heard about a high school for students who wanted to drop out.

She enrolled in Boston High, was given a card of introduction to the personnel officer of the shoe-machinery plant, and obtained a part-time clerical job under school supervision. She expects to graduate next year.

SCHOOL-STORE COOPERATION

Not all Boston High students do as well as these two.

"Some have a spark, other just do a job," said Henry Marsman, selling superintendent in Filene's famous basement where some 150 students from Boston High and other schools of the city are employed as stock clerks.

On the whole, he thinks the school-store cooperation is fine for both.

"These youngsters are . . . good kids," he says. "And the school cooperation is excellent."

He referred to the school's system of weekly visits made by the teacher-coordinators to the students on the job.

Teachers in this school spend only half their time in their classrooms. The other half they put in visiting students in business and industry, observing the students' records and discussing their progress with employers. Since classes are small—a 15-member limit—this work is highly individualized.

If the teacher finds that one of his students needs special counseling, he makes a visit to the child's home and talks with the parents and child together. Sometimes the teacher discovers the parents need guidance.

Teachers in this school often become so interested in their boys and girls that they volunteer their time to coach them after working hours in their studies and their sports, said Mark Crehan, cooperative supervisor.

"Many of us were ourselves children in the inner city and we understand these kids," Mr. Crehan said. "Most of us are here because we applied for this assignment."

AVERAGE 93.47 PERCENT

Results of this friendly relationship and close supervision are apparent in the school's attendance records. Although to get into the school a boy or girl must have dropout credentials, which usually means a truancy record, its current attendance record is one of the three best in the city.

Last year its average daily attendance was second only to that of the two Boston Latin schools. This year comparative figures have not yet been compiled, but the average for the school is 93.47 percent, which is a proud record for any high school.

The problem now is to find room for all who apply for admission and are eligible, says Joseph Ippolito, principal. Last year 150 qualified applicants had to be put on a waiting list.

Next fall five more teachers will be added to the faculty, but the number of applicants is expected to increase as the school becomes better known, says Mr. Ippolito.

One such school for the city of Boston is not enough, it appears to those involved in this program.

PIONEER IN CONSUMER PROTECTION

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Colston Estey Warne is one of the true pioneers of the consumer movement. Today, at the age of 69, he continues to wage the battle for equity in the marketplace with undiminished enthusiasm.

We would do well to familiarize ourselves with the philosophy and activities of this courageous and dedicated American who warms to the cause of the underdog—particularly when it is the general public.

The following excerpt from the New York Times is submitted as a reference for those who are not aware of the great contributions Dr. Warne has made in behalf of consumer rights during the past three decades.

I hope Dr. Warne will carry on his brilliant work for many years to come.

The article follows:

A LONG-TIME CHAMPION OF THE CONSUMER

(By Gerald Gold)

Before Ralph Nader, there was Colston Estey Warne.

In 1936 he helped to found the Consumers Union of the United States, and he has been its president ever since. Dr. Warne, chairman of the sixth biennial conference of the International Organization of Consumers Unions, which opened yesterday in Baden, Austria, has been a champion of the consumer for over three decades, and at the same time a champion of academic freedom, a champion of the poor, a champion of labor and a champion of his own right to refuse, on principle, to sign a loyalty questionnaire.

The 69-year-old Dr. Warne, in fact, has spent a lifetime championing causes, some of which have lately come to be accepted as obvious (such as consumers' rights) and some of which do not seem to be in sight in the near future (such as his early advocacy of socialization of the American banking system).

CALLS HIMSELF A "REBEL"

Dr. Warne, who described himself as a "rebel, a disturber of convention," learned about freedom of expression by observing the attempt to suppress it when a mob tried—unsuccessfully—to prevent Fritz Kreisler from playing in the United States shortly after World War I. Dr. Warne recalled how the mob was "shouting that Hun music should not be tolerated in our land of freedom."

After graduating from Cornell University in 1920 and receiving his doctorate from the University of Chicago in 1925, Dr. Warne taught at the University of Pittsburgh.

It was there that he saw the "bleak rows of wooden shacks" and company policemen and eviction notices and picket lines that turned his mind to the problems of labor and labor unions. This interest eventually led to his involvement in the civil liberties movement.

He went to Amherst College in 1930 and was professor of economics there until his retirement last June.

Dr. Warne married Frances Lee Corbett in 1920. They have three children.

As far back as 1933 Dr. Warne has spoken out on the need for more relief funds and for more taxation to help the poor. He has been a constant critic of what he perceives as the nation's faulty distribution of its wealth.

Tall, courtly, mild in manner, Dr. Warne nevertheless has found himself in the midst of controversy for almost all of his active life, and never more so than in 1947, when, as an unpaid consultant to the Council of Economic Advisers, he refused to sign a loyalty questionnaire that was distributed to all Federal employes.

TAKEN OFF SUBVERSIVE LIST

Declining to comply with President Harry S. Truman's Executive order, Dr. Warne declared: "This Executive order is so completely repugnant to the political institutions of our country that I cannot comply with its terms."

Dr. Warne, who cited the "unfairness" of the House Un-American Activities Committee in trying to link the Consumers Union to Communism, succeeded in getting the Consumers Union removed from the committee's list of "subversive" organizations.

At the time of the Loyalty questionnaire, Dr. Warne described himself as an "upstate New York Yankee"—he was born in Romulus, N.Y., on Aug. 14, 1900. Then, as now, he was living in Amherst, Mass., and what he said then is just as applicable now:

"I have been living in a small New England town upon carrying on the American democratic tradition."

In recent years, Dr. Warne has turned this exercise of the democratic tradition to strenuous campaigning for consumer drives on environmental problems, for stressing examination of marketing practices, for educating the public about proper nutrition and for extending consumer education to the poor—a subject that was the focus of the opening meeting in Austria yesterday.

AID APPROVES GRANT FOR INDIA FAMILY PLANNING PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, the Agency for International Development recently authorized a $20 million grant to help India accelerate its family planning program.

I am happy to say that the funds, which will be matched by the Indian Government, perhaps reflect in part my amendment to the Foreign Assistance Act of 1970, requiring that $100 million be earmarked for family planning programs.

As we know, population control is one of the most serious problems facing India today. The country has responded and has set a goal of cutting its birth rate by 40 percent in this decade. The program is entirely a voluntary one.

While the basic family planning program in India has been regarded as a sound one, most of the experts agree that there is a definite need to expand and to accelerate it.

This $20 million grant should aid in making the operational and administrative adjustments that are needed.

LATEST FORTUNE 500 SURVEY SHOWS SHAKEN FAITH IN NIXON

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my distinguished colleagues in the House of Representatives the latest Fortune 500 survey, which appears in the June issue of Fortune magazine. This survey presents the results of interviews with 250 chief executive officers of companies among the 500 industrials and the largest commercial banks, life insurance companies, retailers, transportation companies, and utilities; in short, the business community.

The results of this survey point out the decline of support for President Nixon among this strongest segment of Presidential supporters. The survey, which compares support of President Nixon's policies during May 1970 with support of the President's policies in July of 1969, points out that whereas only 6 percent of those surveyed considered none of the administration's policies to have been successful when the survey was conducted in July of 1969, the number of those in the business community who consider none of the President's policies successful had increased to 19 percent in May 1970.

This decrease in support for President Nixon's policies amongst even his most traditional supporters indicates to me the precarious nature of the course the administration is following. It is indeed not surprising that there is such polarization in the country today when even the administration's most loyal supporters doubt the wisdom of the President's actions.

I hereby insert the following poll, conducted by the attitude-research firm of Daniel Yankelovich, Inc., which appeared in the June issue of Fortune magazine.

THE FORTUNE 500-YANKELOVICH SURVEY: SHAKEN FAITH IN NIXON

(By Robert S. Diamond)

Recent events have eroded President Nixon's support within the business community. This finding comes out of the latest Fortune 500 survey, conducted by the attitude-research firm of Daniel Yankelovich, Inc. During the tense days right after the U.S. move into Cambodia and the shootings at Kent State, the survey interviewed some 250 chief executive officers of companies among the 500 industrials and the largest commercial banks, life-insurance companies, retailers, transportation companies, and utilities. Since the questions largely paralleled those of a similar 500 survey taken last summer (Fortune, September), it was possible to measure shifts in opinion. Some of the shifts were startling.

Both times the survey asked what actions and proposals of the Nixon Administration the chief executives thought were having the greatest and least success. In the latest survey 19 percent of the executives said that *none* of the Administration's policies was successful, as against 6 percent last time. In the earlier survey, 22 percent praised the Administration for its "slow, calm, realistic approach" to problems; this time only one executive still felt that way. As a rounded per-

centage, that comes out to a statistical zero. Another notable difference this time is the degree to which the executives as a group found fewer things to praise. Last July each panelist cited two items, on average, in reply to the quest *What actions and proposals of the Nixon Administration do you think are having the greatest success?* This time the average number of pluses for the Administration worked out to only 1.2. The responses:

[In percent]

	July 1969	May 1970
Monetary and fiscal policies	41	43
Efforts to end or limit Vietnam war	34	26
Nothing is successful	6	19
Response to social problems	7	9
President Nixon's style credibility or intelligence	10	8
Foreign policy; relations with other nations	13	5
Good appointments	17	4
Tax reform	4	2
Law and order	12	2
Defense policy; ABM system	6	1
Slow calm realistic approach to problems	22	0
Too early to tell	15	0

While the executives added virtually no new issues or policies to the list of Administration successes, there were some notable additions to the "least success" list. Most strikingly, the Administration's lack of communication with the nation's youth has come from nowhere to rank right up with Vietnam. The President's failure to unite the country also was mentioned for the first time.

What actions and proposals of the Nixon Administration do you think are having the least success?

[In percent]

	July 1969	May 1970
Monetary and fiscal policies	23	45
Efforts to end or limit Vietnam war	18	20
Communication with youth	0	20
Position on civil rights	8	14
Response to social problems	15	12
Failure to unite country	0	8
Poor appointments	12	7
Relations with Congress and other government departments	7	5
Dealing with labor unions	0	5
Law and order	0	4
Foreign policy	4	3
Defense policy; ABM system	8	1
Nothing is unsuccessful	6	0
Too early to tell	18	0

It is striking that the two most frequently mentioned topics—economic policies, followed by Vietnam—appear at the top of both lists. This was also true in the earlier survey. The wide divergence among corporate leaders on these key issues mirrors the lack of consensus in the nation as a whole.

Misgivings about the Administration's performance are also apparent in the responses to this question: *If you were to rate your over-all satisfaction with the Nixon Administration on a scale from 0 to 100, where a rating above 50 meant satisfaction and below 50 meant dissatisfaction, what grade would you give this Administration?*

[In percent]

	July 1969	May 1970
90 to 100	11	3
80 to 89	21	11
70 to 79	25	31
60 to 69	15	12
50 to 59	14	13
40 to 49	4	10
30 to 39	3	6
29 and under	3	13

On average, the chief executives give Nixon a rating of 62.6, down around six points since last fall. The highly satisfied group, rating the Administration 80 or higher, shrank from 32 percent to 14 percent. The group rating the Administration as less than satisfactory—under 50—virtually tripled. Among the largest industrialists and retailers, who showed especially strong support for Nixon in the earlier survey, the highly satisfied 80-and-over group dropped from 47 percent to 16.

The onrush of so much bad news has not only modified the executives' appraisal of the President and his policies, but has also dramatically reshuffled their list of national priorities. What has been happening is that the war, the economy, and campus unrest have absorbed so much concern that there is little left for other national ills that seemed so urgent less than a year ago. Last summer 31 percent named problems of minorities among the "most pressing and critical problems." This time the figure was only 9 percent. Urban problems, which ranked third last fall with 37 percent, dropped to ninth position with a stunning 3 percent.

The responses:

[In percent]

	July 1969	May 1970
UP		
Vietnam war	49	65
Inflation/economy	43	61
Campus and social unrest	36	49
DOWN		
Problems of minority groups	31	9
Crime	17	6
Manpower problems and unions	9	4
U.S. foreign policy and international relations	6	4
Urban problems	37	3
Decline of values and spiritual malaise	10	1
SAME		
Pollution	4	4

The drop in concern about urban problems was especially steep among banking and insurance executives; from 56 percent last time—far higher than any other group—all the way to 3. The rise in concern about campus and social unrest was especially notable among chief executives of utilities and transportation companies and of retailing and industrial companies with under $1 billion in sales. In both instances, concern has shot up by some twenty points.

In view of recent events, Fortune asked three new questions this time—two about Indochina and another about campus unrest. First, on a scale from 0 to 100, the executives were requested to rate the Administration's response to the dissent on the nation's college campuses. The overall score was a mediocre 50.8. Breakdown:

[In percent]

91–100	1
81–90	5
71–80	17
61–70	6
51–60	13
41–50	21
31–40	15
21–30	9
11–20	6
1–10	5
Totally dissatisfied	2

Again on a scale from 0 to 100, the executives were asked to evaluate "the Administration's conduct of the Vietnam war." Here the Administration rated quite a bit better. The average score was 68.4. Breakdown:

[In percent]

91–100	14
81–90	16
71–80	26
61–70	12
51–60	8
41–50	8
31–40	4
21–30	4
1–20	2
Totally dissatisfied	4

These results make it clear that despite the decline in enthusiasm shown by the latest survey, the chief executives as a group still fundamentally support the Administration on Vietnam. The responses to the survey's question about Cambodia confirm the point. The question was: *How do you feel about the Administration's decision to move into Cambodia?*

[In percent]

Strongly approve	45
Approve with reservations	33
Disapprove	9
Strongly disapprove	10

Previous surveys have shown that executives in the South as a group often deviate significantly in their responses. That was so again here. They were by far the most hawkish: 68 percent said they strongly approved of the Cambodia operation, and 44 percent rated the Administration's conduct of the Indochina war 80 or better. The southern executives also indicated more concern about social upheaval than other regional groups.

Executives in the West were the most dovish: 22 percent said they strongly disapproved of the move into Cambodia—twice as high a proportion as in the panel as a whole. The West also was more critical than other regions of Nixon's policies on civil rights, and displayed special concern about the economy.

Another Fortune 500 survey, taken in mid-April, measured how the business community was bearing up in this harrowing economic period. Again, this survey was parallel in many respects to an earlier 500 survey (Fortune, November). Of the changes revealed by a comparison of the two surveys, perhaps the most striking is a shift in sentiment toward some kind of government-sponsored wage policy. This time 32 percent favored formal wage-price controls as against 22 percent last time (see chart, this page). The shift was especially notable among the largest industrialists and retailers, where support has nearly tripled.

Yet despite the executives' concern about the economy and their desire to see something done about inflation, a clear majority expressed at least mild approval of the Administration's economic policies.

[In percent]

Strongly approve	29
Approve with reservations	61
Disapprove	5
Strongly disapprove	4

Moreover, the survey indicates that top business leaders have been weathering these stormy times better than might be expected. Only two out of five say that inflation has put a severe pinch on corporate profits—a slight increase since last fall. The question: *Has the inflationary cost-price squeeze in your company thus far been severe, moderate, or negligible?*

[In percent]

	September 1969	April 1970
Severe	35	39
Moderate	56	52
Negligible	7	5

Predictably, inflation struck hardest at the utilities and the transportation companies. In these regulated industries, which cannot quickly pass increased costs along to the

consumer, three out of four characterized the squeeze as "severe."

Surprisingly, the corporate leaders were only slightly less optimistic about this year's profit margins than they were in last September's survey. (Profit data for this year so far suggest that they may be overly optimistic.) The executives were asked whether they expected this year's profit margins to be higher, the same, or lower. Three out of five said their company's margins will be as good as last year's or better.

[In percent]

	September 1969	April 1970
Lower than last year	35	38
Same	32	29
Higher	31	30

Executives in the South were especially optimistic about profits this year: 39 percent saw improved margins ahead. The western executives were the most pessimistic. Only 20 percent expected higher profit margins, and 54 percent thought margins would be lower. Of the industry groupings, the least cheerful were the insurance men and bankers: 46 percent expected lower profit margins. The Fed's credit squeeze has worked particular hardship on the banks, whose operating margins have eroded because of the need to pay high interest rates to get funds.

To shore up profits in the face of steadily rising costs, the executives have been cutting back in a variety of ways. To a great extent they have done what in last fall's survey they said they would do (see chart, overleaf). As the chart shows, however, the cutting has not been quite as widespread as the responses to that survey indicated. Of particular note, there is a disparity of almost two to one—53 percent to 27 percent—between the number who said they would reduce public-affairs expenditures (job training, donations, etc.) and those who have actually done so. It appears that even in a painful profit squeeze corporations are reluctant to pull back from commitments to help ease the nation's strained social conditions.

Laying off personnel is the one cutback area in which actions have outpaced last fall's predictions. The executives' responses to several other questions reflect a hardened attitude, too. On the national scene, for example, the panel is willing to accept a lot more unemployment than it was seven months ago. In the latest survey, 54 percent of the chief executives—and two out of three of those who gave a numerical response to the question—said they were willing to accept a national unemployment rate of 5 percent or more.

Acceptable level of unemployment

[In percent]

3 percent or less	1
3.1 to 3.9	3
4 to 4.9	21
5 to 5.9	40
6 to 6.9	13
7 to 7.9	1
No response/other	19

Over-all, the executives now put the "acceptable" level of unemployment at 5.4 percent, up from 5.1 in last fall's survey. The groupings that are most willing to see unemployment of 5 percent or higher include Westerners, bankers and insurance men, and heads of industrial and retailing companies with sales of over $1 billion.

The survey confirms that the Fed's policy of making credit scarce and very costly has extensively affected corporate decisions. More than three out of five executives say tight money has caused them to change their company's plans and operations. That represents an increase of twenty-four points since the fall survey.

[In percent]

	September 1969	April 1970
Tight money changed plans	38	62
Plans and operations unchanged	61	36
No response	1	2

As the last survey also showed, the impact of tight money has hit with particular force at the banks and insurance companies: 79 percent are feeling the pinch, virtually the same as before. Among the striking changes is the big jump in the number of southern executives who say their companies have been squeezed. Here the proportion who say tight money forced them to change plans and operations have gone up from 24 to 64 percent. Among companies in the West, already bothered by credit restraints last fall, the situation has grown worse: three out of four say tight money has forced them to change course.

The chief executives have apparently gone so far in anticipating tight money and adjusting their operations to it that more than half of them (52 percent) say a continuation of tight money into next year will not "create serious problems" for their companies. The survey does indicate, however, that a continuation of tight money would further slow down corporate expansion. For instance, 28 percent said that tight money has forced them to reduce capital expenditures. But when the executives were asked what they will do if the current economic situation persists, the proportion who say they will cut down capital expenditures increased to 41 percent. Among the largest industrial and retail companies, which do a very substantial amount of the spending, the figure came to 49 percent. Of the regional groupings, those most inclined to cut back were the South (50 percent) and the West (54 percent).

Four out of five executives are agreed on one thing to do if inflation continues at present rates. They intend to increase their prices.

A DYNAMIC PUERTO RICAN

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a recent newspaper story described very briefly the efforts of a fellow Chicagoan, Mrs. Sylvia Herrera de Fox, to implement Aspira, Inc., an educational agency for Puerto Rican youth in Chicago.

Mrs. Fox is a lawyer, with two children, and she has been working with the Spanish-speaking student populations in 10 of our Chicago area high schools to acquaint them with skills and job opportunities for which they are eligible.

I have repeatedly stressed the importance of bilingual education in this Nation to meet the specific needs of children who normally speak English as a second language. Largely through the untiring help of people like Mrs. Fox, we are able to make some small headway with this problem. Chicago is fortunate to have Mrs. Fox in this capacity as head of Aspira and I commend her for her prodigious efforts in behalf of the youngsters of our city.

Mr. Speaker, the news article about Mrs. Fox follows:

A DYNAMIC PUERTO RICAN

(By Carol Kleiman)

A year ago, Mrs. Geoffrey Herrera de Fox, mother of two, made the transition from part-time work to a more than full-time post as head of the new Aspira Inc. of Illinois, 767 N. Milwaukee, an educational agency for Puerto Rican youth.

"I don't think I was planning on all those evenings and week-ends. At first I told myself it was just the organizational stage, but it hasn't gotten better.

"I find myself spending half my income paying people to substitute for me at home," she told reporter Marci Greenwold.

Her husband, a doctoral candidate in social change at Northwestern university, and a full time housekeeper also help Sylvia Herrera de Fox manage the rearing of Alexander, 11, and Joaquin, 3.

When the younger child was born, the Foxes had just returned from Mrs. Fox's native Puerto Rico. Mrs. Fox, a lawyer, spent a year not working—among "the educated American housewife," as she puts it. Because of her limited social contact outside of the family, "you tend to put a tremendous burden on your husband for therapy and amusement."

Mrs. Fox says the climate in this country makes it "hard for a career woman to meet her family obligations. The basic problem is lack of day care centers where the mothers can participate, not just dump their children."

She and her staff of five work with Puerto Rican youth in clubs and workshops in 10 area high schools with large Spanish-speaking student populations. She also visits colleges to speak to deans of admissions about financial aid and special provisions for Puerto Rican students.

Despite this involvement, "one ultimately must make a choice," and there the family is number one.

"I will sacrifice the comfort of my children but not their well-being," she said.

PRESIDENT'S DECISION ON CAMBODIA A WISE ONE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there will be much talk in the days and weeks ahead over whether or not the invasion of the Cambodian sanctuaries was a success.

Time and history will be the final judges of that.

But indications are that both of those judges will look kindly on the President's decision.

Because certainly the enemy's timetable was disrupted. Certainly they were prevented from taking over the whole of Cambodia in one swift blitz. Certainly they lost enough men and arms and supplies to give our Vietnamization program a chance to proceed and our own armies a chance to come home.

Certainly they must rebuild and renew

their sanctuaries before they can again be effective.

And certainly, they must have less certainty about the safety of the sanctuaries they may establish anywhere.

Mr. Speaker, the President's decision to go into Cambodia was a wise one when he made it. It is a wise one today. I support him in that decision.

WAKE UP, YOU ARE AN AMERICAN

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the officers and members of District No. 24, Order of the Eastern Star, recently held a patriotic program for the official inspection of their Worthy Grand Matron, Mrs. Maud Ellis, at Greensburg, La. Since the program was dedicated to support of the United States and our flag, I feel that several speeches from the program prepared by Miss Georgie Fulda are worthy of being commended to the Members on this Fourth of July:

WAKE UP! YOU ARE AN AMERICAN

Every day new definitions for patriotism are being made. The question is by whom?

We are a long way out of the past and a long way forward. It's a tough way, too, and there's plenty of trouble in it. It's a black storm clouding the sky and a cold wind blowing, blowing upon us all.

See it and face it. That's the way it is. That's the way it will be for a time and a time.

We are living in turbulent times. Our security is no longer protection from abroad. It now starts at our doorstep.

Every thinking American believes in safety of the home, of law and order. But there seems to be so many stumbling blocks.

Who encourages disobedience to the law? Who in our country has promoted Communism? Have you ever asked yourself just who is deciding the direction of the United States?

The Crime Commission and Riot Report blames all the criminality in the United States on white racism.

Let no one blame the American people for any emotional showing of concern, distrust, frustration, or extreme resentment.

Our leaders in high places have caused the public chaos. They refuse to listen to the voice of Americans. Why blame the American people, or racism for the ailments of our country?

The American people have not been in control. The trouble began when the Federal Government took over and created the problems that exist today.

Why are we sitting back and allowing eight men, or nine, on the Supreme Court and members of Congress to have the power to set aside the Constitution and force their opinions on us?

And we are appalled at the disrespect being shown for our flag. Certainly our flag is the emblem of our people and it should be respected. And anyone who tears, or mutilates, or tramples, or spits on, or slurs the flag of the United States has committed a crime; not only against himself, but against the dignity of the entire American people—and should be punished.

But, my Sister and Brothers, there are more ways of desecrating our flag, and we could all be guilty.

Are we a nation under God? A nation under God can be under no other power.

There are forces in the world today, forces bent upon the destruction of America, your America and mine, and World Communism is waiting with baited breath.

We are not just dealing with revolutionaries. We are dealing with the devils of Satan, who destroy for the sake of destroying.

Now there is no room in our hearts for hatred of any human being. But I do hate with all my heart what that female atheist does, her power to influence the powers that be to the extent that our prayers to God are limited and cut out. She is given the privilege to state her agnostic beliefs on television where young ears that are not taught can hear.

Are we in a state of apathy, proclaiming to be patriotic Americans, and allowing all these things to come to pass? Should not the guilt be upon our shoulders?

We want our country and every loyal understanding American standing up and speaking out, searching for the truth above rumors and personal gain.

We want more and more public officials who will stand up and defend America and speak out with the truth. The world is not rich enough to buy the vote of an honest man. And nothing is politically right which is morally wrong.

The truth is not always heard in our country today. And it is not going to get any better until more of our people wake up, stand up and start thinking for themselves.

God give us men! A time like this demands—Strong minds, great hearts, true faith, and ready hands; Men whom the lust of office does not kill; Men whom the spoils of office cannot buy—Men who possess opinions and a will; Men who have honor; Men who will not lie.

Practicing Patriotism? Words are what make public opinion, what people think, what we use in peaceful assembly to discuss and talk stability and truth. Words backed by noble deeds.

THE U.S. FLAG

I am the flag of the United States of America. I am whatever you name me, nothing more. I am your belief in yourself, your dream of what a people may become. I live a challenging life, a life of moods and passions, of heartbreaks and tired muscles. Sometimes I'm strong with pride, when workmen do an honest piece of work. Sometimes I droop, for then purpose has gone from me, and cynically I play the coward. But always, I am all that you hope to be and have the courage to try for. I am song and fear, struggle and panic, and enabling hope. I am the day's work of the weakest man, and the largest dream of the most daring. I am the farmer, the lawyer, doctor, cook, counselor, and clerk. I am the battle of yesterday, and the mistake of tomorrow. I am the mystery of the men who do, without knowing why. I am the clutch of an idea, and the reasoned purpose of resolutions. I am no more than what you believe me to be, and I am all that you believe I can be. I am what you make me, nothing more. I wave before your eyes as a bright gleam of color, a symbol of yourself, the pictured suggestion of all that makes this nation great. My stars and stripes are your dream of your labors. They are height with cheer, brilliant with courage and firm with faith, because you have made them so out of your hearts. And as long as men cherish liberty more than life itself, I shall continue to be the enduring banner of the United States of America.

PUBLIC OPINION POLL

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, the results of a public opinion poll which I conducted throughout my congressional district have just been tabulated.

The results show broad support for President Nixon's Southeast Asia policy and for the Vietnamization program. While I intend to include in the RECORD a comprehensive chart giving a breakdown of the results by party preference, age, and sex, I should like to direct the attention of my colleagues to the support indicated by those in the 15- to 29-year-old age group. A total of 41 percent of those between the ages of 15 and 19 expressed support for the President's policy, and 51 percent between the ages of 21 and 29 expressed support. Overall, 58 percent of those responding indicated support for President Nixon's policy.

I should also at this time like to express my thanks to Dr. W. P. Cortelyou and his organization, EPOCH—Everyman's Public Opinion Clearing House—for tabulating the results and for the excellent breakdown. Dr. Cortelyou formerly served on my staff as a public opinion consultant and has long and extensive experience in this field. His work has been invaluable to me.

I am inserting, along with the chart, a copy of a news release:

President Nixon's policy in Southeast Asia and the program of Vietnamization received majority support in a public opinion poll conducted by U.S. Rep. Peter H. B. Frelinghuysen (R., 5th Dist., N.J.), throughout his district. The Congressman made the results of the poll public today.

A total of 58 per cent of those responding said they approved of the President's policy in Southeast Asia, while 24 per cent expressed disagreement and 13 per cent felt they did not have sufficient information to judge. Vietnamization—withdrawing American troops as fast as South Vietnamese troops can take over— was supported by 46 per cent of the respondents. Stepped-up activity toward military victory was supported by 26 per cent; 18 per cent favored the establishment of a definite timetable for withdrawal of American troops, and nine per cent supported an immediate withdrawal of American troops.

Of President Nixon's action to send allied forces into Cambodia, 62 per cent of those responding to the poll expressed the belief that the purpose of this action was to clear North Vietnamese sanctuaries and hasten the Vietnamization program. Sixteen per cent felt the move as to come to the aid of the Cambodian government and 14 per cent saw it as an expansion of the war and a move toward military victory.

The Cambodian action was seen by 50 per cent of the respondents as shortening our involvement in Southeast Asia, while 24 per cent felt it would lengthen the war and 19 per cent felt it would have no effect.

That the role of Congress should be one of full debate and formulation of a comprehensive national policy in Southeast Asia was supported by 50 per cent of those answering. Twenty-two per cent favored using the appropriations process to influence policy and 18 per cent favored Congressional action to establish a timetable for withdrawal.

Domestic problems—such as the economy, civil rights, social programs, the environment—are the most serious today, according to 46 per cent of those answering. The war in Southeast Asia was seen as the most urgent problem by 30 per cent and student unrest by 12 per cent.

Support for the President's Southeast Asia policy was surprisingly strong among young persons. In the 15 to 19 year-old age group, 41 per cent supported the President's policy and in the 20 to 29 year-old age group, 51

per cent expressed support. Nearly half—42 per cent—of those responding were in these two age groups.

In the 15 to 19 year-old age group, 47 per cent favored increasing military activity for a victory, while 34 per cent supported the Vietnamization program. In the 20 to 29 year-old age group, 33 per cent favored military victory and an equal number favored Vietnamization.

A breakdown by party preference shows that 70 per cent of the Republicans, 50 per cent of the Democrats and 45 per cent of the Independents supported the President's Southeast Asia policy. The Vietnamization program was supported by 50 per cent of the Republicans, 38 per cent of the Democrats and 42 per cent of the Independents.

An immediate withdrawal of troops won the support of 5 per cent of the Republicans, 11 per cent of the Democrats and 17 per cent of the Independents.

Congressman Frelinghuysen expressed pleasure at the "good, representative cross section" of opinion, "particularly in the 15 to 30 year-old age group."

"It is apparent from the fact that 42 per cent of the total replies were from individuals in this age group that American involvement in Southeast Asia and the President's program to end that involvement are the foremost issues in the minds of our young people," the Congressman said. "This display of interest and willingness to become involved is heartening, indeed."

REPRESENTATIVE FRELINGHUYSEN'S QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS—JUNE 1970

[Answers in percentage]

What do you think was the principal reason President Nixon ordered our troops into Cambodia?

To clean out the North Vietnamese sanctuaries and thus speed up the Vietnamization program and our withdrawal ---------- 62
To come to the aid of the present Cambodian government ---------- 16
To expand the war and press for a military victory ---------- 14
No answer ---------- 8

Do you support the President's Southeast Asia policy?

Yes ---------- 58
No ---------- 24
Not enough information to judge ---------- 13
No answer ---------- 5

Do you think the President's decision to send troops into Cambodia will—

Shorten the war ---------- 50
Lengthen the war ---------- 24
Make no difference ---------- 19
No answer ---------- 7

Which of the following comes closest to the Southeast Asia policy you would support?

Press for a military victory ---------- 26
Withdraw as fast as the South Vietnamese can take over ---------- 43
Set a definite date for complete withdrawal ---------- 18
Withdraw all troops immediately ---------- 9
No answer ---------- 4

Question	Total (percent)	Party preference: Republican	Party preference: Democrat	Party preference: Independent	Sex: Male	Sex: Female	Age: 15 to 19 years	Age: 20 to 29 years	Age: 30 to 39 years	Age: 40 to 49 years	Age: 50 to 59 years	Age: 60 and up
What do you think was the principal reason President Nixon ordered our troops into Cambodia?												
1. To clean out the North Vietnamese sanctuaries and thus speed up the Vietnamization program and our withdrawal	62	72	47	64	69	67	50	51	67	71	72	84
2. To come to the aid of the present Cambodian Government	16	10	24	15	15	12	25	24	13	10	10	2
3. To expand the war and press for a military victory	14	10	18	17	11	16	15	15	14	11	15	9
No answer	8	8	11	4	5	5	10	10	6	8	3	5
Do you support the President's Southeast Asia policy?												
1. Yes	58	70	50	45	63	57	41	51	58	68	71	75
2. No	24	15	32	37	23	26	29	29	26	20	18	20
3. Not enough information to judge	13	11	13	13	10	13	18	16	11	11	11	2
No answer	5	4	5	5	4	4	12	4	5	1	0	3
Do you think the President's decision to send troops into Cambodia will—												
1. Shorten the war	50	62	39	41	52	48	30	44	51	60	60	69
2. Lengthen the war	24	16	30	29	20	27	30	30	19	18	21	16
3. Make no difference	19	17	16	26	18	20	14	21	24	21	15	11
No answer	7	5	15	4	10	5	26	5	6	1	4	4
Which of the following comes closest to the Southeast Asia policy you would support?												
1. Press for a military victory	26	23	26	21	20	25	47	33	17	16	15	15
2. Withdraw as fast as the South Vietnamese can take over	43	50	38	42	47	43	34	33	49	49	52	55
3. Set a definite date for complete withdrawal	18	18	19	16	16	21	11	20	20	19	19	21
4. Withdraw all troops immediately	9	5	11	17	11	9	5	8	9	12	11	8
No answer	4	4	6	4	6	2	3	6	5	4	3	1
What would be a responsible role for Congress in the present situation?												
1. After full debate set out in broad terms a comprehensive national policy in Southeast Asia	50	60	37	48	58	49	29	35	55	68	69	61
2. Use the power of the purse to influence policy in Southeast Asia	22	17	31	16	20	18	43	29	16	13	9	10
3. Give the President a definite timetable for ending our participation in the Southeast Asian conflict	18	14	18	28	15	23	17	20	21	13	15	24
No answer	10	9	14	8	7	10	11	16	8	6	7	5
What do you believe is the most serious problem facing America today?												
1. The war	30	32	33	27	26	30	25	28	29	29	30	46
2. Domestic problems such as the economy, civil rights, the environment, social needs, drugs, etc	46	48	43	55	54	46	30	44	58	54	52	47
3. Student unrest	12	11	13	7	10	11	15	14	6	13	13	3
4. No answer	12	9	11	11	10	13	30	14	7	4	5	4

1970 QUIE QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, I have received the tabulations of the questionnaires which I distributed in the First District of Minnesota this past March. The questionnaire contained 10 questions relating to different issues now being discussed in America's public life, and it provided space for "his" and "hers" answers. Of the approximately 155,000 questionnaires distributed, 25,809 replies counting the "his" and "hers" were returned.

I have distributed similar questionnaires yearly in order to keep closer contact with my constituency, and I have found that sending them out invites residents of the district to write and express their views along with answering the questionnaires. In this manner, then, I have a better idea of what my constituency thinks and why.

The results were as follows:

[Answers in percentage]

Do you favor:

1. Establishment of the Voyageurs National Park in northern Minnesota?

Yes ---------- 80
No ---------- 16
Undecided ---------- 4

2. Giving the states authority to impose stricter standards than those set by the Atomic Energy Commission governing radioactive discharges from atomic powered electrical generation facilities?

Yes ---------- 80
No ---------- 17
Undecided ---------- 3

3. Legislation to prevent the mailing of unsolicited advertising material for pornographic and obscene literature?

Yes ---------- 87
No ---------- 11
Undecided ---------- 2

4. Establishing a public corporation to own and operate the postal system on a self-sustaining basis?

Yes ---------- 78
No ---------- 18
Undecided ---------- 4

5. Federal subsidies to revive inter-city railroad passenger service?

Yes ---------- 53
No ---------- 41
Undecided ---------- 6

6. Increased Federal support of population control program?

Yes	53
No	41
Undecided	6

7. An all-out Federal attack on pollution of our environment, even if it means higher taxes?

Yes	70
No	25
Undecided	5

8. A volunteer army in place of the draft, even if the cost is higher?

Yes	63
No	32
Undecided	5

9. Enlargment of the "Safeguard" Anti-Ballistic Missile System which was authorized in 1969?

Yes	43
No	50
Undecided	7

10. Are you satisfied with President Nixon's policy of troop withdrawal from Vietnam and the "Vietnamization" of the War?

Yes	46
No	47
Undecided	7

When I was at the Mayo High School in Rochester, Minn., to speak, one of the students suggested that I should send the questionnaire to students as well as to adults. This was an excellent suggestion. Since I had just a few questionnaires remaining, I sent enough for the senior class at Mayo and at John Marshall, the other high school in Rochester.

About 2 weeks before graduation, 280 Mayo High School seniors responded to the questionnaire. There were significant differences in the responses to five questions.

Of the adult population, 87 percent favored legislation to prevent the mailing of unsolicited advertising material for pornographic and obscene literature, whereas only 58 percent of the seniors thought this legislation was necessary.

The establishment of a public corporation to operate the postal system on a self-sustaining basis was favored by 78 percent of the adults, but only 35 percent of the youth.

Increased Federal support of population control programs was favored by 83 percent of the seniors, but only 53 percent of the adults.

Combating pollution was a higher priority item with the young people. Eighty-six percent of the seniors favored an all-out environment, while 70 percent of the adults responded yes to this question.

Expressing greater interest in a volunteer Army than the adults, 78 percent of the students favored a volunteer Army compared to 63 percent of the adults.

I hope to make my next questionnaire available to more students to discover the divergency of opinion on other important issues.

I submit the results of the entire questionnaire taken by the Mayo High School seniors for the information of my colleagues.

The results were as follows:

[Answers in Percentage]

Do you favor:

1. Establishment of the Voyageurs National Park in northern Minnesota?

Yes	84
No	8
Undecided	9

2. Giving the states authority to impose stricter standards than those set by the Atomic Energy Commission governing radioactive discharges from atomic powered electrical generation facilities?

Yes	70
No	24
Undecided	6

3. Legislation to prevent the mailing of unsolicited advertising material for pornographic and obscene literature?

Yes	58
No	38
Undecided	4

4. Establishing a public corporation to own and operate the postal system on a self-sustaining basis?

Yes	35
No	56
Undecided	9

5. Federal subsidies to revive inter-city railroad passenger service?

Yes	52
No	38
Undecided	9

6. Increased Federal support of population control program?

Yes	83
No	15
Undecided	2

7. An all-out Federal attack on pollution of our environment, even if it means higher taxes?

Yes	86
No	12
Undecided	2

8. A volunteer army in place of the draft, even if the cost is higher?

Yes	78
No	19
Undecided	2

9. Enlargement of the "Safeguard" Anti-Ballistic Missile System which was authorized in 1969?

Yes	32
No	61
Undecided	6

10. Are you satisfied with President Nixon's policy of troop withdrawal from Vietnam and the "Vietnamization" of the War?

Yes	44
No	52
Undecided	3

LONG ISLAND SENIORS HOLD OWN GRADUATION

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, on June 18, a number of Members spoke on the floor of the House to object to the treatment of Representative ALLARD LOWENSTEIN by the school board and high school principal in Oceanside, Long Island, who refused to allow this distinguished Member to speak to the graduating class which had invited him.

I want to express my agreement with the sentiments of those Members who were outraged by the limits placed on free speech in this Long Island community. I would also like to compliment Mr. LOWENSTEIN, whose strong advocacy of free speech has advanced the cause of democracy in this country. And I would like to add a footnote to my colleagues' appraisal of this situation by providing an excerpt from a New York Times story, dated June 21, the day after Mr. LOWENSTEIN addressed a supplementary graduation ceremony organized by school pupils.

I think it is appropriate also to add excerpts from letters Mr. LOWENSTEIN has received thanking him for appearances at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, the Tufts-Jackson University combined commencement in Medford, Mass., and Notre Dame University, where he was named a senior class fellow. I believe the statements attest to the value of free speech in a free society and the extent to which one man, ALLARD LOWENSTEIN, in this instance can contribute to his country by exercising that treasured guarantee.

The excerpt from the New York Times is as follows:

L.I. SENIORS HOLD OWN GRADUATION

The Democratic Representative, whose liberal views and outspoken criticism of the war in Vietnam have made him popular among many high school youths, was picked by the senior class in a 386-to-204 vote last month to be the speaker. The board rejected him, however, on the ground that he was running for reelection and would thus be a "political" speaker.

Dissident students responded by renting the Laurel Theater here and organizing today's exercises as a prelude to tomorrow's formal graduation program in their high school auditorium in neighboring Oceanside.

GETS STANDING OVATION

In a 90-minute program that included an invocation, choir singing, addresses by the class valedictorian and the salutatorian and other features of conventional graduation exercises, the students and more than 700 parents and friends today gave a standing ovation to Mr. Lowenstein, a resident of this South Shore city, when he said:

"This program means more than most commencements do. Most end as a reaffirmation of irrelevance—a kind of statement that no matter what, things won't change. . . . Come my friends, 'tis not too late to seek a newer world."

William Hauser, a member of the school board that had rejected Mr. Lowenstein as the students' chosen speaker, showed up. He, too, received a standing ovation when introduced.

"I can only say I'm proud to be here, and proud of the things you have done," Mr. Hauser said.

NO MORTARBOARDS

There were no gowns or mortarboards in the audience. The students—who represent about a third of the school—were scrubbed and combed and clad in suits and spring dresses. Their faces were serious and attentive.

Some parents said after the program that they had come reluctantly but were leaving convinced that their children had done the right thing in holding the exercise.

During the program, the class valedictorian, Charles Adler, told the group: "We must be active, constructive, insistent, but peaceful. We must live by those values we seek to spread. We must take America and purify it."

The salutatorian, Joel Feinberg, seemed to be summing up the sentiments of many in the audience when he said: "To disturb something in a state of inertia requires energy, and I guess that's what this is all about."

Mr. Lowenstein's remarks heavily sprinkled with quotations from Presidents and poets, were not parochially political.

Urging the seniors to "question the system and search for answers," he said: "It is not that as you get older and wiser you will become more tolerant, but that the country will become wiser and more tolerant."

Recalling President F. D. Roosevelt's remark in the Depression era that "this generation has a rendezvous with destiny," Mr. Lowenstein said, "If ever those words had more meaning than in the nineteen-thirties it is now."

"We are the majority of Americans not to be silenced," he said.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, U.S. MILITARY ACADEMY, WEST POINT, N.Y.,
May 18, 1970.

Hon. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LOWENSTEIN: On behalf of the United States Military Academy and our Department of Social Sciences, we wish to express our deep appreciation for the exceptionally fine lecture you delivered to our Seminar in Public Policy last Friday. Both the cadets and faculty were impressed with the substance and frankness of your views.

Your seminar with members of our faculty after the lecture was greatly stimulating and, as you could tell from their response, greatly appreciated. I'm only sorry we couldn't have carried on longer.

Sincerely yours,

AMOS A. JORDAN, Jr.,
Colonel, USA, Professor and Head Department of Social Sciences.

JUNE 8, 1970.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN LOWENSTEIN: I had to express my appreciation and delight to you on behalf of my classmates and most of all, myself, at your appearance and beautiful speech at our Tufts-Jackson Commencement last Sunday. I hope you enjoyed sharing it with us.

We owe many thanks to you for its success—for I am just now beginning to receive the repercussions of its effect. With your help, I believe that we really "succeeded"—in giving people something to think about and be stimulated by . . . not to fall asleep to.

Most sincerely yours,

ADA SHEN,
President, Jackson Class of 1970.

NOTRE DAME, IND.,
May 11, 1970.

Mr. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN:

You added a great deal to this campus. You gave many hope where hope was gone and the future looked dim. For the one day you were at Notre Dame a student body felt that a United States Congressman was one of them, a student, a person. You relighted a torch in faculty and students alike of take heart, get involved, and change the world. You were a voice of sanity in a world of insanity, and you left us with debts that can never be repaid. The students at Notre Dame will never forget what you gave to them in one day.

Best wishes,

BOB RIGNEY,
University of Notre Dame.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL RESULTS

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I wish to insert in the RECORD my June Washington report which contains the results of my recent opinion poll:

MINSHALL OPINION POLL RESULTS—JUNE 1970

More than 35,000 completed questionnaires have been received in an avalanche response unprecedented in all my years in Congress, an indication that there is a genuine and intense concern about the critical issues facing our nation. All returns have been carefully tabulated and I personally have noted the many thoughtful and helpful comments accompanying them. Thank you for your enthusiastic participation. Results follow:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion
1. Do you approve of President Nixon sending U.S. troops into Cambodia?	60.3	35.5	4.2
2. Should the United States—			
(a) Continue Vietnamizing the war while gradually withdrawing our troops?	60.0		
(b) Step up efforts for an all-out military victory?	16.0		
(c) Pull out all U.S. military forces at once?	15.3		
(d) Other suggestions	5.5		
(e) No opinion			3.2
3. Should the U.S. increase arms aid to Israel?	33.5	58.7	7.8
4. Do you support the Safeguard anti-ballistic-missile program?	57.7	34.0	8.3
5. Are you in favor of an all-volunteer Army?	55.0	39.0	6.0
6. Should college draft deferments be phased out so that all men of eligible age are selected by lottery?	69.5	22.8	7.7
7. Do you think 18-year-olds should have the right to vote?	31.0	59.8	9.2
8. Should the House of Representatives bring impeachment proceedings against Supreme Court Justice William O. Douglas?	41.4	39.8	18.8
9. To control inflation, do you favor:			
(a) Wage and price controls?	60.5	18.0	21.5
(b) Credit controls?	49.4	15.2	35.4
(c) Reduced Government spending?	72.8	9.9	17.3
10. In the fight against environmental pollution would you support:			
(a) Higher taxes at all governmental levels for an all-out crash program?	24.7	41.0	34.3
(b) The President's Great Lakes Clean-Up proposals?	60.8	5.8	33.4
(c) Strong local enforcement of more strict regulations governing municipal and industrial pollution?	93.1	1.1	5.8
(d) Strong enforcement of more strict regulations governing motor vehicle and airplane pollution?	78.1	5.8	16.1
11. Should the United States proceed with more exploration of the moon and deeper probes of outer space?	42.8	51.2	6.0
12. To halt student violence, what policies should be adopted in riot situations on campus?			
(a) Expel students who are disorderly or refuse to obey regulations	39.8		
(b) Strict law enforcement, but no use of deadly force	14.5		
(c) Strict law enforcement, use deadly force if absolutely necessary	13.1		
(d) Firmer control by college administrators	8.4		
(e) Keep outside agitators off campuses	5.0		
(f) Miscellaneous suggestions	13.7		
(g) No opinion	5.5		

The July Washington Report will bring you up to date on the status of major legislation, as well as my activities representing you in Congress.

SANDY ACRES GARDEN CLUB

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, recently I was contacted by the good members of the Sandy Acres Garden Club in my district expressing their concern for the disappearance of our native wildflowers and plants—many of which have become extinct—due to highway construction and other land development.

Their desire was to be able to transplant this valuable flora to a natural habitat, thereby preserving it for future generations, before the bulldozer and other construction equipment destroyed it for all time.

Who among us has not marveled at the beautiful simplicity of the wood violet, the cool greeness of the wild fern, and the intricate design of a jack-in-the-pulpit? Let us preserve these marvelous products of nature's plan by permitting our dedicated garden and conservation groups to transplant them to appropriate parks and areas for all to enjoy and to provide the greenery which produces the very oxygen we breathe.

Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to permit interested organizations the opportunity to remove valuable flora from sites before the construction of public works is commenced and I urge the committee to take prompt action on this measure.

MEAT IMPORT CURBS LAUDED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, I certainly warmly welcome President Nixon's decisions to put new curbs on foreign meat imports and to block bootleg meat that has been pouring into the United States from third countries because of unscrupulous practices.

Speaking as one of a number of farm State Congressmen who have been urging the President to act, I believe the President's decision to dehorn these price-depressing imports is good news to rural America. At long last, we have a President who refuses to make our farmers and livestock producers scapegoats for inflation. At the same time, the President's actions also assure every American consumer of a continued, steady supply of wholesome domestic meat.

We all recognize the value of reciprocal trade, but if it is to be mutually beneficial, then we must insist that it be a genuine two-way street.

These observations are a result, of course, of this afternoon's announcement by the U.S. Department of Agriculture that the Secretary of State and the Secretary of Agriculture have been instructed by the President to set new voluntary restraint levels on meat imports

under section 204 of the Agricultural Act of 1956.

Accordingly, Secretary Clifford Hardin has announced a new import level of 1,140 million pounds for 1970 meats subject to the Meat Import Act. Additionally, Secretary Hardin has announced a decision to stop further transshipments through a third country of meat originating in Australia, New Zealand, and Ireland.

THE AMERICAN TEXTILE, SHOE, AND CERTAIN OTHER ECONOMICALLY BESIEGED INDUSTRIES AND THEIR EMPLOYEES SHOULD BE GRANTED EQUAL COMPETITIVE CONDITIONS WITH FOREIGN PRODUCERS AND IMPORTS IN OUR DOMESTIC MARKET

HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. DONOHUE. Mr. Speaker, for too long, such vital industries as the textile, shoe, leather, machine tool, and others in my home area and throughout the country, have increasingly suffered too much from unfair foreign import competition. Over the past several years I have repeatedly contacted the White House, introduced legislation, appealed to the U.S. Tariff Commission, and requested the House Ways and Means Committee to review the nearly disastrous, disadvantageous economic circumstances impacting these industries and their employees, and to administratively grant or legislatively provide fair and reasonable adjustments in order to permit them an equal chance to compete in our domestic market with excessive foreign imports.

As I predicted in the past, this problem of unfair foreign competition in certain industries has currently grown to one of great national significance and, other avenues of hopefully agreeable adjustment having failed, the distinguished House Ways and Means Committee has been focusing its concentrated attention, through extended hearings, upon legislative remedies. Having cosponsored legislation, H.R. 16937, in this 91st Congress, designed to sensibly and reasonably establish equal competitive standards with foreign imports in our domestic market for these domestic industries and their employees, I submitted a further appeal to this esteemed committee last June 17 and I wish to include that statement at this point:

STATEMENT OF HON. HAROLD D. DONOHUE OF MASSACHUSETTS TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS DURING HEARINGS ON U.S. IMPORT POLICIES, JUNE 17, 1970

Mr. DONOHUE. First, I would like to thank the distinguished chairman and the diligent members of this esteemed committee, on behalf of my constituents and myself, for initiating these timely hearings on the vitally important subject of urgent, sensible import quota regulation.

For many years, the United States has enjoyed a healthy international trade surplus. In the early 1960's, our exports exceeded our imports by $5 billion to $6 billion a year. But such a trade surplus is only a memory, Mr. Chairman. The figure for 1968 was less than a billion dollars, and experts agree that we will soon, if indeed we are not already, be confronting a trade deficit.

If international bankers and the balance of payments were the only concerns in this matter, important as they are, I would be inclined to view it more dispassionately. But this rising tide of imports has had and is continuing to have a severe disruptive effect on the market development of certain American industries, with inescapable and intolerable consequences for the workers employed in those industries. The Secretary of Commerce has estimated that, "if imports of textiles and apparel continue to grow at the present rate there could be a loss of 100,000 jobs a year in this country." The labor department has reported the loss, over the past two years, of 48,000 jobs in the manufacture of radio and TV sets and components. Similar concerns have been voiced by those in such industries as steel, chemicals, shoes and flat glass.

Of course, Mr. Chairman, I would hope, even at this late point in time, that those abroad would take notice and heed the worsening situation in America, especially as it is being documented at these very hearings. I would suggest that the most constructive and wholesome solution to this domestic difficulty lies in their prompt response to the practical reality that the United States Congress will not leave unfairly besieged American industries, with their employees, continuously vulnerable to unlimited encroachments from foreign sources. Foreign self-restraint and co-operation in the form of voluntary quotas would undoubtedly offer the best avenue toward averting any serious interruption in the further progress toward balanced, free international trade.

But clearly, Mr. Chairman, the situation must be dealt with, whether voluntarily from abroad, or by legislative mandate from Washington. The problem will not dissolve.

The markets for textile articles and articles of leather footwear, Mr. Chairman, have been particularly hard hit. That is why I have co-sponsored H.R. 16937, one of literally scores of bills designed to help stem this accelerating avalanche of low cost imports, produced under foreign economic conditions that our domestic industries cannot possibly meet without violating our own laws and sabotaging our acclaimed civilized and economic progress.

This is not a new concern, Mr. Chairman. For several years, as the trend toward unlimited expansion of imports has become increasingly discernible, a large number of Members of Congress have repeatedly proposed the setting of responsible restraints on this harmful practice. On many past occasions I have emphasized to the House the need "to develop reasonable and equitable relief from the extreme economic hardships resulting from the excessive imports of ungoverned and unfair foreign competition."

Most recently, as a firm, but fair, step toward meeting that need, in this Congress Mr. Chairman, I have co-sponsored one of the bills, H.R. 16937, now pending before this esteemed committee.

In brief, it calls for textile and footwear importations from any one country to be limited this year to the average amount allowed in from that country during the 1967–68 period. That limit in succeeding years would then be adjusted up or down, growing or contracting according to the total market for that particular product. In other words, ample allowance is made, not only for continuing imports at high levels, but also for increasing imports of an article as demand for that article increased.

The other key provision of the bill would make the adjustment assistance, previously authorized by the Congress, more readily available for domestic workers and industries suffering substantial economic injury because of increased imports.

We are all very well aware, Mr. Chairman, that this is a most difficult and complex legislative area and we also know of this committee's deep interest and studied diligence in seeking a reasonable legislative solution of this challenging excess import problem. Nevertheless, Mr. Chairman, I am very confident that, from and out of all the measures before you, this renowned committee will find and recommend an appropriate legislative proposal designed to best promote our national and international interest in sensibly controlling excessive imports. We just cannot, in all equity, Mr. Chairman, further ignore the increasingly great economic hardships being visited upon substantial numbers of American workers and industries, in my own home area and across the country, as unchecked textile and footwear and other imports force layoff after layoff, plant closing after plant closing.

I do not advocate a return to high tariffs, nor a protectionist program. But I do urge a realistic policy, lest the failure to reach a solution to our import problems does result in protectionism and high tariffs. I do not propose complete economic insulation from foreign competition, nor is that what responsible American employers and workers desire; what is proposed and what they rightfully ask is simply an equal chance to sell their products under mutually fair competitive conditions, in an open and undistorted domestic market. I most earnestly urge and hope that this committee will very soon recommend a legislative proposal that will provide this kind of equally competitive market to the great number of American workers and industries who desperately need it in order to economically survive.

May I again express my deep appreciation to you, Mr. Chairman, and to your committee colleagues for conducting these hearings in the interest of so many beleaguered American industries and their employees.

INDEPENDENCE DAY GREETINGS FROM GERMANY

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, Saturday, here in the United States of America, we celebrate July 4, American Independence Day. We have much to be thankful for—and even though we have many adversaries and critics around the world, we also have many good, loyal friends. One such friend, Dr. Walter Becher, a CDU/CSU Member of the German Bundestag—the West German Congress—sent me—in fact, sent to all of us—a welcome, congratulatory letter on this American independence anniversary celebration which I include in the RECORD for the review of my colleagues. Thank you, Dr. Becher. We appreciate your thoughtful expression of friendship.

The letter follows:

JUNE 24, 1970.

Hon. ED FOREMAN,
U.S. Representative,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE FOREMAN: On the occasion of July 4, the American Independ-

ence Day, I would like to send you the best wishes and congratulations.

In a time when many voices in the world criticize the U.S.A. because it has stood up for freedom, this Day is a special occasion for me to greet your great country. Nobody in the free world could resist the pressure coming from the Soviet side if there were not the mighty counterbalance by the United States.

As a Member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the German Bundestag, I appreciate the efforts by your country to keep the peace in alliance with the free nations. Nobody can claim these efforts only for Europe, and—as many have done also over here—condemn them as far as Asia is concerned.

The right for freedom is indivisible. July 4 is therefore the Independence Day for all nations.

With best personal regards and wishes for you and your great country,

Yours very sincerely,

Dr. WALTER BECHER,
Member of the German Bundestag.

THE HONORABLE ROBERT E. McCORD

HON. HARLEY O. STAGGERS

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. STAGGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I learn of the death of the Honorable Robert E. McCord at Washington Hospital Center on last Sunday, June 21. Bob McCord was a native of West Virginia, and a long-time friend of mine with whom I have had the pleasure of working on numerous occasions.

At the time of his passing, Bob was chief clerk and senior specialist for the House Education and Labor Committee, a post he held since 1965. Prior to that time he served as administrative aide for the Honorable Robert Ramsey, Representative of the First Congressional District of West Virginia, and afterward for the Honorable Cleveland Bailey.

As a staff member of the House committee, Mr. McCord used his formidable talents in developing legislation on various school projects, particularly those on school impact aid, the Service Contract Act, the School Lunch Act, and the Arts and Humanities Act. Due to his interest in public education, Federal support of schools has reached appreciable proportions in recent years, and school people owe him a debt of gratitude for the improved conditions under which they work.

Many Members of this body may recall the devoted and courteous service he rendered to all Members of the House. It is true that his life has been spent in useful service to people. His passing will leave an empty spot difficult to fill.

Bob is survived by his devoted wife, Audrey, and by his mother, a sister, and a brother. To these we extend our sincere sympathy in their bereavement, and our hope that their memory of a gracious and honorable life will afford consolation in the hour of sadness.

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY NAACP HEAD CALLING ADMINISTRATION ANTI-NEGRO

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

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

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY NAACP HEAD CALLING ADMINISTRATION ANTI-NEGRO

CINCINNATI, June 29—Following are excerpts from the keynote address of Bishop Stephen G. Spottswood, chairman of the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, at the association's annual convention here today:

Two years ago, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, speaking for the Kerner commission, called for "the reaffirmation of our faith in one society," and the commission itself sounded a warning that the nation is moving in the direction of two societies—one black, one white—separate and unequal.

Today, the signs are even more ominous. On every hand, the commentators and the politicians, the faint-hearted liberals and the tragically misguided black separatists, are announcing the end of integration, especially in the schools.

For the first time since Woodrow Wilson, we have a national Administration that can be rightly characterized as anti-Negro.

This is the first time since 1920 that the national Administration has made it a matter of calculated policy to work against the needs and aspirations of the largest minority of its citizens.

Here are a few instances supporting our contention of the Administration's anti-Negro policy:

1. Signing of defense contracts with textile companies long in violation of contract requirements versus our recommendations that these contracts be canceled.

2. The pull-back on school desegregation. The Administration went into court to secure delays in already ordered desegregation. Thank God, the Supreme Court struck down these attempts.

HIGH COURT NOMINATIONS

3. The nominations of Clement Haynsworth and G. Harrold Carswell to the United States Supreme Court (which nominations were defeated by the leadership of the N.A.A.C.P., along with other organizations, including the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, of which Roy Wilkins is chairman and in which fight our Clarence Mitchell demonstrated his superb skills on Capitol Hill as truly the 101st Senator).

4. The Administration at Washington weakened our hard-won voting rights act in the House.

5. The Administration opposed the cease-and-desist order power of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

6. The Administration supported the Stennis amendment on the school appropriation bill.

7. The Administration produced the Moynihan memorandum calling for "benign neglect."

8. The Administration supports tax exemption for white, separate private schools, designed to avert desegregation of the public schools.

9. On April 9, after the rejection of his nominee, Judge Carswell, for the Supreme Court, the President described the ideal judge as "someone who believes in the strict construction of the Constitution, as I do—a judge who will not use the power of the Court to seek social change by freely interpreting the law or constitutional clauses." This is the Administration's expressed opposition to the equal protection clauses of the 14th amendment.

The effect of this has been exactly what was predicted. It has given encouragement to the Southern racists whose fullpage advertisements have exposed their radical retreat to the calendar level of the 1870's, such as produced by Senator [John C.] Stennis of Mississippi and Gov. [John J.] McKeithen of Louisiana, to say nothing of the melodramatic pose of Florida's Gov. [Claude R.] Kirk in defying the Federal court's orders to desegregate the Public schools of the Everglades State.

Before us today, in the solution of the problem of a single society, are the issues arising from what seems to many the futility of our effort toward integration. There is a tremendous white backlash as we have forged a difficult path through the metallic barriers in housing, employment and politics.

A small but vociferous number of Negroes has effected the black retreat, as indicated in the black college students' demands for separate dormitories, separate cafeterias, separate curricula and separate facilities. Incidentally, we should sympathize—even as we disagree—with young black youth whose bitter and bloody experiences on white college campuses have driven them to "the black retreat."

ACCENTUATING POLARITY

The white backlash on the one hand and the black retreat on the other hand have combined to accentuate the racial polarity of which the Kerner commission warned.

At this juncture in our national life, we of the N.A.A.C.P., recalling Abraham Lincoln's declaration that "this nation cannot endure half free and half slave," emphatically paraphrase Mr. Lincoln and declare "this country cannot endure half white and half black." If American democracy is to survive, we shall be one society, as the Declaration of Independence visioned and the Constitution declares.

Ours is a national problem affecting all Americans, and no matter where we live, the problem of one society is before us. For instance, it is easy for Northern Negroes to forget the South because local needs are urgent and desperate, but they do so at their own peril.

Fifty-two per cent of black Americans still live in the South, mostly in cities, where the problems of overcrowding, housing, crime, discrimination, poor education are the same as the North's. In addition, they have the Southern segregation traditions, white supremacy ideology and wanton murderousness.

KILLINGS BY POLICE

Even as lynching was the Roman holiday sport of the 19th century America, killing black Americans promiscuously has been the 20th century pastime of our police whose primary duty is law enforcement and keeping the peace.

I'm thinking of the six Negroes killed in Augusta, Ga., all shot in the back; of the Panthers slain in their beds in Chicago; of the students slain at Jackson State College; of the almost daily news stories of the indiscriminate, ruthless slaying of black Americans by police and civilians, under the guise of "law and order," but actually fulfilling the guidelines of a bitter, white majority, whose vain effort to keep us "in our place" leads them to resort to the policeman's pistol and kangaroo court trials.

The white liberals and the churches have not been conspicuous in the fight for freedom lately. No one questions the demand for

an immediate end of the Vietnam war. We ask again, why is it that white people always manage to find some issue other than race to which they give their priority attention, the latest of which is pollution and the ecology?

If racial justice and civil rights had commanded just 10 per cent of the attention that white liberals have given to the Vietnam war, we would not be in the position we are today—and it is unlikely that we would have Nixon in the White House either.

We must counteract some black authors who have tried to show that bad English grammar and slurred consonants and special terminology found among poorly educated Negroes (and poorly educated white people) are really a different language which should be learned and used in ghetto school teaching. Recently a black architect has been working on the theory that Negroes should have distinctive type housing—one which adequately accommodates their tribal instincts inherited from our African past—reductio ad absurdum!

Then, after the long series of suggestions of self-imposed apartheid, we must beware of those who once stood on the solid ground of full freedom for all Americans and have now retreated to the wabbling field of compromise and sinking sands of surrender.

For example, Roy Innis, national director of CORE, recently made a Deep South visit where he was warmly received by Govs. John Bell Williams of Mississippi, John J. McKeithen of Louisiana, Albert Brewer of Alabama and Lester (Ax-Handle) Maddox of Georgia.

FOR DUAL SYSTEM

He was there to solicit their interest and support of the Innis plan to re-establish a dual school system. His scheme is not to have separate black and white systems by race—oh, no—but to split the city in half along residential lines, with the white half under its school system and the black half under its system.

You can just imagine how the Governors were delighted with the Innis proposal.

There are others who advocate a separate nation, to be set up somewhere, or for autonomous neighborhoods or districts in the cities—to run our own police, fire department, hospitals, schools and everything else. But they always make it clear that they expect to get the money from the rest of the community. There is no such thing as autonomy on some one else's money.

No major problem afflicting black Americans can be solved except by solving them for all Americans.

We have worked too long and too hard, made too many sacrifices, spent too much money, shed too much blood, lost too many lives fighting to vindicate our manhood as full participants in the American system to allow our victories to be nullified by phony liberals, die-hard racists, discouraged and demoralized Negroes and power-seeking politicians.

RE: H.R. 16065—ARTS AND HUMANITIES

HON. DAVID W. DENNIS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. DENNIS. Mr. Speaker, it is somewhat invidious to oppose a bill of this character and such opposition requires some explanation, since honest friends of the arts or political opponents may equate such opposition with a crass materialism, and may accuse the opponent of the bill of being a Philistine, wholly lacking in interest in, or appreciation for, the finer things of life.

Nevertheless, I do oppose this bill, and for at least two reasons.

First, and most obviously, it seems to me—as our liberal friends are so fond of saying—that, in this measure, we are mixed up on our priorities. When one considers the needs and demands for national defense, the environment, education, public health and welfare, the inner cities, and other important matters now before us; and when one considers our elastic debt ceiling, our unbalanced budget, and our still unchecked inflation, it seems fairly clear that this is not the time to substantially expand governmental participation in the fields covered by this bill.

Less obviously, but, to my mind, more importantly, I am not convinced that Government support, at public expense, of activities in the field of the arts and humanities, as provided in this measure, is, philosophically or in principle, a valid field for governmental activity.

Progress in and appreciation for the humanities and the arts are, it seems to me, preeminently individual matters, which depend upon the interest, the inspiration, and the efforts of the individual—and in which the dead land of governmental bureaucracy has scarcely any proper role to play.

It has been pointed out in the minority committee report that the well-known authors and artists of the 19th and 20th centuries have, up to date, flourished without Government subsidy or support. On the other hand, while such individuals may exist, I, at least, am not aware of any prominent contemporary artist who achieved his training under the WPA, or of any unsung modern Homer who produced his masterpiece while subsisting upon a public subsidy.

The academic spirit, and genuine achievement in the humanities and in the arts are, I believe, fundamentally incompatible with governmental paternalism, subsidy, and, as I fear, Government control; for where there is the power to grant or to withhold funds the power to control always exists. In European principalities, it is true, the state theater and the state opera are not unknown. Our American history and tradition are quite otherwise, and there seems to me to be no valid reason for departing from that free and vigorous tradition.

A GREAT AMERICAN—SENATOR SPESSARD HOLLAND

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, Florida's foremost honored statesman, and one of America's greatest men, Senator SPESSARD HOLLAND, has long been recognized for his great mind, his beautiful spirit, and his just and sound philosophy. Just recently, Senator HOLLAND gave the commencement address at Stetson University College of Law at St. Petersburg, and in it he exemplifies all these wonderful attributes.

Because this is a time in America when we should turn to men of Senator HOLLAND's great stature, I would like to record the speech he gave on this occasion for all our people to read, and for all posterity, here in the U.S. CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The speech is as follows:

SPEECH BY SENATOR HOLLAND

Mrs. Holland and I greatly appreciate the invitation of Dean Dillon and Chairman Clapp of the Board of Overseers to be present at this commencement of the Stetson University College of Law. Both of us are grateful for the warm hospitality and the generous courtesy which we have received. I count it a personal honor to speak to this large group of new lawyers who comprise the members of this graduating class on the 70th anniversary of this fine institution. Stetson University and the Stetson School of Law have been distinguished through the years by the large number of alumni who have served this state and the nation.

It has been my own great pleasure to serve with, and frequently under, Stetson alumni who have become Governors of our State, Judges of our State Supreme Court and other courts or members of our State Legislature. I served under your great Governor Doyle E. Carlton when I was the County Judge of my own Polk County. I served in the State Senate under Governor Sholtz and argued many, many cases before Circuit Judges and Supreme Court Judges who were Stetson alumni from the earliest days of my law practice in 1916. In the State Senate for eight years I worked continuously with highly-regarded Senators and Representatives who were Stetson alumni, most of them lawyers. The President of the State Senate in my last session, 1939, was the beloved J. Turner Butler, an eminent alumnus of the Stetson Law School.

I remember with pleasure that I participated in the naming of one of your finest alumni, the late Judge Louie Strum, to be a member of the Fifth U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals and also in the naming to that court of another of your best, Judge David Dyer, who still serves with distinction. Every Supreme Court of Florida before whom I practiced included Stetson men just as there are now two Stetson members of our State Supreme Court, Justices Harris Drew and Vassar Carlton. It was a great pleasure to join in confirming one of your distinguished law alumni, Honorable Amory Underhill, as an Assistant Attorney General of the United States, and another, Honorable Francis P. Whitehair as Undersecretary of the Navy during the Korean War. In these important posts both rendered great service to our nation. I am happy to say that nearly all of the Stetson Law alumni whose public services I have observed have been moderates or conservatives.

Of course, I well knew your late Dean, Honorable Tom Sebring, when he was at the University of Florida and later as a member of the State Supreme Court while I was Governor. After that time, he came here to be dean of this Law School feeling, as he told me, that service here offered him his greatest challenge. It has been my privilege for many years to be the friend of your former President, now your Chancellor, Ollie Edmunds, another Stetson alumnus, and I know much about the fine work that he has accomplished for Stetson. So, I am no stranger to the great work which Stetson, and particularly the Stetson Law School, has done in serving this state and our nation. It therefore gives me real joy to participate in these graduation exercises.

I assume that all of you law graduates, following the tradition of earlier Stetson

graduates, will soon have passed the Florida Bar examination with flying colors and will be practicing law. I hope that most of you will remain right here in Florida which seems to me to be a peculiarly fertile field at this very time for the practice of the law. Not only are we a fast-growing and prosperous state whose census, now being taken, will approach 6½ million, but also we have just begun to live under a new constitution which will necessarily bring on for some years much new litigation of the most interesting type. Further, many old precedents will cease to carry weight and as new lawyers you will start practice on much more equal terms with your older brethren at the Bar than would normally be the case. May I hope for all of you, therefore, an abundance of wealthy and generous clients, many of whom will be so aggressive and competitive as to require much good advice and considerable representation in litigation.

My first serious observation is this: I hope that many of you will enter public life, just as have so many of your predecessors who have studied law here. You inherit from Stetson a strong tradition for public service and there has been no time when the state and the nation have had greater need of trained legal minds to help in passing constructive legislation or in administering the laws in skillful fashion or in interpreting the laws justly in the courts of our state and the nation.

Speaking for a moment from experience, since I have served to a small extent in the judicial field and for other periods of time in the legislative and executive areas I well know that a public servant cannot hope to always have the acclaim and approval of all of his citizens. Nevertheless, he has many occasions of great satisfaction when he helps to get something done which he knows to be useful to his public, and sometimes he even receives acclaim from them. One in public life should develop a rather thick skin but should learn also to accept with the greatest possible pleasure and satisfaction the approval of his constituents on those occasions, not so rare as you may believe, when he receives such approval. Public life gives two clear satisfactions—you can know you are working for objectives which you regard as well-worthwhile and there are few pleasures which compare with your joy when a particular controversy on legislation which you have fought for and helped to pass, to administer or to interpret, is finally approved by the highest courts as meaning what you intended it to mean and as bringing about the good results for which you have worked. I hope, therefore, that many of you will seriously consider going into public life—and I hope that many of you may come to the conclusion that public life is the field in which you can count for most and can do those very things which you feel in your hearts will mean most to yourselves and your people.

Public life is hard work but it is also intensely interesting.

As you know, I am now serving in my 24th year in a body which is composed mostly of lawyers, many of them successful and distinguished. I hear legal anecdotes every day and feel that two of them might be appropriate at this time.

Senator John Stennis of Mississippi served for many years as a District Attorney and as Circuit Judge in his state before coming to the Senate. He likes to tell the story of a lawyer who asked one question too many of a witness in a trial in which Senator Stennis was participating. I pass the story on to you.

The trial was on a very important criminal case in which the most effective witness for the state was an eye-witness, a teenage Negro boy. When the time came for cross examination the lawyer for the defense tried skillfully to break down the testimony of the witness but failed to make any headway whatever. He finally asked, suddenly, "Young man, before you came to court this morning did you discuss with any person what you should say on the witness stand?" The witness answered readily, "Yes, sir, I did." With great satisfaction apparent on his face the lawyer said: "And who was the person you discussed your testimony with?" The witness said: "Sir, he was my papa." And then the defense lawyer asked that one question that went too far. "And what did your father tell you to say when you got before this jury?" Respectfully the boy answered: "Sir, my papa told me, 'Son, when you get on that witness stand you just tell them the truth just like it was.'"

The second story which I recall is told by Senator Sam Ervin of North Carolina, who, besides serving as a trial judge for many years, was a member of the Supreme Court of his state before coming to the Senate. He said there had been a very famous trial in Raleigh in which a noted trial lawyer had won for a wealthy client a very difficult case before a jury and there was much speculation as to the amount of the fee which he had received. Two young lawyers were discussing the matter and one told the other he had heard from a reliable source that the fee had been $25,000, which the other young lawyer just could not believe. At that very moment they saw approaching them on the sidewalk the famous lawyer who had won the case, spontaneously, they said: "Let's ask him what was the amount of his fee." So, approaching him and receiving a very cordial greeting, they said: "Sir, we would like to ask you a question about something which is not our business but which we have a very great interest in as young lawyers. One of us has heard that you received a fee of $25,000 for the great case that you won yesterday and we are wondering if you would be willing to tell us just what your fee actually was." The older gentleman put his arm affectionately around each of them and drew them close to him and said: "Young men, can you keep a secret?" Whereupon they both said, breathlessly: "Yes, sir, we can." The older lawyer replied: "So can I, gentlemen," and he smilingly left them.

Perhaps there may be a point in my relating these two stories to you both for what they contain and also to make it clear that when you go into public life all is not serious. Your life is enriched by meeting hundreds of interesting people and hearing hundreds of episodes, many of them well worth remembering.

Another thought which I will mention at this time is that I have been disappointed often in late years by the willingness of too many members of our profession to seek the limelight of public recognition by adopting causes in which they cannot possibly believe and talking and acting in unbecoming ways both in the courtroom and outside. In these days of passionate advocacy the William Kunstlers seem to forget that they are sworn officers of the courts. They demean the dignity of our profession not only by the goals they advocate, but by the methods they use. They break down public confidence in the law and in our system of justice. Truly dedicated lawyers cannot follow such an obstructive and destructive course and I have no fear whatever that any of you will ever do so.

On another observation, may I say that public service, particularly in the legislative bodies and in the courts of law, is now very badly needed in averting and defeating a drive already quite evident and in some areas quite popular to radically change our type of government. I mention first in this connection the current vigorous effort to change our electoral system of choosing the president and vice president by adopting the direct election plan. Many people are dissatisfied, and I am one of them, with the old system of choosing the president and vice president through the electoral college. The public dissatisfaction with that system has grown so great that many Americans seem willing to discard it for almost any other means, whether good or bad. The leading proposal just now in many quarters is to do away entirely with the electoral college and elect the president and vice president by popular votes cast in all 50 states and the District of Columbia with the proviso that if no candidate receives 40% of the total votes cast nationally, there shall be a run-off or second race between the leaders in the first race.

At first blush this may look like a good proposal, but more and more of the real scholars in government are now coming out against it and proclaiming its disadvantages. Direct election of the president will undoubtedly encourage and create splinter parties and we well know from looking at what goes on in some other democratic nations which do have many political parties how little stability has been produced under these systems. Furthermore, the expense and delay of a second general election interposes obstacles which are simply enormous. It sets up an open invitation to log rolling and political trades the like of which we have not seen in this republic. Furthermore, the direct election plan takes a long step toward elimination of the dual sovereignty system under which our nation was created and has prospered unbelievably. Many of those who favor the direct election system are the same persons who prefer an all powerful centralized government, with less and less power and responsibility left to the states. Under the direct election system at least 32 states would lose a part—some of them a large part— of their weight in a presidential election. Our present constitutional system gives weight to both the population of the several states and the identity of the states as such by allowing to each state an electoral weight equal to the total number of its representatives in Congress, including members of the House and members of the Senate. In short, the electoral college weight of each state includes one vote for every House member, representing population, and one vote for each Senator. The two Senators of each state represent the state as such and its identity as a sovereign under our concept of dual sovereignty, that is, a sovereign nation consisting of sovereign states. This arrangement was part of the original compromise in the Constitutional Convention of 1787 by which the large and small states were brought in accord in creating our republic. To deprive all states of that portion of their weight which comes from their statehood is a long step away from the concept of dual sovereignty and goes far in giving the heavily populated states vastly greater weight than they now have in presidential elections. I have already stated what is fact: Under the 1960 census, 32 out of the 50 states would lose a part of their weight in the selection of our president by adopting the direct election scheme.

Aside from the improbability of the ratification of such a constitutional amendment, by the required 38 states, it seems to me to be a readily understandable fact that those who favor the direct election plan really desire to radically change our form of government. They propose to give much greater weight proportionately to the larger states than they now have and much less weight to the smaller states. They propose to make it more certain that the presidents and vice presidents will always come from the heavily populated states; that the major campaigning will take place there; that the tendency for major political trades between the first election and the run-off election will exist there and that in every respect the influence of the larger states will be greatly enhanced, while the smaller states will be heavily downgraded. Perhaps the most specific illustration of this fact is seen when we consider

that the District of Columbia, itself, not a state and without the sovereignty of statehood, would under the direct election system outweigh each of the eleven states and would even outweigh several combinations of two of the states. But to summarize my major objection to the direct election plan, I feel it is hopelessly unwise to adopt a radical and far-reaching change in our entire system of government that will start us down-grade on a well paved road leading to the creation and aggrandizement of a single great federal state and the emasculation and perhaps ultimate destruction of state sovereignty. In my judgment, adoption of this system would soon result in the taking over by the federal government of all election provisions—the age limit, residential requirements, registration machinery, absentee voting and every other detail. The federal government is already too large—too unwieldly. It is not doing well economically on much of the public business which it handles simply because it is so big that well-intentioned and dedicated minds cannot grasp all of its manifold details.

Sometimes we overlook, because of the impairment of state rights in some matters, the immense responsibility still retained by the states to control most fields which vitally affect the lives of their citizens, such as the following:

Taxing real and personal property; operating the public schools; keeping vital statistics; such as registration of births and deaths; appointment of guardians for minors and incompetents and handling their estates; ownership and conveyancing of property; providing for the distribution of the estates of decedents; providing for the licensing of teachers, doctors, dentists, engineers, lawyers, and other vital professions and businesses; creating and regulating corporations and trusts; providing for marriage and divorce; handling civil actions and criminal prosecutions; enforcing law and order; taking life as a penalty for certain heinous crimes; providing, through police, firemen, inspectors and sanitary workers, for their security and that of homes and business; providing for the poor house and for hospitals for the insane, the feebleminded and the ill, controlling the highways; regulating the rates of water, power, gas and local transportation and controlling fresh water supplies.

To me it is unthinkable that the sovereignty of each state as a state controlling so many of those matters which vitally affect the lives of all people should not continue to have weight in speaking as one of the family of states in helping to select the president and vice president of our nation. Shall we continue our time-honored system of dual sovereignty or will it become an historic myth?

I have already stated that I am dissatisfied with the ancient electoral college system which was built into the constitution to meet conditions prevailing at that time, but there are several methods by which that system may be changed without destroying its fundamental concept that both people as people and the sovereign states as states shall take part in the selection of our president. The method which I prefer and which on one occasion some years ago was passed in the Senate in much the same form by the required ⅔ vote is the so-called fractional system by which, after abolishing the electoral college as such, the entire electoral vote of each state is continued and would be divided among the several candidates fractionally in the same proportion as the votes cast in that state were divided. In other words, every person's vote would count. There would be no continuation of the "winner take all" provision in the present system. There would be no individual electors who may follow their own individual choice in casting their vote for president and vice president, but the total strength of the people of the state, combined with the strength of the people of all other states and the District of Columbia, would be compiled automatically in determining the outcome of the election. In the event no candidate for president or vice president received 40% of the total electoral weight of the nation, the issue would be decided at a joint meeting of the Congress in which every member of the House and the Senate would have an equal vote; thus again giving representation both to the people as people and to the states as states. This method would retain the original constitutional concept and would allow the choice of every voter to be reflected in the final outcome.

There are, of course, other methods of dealing with this important subject which would not bring about the complete change of our governmental system which would result if the direct election method were adopted. The fundamental concept of our original system has succeeded too well for us to consider lightly its complete abandonment.

Another matter which is now pending to which much careful consideration should be given by trained legal minds is that of changing the age for voting. This matter is closely akin to the change of the electoral system, which I have already discussed. I am speaking now not of the wisdom of making a change in the voting age, but of the methods which are being eagerly pursued to effect such a change. I think this is a matter which should primarily be decided by each state for itself. If the people of Florida desire to change the voting age of their citizens from 21 to 18, and so decide by approving a state constitutional amendment to that effect, that is certainly a correct method of accomplishing the change. As a citizen of Florida I do not support such a change but I do strongly support the method.

When we look at Washington, however, we find pending there an effort to accomplish this change on a national basis by a proposed statute now pending as an amendment to a so-called voting rights bill which has been passed by the Senate and is under consideration in the House. It is difficult for me to understand how anyone who has studied the federal constitution can come to the conclusion that such a change by federal statute could possibly be held constitutional. Section 2 of article 1 of the original constitution reads: "The House of Representatives shall be composed of members chosen every second year by the people of the several states and the electors in each state shall have the qualifications requisite for electors of the most numerous branch of the state legislature." The courts have on various occasions held under this provision that the states reserved to themselves the setting of qualifications for voting. Those who claim that the 14th Amendment changed by implication the specific provision of the constitution which I have just quoted, overlook the fact that the 17th Amendment providing for the direct election of senators, adopted 45 years after the 14th Amendment, repeated and renewed the identical words already quoted in Section 2 of article 1 of the original constitution. There are, of course, other provisions in the constitution, notably the 10th Amendment, which many legal scholars hold reserved to the states the power to fix the qualifications of their voters. Yet, there are many so-called activists, who favor change for change's sake, who are perfectly willing to ignore the constitution and throw the whole process of electing public officers, not only the president and vice president, but all other offices, federal, state and local, into question by mere adoption of a statute on this vital subject.

I have cited only two of the several matters which are pending in the Congress and in national debate which give me deep concern and which I think may offer a challenge to you as young lawyers eager to serve the law, our "Jealous Mistress," and also eager to serve your country and safeguard its institutions. That we will and must have changes, it is quite sure, and this should be the case. As the old saying goes: "The world do move." But I hope and pray that the changes agreed upon will be sound and will follow constitutional guidelines and not carelessly destroy fundamental provisions under which our nation has grown so great.

There are many other proposed changes by the so-called activists and ultra-liberals which are no doubt based on good intentions but which I think are fraught with possible grave conequences to our nation. I am thinking of such things as the proposal in the new food stamp program which passed the Senate though it had the approval of only one member of the Committee which had long studied that question. Under this proposal food stamps representing a food subsidy to individuals would become available to families of four who have an annual income of $4,000 and solely upon the affidavit of a member of such family. There are other proposals equally over-liberal, in my opinion. In am thinking of the proposed new Welfare Act whose provisions are so liberal as to virtually destroy all incentive to work for many families which will be content to become public charges and live on a public dole. I could give additional illustrations of the trends which I have been trying to describe. I am very sure that some of you who are here, though not necessarily in accord with my thinking, yet will have your own grave doubts as to the wisdom of some of the matters which I mentioned or perhaps many of the others which time limitations do not permit me to mention this morning.

The point I am trying to make is: that in this time of confusion in our country when I am sure that most citizens want to do what is right and that all citizens of character want our country to survive and remain strong and the leading exponent of individual freedom, personal opportunity and competitive private enterprise, there is need for the devoted service of many, many young men and young women upon whom much of the responsibility must lie for straightening out these difficulties which are our inheritance from two world wars, the Korean War and the Vietnam War, which all of us ardently wish to bring to an honorable end and on which I strongly support the President in his efforts to bring it to an end. Along with your opportunities for personal success these times present, therefore, a challenge for public service the like of which has faced few other generations of young Americans in earlier years. I hope that you, each of you, may, while attaining your own success, may feel it a duty to dedicate much of your time and energy to serving the state, the nation and the world which cries out for solutions to so many unanswered problems.

Mr. Speaker, in this speech Senator HOLLAND has given us his thinking on a number of vital proposals that face this country today. His thoughts are meaningful to all of us. I pray we heed his advice on all these matters.

REASON MUST RETURN TO AMERICA

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine recently wrote to me with respect to both our military presence

in Southeast Asia and the reaction here at home resulting from that presence. The writer is so perceptive about the excesses of so many Americans supporting so many causes, that I felt that my colleagues should have the opportunity to share the text of the letter with me. The writer ends her letter by asking for an effort "to restore this country to a rationally functioning state." No matter how we view the situation in Indochina, this should be our primary objective. As I have said again and again, the polarization in this country has got to stop; and all of us bear a responsibility to speak with one another, rather than shouting past one another.

The text of the letter follows:

While I heartily support the stand calling for an immediate cessation of all offensive action by the United States in Indo-China, a rapid though prudent withdrawal of troops from that area, and a substantial reduction of U.S. military commitment throughout the world, I am dismayed that the use of violence at home has become an effective means of attracting the necessary attention to this matter, unduly over-shadowing the less ostentatious efforts of a concerned majority.

I support, and will continue to support, enforcement of the individual's right to dissent. I will *not* condone the childish, egotistical destruction which has been taking place on the nation's college campuses. Those who are party to such acts reduce themselves to the level of those they would condemn for violent acts in Viet Nam, and accomplish nothing more than the alienation of people who are in a position to do something constructive about the situation. Similarly, those who bow to such pressure, or threat of pressure, only succeed in doing a disservice to themselves, the disruptive elements, and the country by rewarding such tactics with immediate compliance to the demands, thereby appearing to condone such methods of protest, and subjecting the country to further outbreaks of this kind.

Your efforts to end the fighting in Southeast Asia are greatly appreciated. I would hope that you will continue to make such efforts because, and only because, our withdrawal is the right thing to do, *not* because you are being frightened into a decision by threats of violence. A policy made for the latter reason is meaningless. The "face saving" so desired by our nation *can* come through our leaders' making of rational, well-thought out decisions, but will never be realized through hurried, irrational policies made in a rush to meet a protester's deadline so that a building will not be destroyed. It's time we called the bluffs of a few people, letting a few buildings burn if necessary, to show that action and policymaking on the part of our country will result *only* from the many legal and democratic processes already available to the nation's citizens. It is through these avenues that disssent must be made effective and so should be encouraged to take place.

Lest I be categorized as one of the "over-thirty, silent majority", I am a 1969 graduate of Ithaca College and am presently employed by the College, from which vantage point I have seen, and become increasingly disillusioned by, educators' panicked compliance to students' irrational, impractical, and undemocratic demands, both here and at Cornell University. The "agree with me, or I'll destroy you" attitude of the violently vocal minority must be firmly repudiated at this time, if only to insure the freedom of *non*-protesters to *not* protest if they so choose. That the violent protesters insist that they are for freedom of speech and thought is amusing, though ironically so, since they will not allow anyone who disagrees with them to express his thoughts, while at the same time insisting that *their* right to their opinions be respected.

In closing, let me again express my appreciation for your continued efforts to bring America responsibly out of the difficult and unfortunate situation she is in, in Southeast Asia. But I won't close by simply asking your continued support on ending the war. Your calm but firm voice is also greatly needed and requested in helping to restore this conutry to a rationally functioning state. I am optimistic that your constituents can look to you as a moving force in this direction and can enlist your aid in such an effort.

BIGOTED EUROPE MAKES THE UNITED STATES LOOK GOOD

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare for our traditional observation of the Fourth of July and American Independence Day, it might help some of us to remember that, with whatever faults we may possess, the United States has done more to bring about genuine appreciation of human rights and human dignity than any nation on the face of the earth.

Not long ago an article appeared in the San Francisco Examiner that discussed the pernicious type of bigotry that travelers can find with little trouble in other countries. Perhaps we need to be reminded, as this article reminds us, that while we have far from solved our internal problems, we at least can take the lion's share of credit for attempting to solve them. Few other governments can respond either positively or readily to a question directed to their own human problems.

Mr. Speaker, I bring this article to the attention of my colleagues with the hope that they will find it a good illustration of the injustice that permeates other societies.

The article follows:

BIGOTED EUROPE MAKES THE UNITED STATES LOOK GOOD

(By Thomas B. Ross)

PARIS.—The enduring impression of a year's reporting in Western and Eastern Europe is how much more there is to protest about here and how much less protesting is done.

By official U.S. definition, half the people of Western Europe and more than three-fourths of those in Eastern Europe are "poor" and "hungry."

The American Negro, one of the most disprivileged members of U.S. society, has a higher average income than the citizen of Britain, one of the most economically privileged members of the human community.

Despite the discrimination the Negro continues to suffer in the United States, he would have fared even worse here. Europe operates under the unspoken segregationist assumption that people who are different, by language, nationality and religion, as well as by color, cannot live amicably together.

France had the best racial record of any of the colonial powers, but conditions at home leave much to be desired. The Algerian and Africa slums of Paris, the so-called bidonvilles, are unspeakable, much worse than the worst Negro ghettos in the United States.

In Britain, the question of "color" may become the critical issue in the forthcoming parliamentary election, although less than 3 percent of the population is of African or Asian extraction.

The German performance on race hardly needs to be cited.

Even after the Jewish holocaust of World War II, anti-Semitism remains a potent political force in Eastern Europe. The Soviet Union requires Jews to carry special identity cards and refuses to allow them to emigrate to Israel.

In Poland, the communist regime sought to contrive an entire political policy out of anti-Zionism even though the Jewish population already had declined from a prewar level of 3 million to fewer than 25,000.

In the Middle East, a variant of racial antagonism lies at the root of the conflict over Israel, even though Jew and Arab are of the same Semitic stock.

The Moslem world, contrary to the sentimental notions of some U.S. Negroes, also harbors a strong prejudice against Negroes. American black radicals in Algeria grumble privately and bitterly about the prejudice they have encountered there.

Even Sweden, which has gained a reputation for racial tolerance largely through unremitting criticism of the American scene, is not without blemish. The local press is sprinkled with slighting allusions to the swarthy southern Europeans imported into its labor-short market.

Negro deserters from the U.S. Army quickly discover a wall of Aryan consciousness just beyond the official welcome mat.

Confronted by widespread evidence of prejudice, it is hard to accept the popular notion that racism is a uniquely American phenomenon. To the contrary, he is led to the conclusion that the evil has deep, tenacious and universal roots in the human psyche, and that the United States is remarkable, less for its inadequacies than for being the only society to attempt a just resolution of the problem.

A close look at the law enforcement practices in other countries produces a different perspective on charges of police brutality in the United States.

Recently, a mildly heated political debate among Parisian students spilled out onto the sidewalk in front of a cafe on the Left Bank, near the Sorbonne.

Soon a squad of gendarmes, without so much as a warning to disperse, proceeded to beat the students over the heads with rubber truncheons. The youths were then packed in a police van and driven off, undoubtedly to be locked up for the weekend without charge, without lawyer and without legal recourse.

Under France's Nepoleonic Code and a stern set of laws laid down at the time of the riots in 1968, the police here have extraordinary freedom. Except in Britain and Scandinavia, that is true throughout Western Europe.

Those conditions moreover, are broadly tolerated, among the young as well as the old, as somehow beyond the possibility of change. In Eastern Europe, they are not even the subject of theoretical challenge.

"American institutions, which (in the United States) are taken for granted like oxygen," commented Leopold Tyrmand, the expatriate Polish essayist, "are the subject of our wildest dreams in Eastern Europe. I have a certain pity for the Americans because they do not know how to cherish what they have and what others know they have."

On a recent tour of eastern Europe, I found the intellectuals in utter despair of Marxist

economics and elitist politics and astonished that they should be the vogue in certain sectors of the protest movement in the United States.

Late last month as I sat in a bus edging its way through a checkpoint in the Berlin Wall, emerging from the gloom of eastern Europe. I could not help thinking that the American society is better than the others that had been tried—and that it deserves more than violent words or deeds.

THE 1970 EMMY AWARDS FOR PUBLIC TELEVISION PROGRAMS

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, the National Academy of Television Arts and Sciences announced the winners of the annual Emmy awards, given for the most outstanding television productions and performances during the past year. This year, however, the impressive list of winners was unique, for public television, once considered the stepchild of the television media, captured seven of the Emmy awards. Chosen by distinguished members of the broadcasting community, most of them in commercial broadcasting, these awards seemed to give credence to the statement of TV critic Cleveland Amory in the May 23, 1970, issue of TV Guide when he said:

> The 1969–1970 season will go up in history for one thing—it was the year when educational TV came of age.

It was only 3 years ago that Congress passed the Public Broadcasting Act of 1967. In this short span of time, through the efforts of the Corporation for Public Broadcasting, National Educational Television, State, local, and private interested parties, public television began to provide the American people with television of distinction. It has become a medium for the whole family with top adult and children's entertainment as well as highly attractive educational programs. I know, for example, the widely acclaimed "Sesame Street" series has done much to erase the image of talking professors dominating educational television.

It is also interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that most of the public television programs honored were of a type of television service not available on commercial channels. "Black Journal," for example, is the first national program produced by and for the black community.

The long list of additional programs nominated for the Emmy awards indicates further that the television industry on a whole feels that public broadcasting is providing excellence in programing in a large variety of categories: children's programs, cultural programs, drama, and public affairs. The winning programs were:

The 1970 Emmy Awards—News and Documentary categories:

"Black Journal" for outstanding achievement in magazine-type programing.

"Hospital," a documentary which covered a day-to-day drama of events in a large metropolitan hospital—for outstanding achievement in news documentary programing.

Frederick Wiseman, director of "Hospital" for outstanding achievement by an individual in news documentary programing.

Entertainment categories:

"Cinderella," performed by the National Ballet of Canada and part of the NET Festival series, for outstanding variety or musical program.

Susan Hampshire for outstanding performance by an actress in a leading role in a dramatic series—"The Forsyte Saga," a 26-week series based on the John Galsworthy saga of life in England during the latter part of the 19th century and the early 20th century.

"Sesame Street" an educational television program for preschool children, for outstanding achievement in children's programing.

"Sally Sees Sesame Street" segment of "Sesame Street": Jon Stone, Jeff Moss, Ray Sipherd, Jerry Juhl, Dan Wilcox, Dave Connell, Bruce Hart, Carol Hart, Virginia Schone; writers, for outstanding achievement in writing for a children's program.

Though this list of Emmy Awards is praise enough, this year public television was the recipient of honors from competitions held by other distinguished groups in the communications media. For example:

Saturday Review Awards—the magazine's first independent television awards competition:

"Forsyte Saga," in regular series category.

"Trial: the City and County of Denver versus Lauren R. Watson," in limited series category.

"Hospital," in single program category.

"Sesame Street" and "Misterogers' Neighborhood," in children's programing category.

George Foster Peabody Awards:

"Sesame Street," for imaginative use of television in teaching.

"The Advocates" program, for television education.

KQED Newsroom program—San Francisco—for television news approach.

Newspaper Enterprise Association TV Scout Awards:

"Sesame Street," for show of the year.

European Broadcasting Union International competition:

"Trial: The City and County of Denver versus Lauren R. Watson," first prize for reporting of events on film.

Golden Television Award, National Association-of-Television and radio announcers:

"Black Journal."

Russwurm Award, National Newspaper Publishers Association:

"Black Journal."

Golden Eagle Awards, Council on International Nontheatrical Events—CINE:

All three films were recommended by CINE juries for international film festival competition.

"In search of Rembrandt"; "Ascent," a film produced by KQED, San Francisco; "Act Now," also produced by KQED.

The world of public television is just opening and the fall season promises an even greater variety of outstanding programing. I am sure the awards I have just listed, are only a small indication of what we can expect in the future.

BISHOP SPOTTSWOOD DENOUNCES ADMINISTRATION'S PERFORMANCE ON CIVIL RIGHTS

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Bishop Stephen G. Spottswood, an eminent leader of the African American Episcopal Zion Church and chairman of the board of directors of the NAACP, yesterday delivered a very incisive assessment of the administration during his keynote address at the 61st annual convention of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People.

Bishop Spottswood registered the concern and discouragement of all of us who find the administration civil rights posture totally inadequate, and even regressive. As Bishop Spottswood stated:

> This is the first time since 1920 that the national Administration has made it a matter of calculated policy to work against the needs and aspirations of the largest minority of its citizens.

The Kerner Commission warned of a nation moving toward two separate societies—one black, one white. No one of perception was surprised by the Commission's warning. We had seen the danger long before. But that danger, articulated once again by the Commission, is far greater today. The possibility for irreparable division has been encouraged by the administration's policies of ambivalence, indirection, and overt hostility toward civil rights.

Today's New York Times reprinted excerpts from Bishop Spottswood's speech at the NAACP convention. I urgently commend them to my colleagues. The administration, which could have donned the mantle of moral leadership in achieving equal rights for all Americans, has defaulted. Our obligation is now even greater, therefore, to provide the leadership so lacking from the executive.

Excerpts from the speech follow:

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY NAACP HEAD CALLING ADMINISTRATION ANTI-NEGRO

> Two years ago, former Attorney General Ramsey Clark, speaking for the Kerner commission, called for "the reaffirmation of our faith in one society," and the commission itself sounded a warning that the nation is moving in the direction of two societies—one black, one white—separate and unequal.
>
> Today, the signs are even more ominous. On every hand, the commentators and the

politicians, the faint-hearted liberals and the tragically misguided black separatists, are announcing the end of integration, especially in the schools.

For the first time since Woodrow Wilson, we have a national Administration that can be rightly characterized as anti-Negro.

This is the first time since 1920 that the national Administration has made it a matter of calculated policy to work against the needs and aspirations of the largest minority of its citizens.

Here are a few instances supporting our contention of the Administration's anti-Negro policy:

1. Signing of defense contracts with textile companies long in violation of contract requirements versus our recommendations that these contracts be canceled.

2. The pull-back on school desegregation. The Administration went into court to secure delays in already ordered desegregation. Thank God, the Supreme Court struck down these attempts.

HIGH COURT NOMINATIONS

3. The nominations of Clement Haynsworth and G. Harrold Carswell to the United States Supreme Court (which nominations were defeated by the leadership of the NAACP, along with other organizations, including the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights, of which Roy Wilkins is chairman and in which fight our Clarence Mitchell demonstrated his superb skills on Capitol Hill as truly the 101st Senator).

4. The Administration at Washington weakened our hard-won voting rights act in the House.

5. The Administration opposed the cease-and-desist order power of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

6. The Administration supported the Stennis amendment on the school appropriation bill.

7. The Administration produced the Moynihan memorandum calling for "benign neglect."

8. The Administration supports tax exemption for white, separate private schools, designed to avert desegregation of the public schools.

9. On April 9, after the rejection of his nominee, Judge Carswell, for the Supreme Court, the President described the ideal judge as "someone who believes in the strict construction of the Constitution, as I do—a judge who will not use the power of the Court to seek social change by freely interpreting the law or constitutional clauses." This is the Administration's expressed opposition to the equal protection clauses of the 14th amendment.

The effect of this has been exactly what was predicted. It has given encouragement to the Southern racists whose fullpage advertisements have exposed their radical retreat to the calendar level of the 1870's, such as produced by Senator [John C.] Stennis of Mississippi and Gov. [John J.] McKeithen of Louisiana, to say nothing of the melodramatic pose of Florida's Gov. [Claude R.] Kirk in defying the Federal court's orders to desegregate the Public schools of the Everglades State.

Before us today, in the solution of the problem of a single society, are the issues arising from what seems to many the futility of our effort toward integration. There is a tremendous white backlash as we have forged a difficult path through the metallic barriers in housing, employment and politics.

A small but vociferous number of Negroes has effected the black retreat, as indicated in the black college students' demands for separate dormitories, separate cafeterias, separate curricula and separate facilities. Incidentally, we should sympathize—even as we disagree—with young black youth whose bitter and bloody experiences on white college campuses have driven them to "the black retreat."

ACCENTUATING POLARITY

The white backlash on the one hand and the black retreat on the other hand have combined to accentuate the racial polarity of which the Kerner commission warned.

At this juncture in our national life, we of the N.A.A.C.P., recalling Abraham Lincoln's declaration that "this nation cannot endure half free and half slave," emphatically paraphrase Mr. Lincoln and declare "this country cannot endure half white and half black." If American democracy is to survive, we shall be one society, as the Declaration of Independence visioned and the Constitution declares.

Ours is a national problem affecting all Americans, and no matter where we live, the problem of one society is before us. For instance, it is easy for Northern Negroes to forget the South because local needs are urgent and desperate, but they do so at their own peril.

Fifty-two per cent of black Americans still live in the South, mostly in cities, where the problems of overcrowding, housing, crime, discrimination, poor education are the same as the North's. In addition, they have the Southern segregation traditions, white supremacy ideology and wanton murderousness.

KILLINGS BY POLICE

Even as lynching was the Roman holiday sport of the 19th century America, killing black Americans promiscuously has been the 20th century pastime of our police, whose primary duty is law enforcement and keeping the peace.

I'm thinking of the six Negroes killed in Augusta, Ga., all shot in the back; of the Panthers slain in their beds in Chicago; of the students slain at Jackson State College; of the almost daily news stories of the indiscriminate, ruthless slaying of black Americans by police and civilians, under the guise of "law and order," but actually fulfilling the guidelines of a bitter, white majority, whose vain effort to keep us "in our place" leads them to resort to the policeman's pistol and kangaroo court trials.

The white liberals and the churches have not been conspicuous in the fight for freedom lately. No one questions the demand for an immediate end of the Vietnam war. We ask again, why is it that white people always manage to find some issue other than race to which they give their priority attention, the latest of which is pollution and the ecology?

If racial justice and civil rights had commanded just 10 per cent of the attention that white liberals have given to the Vietnam war, we would not be in the position we are today—and it is unlikely that we would have Nixon in the White House either.

We must counteract some black authors who have tried to show that bad English grammar and slurred consonants and special terminology found among poorly educated Negroes (and poorly educated white people) are really a different language which should be learned and used in ghetto school teaching. Recently a black architect has been working on the theory that Negroes should have distinctive type housing—one which adequately accommodates their tribal instincts inherited from our African past—reductio ad absurdum!

Then, after the long series of suggestions of self-imposed apartheid, we must beware of those who once stood on the solid ground of full freedom for all Americans and have now retreated to the wabbling field of compromise and sinking sands of surrender.

For example, Roy Innis, national director of CORE, recently made a Deep South visit where he was warmly received by Govs. John Bell Williams of Mississippi, John J. McKeithen of Louisiana, Albert Brewer of Alabama and Lester (Ax-Handle) Maddox of Georgia.

FOR DUAL SYSTEM

He was there to solicit their interest and support of the Innis plan to re-establish a dual school system. His scheme is not to have separate black and white systems by race—oh, no—but to split the city in half along residential lines, with the white half under its school system and the black half under its system.

You can just imagine how the Governors were delighted with the Innis proposal.

There are others who advocate a separate nation, to be set up somewhere, or for autonomous neighborhoods or districts in the cities—to run our own police, fire department, hospitals, schools and everything else. But they always make it clear that they expect to get the money from the rest of the community. There is no such thing as autonomy on someone else's money.

No major problem afflicting black Americans can be solved except by solving them for all Americans.

We have worked too long and too hard, made too many sacrifices, spent too much money, shed too much blood, lost too many lives fighting to vindicate our manhood as full participants in the American system to allow our victories to be nullified by phony liberals, die-hard racists, discouraged and demoralized Negroes and power-seeking politicians.

THE VILLAGE TRUSTEE AND NATIONAL POLICY

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, on occasion, an elected official says something that is so profound and yet so sensible that it deserves a wider audience than it originally received.

It is in this light that I view the statement of Trustee Russell B. Joseph of the Village of Wilmette in the 13th Congressional District of Illinois which I have the honor to represent. The matter under discussion was a letter from a local citizens' group, and Trustee Joseph's remarks help to put the role of cash level of government in its proper perspective.

Excerpts from the minutes of the trustees' meeting of the Village of Wilmette of June 2, 1970, follow:

Mayor Schwietert presented a letter, dated June 1, 1970, from Mr. Robert A. Cleland, 810 Forest Avenue, representing the North Shore Committee of Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, requesting to address the Board seeking support for Senate Amendment No. 609, popularly known as the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment. Mr. Cleland presented copies of their resolution in support of this Amendment to the Board. Rev. Paul Berggren, 700 Linden Avenue, then addressed the Board and stated that he was not representing his congregation as there are differences of opinion among the members, but urged the Board to give serious consideration to this matter. Mr. Marvin Miller, 3133 Wilmette Avenue, addressed the Board. Trustee Joseph made the following statement:

"I should like to remind the petitioner of something of which I feel sure he is aware, but obviously overlooks. It is simply the fact

that the members of this Board occupy their position through the elective process and thereby have an obligation to every citizen of Wilmette, whether or not we happen to be their choice.

"As Trustees, we are responsible to all the people as custodians of the community's assets and the administration of the corporate affairs of the Village.

"On the other hand, I do not believe that the people of this community, or this north shore area, either expect or desire this Board to speak on their behalf on state or national legislation, dealing with political issues or foreign policy concerning which there may be profound differences of opinion. Certainly we must recognize that people do their own thinking based upon the best information available to them, and to take such action as suggested here would not only be repugnant to many of our fellow citizens, but also would be the height of arrogance on our part.

"The group represented here has the freedom to persuade anyone who cares to listen as to the validity of its ideology, just as it chose to do last Saturday morning when most people were gathering to honor our Nation's war dead. But I, for one, am not yet ready to see this Board, or for that matter any local unit of government answerable to all the people, used as a mouthpiece for any pressure group—especially so when the ultimate result is to impugn and discredit the integrity of the government of the United States."

Discussion followed and Trustee Tate moved that the Resolution be given no further consideration before this Board, that citizens as individuals be urged to contact their own legislative representatives on this matter, either for or against. Motion seconded by Trustee Fernholz. Voting aye—Trustees Orth, Fernholz, McHugh, Joseph, Ostergaard, Tate. Voting nay—none. *Motion carried.*

ON A NATIONAL LOTTERY FOR SELECTION OF SCAPEGOATS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, my good friend Alan Barth of the Washington Post has outdone himself this morning with his column on the selection of scapegoats to expiate our collective guilt for war crimes committed in Indochina. While Mr. Barth's droll proposal for a lottery to select scapegoats from among Congressmen and administrators is not likely to go far beyond the editorial page, its logic is superior to that which puts the whole burden of expiation on a 21-year-old marine, conditioned to kill and to obey orders instantly and unquestioningly, because he failed to "exercise judgment in obeying orders." But Mr. Barth states the case so well. I urge my colleagues to read him.

[From the Washington Post, June 30, 1970]

(By Alan Barth)

There is an anguishing dilemma in the decision of a court martial last week that a 21-year-old Marine private was guilty of the premeditated murder of nine Vietnamese children and three women last February. The young man was sentenced to life imprisonment.

According to the government, the Marine was a member of a "killer team" which shot down the unarmed women and children as they huddled together in the village of Sonthang crying and screaming. "This was not war," the prosecutor told the court martial, "this was murder."

In his defense, the Marine said he believed his squad was under attack by the Vietcong when he fired, that he acted under orders and in self defense, and he added, after the verdict: "I had no intention of killing anyone. People got in the way when I fired. It was unavoidable. I'm sorry."

Testimony at the trial indicated that the team leader (who is to be tried also) ordered his men to shoot the women and children. But the military judge ruled that a Marine is a "reasoning agent" who must "exercise judgment in obeying orders."

This recognition of individual responsibility is traditionally American. The killing was inexcusably atrocious and deserving of severe punishment. And few Americans would wish to have their country's reputation among the nations of the world stained by any seeming condonation of such barbarous conduct.

Nevertheless, there are considerations which dictate a degree of sympathy for this unhappy youth condemned at the very beginning of his manhood to spend the rest of his life in confinement.

He was sent, in uniform, to engage an enemy whose troops are indistinguishable from civilians, whose women and children sometimes participate in setting mines and traps and ambushes for American fighting men, and an enemy, moreover, capable of terrible cruelty and known to employ terror as a tactic of war. Perhaps he had seen his own companions die because they delayed a moment for inquiry instead of shooting first.

And undoubtedly he had seen how carelessly and indiscriminately death is distributed among soldiers and civilians, some enemies, some friends, by the bombing and napalming of Vietnamese villages. He was not in a situation where life is highly regarded.

And 21, one must acknowledge, is not an age at which young men always reach ripeness of judgment. Some are still callow and unstable and subject to emotional outbursts. They cannot be released from responsibility on this account, of course. But it may be that the fact deserves consideration. That some will break under stress and go beserk seems absolutely predictable.

Finally, moreover, there is a fact that simply cannot be left out of consideration—the fact that the peculiar character of the Vietnam war was not entirely of this young man's choosing. He was sent there and told by men older and wiser than himself to kill. Since the men who sent him there and told him this are representatives of all of us, the idea suggests itself pretty inescapably that we all bear some measure of responsibility for his terrible crime.

Primitive peoples of ancient times had an ingenious method, perhaps as efficacious as any other mode of punishment, for dealing with cases of collective guilt. They chose a scapegoat—an animal or person on whose head the sins of the people were symbolically heaped and who was then sacrificed or driven into the wilderness in a ceremony symbol of dispelling the evils. It did not work out too badly, except from the narrow point of view of the scapegoats. Often, the gods appeared to be propitiated by it.

In a certain sense, the unfortunate Marine private convicted in Vietnam serves as a scapegoat for other Americans in Vietnam who may have killed women and children but who were not observed or accused. One fears, at any rate, that he and the others in his particular group at Sonthang, and the GIs charged with indiscriminate killing at Mylai, were not alone in their violation of the rules of war. And one cannot escape a feeling that an example is being made of these culprits for the sake of cleansing the nation's name and to expiate a collective shame.

This is not to say that scapegoating is a bad practice; it has manifest uses. It is simply to say that the method of selecting the scapegoat may seem inequitable and inadequate for purposes of propitiation. If it is true that those who sent the young Marine into the situation where he behaved so brutally share his guilt, an additional scapegoat might properly be selected from among them.

This could be done in a very fair and evenhanded way by, say, putting into a large drum capsules containing 365 dates and into another drum slips numbered 1 through 365. As soon as a birthdate is drawn from one drum, a number can be drawn from the other to set an order of call for all members of the Senate and the House of Representatives and, perhaps, if the need proved great enough, all members of the executive departments and agencies at, say, the assistant secretary, chief of bureau and chief of division levels.

This sort of selective scapegoat service would operate in an economical way to distribute the burden of expiation more justly. It surely cannot be accounted unreasonable to ask the men who contrive the combats to share in the consequences—the predictable consequences—of their decisions.

It is quite true, as the court martial declared, that a Marine is a "reasoning agent" who must "exercise judgment in obeying orders." But it is hardly less true that a government representing a free people is a "reasoning agent" too—and one that must exercise judgment in issuing orders.

COAL RESEARCH IS NEEDED

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to note that Under Secretary of the Interior Fred J. Russell denies making any recommendation that all coal research programs of the Department of the Interior—including those of the Office of Coal Research and those of the Bureau of Mines—be phased out by the end of fiscal year 1972.

The coal industry is an important national asset and is expected to supply increasing energy requirements during the remainder of the century, even under conditions of a rapidly growing nuclear power industry. Coal represents about 80 percent of the Nation's fossil fuel reserves, and will be required to supply the vast amounts of energy needed in the future.

If total research programs were ended, it would put an end to all of the coal gasification programs, which experts in industry and in the Government believe are essential if the Nation is to meet its future energy needs without pollution of the atmosphere.

Moreover, there are numerous research projects underway that would be stopped. In my State of Utah, under the direction of Dean George R. Hill, we have at the University of Utah the College of Mines and Mineral Industries which is conducting many research projects. These projects are designed to get the highest product yield while protecting our environment from pollution.

The Bureau of Mines is doing some research work on methods of abating air pollution by removing sulfur dioxide from the stack of coal-burning plants. The Bureau is also doing research on methods of improving health and safety in coal mining. These programs should not be stopped.

Because of the precarious situation in the Middle East, and other areas of the world, we should be developing our own domestic resources for energy. And since there is generally a period of 10 years between the proposed project and implementation, we should actually be accelerating our efforts in research rather than slowing down or stopping.

In sum, halting research in coal would hurt the entire Nation. Therefore, I feel that we should do all we can to provide for coal research programs.

The need for increased coal research is further illustrated in a talk presented at the 20th Annual State Economic Development Conference at the Hotel Utah on August 20, 1969, by George R. Hill, dean of the College of Mines and Mineral Industries, University of Utah. The talk follows:

PROSPECTS FOR COAL UTILIZATION IN UTAH

(By George R. Hill)

[Figures not reproduced in the RECORD]

Ladies and Gentlemen, what I am going to talk with you about today has a great deal to do with the major developments I believe will occur in the State of Utah if we are alert enough and aggressive enough to capitalize upon the quality of Utah coal and its location. The developments will require building plants outside the Wasatch Front. There will be spin-offs from such plants that will require enlargement of the petroleum refineries along the Wasatch Front. However, the bulk of the industrialization ought to be adjacent to the coal reserves themselves where air pollution problems are minimal and where the raw materials are located. The potential is there for a much broader industrial base to the state's economy.

There are five large scale new or expanding uses of coal: Electric power generation, petroleum supplement, natural gas supplement, water purification and chemicals. In these there is the opportunity for a tenfold increase in coal utilization, using Utah coal. I am assuming here, of course, that we will have continued and increased use of coal for making coke for the steel and phosphorous industries.

COAL FOR ELECTRIC POWER GENERATION

The pattern of increase in coal utilization is quite well illustrated in statistics from the U.S. Bureau of Census which show the increase in energy consumption from 1920 to 1980. (Figure 1.) The upper curve is the total energy consumption, the lower curve represents electricity generation. Coal is an increasingly important component in electric power generation.

To represent the increase in demand for energy with time requires a special kind of plot. This is also true of other growth curves since the increases are "exponential" in character. That is the number of units consumed or produced increases geometrically with time rather than in a linear manner. To represent all the data on one chart it is necessary to plot the logarithm of the amount on the ordinate (vertical) scale versus time on a linear abscissa (horizontal) scale. On such a plot, unit distance along the ordinate scale represents not a doubling of the amount but a tenfold increase.

Figure 2 illustrates total electricity production by electrical utility systems. Bar graphs of this type are very useful as they show the rather dramatic increase that has occurred in the last several years. One should note the specific year represented by each bar.

Figure 3 is a map of the western United States on which are located the large reserves of bituminous, sub-bituminous coal and lignite. It is important to note the location with respect to California, of the Kaiparowits, Kanab and the Wasatch Plateau coal fields. They are the closest large fossil fuel resources to the burgeoning southern California power, chemical and fuel markets.

Other coals which will provide the competition to the three Utah fields are in the Black Mesa, the San Juan Basin and the Green River regions. These coals, however, are of sub-bituminous rank, a lower quality coal than the high volatile bituminous coals in the Utah fields. In terms of the volume and the quality of liquid for a petroleum supplement, or chemicals, the high volatile bituminous coals are superior on an "as mined" basis to the lower (or higher) rank coals.

Figure 4 illustrates possible developments for electric power generation in the west. The mine site areas and possible mine mouth plants, the load centers and possible mid-point generating plants have been considered in a report made under the sponsorship of the Office of Coal Research by Robert R. Nathan Associates, Inc. The kaiparowits and Kanab fields in southern Utah are considered competitive with the Black Mesa field in northern Arizona and with the Kane, Emery and Carbon County coal fields, all of which are the closest coal sources to the Phoenix, Los Angeles and San Francisco load centers.

There are two ways to utilize the coal when it comes to generating power. One is to build the power plant at the site of the mine. The other is to transport the coal part way to the load center and to have a mid-point generating site. One of the latter type has now been initiated. The Mojave plant in Nevada will utilize Black Mesa, Arizona coal. Five and two-tenths million tons of coal will be transported each year by pipeline from Arizona to that plant. It will be very much to the advantage of the economy of the State of Utah to try to develop mine site plants where both the mining and power generation can be done within the state rather than to transport the coal to a site nearer the load center.

In order for mine-mouth generated power to be utilized there has to be developed an extra high voltage power transmission system. Figure 5 shows a proposed EHV Intertie system. These interties, utilizing the coal from this area, can feed logically the Los Angeles, the Sacramento and even the Northwest—Portland and Seattle—power demands. There is some coal in Washington but it is very expensive to mine and will not begin to meet the needs of that part of the country.

PROJECTED DEMAND FOR COAL

The Robert R. Nathan Associates report projected the power demand and the population increases for the western United States in order to obtain an estimate of the total fuel consumption in the far West in 1980. The lowest estimate was 124 million tons of coal, the highest one 163 million tons. They looked at the projections for new plants of the major power companies in the West and found that 26.3 million tons of coal equivalent were predicted for nuclear, gas or oil fired power plants, and a slightly larger amount projected to go into coal fired plants. More than half of the projected increase is uncommitted. Coal plants could provide a major part of this uncommitted portion if the economics warrant.

TABLE I.—ESTIMATED POTENTIAL MARKET FOR COAL AND LIGNITE FOR GENERATION OF ELECTRICITY IN THE FAR WEST 1980

[In million of tons coal equivalent]

	Low	High
1. Estimated total fuel consumption	124.1	163.6
2. Estimated consumption of existing, scheduled and announced plants:		
(a) Gas-oil and nuclear plants	26.3	26.3
(b) Coal plants	30.5	30.5
(c) Total	56.8	56.8
3. Uncommitted balance of fuel consumption requirements	67.3	106.8
4. Estimated share of uncommitted balance potentially available to coal	44.9	71.2
5. Total estimated potential market for coal (2b + 4)	75.4	101.7

Source: The Potential Market for Far Western Coal and Lignite, vol. 1, R. R. Nathan Associates, Inc.

Table II is a comparison between this 1980 estimate and 1963 consumption. The Western States provided only 5.4 million tons of coal for power generation in the year 1963. In the year 1980 the low estimate would have 75 million tons of western coal utilized, the highest 102 million tons, just for power generation. This is the "possible" amount. There is no guarantee that Utah will have a share of this coal unless we plan for it.

TABLE II.—ESTIMATED POTENTIAL MARKET FOR COAL AND LIGNITE IN THE FAR WEST, 1980

[Million tons]

	1980	Consumption, 1963
Electrical utilities	75–102	5.4
Steel industry	7	3.8
Other manufacturing	15–25	1.6
Total	97–134	10.8

Source: "The Potential Market for Far Western Coal and Lignite," vol. 1, R. R. Nathan Assoc., Inc.

It is further estimated that the steel industry demand for coke will about double in that period and that other manufacturing utilization of coal will go up by a factor of about 10. This too, will have a terrible impact on Utah's economy if properly developed.

NEW USES FOR COAL

In 1960 the U.S. Office of Coal Research (OCR) was organized in the Department of the Interior to stimulate efforts toward increasing utilization of coal. We at the University of Utah had, prior to that time, been conducting a small research project on the conversion of coal to liquids. Governor Rampton and several legislators visited the University laboratory to see what could be done to increase the effort and to establish a cost sharing research program with OCR. Since that time there has been a legislative appropriation of $25,000 annually which, coupled with the Uniform School Fund money from the University, has enabled us to establish with the Office of Coal Research, a cost sharing research program. A new $1,020,000 contract for an additional five years of supported research on this sharing basis has just been signed.

The Office of Coal Research is filling well its function of contracting with research laboratories, with universities and with other agencies to develop new ways of using coal. In the area of power generation, Table III lists a few of those projects with the dollar amount of funding for each. The results of just one of the projects has been a large package fluidized char boiler which will allow coal or char to be used as the fuel. (Char is

the residual product from the production of a petroleum supplement from coal). This package power unit can be moved to a particular location to take care of the small unit operations that coal is advantageously suited to handle.

TITLE III.—OCR SPONSORED OR COSPONSORED PROJECTS DIVISION OF UTILIZATION POWER GENERATION

Project	Organization	Amount (millions)
Coal energized fuel cell	Westinghouse Electric Corp.	$2.40
Electrogasdynamic power generation.	Gourdine Systems, Inc.	1.0
Thermionic topper	Consolidated Controls Corp.	.24
Project boiler	Pope, Evans & Robbins	.164
Large package boilers	Pope, Evans & Robbins	.81
High temperature boiler tube corrosion.	Combustion Engineering, Inc.	.41

PETROLEUM SUPPLEMENT

Another area of research of vital importance is that of making a petroleum supplement from Coal. (Table IV). During the past several years the petroleum reserves in the United States have decreased from a 13:1 ratio between the proved reserves and annual consumption to about 10:1. This is very serious. The new North Slope of Alaska petroleum discovery will raise the ratio somewhat, but will probably provide only an additional two year's supply. To the companies involved this find is a bonanza. This does not, however, solve the problem of need for supplemental sources of liquid fuels, for the United States as a whole.

TABLE IV.—OCR SPONSORED OR COSPONSORED PROJECTS, DIVISION OF UTILIZATION, PETROLEUM SUPPLEMENT

[In millions]

Project	Organization	Amount
Project COED	FMC Corp	$7.67
Low Ash Coal	Pittsburgh & Midway Coal & Mining Co.	7.64
Project Gasoline	Consolidation Coal Co	10.93
Project Seacoke	Atlantic-Richfield Co	.92
H-Coal Process	Hydrocarbon Research, Inc.	2.06
Project Western Coal	University of Utah	.48+0.35

The Office of Coal Research is sponsoring a project with FMC Corporation called Project COED (Coal, Oil, Energy Development). The COED process is a carbonization operation for production of a material that can be converted into petroleum. The OCR contract with the Consolidation Coal Company, Project Gasoline, which has a nearly $11 million investment—involves dissolving the coal in a hydrogen-donor solvent. Each of these is a process for handling coal in a different way to get a petroleum supplement. The liquid produced can be fed into a petroleum refinery with hydrogenation facilities to make the liquid into gasoline, jet fuel, etc.

For six years at the University of Utah we have been working on Project Western Coal. This has cost the Office of Coal Research a little less than one-half million dollars together with the state money to which I have alluded. The work has resulted in over thirty publications in scientific and engineering journals based on talks presented at national and international meetings as well as in the development of a new hydrogenation distillation process we are now to enlarge. The attention of companies all over the world has thus been drawn to the very high quality coal in this state by these publications.

The petroleum supply-demand picture in the United States is dramatically illustrated in Figure 6. Until the year 1950–55 the U.S. supply was adequate at economic levels to supply the total demand for liquid petroleum products in the United States. In about that year we began importing large quantities from overseas. When the figure was compiled it was estimated that by the year 1969 the total demand would be about 9 million barrels a day and the total production would be 6 million barrels a day. The estimate was wrong. U.S. consumption is now between 10 and 11 million barrels and the production is 8 million barrels a day. The country has produced more oil than was anticipated; it is importing now far more than the report predicted. We are importing in excess of 25% of our annual needs. To meet all of our needs from internal production would require a major increase in price.

Dr. Henry Linden at Illinois Institute of Technology has done some excellent work on conversion of coal to a natural gas supplement under American Gas Association and Office of Coal Research sponsorship. In connection with this he has worked out some correlation equations which predict the ultimately recoverable petroleum and gas in the United States. Figure 7 predicts that in the mid-1970's we will maximize our production, and demonstrates that we are already on the shoulder of the production curve at a 2.93 billion barrels a year level.

The increased production within the United States is at an increased cost of finding and producing the oil. The North Slope oil is going to be fairly expensive because of its location. Humble Oil Company has converted an oil tanker into an icebreaker, the Manhattan, that has made it through the summer ice pack along the northern route to see if oil can be hauled by ship through the ice fields back to the east coast of the United States at reasonable costs. A pipeline across Alaska, estimated to cost one billion dollars, is also under construction.

Even with these new reserves, we will still be importing petroleum. The United States needs to be concerned with maintaining its national security in times of stress when these supplies (including Alaska) might be cut off.

The reasons for the increase in cost of petroleum are shown in Figure 8. The top line of numbers in the figure show that in the period of 1920–30, sixty-five major oil fields were discovered in the United States. In the next ten year period, 70; in the period 1940–50 only 43; in the next ten year period, even with more exploration going on, the number dropped to 25 and in the next five years of the decade only five major fields producing a million barrels or more were discovered. On the same figure we see that the number of millions of barrels of oil discovered per new "wildcat" well drilled has decreased from 130 in the 1945 period down to nearly 30 at the present time. Costs of exploration and oil field development have risen as well. It is no wonder that the cost of crude oil must increase if more is to be discovered and developed. Because of these factors the exploration investment by the oil companies within the United States has dropped dramatically. We are keenly aware of this in Utah since many petroleum exploration groups have moved out of the state in the past 10 years.

Now how can coal be used to solve the problem? In our laboratory and in the other laboratories and plants with research sponsored by OCR, as in the Bureau of Mines and in some private oil company laboratories, techniques have been developed for converting coal to a petroleum-like material which can be made into gasoline at costs that are approaching the cost of producing gasoline from petroleum. The figure we have in the back of our mind is that oil from coal conversion is competitive with oil costing $3.50 a barrel. This is an approximate figure but is worth thinking about. With less expensive imported crude available, a synthetic crude from coal is only marginally attractive. However, minor new developments will change this. Significant savings in terms of cheaper conversion processes and transportation of coal by slurry pipelines and railroad unit trains will allow Utah coal to be processed for the manufacture of gasoline for western markets in the not too distant future.

I mentioned Project Gasoline of the Consolidation Coal Company. Figure 9 is a schematic diagram of the plant. In this process a coal-derived liquid is used to extract the hydrogen-rich gasoline components from the coal.

At the University of Utah we have used an approach that is different from the Consolidation Coal approach and the carbonization approach of the FMC Corporation. In the direct carbonization FMC project the naturally occurring volatile matter is distilled. This might be 40 to 45% of the coal. In the solid extraction process of Consolidation Coal, 80% of the coal material can be extracted and put into solution. However, the liquid material produced by this process is more costly to convert into gasoline. The greater the degree of conversion of the coal, the more expensive the conversion process to gasoline step becomes.

At the University of Utah we have developed a technique that is a possible intermediate approach. It is the hydrogenization-distillation of coal at 2,000 pounds hydrogen pressure which gives a liquid yield higher than direct carbonization. The liquid is a higher quality material than that obtained by solvent extraction. The convertibility of this material into gasoline is as high as that of the oil from the direct carbonization route. The new contract with OCR will allow us to develop a very small pilot plant where we can investigate the economics of the technique more thoroughly.

NATURAL GAS SUPPLEMENT

I mentioned that petroleum is becoming more expensive. Natural gas is also becoming more expensive. We are actually in more serious trouble with respect to natural gas availability in the long term than we are oil because of its convenience as a fuel and of the tremendously widespread use it now has in the country. There are a number of gas from coal projects under OCR sponsorship listed in Table V. The table gives the amounts of money invested by the Office of Coal Research on these various projects.

TABLE V.—OCR SPONSORED OR COSPONSORED PROJECTS DIVISION OF UTILIZATION NATURAL GAS SUPPLEMENT

[In millions]

Project	Organization	Amount
Pipeline gas from coal	Bituminous Coal Research Inc.	$1.96
CO_2 acceptor process	Consolidation Coal Co	8.5
Molten salt gasification	M. W. Kellogg Co	1.71
Pipeline gas by hydrogasification.	Institute of Gas Technology.	11.65
	American Gas Association.	2.38
Electrofluidic coal processing.	Iowa State University	.23
Szikla-Rosinik combustor systems.	Franklin Institute	.153

At Illinois Institute of Technology, a process is being tested which can produce a natural gas supplement at just slightly higher cost than the current price of natural gas in the Northeastern part of the country. A large amount of money is now being invested in other pilot plants to determine the best process for making a natural gas supplement.

FOSSIL FUEL RESERVES

The U.S. fossil fuel reserves of coal, oil, gas and oil shale are tabulated in Table VI. The proved recoverable reserves of crude oil are 182 quadrillion BTU compared to 1,038

quadrillion BTU in reserves of coal. The *estimated* recoverable reserves in the final column are 860 quadrillion BTU of oil against 17,300 BTU for coal. Estimated reserves of oil shale are about 1,000 quadrillion BTU. The tremendous reserve of coal, the most abundant fossil fuel in this country, undoubtedly will be used to provide gasoline and jet fuels in the years ahead.

TABLE VI.—U.S. FOSSIL FUEL RESERVES (JAN. 1, 1966)

	Proved recoverable		Estimated recoverable	
	Billions or units	Quadrillion (10) B.t.u.	Billions or units	Quadrillion (10) B.t.u.
Natural gas, 1,000 CF	288[A]	298[B]	1,480[C]	1,530[B]
Natural gas liquids, bbl	8.0[A]	34[D]	41[E]	170[D]
Crude oil, bbl	31.4[A]	182[F]	148[G]	860[F]
Oil share, bbl assay	250[H]	1,450[J]	750[K]	4,350[J]
Coal, tonM	50	1,038	830	17,300

Any synthetic chemical you can make from petroleum can be made from coal. Costs of the synthetic products differ depending on the source and the treatment required. Many coal hydrogenation chemicals are currently available commercially. They are different from the molecules you find in petroleum in that they already consist of cyclic aromatic compounds. These compounds are the basis for a great deal of the organic chemical industry. Other chemicals currently cost more to produce from coal than from petroleum but the picture will change as large coal conversion plants are built.

How we stretch out our reserves of coal and oil and gas is of vital importance to future generations. The total estimated energy we have in fossile fuels, if we continue our present increase in rate of consumption, will last mankind to the year 2100 or 2150. (Figure 10.) If we use our resources more intelligently the time of exhaustion can be extended. Continued research on coal utilization is essential in order that succeeding generations will not be shortchanged and that the greatest possible lifetime for each type of raw material be assured.

ECONOMIC FACTORS

I have become aware during the few years we have worked on coal research that our economy is not completely free. There is established in the production of gasoline or the production of electric power a matrix of supports and controls within which companies can operate to provide products at a profit. The matrix for the production of gasoline has included a 27½% depletions allowance for petroleum which stimulated discovery efforts to replace the oil that was used. That allowance is proving now to be insufficient. The companies are not doing the necessary exploration work to keep up the needed petroleum reserves. That matrix unit, 27½% was established about 40 years ago. It proved adequate for about a 25-year period. Since then it has been inadequate. The temper of the country right now is to decrease rather than increase this incentive allowance. If this is done the oil companies will have to pass on to the consumer another cent or two a gallon on gasoline to pay for the decreased tax write-off. This cent or two a gallon difference will more quickly bring the time of making gasoline from coal competitive. There are obviously advantages and disadvantages to any such change in the matrix.

Another example of an economic matrix element is in the electric power generation field. There has now been established a competitive power generation package to fossil fuels, viz., nuclear power. In order to establish the newly competitive system some 13 billion dollars worth of research and development efforts have been paid by the government. There are still built-in (minor) subsidies in terms of cost of insurance, the cost of spent fuel disposal, etc. A matrix has been established which allows nuclear power plants to be competitive with fossil fuel plants in areas some distance removed from the source of the fuel. This matrix will insure the simultaneous development of nuclear and coal-fired power plants in this country.

These matrices are established by debate involving the proponents of various systems and our Congressional representatives. We, therefore, must be participants in the decision making if we wish to broaden the industrial base in this state and to capitalize upon the advantages we have. Utah coal is the coal closest to the southern California market. Utah high volatile bituminous coal is the highest quality of any available in large amounts, for the production of liquid fuels and of electric power. That it will be used to the fullest extent is not automatic, but will be the result of intelligent involvement in establishing some new matrix elements.

There are some disadvantages to our coal. It has to be mined by underground mining methods. The sub-bituminous and lignite coals can be strip-mined at lower cost. The advantages we have in location and quality are, therefore, somewhat offset by higher mining costs.

As we choose between nuclear power plants and coal burning power plants in the southern part of the state, we must be aware of and weigh all of the factors. As far as a revenue to the state is concerned, the coal plant would involve coal miners and production engineers in far greater numbers than the nuclear plant. Even if basic plant costs were the same, it might be to the state's advantage economically to press for a coal fired plant to insure the broader economic base.

The developments in coal use we have discussed require continuous attention. We need to be concerned enough about the development of the state to exercise an increased entrepreneural drive. A comparable drive a century ago brought the railroad and built the irrigation systems and the businesses and even the communities in this state. If we have that kind of drive we can couple the interests of the natural gas, electric power, petroleum and coal industries in a way that each of the involved companies can see where it will profit. Then we can move ahead and really see this state achieve its maximum potential.

Thank you very much.

THE 1971 BUDGET "SCOREKEEPING" REPORT

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, an updated issue of the periodic "budget scorekeeping report" prepared by the staff of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures has been mailed to all Members. The report, cumulative through June 25, 1970, shows how various actions of the President and the Congres have affected the President's budget estimates for fiscal 1971, since that budget was submitted on February 2.

The scorekeeping report is about 27 pages of largely statistical data related to the budget and requires some study for a full understanding of a necessarily complex subject. However, certain highlights, giving, in summary fashion, the current status of the 1971 budget, are printed as an introduction to the report. These highlight statements are as follows:

HIGHLIGHTS—INTRODUCTION

STAFF REPORT ON THE STATUS OF THE 1971 FISCAL YEAR FEDERAL BUDGET—HIGHLIGHTS AND CURRENT STATUS OF THE 1971 BUDGET

Presidential revisions in the budget

A. New budget authority for fiscal 1971 in the February 2 budget submission was estimated to be $218,030,495,000. By budget amendments, legislative proposals and reestimates (May 19, 1970), the President has increased the estimates for new budget authority for 1971 by $2,321,249,000 to a new total of $220,351,744,000.

B. Budget outlays for fiscal 1971 in the February 2 budget submission were estimated to total $200,771,129,000. By budget amendments, legislative proposals and reestimates (May 19, 1970), the President has increased the estimated budget outlays for fiscal 1971 by $4,571,871,000 to a new total of $205,343,000,000.

C. Budget receipts for fiscal 1971 in the February budget submission were estimated to total $202,103,000,000, including $1,522,000,000 for increased taxes proposed to the Congress. By additional revenue proposals for estate and gift taxes ($1,500,000,000) and leaded gasoline tax ($1,600,000,000) offset by some adjustments downward in his May 19, 1970 reestimates, the President has increased fiscal 1971 estimated receipts by a net of $2,006,000,000 to a new total of $204,109,000,000.

Congressional changes in the budget

A. Budget authority for fiscal 1971:

1. *House* actions to June 25, 1970 on all spending bills—appropriations and legislative—have *increased* the President's requests for fiscal 1971 budget authority by $1,197,277,000.

2. *Senate* actions to June 25, 1970 on all spending bills—appropriations and legislative—have *increased* the President's budget authority requests for fiscal 1971 by $1,992,529,000.

3. *Enactments* of spending bills—appropriations and legislative—to June 25, 1970 have *added* $457,584,000 to the President's budget authority requests for fiscal 1971.

B. Budget outlays for fiscal 1971:

1. *House* actions to June 25, 1970 on all spending bills—appropriations and legislative—have *added* a net of $1,833,363,000 to the President's total estimated outlays for fiscal 1971.

2. *Senate* actions to June 25, 1970 on all spending bills—appropriations and legislative—have *added* a net of $1,028,852,000 to the President's total estimated outlays for fiscal 1971.

3. *Enactments* of spending bills—appropriations and legislative—to June 25, 1970 have *added* $465,084,000 to the President's total estimated outlays for fiscal 1971.

C. Budget receipts requested by the President for fiscal 1971 requiring Congressional actions total $4,622,000,000:

1. *House* actions to June 25 on revenue proposals total $708,000,000 (including a net of $173,000,000 not requested for fiscal 1971 by the President) leaving a balance of $4,087,000,000 additional revenue increases required to meet the President's revised fiscal 1971 budget requests.

2. *Senate* actions to June 25 on revenue proposals total $529,000,000 (including $211,-

000,000 not requested for fiscal 1971 by the President) leaving a balance of $4,304,000,000 additional revenue increases required to meet the President's revised fiscal 1971 budget requests.

3. *Enactments* of revenue proposals to June 25 total $322,000,000, leaving a balance of $4,300,000,000 additional revenue increases required to meet the President's revised fiscal 1971 budget requests.

Facts on the budget deficit

The budget for fiscal 1971 submitted to Congress February 2, 1970 reflected a unified budget surplus of $1.3 billion, made up of an $8.6 billion surplus from the trust funds and a $7.3 billion deficit in the general Federal funds.

The budget for fiscal 1971 as revised by budget amendments, additional legislative proposals, and reestimates, exclusive of any separate direct Congressional actions on the budget, as announced by the President on May 19, 1970, reflected a unified budget deficit of about $1.2 billion. Including congressional actions, as announced by the President May 19, 1970, the unified budget deficit was estimated to be $1.3 billion, made up of a $8.7 billion surplus from the trust funds and a $10 billion deficit in the general Federal funds.

These surplus and deficit projections are dependent upon various factors of an uncertain nature, such as:

1. Experience shows that actual outlays are likely to increase over earlier projections—thus increasing the deficit.

2. The economic slowdown may decrease actual revenues from the amounts projected—thus increasing the deficit.

3. The budget contains about $2.1 billion in negative outlay estimates for various legislative proposals (such as postal rate increases, etc.) which if not enacted by Congress will automatically increase budget outlays by the amounts not enacted—thus increasing the deficit.

4. The budget reflects reduced outlay estimates in the amount of $2.1 billion for various program terminations, restructuring, and reforms, some requiring congressional enactments, which if not accomplished will automatically increase budget outlays by the amounts estimated—thus increasing the deficit.

5. The budget as revised to May 19, 1970 contains receipt estimates from various revenue producing proposals in the amount of $4.8 billion (including $503 million for trust funds of which $194 million was not requested by the President) which if not enacted by Congress will automatically reduce receipts of the Treasury by the amounts estimated—thus increasing the deficit.

Adding these uncertain budget estimates to the deficit projections made by the President May 19, 1970, the unified budget deficit might be $10.3 billion made up of a $8.2 billion surplus from the trust funds (excluding $500 million from new proposals) and a $18.5 billion deficit in the general Federal funds. Any changes upward in outlays by Presidential or congressional add-ons or reestimates and any changes downward in revenues (and the staff of the Joint Committee on Internal Revenue Taxation has recently estimated that revenues will be about $3.2 billion less than the administration projects for fiscal 1971) will necessarily add to these deficit projections.

SUPPORTING TABLE NO. 1

Mr. Speaker, in addition to the foregoing highlight statements, I am sure Members and others will find supporting table No. 1 of special interest. This is perhaps the key table in the report showing, bill by bill, what Congress is doing to change both the budget authority and the outlay—expenditure—sides of the President's budget. It shows actions in terms of increases or decreases from the budget estimates. I am inserting supporting table No. 1 in the RECORD.

By referring to the various subtotal lines on the table, the cumulative change from the budget estimates can be readily determined.

This table is in several parts.

APPROPRIATION BILLS

The first part of the table shows the effects of actions taken—to June 25—at this session on appropriation bills.

The report indicates that the net effect of House actions in appropriation bills to June 25 have resulted in decreasing 1971 appropriation requests for budget authority by about $665 million, and increasing estimated outlays over the President's budget estimates by about $112 million. Outlays show an increase, because the outlay figure includes the effect in fiscal 1971 of the Labor-HEW-OEO appropriation bill for fiscal 1970 passed at this session—the budget for fiscal 1971 submitted in February did not reflect final congressional action on this appropriation bill, but did reflect final congressional action on all other appropriation bills for fiscal 1970, except, of course, the pending second general supplemental bill.

BACKDOOR BUDGET AUTHORITY

The second part of this table shows changes in the budget made in the form of new budget authority through the so-called backdoor appropriations process. To June 25, the House has voted $1,724 million in budget authority over the President's budget requests. Since only contract authority is involved, no change is shown for outlays. The figures shown in parentheses are for actions taken during the last session on bills still pending before the Congress.

LEGISLATIVE BILLS MANDATING SPENDING

The third part of this table reflects estimates for budget increases or decreases which result from congressional action on legislation containing mandatory spending authorizations such as pay or pension increases for which spending does not wait until an appropriation is made as is the case for most legislation authorizing new or expanded programs.

The net effect of House actions to June 25 for such legislative items is an increase in 1971 budget authority of $138 million and an increase in 1971 budget outlays of about $1,722 million. This does not reflect enacted or pending Federal or postal pay increases which were proposed by the President as increases to his own February budget and therefore not accounted for as congressional increases in the budget.

A similar tabulation, giving the details of congressional actions affecting fiscal 1970 estimates, is included at the bottom of this table:

SUPPORTING TABLE NO. 1.—EFFECT OF CONGRESSIONAL ACTIONS DURING THE CURRENT SESSION ON INDIVIDUAL BILLS AFFECTING BUDGET AUTHORITY AND OUTLAYS (EXPENDITURES) (AS OF JUNE 25, 1970)

[In thousands of dollars]

	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
Items acted upon	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Fiscal year 1971:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the 1971 budget):						
Labor, Health, Education and Welfare, and related agencies, 1970 (H.R. 15931, Public Law 91-204)				[1] +248,000	[1] +248,000	+248,000
Education (H.R. 16916) [2]	+319,590	+965,997		+215,000	+567,000	
Legislative Branch (H.R. 16915)	−9,394			−8,750		
Treasury, Post Office, and Executive Offices (H.R. 16900)	−73,053			−65,000		
Second Supplemental, 1970 (H.R. 17399)				−19,700	−200,300	(‡)
Independent Offices and Department of Housing and Urban Development (H.R. 17548)	+173,389	†+451,380		−114,650	†+79,500	
State, Justice, Commerce, the Judiciary and related agencies (H.R. 17575)	−136,949			−50,000		
Interior and related agencies (H.R. 17619)	−731			−3,350		
Transportation and related agencies (H.R. 17755)	−36,235			−34,700		
Foreign assistance and related agencies (H.R. 17867)	−655,578			−150,000		
District of Columbia (H.R. 17868)	−150	−150		−150	−150	
Agriculture and related agencies (H.R. 17923)	−81,587			+105,800		
Military construction (H.R. 17970)	−137,763			−11,000		
Public Works and Atomic Energy (H.R. 18127)	−26,625					
Subtotal, appropriation bills	−665,086	+1,417,227		+111,500	+694,050	+248,000

Footnotes at end of table.

Items acted upon	Congressional actions on budget authority (changes from the budget)			Congressional actions on budget outlays (changes from the budget)		
	House	Senate	Enacted	House	Senate	Enacted
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Legislative bills with "backdoor" spending authorizations (changes from the 1971 budget): [3]						
Emergency home financing (S. 3685)	+1,500,000		(‡)	(N.A.)		(‡)
Navajo Road (S. 404)		(+5,000)				
Land and water conservation (S. 2315)	+30,000	[1] +30,000	††+30,000			
Unemployment trust fund (H.R. 14705)	[1] +194,000	+194,000	†+194,000			
Outdoor advertising controls (S. 1442)		(+15,000)				
Federal-aid highways (H.R. 14741)	(+26,000)					
NSLI trust fund for veterans' home loans (H.R. 9476)				(†+1,000,000)		
Subtotal, "backdoor"	+1,724,000	+224,000	+224,000			
Legislative bills with mandatory spending authorizations (changes from the 1971 budget):						
Additional district judges (P.L. 91-272)	−2,370	[1] −727	−727	−2,370	[1] −727	−727
Court leave for Federal employees (H.R. 12979)	(N.A.)			(N.A.)		
Uniform relocation assistance (S. 1)		(N.A.)			(N.A.)	
Employee health benefits (H.R. 16968)	†+140,000			†+140,000		
Defense: overseas mailing privileges (H.R. 8434)	(+8,900)			(+8,900)		
Military lawyers retention (H.R. 4296)	(+7,000)			(+7,000)		
Family separation allowance—residence (H.R. 110)	(+17,000)			(+17,000)		
Family separation allowance—POW (H.R. 9486)	(N.A.)			(N.A.)		
Air evacuation subsistence (H.R. 9654)	(+50)			(+50)		
Dependents' health care (H.R. 8413)	+255			+255		
Reserve retirement—Berlin-Vietnam (H.R. 3813)	(N.A.)			(N.A.)		
Reserve retirement—aviation midshipmen (H.R. 11265)	(N.A.)			(N.A.)		
Public Health Service retirement (Public Law 91-253)	+259	[1] +259	+259	+259	[1] +259	+259
Social security (H.R. 17550)				+1,500,000		
Family assistance (H.R. 16311)	−450,000			−350,000		
Federal lands for parks (reduces offsetting receipts) (S. 1708)		(N.A.)			(N.A.)	
Foreign Service retirement (Public Law 91-201)	(N.A.)	(N.A.)	(N.A.)	(N.A.)	(N.A.)	(N.A.)
Veterans' hospital care for 70-year-olds (H.R. 693)	+(7,000)	(+7,000)	(‡)	(+7,000)	(+7,000)	(‡)
Veterans non-service-connected benefits (H.R. 372)	(+8,538)			(+8,538)		
Veterans education assistance (Public Law 91-219) [4]	[1] +185,500	[1] +185,500	+185,500	[1] +169,000	[1] +169,000	+169,000
Veterans additional $5,000 insurance (S. 1479)	+45,000	[1] +45,000	††+45,000	+45,000	[1] +45,000	††+45,000
Veterans compensation increase (S. 3348)	+226,481	+114,370		+226,481	+114,370	
Redefine "child"—(dependency compensation) (Public Law 91-262)		+6,900	+3,552		+6,900	+3,552
Veterans auto allowance increase (H.R. 370)	+938			+938		
Railroad retirement (H.R. 15733)	−7,700	(N.A.)	(‡)	−7,700	(N.A.)	(‡)
Subtotal, mandatory	+138,363	+351,302	+233,584	+1,721,863	+334,802	+217,084
Subtotal, legislative bills	+1,862,363	+575,302	+457,584	+1,721,863	+334,802	+217,084
Total, fiscal year 1971 [5]	+1,197,277	+1,992,529	+457,584	+1,833,363	+1,028,852	+465,084
Fiscal year 1970:						
Appropriation bills (changes from the revised 1970 budget):						
Foreign Assistance (Public Law 91-194)	[1] −150	[1] −150	−150	[1] −100	[1] −100	−100
Labor, Health, Education, and Welfare and Related Agencies (H.R. 15931, Public Law 91-204)	[1] +567,000	[1] +567,000	+567,000	[1] +335,000	[1] +335,000	+335,000
Second Supplemental, 1970 (H.R. 17399)	−153,957	[6] +122,203	(‡)	−121,300	−84,800	(‡)
Subtotal, appropriation bills	+412,893	+689,053	+566,850	+213,600	+250,100	+334,900
Legislative bills with spending authorizations (changes from the revised 1970 budget):						
Food for needy children (Public Law 91-207)				[1] +30,000	[1] +30,000	+30,000
Veterans education assistance (Public Law 91-219)	[1] +107,400	[1] +107,400	+107,400	[1] +94,000	[1] +94,000	+94,000
Airports and airways development (Public Law 91-258)			+840,000			(N.A.)
Subtotal, legislative bills	+107,400	+107,400	−947,400	+124,000	+124,000	+124,000
Total, fiscal year 1970	+520,293	+796,453	+1,514,250	+337,600	+374,100	+458,900

[1] Reflects conference on final action for comparability.
[2] $425 million budget authority ($212 million outlays) for impacted area School aid, carried in budget as "proposed legislation," is regarded as budget appropriation request for scorekeeping purposes although no formal amendment has been transmitted.
[3] "Backdoor" refers to budget authority and outlays provided in basic legislation not requiring further appropriation action.
[4] Congressional increase of $185.5 million subsequently included in budget amendment (H. Doc. 91-312).
[5] Excludes actions taken in previous session, shown in parentheses above.
[6] Does not reflect provision of $300 million for food stamp program to be charged against 1971 Agriculture Appropriation Bill. Reflects points of order on the floor against foreign military credit sales and emergency school assistance.
‡Subject to or in conference.
†Committee action.
††Pending signature.
N.A.—Not available.

INCURABLE HUMANITARIANISM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we note the withdrawal of all U.S. troops from Cambodia consistent with the President's pledge to the country at the time he directed the sweep through Communist sanctuaries there, it is time to reemphasize our respect for the conduct of our men in uniform and for the character they display in defense of our freedoms.

Too often news reports have concentrated on isolated instances which reflect on the character and integrity of our fighting men. Therefore, I feel that the editorial in the June 27 Polish American emphasizing the positive factors of their behavior is worthy of greater attention.

The editorial follows:

INCURABLE HUMANITARIANISM

The question of whether American forces are becoming a brutalized lot in Viet Nam is answered in an article in *The Readers Digest*, entitled "Beyond the Call of Duty in Viet Nam." It tells how individually and collectively U.S. forces are voluntarily laboring to make life a little easier for a people whose land has been riddled by war for many long years.

In the words of *The Digest*, "All over South Viet Nam our soldiers are engaged in . . . humanitarian missions. . . . The list of individual acts of mercy is unending. In fact, as one senior military officer . . . (says), 'My hardest task is keeping track of the incurable humanitarianism of our troops.'" Last year, reports *The Digest*, Army volunteers helped construct 1,253 schools and 597 hospitals and dispensaries, contributing $300,000 from their own pockets. If there is a "sickness" sweeping our country, it is largely the product of distorted news that seems deliberately designed to make our people lose faith in the ideals and principles that lie at the core of U.S. existence. U.S. servicemen in Viet Nam have been keeping these ideals and principles alive in spite of whatever may be said to the contrary.

MEAT CUTTERS AND BUTCHER WORKMEN AGAINST THE WAR

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly apparent that opposition to the war is not confined to the campus longhairs, the parasites of passion, the Sunshine patriots and the limousine liberals. Dissent against the war is becoming a consensus in favor of complete withdrawal within a year at most. The consensus against the war is cutting across every element of American society.

In recent months we have seen the board chairman of IBM and the Bank of America making impassioned statements against the war. We have seen one church group after another come out for withdrawal. We have seen polls showing that withdrawal sentiment is even stronger among those over 30 than it is among the young.

And we have seen withdrawal sentiment building in the labor movement. The President would be most ill-advised to assume that George Meany and the foul-mouthed hard hats speak for all of organized labor. We have seen the auto workers, the clothing workers, the teamsters, and a host of west coast unions call for immediate withdrawal. Now we have a ringing denouncement of the war from the Amalgamated Meat Cutters and Butcher Workmen of North America, AFL–CIO.

All of this does not make us necessarily right, but it is encouraging. It means policy is going to have to change. At the very least, it means if Mr. Nixon does not get out by 1972, his successor will get us out in 1973.

Under unanimous consent agreement, the editorial entitled "War and the AFL–CIO," from the Butcher Workman of June–July 1970, is inserted in the RECORD.

Following the "Butcher Workman" article, the labor survey article entitled "Labor Opposition to War Rising Across Country," from the Labor Journal of Napa and Solano Counties, is inserted in the RECORD:

WAR AND THE AFL–CIO

Senator Fulbright of Arkansas, in the estimation of trade union leaders, may not have the best voting record in the Senate of the United States. Time will prove, however, that he is one of the nation's best statesmen and will be remembered in history as a great humanitarian.

The Arkansas Senator had the courage to state that the AFL–CIO has become part of the military establishment of our nation. Such is a serious charge. In our opinion, however, the charge, to a great extent, is true.

We do not believe that the leader of our great American trade union family speaks for that family in supporting the President in the present war dilemma of our nation. We have never been out of the official family of labor since we received our International charter in 1897. We have never, however, followed blindly, and never will, every edict that emanates from the official headquarters in Washington, especially where war is the issue.

The AFL–CIO is not infallible, and many of us feel strongly that it is out of step with the thinking of the 13,000,000 members it represents.

No rational segment in the make-up of America puts the stamp of approval on our war involvements. Thirty-two Presidents of our nation's best known universities are on record that our boys should be brought home from Southeast Asia.

Our university students from coast to coast who feel *they* will have to fight this war have the same opinion.

Practically every church denomination in our nation believes our involvement is immoral. Fraternal orders and groups double and triple the numerical strength of the AFL–CIO have advocated the stopping of this human slaughter. Millions have marched in our streets expressing a longing for peace. And martyrs, like Martin Luther King, have died in opposition to what is going on.

Even Louis D. Lundborg, chairman of the Board of the largest bank in the United States, before our own Senate Foreign Relations Committee said that the war is bad for business. He also said that if anyone is to blame, it is people like himself for not speaking up and speaking out sooner and asking "What goes on here?" Remember—this is a banker speaking, not a trade union leader! Is everybody out of step except the AFL–CIO?

We wonder how long the 13,000,000 trade unionists in the United States will sustain this opinion. We wonder also how many of the executive officers of the AFL–CIO down deep within their hearts share this ridiculous position. Until a more sane policy is developed, we have only to wait through a dark night for a clearer dawn and the moving finger of fate will write indelibly across the hearts of every person that there must be justice, freedom, peace and equality among the peoples of the world!

LABOR OPPOSITION TO WAR RISING ACROSS COUNTRY

Another major indication of the increasing opposition of California unionists to the war in Southeast Asia appeared in the S. F. Chronicle last week.

It was an ad carrying the signatures of a large number of attorneys, and among the labor attorneys listed was Charles F. Scully, long-time legal counsel of the California Labor Federation, AFL–CIO.

The text of the full-page ad signed by 451 Bay Area unionists, which was published the week before, was placed in the Congressional Record during debate on the Cooper-Church amendment, which would hold President Nixon to his promise by cutting off funds for the Cambodian invasion, effective July 1.

Due for a vote in June is the McGovern-Hatfield-Cranston-Hughes-Goodell Amendment 609, the "amendment to end the war," which would cut off all funds for the war except those needed to bring American troops home safely by June, 1971.

Lobbying for this measure continues at a high level as doctors, lawyers, clergy, unionists and others join students in buttonholing legislators. A national petition campaign supporting it is getting millions of signatures.

While leaders of New York construction workers and longshoremen—organizers of prowar rallies which led to assaults on students—met with President Nixon to express support for the widening of the war, several AFL–CIO unions and leaders broke openly with Nixon and the AFL–CIO position supporting him.

The 417,000-member Amalgamated Clothing Workers, in convention at Atlantic City, applauded anti-war senators and President Jacob Potofsky, who said:

"Our members, like all working people and like the majority of all Americans, want peace. And they want peace now, without delay, without further military adventures, without more killing. . . . If we do not end our involvement in Southeast Asia, which is tearing us apart, our nation and the democratic process are in danger of dying."

AFL–CIO President George Meany then canceled his planned speech to the convention.

Patrick Gorman, president of Amalgamated Meat Cutters & Butcher Workmen, in the union's official journal, said, "We do not believe that the leader of our great American trade union family speaks for that family in supporting the President."

The 35-member AFL–CIO Executive Council had endorsed the invasion of Cambodia with three rare public dissents, including those of Jerry Wurf, head of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, and William Pollock, president, Textile Workers Union.

The United Electrical Workers general executive board joined the mounting protest, declaring:

"Continuation of Administration policies will result in further deterioration of the economy, more killings in the war, more repression at home as the Administration attempts to eliminate dissent to its harmful and dangerous policies."

The International Executive Board of the United Auto Workers said, in its first policy statement since the death of Walter Reuther:

"The terrible shame of violence by government has cast a grim and ominous shadow across our nation in recent weeks. It is a shadow that has dimmed the light of democratic rule in Kent, Ohio, in Jackson, Mississippi and in Augusta, Georgia . . . The dangerous military policy of the Nixon administration have driven the wedge of division even deeper.

"We cannot successfully preach non-violence at home while we escalate mass violence abroad. At no time in the history of our free society have so many troops been sent to so many campuses to suppress the voice of protest by so many young Americans."

Michigan AFL–CIO President Gus Scholle said there is a need for a "joint cause" of students and workers. He endorsed a National Emergency Conference Against the Cambodia-Laos-Vietnam War to be held in Cleveland, Ohio, June 19–20.

In the May issue of the International Teamster, IBT General Vice-President Frank Fitzsimmons said, "Almost everyone is frustrated by a backlash from the war, which has caused the wildest runaway inflation in the history of our country."

The ILWU Dispatcher points out an "even more frightening aspect of the crisis which has split the nation—and which the administration continues to feed with Agnew's speeches, and Nixon's meetings with the rightwing Young Americans for Freedom."

It is "the fact that more than 5,000 'technical' nuclear weapons are now located in the Southeast Asia area, including Thailand."

The Dispatcher says, "With the reckless decision to invade Cambodia made by a few military men and White House advisors, and an Administration asserting that protest 'would blow over in 24 hours,' the President's determination to seek 'victory' in Indochina raises new dangers of atomic warfare . . .

"Nixon's May 8 threat of 'more force and more effective force against North Vietnam' suggests the possible use of nuclear weapons."

Lt. General James M. Gavin (US Army Ret.) told the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on May 12:

"Our relations with other nations, the state of our economy, and the domestic condition scream for constructive attention, yet, everything that we are doing is tearing our country apart and alienatng us from our best friends.

"We must bring our Southeast Asian involvement to an end as rapidly as possible, for each day of delay increases the likelihood of the one confrontation we should avoid at all cost, a war with Red China."

FORMER GOVERNOR OF MARYLAND SPEAKS

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, we live in an era when it seems that calm, rational debate has been superseded by the politics of confrontation; when it seems that those who make the loudest noise, regardless of what they say, and those who proffer the most outlandish protestations get the most attention; when it seems that thoughtful, realistic action is often dubbed do-nothing.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the recent remarks of a quiet man who offers some quiet thoughts on the case for what should be points of fundamental agreement on the President's conduct of withdrawal from the war in Southeast Asia.

Former Maryland Gov. Theodore J. McKeldin, speaking before a business convention in Ocean Grove, N.J., gave the following thoughts:

This is neither the place nor the occasion on which to inject partisan politics, and if I were to urge you either to support or to oppose any party program, or any party leader, I should be abusing your hospitality.

But I do not think it partisanship for me to mention my anxiety over a very strong trend in recent political debate. That is the rising fury with which it is conducted on all sides. My distrust of that trend is not partisan. It is based on the fact that all experience has shown that furious denunciation never leads to intelligent action. On the contrary, it is almost a guarantee of foolish action, regardless of which side prevails.

I venture to remind you, therefore, that while the nation is not merely divided, it is split into a half dozen segments clamorously denouncing each other, there are wide areas on which there is no disagreement whatever.

To begin with, take the most unpopular activity of the present administration, the war in Southeast Asia. The division on that issue is deep and bitter, but there is no disagreement, because nobody can deny the fact, that this administration inherited the war. If it were a mistake from the start it was not President Nixon's mistake because he was not in power at the time.

Furthermore, it cannot be denied, because it is on record, that President Nixon promised very early that he would omit no effort to end that war as soon as possible. It cannot be denied, because it is on record, that he has withdrawn about twenty percent of our combat troops from the theater of war. He has not yet ended the war, but rational men agree that getting out of such a situation is bound to take time. If you think that Mr. Nixon has not gone about it in the best way, it is your right, indeed, your duty, to say so, but to charge a man with making mistakes is very different from charging him with not trying.

As much may be said of the other great problems that are disturbing all thoughtful men—racial collisions, the revolt of youth, rising unemployment and decreasing business activity. All of them have many roots and therefore are difficult to treat, all of them have brought to the surface the lunatic fringe that attends every reform movement, all of them contribute to the turbulence that has jarred the political structure to its foundation and that is driving the faint-hearted into hysterics.

I repeat, I am not here to inject partisan politics into this meeting. Of course, the Administration has made mistakes, and I am sure the President would be the first to admit it. Every administration has made mistakes, from that of George Washington to that of Lyndon Johnson. The fair basis for judging an administration is not to ask, has it avoided all mistakes? but, has it avoided the worst of all mistakes, which is to fold its hands and do nothing. I submit to you, as fair-minded men whether Democrat or Republican, is there one of these that the administration has failed to attack? I am sure that the answer will be, no. In my own opinion it has attacked them with some success, but I don't ask you to agree with me on that, only to admit that it hasn't quit, but is on the job for which it is responsible.

If that is the case, then in spite of the uproar we may rest assured that the divisions that afflict us do not cut deep enough to touch any vital organ. I do not deny that they are painful and dangerous. I do not deny that we ought to apply every sterilizing and curative agency available to heal them. But I do deny that they are fatal, I do deny that they excuse our tendency to substitute hysterical recrimination and unproved accusation for cool and reasoned argument, because on the most important things we are not divided, on the fundamentals we are still agreed.

So without attacking anyone or defending anyone, I venture to remind you of the supreme obligation that over-rides all other political obligations whatsoever. It is the duty that lies upon all parties, all factions, all sects, all ideologies, all Americans. It is incumbent on Democrat and Republican, on liberal and conservative, on black and white, on men and women, on youth and on grandfather. It is the duty to "highly resolve . . . that government of the people, by the people, for the people shall not perish from the earth."

AMERICA'S TRANSPORTATION CRISIS

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, as most of us living in New England realize, there is no transportation system existent in the United States today. Rather, there are a thousand transportation happenings, each of which we have had the misfortune to sample on one occasion or another. Certainly you as professionals, concerned with the proper development of land, must realize by now that unless something is done and done immediately, New England will lose its attraction as a place in which to both work and live. However, my comments today are not a provincial cry for help to my fellow legislators in Washington, but rather a warning to do what is transportation right rather than what is historically comfortable. What is an acute problem in the Northeast and Middle Atlantic States is a serious problem in the Midwest, is a problem on the west coast, is a blossoming problem in the Southwest and a future problem in the South. Let me illustrate my general theme by referring to our latest transportation crisis. For years a handful of public officials in Connecticut have devoted nearly all their time to the problems of the New Haven Railroad. Coming from southwestern Connecticut, my first duty as a State legislator in 1963 was to involve that two-thirds of Connecticut that seemingly had no direct interest in urban mass transportation in the crisis. Fortunately, it only took a year to convince the people of central Connecticut that a strong economy in the southwestern portion of the State was vital to their well-being. That a strong economy in eastern Connecticut was vital to the prosperity of western Connecticut.

In short that to a great commercial State, transportation, specifically rail transportation, was a No. 1 priority if Connecticut were to prosper.

At the time our rail problems in Connecticut were coming to the fore, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts were experiencing similar difficulties. It seemed as if all of New England had woken up to find that while years and millions of dollars had been spent on building the most progressive highway system in the world, the one mode of transportation that could carry the largest number of people over the smallest amount of real estate had been allowed to expire by default. It seemed as if all of New England had suddenly become aware that as highways proliferated, open space, living areas and the country for which New England is known became scarcer and scarcer. It seemed as if on one morning all of New England wondered why its highways were competing with its railroads and its airports were connected with neither. And on that same morning New York and New Jersey realized that they had similar problems and the solutions had to come in cooperation with Connecticut, Rhode Island, and Massachusetts. All of this came into focus because of the problems of a small regional commuter rail line.

For 7 years the battle of the New Haven raged first in New England and then in the Nation's Capital. Still there was no great stir. No panic no national headlines. In a national sense we were only talking about one mode of transportation, rail, in one small section of the country, specifically, the area from New York to Boston. Then a little over a week ago the problem acquired the necessary credentials of crisis to make it a national issue when the Penn Central filed for bankruptcy.

All the arguments, pro and con, that had attended the New Haven crisis would now appear again on a broader scale. Those of us in Government who had spent 7 years in the minor leagues of the New Haven crisis were well prepared to take the field in the big time expiration of the Penn Central. However, the time is a little too desperate to indulge in the luxury of I told-you-sos, or to indulge in the laziness of solutions based solely on Government handouts. For if we spend all the money that we have spent on transportation in the last 50 years and we spend it in the same way, then we can expect that after today's transportation crisis is surmounted, in 50 years, cars will again be bumper to bumper on the highways, railroads will again be bankrupt and planes will again be stacked in holding patterns all over the sky. I think the time has come to recognize the whys of our present predicament.

As to the railroads, they have suffered from a lack of governmental assistance even when all other modes of transportation were given such assistance.

Secondly, railroad management itself has long been comfortable in the role of cry-baby seeking handouts rather than in the role of businessman seeking customers.

Lastly, State and Federal regulatory agencies have spent their energies solely in the area of rates and politics rather than in areas of service and transportation. With this in mind, I will today introduce legislation calling upon the Secretary of Transportation to initiate an immediate study as to the feasibility of the following three propositions.

First. The take over by the U.S. Government of all of the rights of ways of American rail carriers. Far from nationalizing our railroads, this proposal is designed to put railroads on the same footing as the other component parts of U.S. transportation. The Government subsidizes both highway and airport construction. The Government has just begun to reassert its assistance role in the area of our Merchant Marine. The advantages of this proposal are as follows:

First. It would base government subsidy not on the fluctuating figures of operating revenues or losses but rather on the more ascertainable figure of maintenance of rights of ways. I think the Congress of the United States would be more receptive to such sums certain than to the open ended proposition of covering operating deficits.

Second. It would free up such capital as the railroads are spending on the maintenance of their rights of ways to be used by the railroads in new equipment and service improvements.

Third. It would give the U.S. Government a hold over the service provided by the railroads. A hold it presently does not have.

Fourth. The business of running the railroads will be left in private hands. A state of facts that I find far more preferable than getting Washington bureaucrats into the business of running railroads.

The second proposition is the establishment of one transportation trust fund. This would once and for all base the spending of our transportation dollars on transportation needs rather than on transportation lobbying or national fads.

The administration of this trust fund would be under the Department of Transportation. Allocations of money to the States would be based on a formula of land area, population, and urban centers. No State would be eligible to receive any money for any particular transportation project unless it has shown how that project was part of a coordinated transportation system within the State. No money would be released by the Secretary of Transportation unless it were shown that a definite tie-in existed as between the transportation systems of the various States.

As long as the present system of separate transportation trust funds exist, you are going to have highways unconnected to our railroads. You will have airports unconnected to our highways. You will have railroads unconnected to our airports. And what that means is that you will have to have two or three times the number of component parts than would be necessary if you coordinated all three.

The third proposition relates to our State and Federal regulatory agencies. It is my firm belief that their actions are based more on politics than on the realities of transportation. Initially set up to protect the public from a monopoly, they have, because of their laziness, lack of technical know-how and abundance of political sensitivity, equated service with rates rather than to set up standards of service and then establish rates that enable the carriers to deliver the service. The net result has been that neither the public nor the carriers have been well served. The public has no service and the carriers get only a politically sufficient return to enable them to exist rather than create. I seriously doubt the usefulness of transportation regulatory agencies as presently constituted.

Maybe the thoughts that I have expressed this morning do not sound very radical to those of you assembled in this room. However, I can assure you they are going to shake up an awful lot of lobbyists, politicians, and bureaucrats in Washington. You see, what is good for them has not been good for the traveling public.

Yesterday's Penn Central crisis is only different from several other crises in transportation over the past several years because of its size. The whys are all the same.

Why is it that we have to see the garbage in Long Island Sound before we recognize water pollution as a problem. Why is it that people must die of respiratory disease before we recognize air pollution as a problem. Why is it that our own sons or daughters have to get hooked on drugs before we recognize narcotics as a problem. Why is it that the slums must burn before we recognize housing as a problem.

Is it not that we lionize to a greater degree the crisis solver rather than the crisis anticipator.

Well I say to you this morning, no small steps and no slight alterations of business as usual, transportationwise, will give to this country the transportation system it is capable of having. We have the greatest technical know-how in the world. We also have the greatest transportation needs in the world. Now the time is to reject the sacred cows of transportation that the cowcatcher did not catch. Now the time is to enable man as he travels the breadth of this country to say once again, I can move.

HOBART, IND., AND ITS BEAUTIFICATION PROGRAM

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I wish to draw the attention of my colleagues in the Congress to the plans and efforts of the city of Hobart, Ind.—a city which has been named the "City of National Awards" for its beautification program.

Hobart is fortunate in having a dynamic mayor who is totally dedicated to the progress and prosperity of that charming Hoosier city. His name is Lilburn J. Titus. An active group of citizens headed by Fire Chief H. Richard Harrigan, concentrate much of their time and energy to carry on a beautification and cleanup program. The city has received a national award for its program for the last 5 years. As their Congressman, I want to take this opportunity to commend Mayor Titus and the citizens of Hobart, and particularly those serving on the beautification committee, for their hard work and devotion to making this city a better place in which to live and work.

I enclose at this point in the RECORD an article that appeared in the Gary Post Tribune of June 10 relating to Hobart's beautification program:

"UNIFY TO BEAUTIFY" AT HOBART

HOBART.—"Unify to Beautify" has been selected as the 1970 slogan for Hobart's beautification and clean-up program.

During a recent Beautification Committee meeting, plans were discussed for continuing with an over-all plan for the garden-type park to be located at the present city dump site on Ridge Road.

Mrs. Emil Aldrin, chairman of the planning committee, reported only investigative work had been completed since the May meeting.

Her committee, to include representatives from the Heritage Club, Historical Society, Woman's Club, Jaycees, Business and Professional Women's Club and the Chamber of Commerce, will present a plan for landscaping of the western third of the area, excluding the corner requested by the Chamber of Commerce for its new building and a parking lot.

Chairman H. Richard Harrigan announced that large heavy-duty plastic trash bags, to be sold by the organizations represented on the beautification committee, have not arrived. These commercially manufactured bags will be sold in a roll of 50 bags for $3. Proceeds will be used for the beautification of Hobart.

John Goff, Civil Defense representative, announced his organization will begin checking all areas of Hobart this week for junk cars, high weeds and other violations of city ordinances. The month-long project will be conducted in the same manner as last year, when 167 violations were discovered and referred to the police department for action.

Small neighborhood litter baskets, distributed at no cost by the Chamber of Commerce, are being replaced where damaged during the winter months. It was announced that a few baskets are still available for residents wishing to place them near walking areas for use by pedestrians.

MRS. BENTLEY'S PATRIOTIC REMARKS LAUDED

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, a distinguished Baltimorean, Helen Delich Bentley, has gained world-wide recognition as an expert on maritime matters. Because of her background—first as an outstanding newspaperwoman, and now as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission—her remarks are often quoted.

Recently, Mrs. Bentley's speeches and public remarks have included other thoughts that should also be quoted: They are expressions of a patriotic American who is grateful to her country and proud of her flag.

On June 28 in Chicago, Helen Delich Bentley delivered a speech before a group of Americans of Serbian descent. She spoke both as a Serbian and as a first-generation American, and her thoughts reflected the intense patriotic feelings typical of many American citizens, of all nationalities—especially those immigrants who escaped the oppression of foreign lands, to find freedom under the Stars and Stripes.

Mr. Speaker, at a time when our great country is being criticized and attacked, both at home and abroad, it is encouraging to have great Americans like Mrs. Bentley answer the critics with boldness and with patriotic zeal. I hope my colleagues will read and reflect upon her remarks. The speech follows:

REMARKS BY MRS. HELEN DELICH BENTLEY

As one with all of you of Serbian heritage, on the occasion of Vidov Dan and one in the Spirit of Kossovo, I greet you. I bring to you, also, on this occasion at his specific request, the personal greetings and well wishes of President Richard Nixon.

It is with great depth of feeling that I so act as the emissary of the President of *all* Americans in carrying his personal message to those Americans of my own ethnic background.

It is with a similar depth of feeling, one of humility coupled with pride in our history as a people, that I join you on this occasion. You have done me a great honor in asking me to do so. It is an honor of which I am fully aware, and one that I shall cherish for all the days of my life. Certainly, there is no place on earth that I would rather be tonight and now than here with you, my fellow Serbs.

I join with you in our pride of belonging to a people strong in spirit, steadfast in their belief in God of their fathers. We are a people closely joined together, and joined more closely still when faced with adversity. We are people answering in our loyalties, unconquered by defeats, and dedicated to the Spirit of Kossovo.

In the native land of our fathers, our forebearers stood throughout centuries in the path of those intent upon conquest, sometimes to no avail. But never were they broken in Spirit. It is a land that has known the rule of sultans and their jannsaries, religious persecution for the faith of its people—who have been forced on occasion to bend to the will of fate, but have never bowed their heads except to God. Though not always successful in its defense, the Serbs were known as the Guardians of the Gate at famed Presevo Gap.

We have known our glories and our successes, but perhaps it was in the crucible of defeat that we became more closely annealed into a single people with the single purpose of remaining a unified people. Not that we have always known unity, among ourselves, except in purpose. But always deep within ourselves, regardless of circumstances, we have retained the will for freedom from domination, both as a people and as individuals and the intense desire to hold our fate in our own hands.

An independent people, whether ruling themselves or under a foreign yoke—a friendly people, yet quick to take affront—loyal and generous to proven friends, but implacable toward their enemies and sometime masters—a frugal people both by nature and necessity—a people who tended the earth, and tapped its riches below the surface—a people who tended their flocks—a people who knew the security of rocky slopes and crags, the freedom of hills and mountains—a people of steadfastness in all things—a people who carry within them the will to achieve the things of the spirit—that is our heritage today passed down to us through fourteen centuries of forebearers, since the great migration carried the Serbs into the Balkans in the sixth and seventh centuries A.D.

It is the history, it is the character of our people in which we take justifiable pride. It is this that we of Serbian origin can hold forth as virtues as a people. It is this that our parents, our grandparents, and our great grandparents brought to this America that now is ours. This was their contribution to the wonderful land that welcomed them to its shores and to the freedom that as a people they long had sought.

They found a breathtaking vista opened before them—a land that spanned a continent—a land of peace and beauty, of magnificent natural resources—a land not measured in tens and hundreds of miles, but in thousands—a land of tall mountains, of rolling hills, of broad prairies, of wide rivers and lakes, of forests and deserts—a land whose blue tinged mountains merged with the blue of the sea on three coasts, and with lakes breathtaking in size and beauty in the north.

To those who had farmed, there was the rich earth waiting to be tilled and planted, and harvested for crops. To those who had mined, there were rich deposits of gold and silver, copper and iron ore, and coal. But whatever their bent, whatever their skills, a wealth of opportunity opened before them. If there were no streets paved with gold, nor rain or nuggets from the sky, there was that much more to be desired—that for which they hungered, the golden opportunities that lay before them in this land of opportunity to which they had come. All that it asked in return was that they give of their energies and their skills to the growth, to the building of this nation that now was theirs. All that it asked was that they join with others already here or still to come in their dedication to freedom and to building a way of life such as never had been known before in the history of man.

While retaining their own identity as a people, they joined with others from many lands to become "one people." They embraced this Nation that held for them all that they had ever desired, more indeed than they had known that man could achieve. They embraced it and made it lovingly, possessively, fiercely their own.

Whether they sought the fields, the mines, the open hearth of the steel mills as a means of livelihood—whether they gravitated toward New Orleans or Steelton, California, or Alaska, Chicago or Kansas City—or Ruth, Nevada—or elsewhere across the length and breadth of this new land of theirs, they knew with assurance that they now held for themselves and in keeping for their children the culmination of their dreams through centuries of oppression.

Their right in this new nation of theirs to "life, liberty and the pursuit to happiness . . ." were as wine to their spirits, and they thanked God for having brought them to such a land.

Nor could time dim for them the wonder of it, their delight in this new nation of theirs, their pride in becoming citizens and Americans.

No more could time dim the memories of the past, of what their lot had been in that world they had left. And while they etched deep in the minds of their children and their grandchildren their own pride in the Serb stock from which they had sprung, relating to them the folk history of the Serbs, naming those honored among them through the centuries, they also told of the suffering of their people, the long centuries of domination by the Turks and others of religious persecution and the lack of freedom and of opportunity.

In like fashion, they spoke often and with feeling of this America that now was theirs. They spoke of it with a simple love that transcends all rhetoric, for it came from the heart.

I know whereof I speak for I am a "first generation" American. I am the child of parents who sought these shores at the Turn of the Century—in 1906, to be exact I heard my father and mother speak just so, and in the fashion I have related. In doing so, they etched their memories deep within my consciousness, and their love of America deep within my heart.

They and those like them saw themselves not as Serbs in exile, but as Americans in residence. They saw their new land, their new loyalties to that land not as a denial of their past as a people, but as a joining together with other people from many lands who—following the same deep urge toward freedom—had crossed the seas as had they to find it on the shores of a new continent. They saw themselves as the same as others—those who had come before and founded this Nation, and those who were still to follow in similar search of "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness."

They saw themselves as one with such as they from other lands, the English, the Scotch, the Irish, the Poles, the Swedes, the French, the Italians, the Spanish, the Finns, the Latvians, the Greeks, the Germans, the Russians, the Jews. Yes, and those from still other lands beyond the seas, from still other continents where despotism ruled.

Through the decades the people of many lands came in their thousands, their tens of thousands, their hundreds of thousands and millions, wondering at the bounty of a nation and a people that said: "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest tossed to me. I lift my lamp before the golden door."

And they came not only to gain the advantages of this new land that now became theirs, but to give in full measure of themselves, their skills, their crafts, and where all other lacked, their brawn, their strength of body and of will. All that they sought was opportunity to build anew for themselves, for their families, and for the future of their children and their children's children. And this they received in full measure.

Nor, as they found the place best suited to their individual capabilities and to make a living did they think of themselves as constituting a minority. It would have been inconceivable for them to do so, for were they not now Americans—and was not America the melting pot—and were not all Americans one people? They thought so, and they were right.

Oh, there were some of larger ethnic groups who, as people will to feed their own egos. spoke of them as "hunkies," as they spoke of the Poles as "Polocks," the Spanish as "Dagos," the Italians as "Wops," the Jews as "Kikes," and Dutch and Germans as "Heinies" and "squareheads." But the "hunkies" and all the others is the nature of this land of ours that such expressions have long since lost their meaning and passed out of existence. Indeed, I found myself hard put to recall them, they have so long been gone from the language and the conscious memory of the nation. We are one and all Americans, and none is more and none is less.

We are intermingled, and intermingling. We are a people—a great people—a people in which each generation of Americans strives to achieve—and achieves—that "more perfect Union" enunciated as a national purpose in the preamble to the Declaration of Independence.

Americans have done so by evolutionary means, not revolutionary, through nearly two centuries of dedication to the principles of

the rights of the individual. Within the framework of the Constitution—that most magnificent of all documents devised by man—the progress of the Nation in response always to the will of the majority of its people has been unprecedented in the annals of man. In doing so, each generation has built anew upon the firm foundation of the achievements of those generations that preceded it, each generation using the ballot and due elective process to express the will of the people.

That is why the so-called, self-styled "revolutionaries"—the "SDSers," the "Black Panthers," the self-labeled "Weathermen," leave me cold as do all other professional dissidents and their dupes. Their vain posturings before TV cameras and the press—who breathlessly report their antics, their anti-American attitudes, their demagogic rhetoric—are out of all consonance with the very principles for which better men fought and died to bring this nation into being, and maintain it as the bastion of freedom that it stands today.

Those who shout "All power to the people!" know full well that all power in this Nation is exercised by the people—all the people. What they cry for is all power to themselves!

To what other purpose do they seek to heap calumny upon our institutions, attacking them by word and deed, slandering our universities, castigating our police and our military, openly advocating disobedience to our laws, attempting to downgrade our courts through ridicule, libeling our national leaders and our very nation itself. Nor are they missing any opportunity to attack the very moral fiber of our people, overtly seeking to undermine our character as a people through attempts at achieving license and permissiveness toward sex and dope, their main target our young.

The daughter of Mike Delich—immigrant and copper miner of Nevada, a simple man who loved this country—has had enough of license masquerading under the false banner of freedom, whether it be on the campus, in the streets, or in the courts. Haven't you? Isn't it time that you and I say "No More!" to riots, to lootings, to burnings, to bombings, to disruptions?

Certainly those of us who are of Serbian origin should be close enough in family memory to what lack of liberty, of self-determination means to a people, to value the freedom we now enjoy at its true worth. We must know its value, for we can measure that value against what once we as a people lacked.

As a generation, I suggest, also, that we get up off the psychiatrist's couch. I do not accept the role assigned us, that we are the villains in today's scenario of discontent. I do not buy this heaping of coals upon our heads that is popular today, they claim that past generations—our own, in particular—have failed in our responsibilities. We have no cause for taking to Sackcloth and Ashes.

To those who have not yet proven themselves nor shown their capability for solving our major problems instead of creating more, who have received from the nation, and not yet given to it in return, I would quote from the statement by the President of the Pennsylvania State University at the commencement exercises of the graduating class last September. It reads, in part:

"This ceremony marks the completion of an important phase of your life. It is an occasion in which all who know you can share in your sense of pride and accomplishment. But no one has more pride in your accomplishment than the older generation. But I am not going to tell that older generation how bright you are. Nor am I going to say we have made a mess of things and you—the younger ones—are the hope of mankind. I would like to reserve that progress. For if you of the graduating class will look over into the bleachers to your left or right, I will reintroduce you to representatives of some of the most remarkable people ever to walk the earth. People you might want to thank on this graduation day. These are people you already know—your parents and grandparents. And, if you will bear with me for five minutes, I think you will agree that a remarkable people they are indeed. Let me tell you about them. . . .

"These—your parents and grandparents—are the people who within just five decades—1919–1969—have by their work increased your life expectancy by approximately 50 percent—who while cutting the working day by a third have more than doubled per capita output.

"These are the people who have given you a healthier world than they found. And because of this you no longer have to fear epidemics of flu, typhus, diptheria, smallpox, scarlet fever, measles or mumps that they knew in their youth. And the dreaded polio is no longer a medical factor, while TB is almost unheard of.

"Let me remind you that these remarkable people lived through history's greatest depression. Many of these people know what it is to be poor, what it is to be hungry and cold. And because of this, they determined that it would not happen to you, that you would have a better life, you would have food to eat, milk to drink, vitamins to nourish you, a warm home, better schools and greater opportunities to succeed than they had.

"Because they gave you the best, you are the tallest, healthiest, brightest, and probably best looking generation to inhabit the land.

"And because they were materialistic, you will work fewer hours, learn more, have more leisure time, travel to more distant places, and have more of a chance to follow your life's ambition.

"These are also the people who fought man's grisliest war. They are the people who defeated the tyranny of Hitler, and who when it was all over, had the compassion to spend billions of dollars to help their former enemies rebuild their homelands. And these are the people who had the sense to begin the United Nations.

"It was representatives of these two generations, who through the highest court of the land, fought racial discriminations at every turn to bring a new era of civil rights.

"They built thousands of schools, trained and hired tens of thousands of better teachers, and at the same time made higher education a very real possibility for millions of youngsters—where once it was only the dream of a wealthy few.

"And they made a start—although a late one—in healing the scars of the earth and in fighting pollution and the destructions of our natural environment. They set in motion new laws giving conservation new meaning, and setting aside land for you and your children to enjoy for generations to come.

"They also hold the dubious record for paying taxes—although you will probably exceed them in this.

"While they have done all these things, they have had some failures. They have not yet found an alternative for war, nor for racial hatred. Perhaps you, the members of this graduating class, will perfect the social mechanisms by which all men may follow their ambitions without the threat of force—so that the earth will no longer need police to enforce the laws, nor armies to prevent some men from trespassing against others. But they—those generations—made more progress by the sweat of their brows than in any previous era, and don't you forget it. And if your generations can make as much progress in as many areas as these two generations have, you should be able to solve a good many of the world's remaining ills.

"It is my hope, and I know the hope of these two generations, that you find the answers to many of these problems that plague mankind.

"But it won't be easy. And you won't do it by negative thoughts, nor by tearing down and belittling. You may and can do it by hard work, humility, hope and faith in mankind. Try it . . ."

Let me add to that some remarks of my own at the graduation exercises held early this month at the White Pine High School, in Ely, Nevada, the same school from which I graduated 29 years ago. To the so-called younger generation, the "now" group, I had this to say:

"Instead of according with the idea of a 'generation gap,' let us instead hold to the fact that from the oldest to the youngest, and the youngest to the oldest, we are a single people intent on the welfare of our Nation and the continuance of our 'way of life'.

"The basic difference in outlook is not one of years, but one of what the years may bring. It is as though you were standing at the foot of the mountain looking up and thinking, 'what a long, hard climb lies ahead.' We, on the other hand, have been climbing that mountain, and are half way up. We not only see the climb ahead of us, but we see where we are today, and can look back and see how very far we have come, how truly great has been our progress.

"It is so with our problems. This Nation's social advances even in my lifetime, have been outstanding. Of many of them you are unaware because the then problem no longer exists today. It has been solved, and you are the beneficiary of that solution. Many, only a few years older than I, can remember well when college graduates along with others dug ditches for the WPA. They remember, too, the bank closings with savings swept away, and homes sold out from under them for unpaid taxes and mortgages. Others but slightly older can remember the six-day work-week of sixty hours, and 'sweat shops', and 'child labor'.

"All that has changed. We have thousands of college scholarships, low-cost government loans for college students teacher and land grant colleges, unemployment insurance, social security, medicare, minimum wages, a five-day week of forty hours or even less, FHA and VA mortgages, employee-employer shared health insurance and life insurance, employee pension funds, old age assistance and bank deposit insurance.

"Thus, you can see that we have come a long way in social benefits as a Nation, even in your lifetime. The only difference is that we who lived through it, and actually participated in it, are aware of what has been accomplished through practical means. We know that with proper planning, the practical approach, hard work, and a sense of responsibility to our Nation and its people, together we can accomplish as much or more in the years ahead.

"But further accomplishment can only be achieved by constructive effort. Destruction serves no purpose. An idiot can set fire to a school or a university library that it took money, effort and skilled labor to build—and will take to replace. Idiots can riot on campuses and falsely cry 'repression' where there is none, but it took generations of brave men whose blood was spilled in battle to defend the freedom they flout to do so. Nor are we who are dubbed the 'older generation' misled by the noise of the vocal radicals into believing that they are representatives of the majority of our youth today—not when 10,000 young Americans volunteered for military service in one week's time!"

In closing my remarks tonight, let me add but this, and therein speak my heart.

Sing me no siren song of lands where freedom lies imprisoned. Let those who would mislead others, or would themselves be

fooled, be so misled. For my own part, I thrill to the words and to the music of "America, the Beautiful."

Let others march to the different beat of a distant drum. I'll march to that of the "Star Spangled Banner." And to the last full measure of my devotion—tonight, tomorrow, and for all the days of my life—I give freely of my love to my Nation, to my Nation's flag, and all that for which they stand.

Even as did those brave, wise men who signed the Declaration of Independence, to this, I too pledge my "life", my "fortune", and my "sacred honor".

WIRETAPS MADE BIG DRUG RAIDS POSSIBLE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, our recent U.S. Attorney General, Mr. Ramsey Clark, said recently that "crime cannot be controlled by wiretapping." But just the other day his judgement was proved wrong. I refer to the recent tremendously successful drug raids which were greatly aided by wiretaps—in fact could not have taken place without them.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the details, as reported in the Republican Congressional Committee Newsletter, at this point in the RECORD:

WIRETAPS MADE BIG DRUG RAIDS POSSIBLE

"The success of the recent drug raids was proof of the pudding for wiretaps. We just couldn't have done it without the taps."

That was the comment of Assistant Attorney General Will Wilson as he explained to the *Newsletter* last week the role wiretaps played in the recent Justice Department 10-city narcotics raid. The raid resulted in the arrest of 139 persons involved in handling an estimated 30 percent of all heroin sales in this country and 75 to 80 percent of all cocaine sales.

"The importers and wholesalers of drugs are well organized and are experts at secrecy and disguise," said Wilson, who heads the Department's Criminal Division. "When you consider the vast torrent of people flowing across the borders of the U.S. and the necessity for knowing the profile of the entire system of distribution before striking, it becomes obvious that you must secure accurate intelligence on the movement and plans of a great number of people."

What's behind the increased flow of narcotics and dangerous drugs into this country? One reason, said Wilson, was the previous Administration's refusal to use wiretaps.

"In my opinion," he explained, "the refusal to use telephone taps in narcotics cases in the past partially accounts for the big inflow of narcotics into the United States and the expansion of drug traffic in general."

(LBJ's Attorney General, Ramsey Clark, had refused to use wiretap authority provided him by Congress in the fight against crime. Clark has said on television that he believes "crime can't be controlled by wiretapping. . . . It demeans human dignity. . . . It escalates the levels of violence in America.")

The 10-city narcotic raid, labeled "the biggest of its kind in history" by Attorney General John N. Mitchell, is but one of many things the Nixon Administration has done in its continuing fight against drugs.

Speaking last week in Hot Springs, Ark., to the National Sheriff's Association, Vice President Spiro T. Agnew listed five steps the Administration has taken to educate the public about drugs:

Established a new $3.5-million program to train school personnel in drug-abuse education.

Created a National Clearinghouse for Drug Abuse Information giving the public one central office to contact.

Modified the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration to allow large cities to apply for funds to be used for drug education as well as law enforcement.

Embarked upon an expanded campaign of advertising against drug abuse.

Supplemented by $1 million the funds for research into the effects of marijuana.

BICENTENNIAL SEEKS SPIRIT OF '76

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the Sunday, June 28, edition of the Washington Post contained an article by Wolf Von Eckardt, on the Bicentennial celebration coming up in 1976.

Eckardt points up the need for our Nation to avoid the pitfall of noting our 200th anniversary with just a gigantic exposition. He also expresses doubts about spreading the celebration to the four cities that want it: Boston, Miami, Philadelphia, and Washington. This would result in four not-so-big expositions.

Eckardt concludes that Washington, D.C., the city with the greatest cross-section of our Nation's problems and potentials should be the host: "And by making a crash effort to redeem the promise for a great capital of a great Nation, we also help redeem the promise of the American Revolution."

In the course of my responsibilities on the District of Columbia Committee, I have grown to like Washington a lot. It has been noted in this Chamber that service on the District of Columbia Committee has few political rewards, but I feel that this city is every American's second hometown and we all should work to improve it. For this reason I feel we should give every consideration to celebrating our Nation's bicentennial in this great city.

I include Mr. Von Eckardt's article in my remarks at this time:

[From the Washington Post, June 28, 1970]

BICENTENNIAL SEEKS SPIRIT OF '76

(By Wolf Von Eckardt)

By the time Bob Hope, the Rev. Billy Graham and Disney Productions shoot off their firecrackers next Saturday, the President will have yet another, presumably bulky report on his desk.

It will tell him how we ought to celebrate the 200th Fourth of July six years from now.

To most people that seems hardly a momentous issue. In these days of continued war in Inochina, violent unrest on the streets and campuses, economic downturn and a widening gulf between black and white, it seems hard to focus on this still distant event.

But that is precisely why firm plans and commitments ought to be made now.

A whole year of mere commemoration, historic entertainment, flag-waving, Bob Hope, Disney productions and firecrackers would aggravate malaise.

The next most discouraging way to celebrate the bicentennial would be to spread the birthday cake among the four cities—Boston, Philadelphia, Miami and Washington—that are competing for the honor. But that's what the American Revolution Bicentennial Commission seems to have in mind.

It would reportedly declare Boston a "historic city" (what else has it been all along?), let Philadelphia have a less than full-fledged World's Fair, let Miami have another second-class international fair (which it has been trying to get for a good many years), and encourage Washington to carry on its renewal program over a period of the 11 years that the American Revolution lasted.

A COMMONSENSE PLAN

There is, of course, nothing wrong with all kinds of festivities all over the land. But a truly national celebration could go far to restore a sense of common sense in divided America. Most groups and experts who have testified before it have therefore urged the Bicentennial Commission to use the occasion for a national demonstration of our ability to solve our urban problems.

"Jeffersonian suspicions as to the relative undesirability of the virtues and influences of cities may linger," the Joint Center for Urban Studies of Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Harvard University told the commission, "but we are very much an urban nation—and becoming more of one, not less." The bicentennial offers "a tremendous opportunity to provide lasting benefits for our national urban life."

Philadelphia, Boston, Miami and Washington have all stressed that the celebration must, of course, be nation-wide. But none, in asking for federal funds to put on its show, has been able to avoid the suspicion of a self-serving Chamber of Commerce promotion.

Philadelphia, in fact, has reportedly spent $2.5 million on elaborate plans and public relations efforts to reinforce not only its historic claims to the event, but also to stage an international exposition.

A PASSIVE ATTITUDE

Washington, in contrast, has done little to beat the drums. Its proposal was drawn up jointly by three local commissions, representing the District of Columbia, Maryland and Virginia. It comes unquestionably closest to the idea of turning much of the bicentennial effort into creating a model and a catalyst for urban innovations and development. And it nevertheless gives mean to the idea of a national celebration because of the simple fact that Washington happens to be the national capital, a fact that can hardly be changed during 1976.

What is more, as the MIT-Harvard group put it, "Washington, D.C., as an urban area, is a showplace not only of our past heritage but also, unfortunately, of our present difficulties; of the deterioration of both the physical and social fabric, of the concentration of the poor and the black in central cities, of insufficiencies in public services, of breakdown in public order."

Though we managed to fulfill a presidential commitment to reach the moon in less than 10 years, even moon money and cosmic ambition would not be sufficient to redevelop and rebuild our ailing capital in the six years that remain. But it does give us time—if that deadline is taken as a challenge—for decisive improvements, exciting experiments and significant benefits.

There is as yet no precise blueprint for turning Washington into a bicenntial city, but there are three documents—the basic proposal of the D.C., Maryland and Virginia Bicentennial Commissions, a lengthy review

of it by the MIT-Harvard group, and what might be called a feasibility study prepared by the National Capital Planning Commission.

While the basic proposal puts major emphasis on "the Living Process of Urban Development," it also argues in favor of holding a 1976 World's Fair in Washington. It acknowledges that fairs smack of commercialism and cost a lot of money. But it says that this one could, if properly designed, "create something new, something of quality befitting the bicentennial, emphasizing human values over material things."

And it implies that an international exposition would give America's bicentennial international attention, bring a larger number of visitors to Washington, commit more federal funds and give us an even greater incentive to make this city presentable.

But just how and where the fair would be mounted is left vague. The MIT-Harvard report only points out that past international expositions have "presented advanced trends in architecture and a few exerted a strong influence on social and cultural thinking." The Planning Commission ignores the fair—either because it doesn't believe that President Nixon and Congress will buy us one, or because it just doesn't know where to put it, or both.

The proposal contains enough other suggestions for special attractions and events, however, to draw the crowds. Most of these proposals either make use of the great national assets this city already has—the Mall with its many museums as well as the historic shrines in the area, such as Mt. Vernon, Annapolis or Fort McHenry—or they focus on institutions that are already under construction or planned anyway—such as the Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, the Aquarium and the Science and Industry Park (a proposed private development where industry hopes to demonstrate how technology can solve the human problems it has created).

And that is really the gist of the Washington bicentennial idea: To complete the national capital's much touted "magnificent intentions" and, by 1976, turn them into magnificent accomplishments.

ATTACKING THE GHETTO

Aside from completing Washington's monumental core—Pennsylvania Avenue, the Hirshhorn Museum and National Gallery Sculpture Garden and converting Union Station into a Visitors Center—much of the "Living Process of Urban Development" proposal would be a real attack on the miseries of the ghetto with new housing, new neighborhoods, "little city halls," cultural facilities and the whole, long promised lot.

A worldwide attraction would be a completed Fort Lincoln—a model new town for 21st century living. The plans for this proposed community for 4,500 families of various incomes and skin colors, complete with built-in transportation, employment, education and recreation, have already excited urbanists around the country and abroad. In the Spirit of '76 we would demonstrate that the American genius cannot only plan and design for a new and better quality of life, but that we can also deliver.

We need only remember the stir caused by Moshe Safdie's Habitat at Expo '67 in Montreal to imagine the sensation this town would create if people could actually ride those minerals, drink in its outdoor cafes, swim in Kingman Lake and share the laughter of its happy children.

Much of Washington's Metro, furthermore, would be in operation. Much of downtown would be renewed. And much of the Anacostia Valley, that most dismally underdeveloped area, would be redeveloped for new living and recreation.

The Planning Commission estimates that by 1976 anywhere from 35 to 45 million visitors can be expected in Washington, compared with an estimated 18 to 20 million this year.

If, as at present, two-thirds or more of these visitors do their sightseeing in private automobiles, the resulting jams and air pollution—not to speak of the parking dilemma—can hardly be imagined. The Planning Commission has therefore advanced a thoughtful program designed to reduce the number of cars entering the city by fringe parking and accommodations—combined with a vastly improved bus system as well as sharply reduced fares on all public transportation.

COST CAN BE MET

All this, the commission estimates, would cost $4.2 billion. But $2.3 billion has already been authorized by Congress. Only $1.9 billion of public and private investment is needed to round out these programs and accelerate their implementation so they are completed by 1976.

To these hardware proposals the MIT-Harvard group would add some innovative experiments with new policies and techniques in inner-city transportation, communication, pollution control and medical care. None of these are pie-in-the-sky. They are all possible, based on industrial inventions that are now available but—due to the current stagnation in our cities—still awaiting demonstration, marketability and consumer acceptance.

What Washington—aside from special exhibits and cultural entertainment and festivities—proposes to do, then, is basically nothing much more or less than what we really ought to be doing anyway, what we must do anyway, and what we have promised ourselves to do—but to do it by July 4, 1976.

No gimmick in the world can make that July 4 a successful celebration, let alone conjure the Spirit of '76. But like any good host we can clean house and complete the necessary remodeling so the party has at least a chance to be a success. And by making a crash effort to redeem the promise for a great capital of a great nation, we also help redeem a promise of the American Revolution.

It had better be effectively started by the end of our first 200 years, if its ideals are to survive the next two centuries.

CONSTITUTION CLEAR: CONGRESS HAS POWER TO DECLARE WAR

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I believe the last 2 months' adventures in Cambodia require inclusion in the RECORD of the following article. It first appeared in the New Yorker, was reprinted in Forbes and sent to me by my constituent Mr. Robert Bowdler. I think both Members and the public will find it profitable, and I am happy to have it printed in its entirety.

I was particularly taken by its discussion of the President's war powers under the Constitution:

As sophisticated men the Founding Fathers foresaw some of the dangers that lay ahead. They recognized explicitly that formal declarations of war were going out of style, but they still required our legislature to declare war. They saw "how easy would it be to fabricate pretenses of approaching danger," but they said that this would demand "a combination between the executive and the legislative, in some scheme of usurpation." In other words, the Constitution would protect the American people against the misuse of military power by prohibiting the executive from going to war without congressional approval and prohibiting Congress from directing the war it had started. Even this was dangerous, they acknowledged, but it was the best that could be done.

Our apprehension for the survival of this system will be evident to all. The allure of a startling military success, I fear, was too close and too tempting. But it seems to me that constitutional balances are more to be cherished than possible short-term gains in an already too-long war.

I include the New Yorker article at this point in the RECORD.

NOTES AND COMMENT

As the defeated British regiments marched past the files of French and American troops at Yorktown, the British bands, in detached resignation, played "The World Turned Upside Down." The same tune would have been an appropriate accompaniment to the events of last week. For the two-hundred-year-old American system came under its most serious attack in modern times, not from the poor, the blacks, or the students but from the White House—the fount, the pinnacle, the keystone of the established order. President Nixon became the first President in the history of the United States deliberately to order American forces to invade another nation on his own, without seeking congressional approval or support. This order was in disregard of the Constitution, the tempering strictures of our history, and the principles of the American democracy. It was, therefore, an act of usurpation.

Few prohibitions are more likely set forth in the Constitution. That document makes the President Commander-in-Chief, and explicitly states that only Congress shall have the power to declare war or raise armies. The Federalist Papers reaffirm what the law makes clear; the term "Commander-in-Chief" meant only that the President could direct the conflict after Congress had decided to make war. Hamilton wrote that the President's power would be much less than the power of the British King, for "it would amount to nothing more than the supreme command and direction of the military and naval forces, as first General and Admiral of the Confederacy; while that of the British King extends to the declaring of war and to the raising and regulating of fleets and armies—all which, by the Constitution under consideration, would appertain to the legislature." This was no casual division. The fear of military power under the control of a central government was one of the most serious popular objections to the establishment of the new nation. The only way this could happen, the founders responded, was by a "continued conspiracy" between the executive and the legislature. In this case, Hamilton advised, "the people should resolve to recall all the powers they have heretofore parted with out of their own hands . . . in order that they may be able to manage their own concerns in person." As sophisticated men, the Founding Fathers foresaw some of the dangers that lay ahead. They recognized explicitly that formal declarations of war were going out of style, but they still required our legislature to declare war. They saw "how easy would it be to fabricate pretences of approaching danger," but they said that this would demand "a combination between the executive and the legislative, in some scheme of usurpation." In other words, the Constitution would protect the American people against the misuse of military power by prohibiting the executive from going to war without congressional approval and prohibiting Congress from directing the war it had started. Even this was dangerous, they

acknowledged, but it was the best that could be done.

For over a hundred and sixty years, the Constitution was followed. Congress declared the War of 1812, the Mexican War (even though there had been a somewhat provoked attack on our troops), the Spanish-American War, and both World Wars. In the period after the Second World War, things began to change. The development of Soviet atomic power, the military impotence of Western Europe, and the shock of Korea impelled us toward the creation of a large peacetime standing Army—the first in our history. It was seen that a sudden emergency might require instant action, with no time to go to Congress. This implied exception to Constitutional principle was based on the technological realities of atomic war, and it has been invoked only once—when we intervened in the Dominican Republic. That intervention, however, was based on the claim that action within hours was necessary to protect the lives of Americans trapped between the contending forces—simply a traditional rescue operation. This claim may well have masked other motives, but American forces were not committed to combat, and support of the congressional leadership was sought and received within hours of the order to intervene and before the Marines had actually landed.

In Korea in 1950, President Truman acted pursuant to a resolution of the Security Council, whose powers had been confirmed by the Senate when it consented to ratification of the United Nations Charter. In addition, Truman met with the congressional leadership of both parties before ordering combat forces into action, and he received their unanimous support, along with that of the defeated Republican nominee, Thomas Dewey. Nor was there any doubt of the overwhelming public and congressional approval of his action—at least in the beginning. (The same week, the draft was extended with only four dissenting votes.) President Eisenhower sought, and received, congressional resolutions authorizing him to act in the Middle East and in the Formosa Strait. President Johnson himself asked for a resolution at the time of the Gulf of Tonkin incident, and it was the literal verbal scope of this resolution that was construed as authorizing all subsequent action in Vietnam. Yet such a construction was clearly an evasion, and it was at this point that the great Constitutional principles began to decay.

Now President Nixon has taken a giant step. Not only has he evaded the spirit of the Constitutional division of powers but he has deliberately ignored its plain meaning and intent. He has decided that he will go to war in Cambodia because he feels it necessary, no matter what Congress wants or what the people think. He has even implied that such willful disregard of the people and their elected representatives is an act of noble self-sacrifice, and has hinted that we should admire his courage in exceeding the limits of his Constitutional powers. The war in Cambodia was not an emergency. There was time enough to present the matter to Congress for a swift decision. Indeed, unconcealed debate within the executive branch went on long enough to permit the Vietcong to evacuate the threatened area. But the President did not follow the precedent of all his postwar predecessors by seeking assurance of congressional support, either formally or through meetings with the leadership. Rather, he made war by fiat. He has thus united in himself the powers that the Constitution divides and that have remained divided through our history. And this comes from an Administration that proclaims its devotion to "strict construction."

This is not a technical, legal question. In import, it transcends a challenge to the wisdom of the war itself. The President, in effect, has said, "I, and I alone, have decided to go to war in Cambodia." Where does he get that power? The Constitution denies it to him. He is not acting under the necessity of instant reaction. He has the power only because he asserts it, and because the armies follow. In a world in which conflicts are interrelated, there is no limit to the possibilities unfolded by this reasoning. He can invade Laos and Thailand, where Communists are active. He can enter North Vietnam itself. He can attack China, which is both a sanctuary and a source of supply for the North Vietnamese. Nor is the Soviet Union exempt, since it, too, helps our adversaries in Vietnam. Such an assertion of authority is not among the prerogatives of a democratic leader in a republic of divided powers. Our democracy is not an elective dictatorship. It is a government in which all elected officials have carefully limited powers. Suppose the President said he was going to change the tax laws, because the rates were unjust. What an outcry we would hear. Yet how trivial such an act would be, compared to concentrating the power over war and peace in a single office. The life of democracy depends on a common acceptance, by people and government, of the limits of power. What if, two years from now, the President should cancel the elections, on the ground of national need? Would it be easy to revolt against an armed force of three and a quarter million men if they remained obedient to their Commander-in-Chief? The possibility now seems absurd. But it illuminates the fact that our system works only because men have felt constrained by its assumptions. Courts and legislatures have neither guns nor treasuries to enforce their will. Now one of the most basic of these liberating assumptions has been swept away. It must be restored.

The first duty of resistance lies with the legislative branch. For years, its members have been abdicating their responsibility, watching almost without protest while their authority was eroded and their mandates were evaded. They have allowed their power to be usurped. Now they are scorned and ignored, because the President is confident that they have neither the courage nor the will to challenge his action—that each, looking to his own interest, will allow the common cause to decay. If this is a true judgment and the President's act is not repudiated, then they will have denied the oath they took to uphold the Constitution. For Congress is the people's guardian. The authors of the Federalist Papers reassured the doubtful that "in the only instances in which the abuse of the executive authority was materially to be feared, the Chief Magistrate of the United States would . . . be subjected to the control of a branch of the legislative body. What more could be desired by an enlightened and reasonable people?" What more indeed?

The other possibility is the Supreme Court. In 1952, President Truman seized the steel mills, because, he claimed, a steel strike was endangering the war effort in Korea. The Supreme Court decided that he had no such power and ordered him to return the mills. The Court's opinion concluded, "The Founders of this Nation entrusted the lawmaking power to the Congress alone in both good and bad times. It would do no good to recall the historical events, the fears of power and the hopes for freedom that lay behind their choice. Such a review would but confirm our holding that this seizure order cannot stand." How much more does this invasion transgress those same hopes and fears.

There are many ways to bring the issue to the Supreme Court. The Senate itself might instruct its leaders to bring an action to restrain the President or the Secretary of Defense from ordering further combat in Cambodia. This would be an unprecedented response to an unprecedented act. However, the issue is Constitutional, and is thus within the jurisdiction of the federal courts. And surely no individual or institution has greater standing to bring such an action than a branch of the very body whose powers have been taken away. Another route lies through the recent Massachusetts statute that makes it unlawful to require any resident of that state to serve outside the United States in an undeclared war. The Attorney General of Massachusetts has been instructed by the law to bring an action in the Supreme Court in order to prevent such service from being required. In relation to Vietnam, the passage of the bill was a symbolic action. In the case of the Cambodian invasion, the law could be a vehicle for resolving a momentous issue. Would the Court decide? No one can be sure. But it also can decide, and that is its responsibility. Discussing the Supreme Court, Hamilton wrote that it must have the power to invalidate all acts by the other branches of government which are contrary to the Constitution. "To deny this," he said, "would be to affirm that the deputy is greater than his principal; that the servant is above his master; that the representatives of the people are superior to the people themselves; that men acting by virtue of powers may do not only what their powers do not authorize but what they forbid."

The President has now declared himself superior to the people, to the legislature, and to the laws. We have lasted as a functioning democracy for almost two hundred years. The foundation of that democracy has been a vigilant regard for the principle that no one man or institution shall impose an unrestrained will on the decisions that shape the nation. If the American people now let this principle be eroded, while the capacity for resistance still remains, then we will deserve our fate. For we will have lost the ultimate protection of liberty, stronger than governments, more enduring than constitutions—the will of a people to be free.

WOMEN'S EQUALITY ACT OF 1970

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, along with my colleagues from Washington (Mrs. HANSEN), from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS), from New York (Mr. KOCH), from Hawaii (Mrs. MINK), and from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON), the Women's Equality Act of 1970, a bill to carry out the legislative recommendations of the Presidential Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities.

The bill would eliminate sex discrimination in all federally-assisted programs, in State and Federal employment, in employment in educational institutions, and in the payment of wages for professional, executive, and administrative jobs. The bill actually goes beyond the recommendations by the President's Task Force by also banning sex discrimination in housing practices, just as racial discrimination is prohibited under the Federal Fair Housing Act.

The Women's Equality Act authorizes matching grants through the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to finance State advisory commissions to study the status of women. It requires

the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make recommendations to equalize the treatment of women under the Social Security Act, the Internal Revenue Code, and the Family Assistance Act, and extends the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission to include sex discrimination. It provides the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission with cease and desist powers, authorizes the Attorney General to initiate suits in cases of sex discrimination in public facilities and public education, and confers jurisdiction upon the district courts to provide injunctive relief against discrimination in public accommodations.

Earlier this year, I cosponsored the "equal rights for women" amendment to the Constitution and was one of the 10 original signers of the petition to discharge the equal rights amendment now pending in the House. The purpose of a constitutional amendment is to give women general protection against laws and official practices that are discriminatory.

But Congress, as we know, could take years to pass this amendment and the ratification process by 34 States could take many more years after that. There is a desperate need for specific statutory action now which would have immediate effect in securing the rights denied to women in the areas of employment, wages, education, and discriminatory State and local practices. The President's Task Force on Women's Rights and Responsibilities strongly urged the President to recommend legislation to the Congress. Their report was submitted to the President in December of last year, but so far no legislation to implement the task force's recommendations has been sent to Congress. The Women's Equality Act includes the legislative suggestions by the task force. The plea by women for equal rights under the law is not radical. This legislation asks for no special privileges. Adult women make up over one-third of the working population of the United States and they want to enjoy the full benefits of citizenship. The Women's Equality Act amends existing civil rights law to extend the coverage to women. Actually, it goes beyond the President's task force recommendations by extending the Federal Fair Housing Act to prohibit sex discrimination.

Let me give you examples of the most blatant forms of sex discrimination. Although women make up 37 percent of the total work force in this country, they suffer inequalities in employment opportunities, and wage payments. Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has brought some progress in industrial hiring practices, but it exempts educational institutions and State and local governments from its coverage. As a result women who make up 90 percent of public school elementary schoolteachers can be discriminated against in public school systems. In 1966, for example, 75 percent of elementary school principals were men out of a teaching force made up of about 10 percent men. The bill I propose today will amend title VII, removing the exemption clause to oblige State and local governments to hire and promote women on their merit. Furthermore, in its present form, title VII places the main burden of enforcement on the aggrieved individual. This enforcement provision is inadequate and will be amended in line with the task force recommendations to give the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission authority to enforce the law in all cases of discriminatory hiring practices.

Women suffer gross injustices in wage payments as well as employment practices. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 guarantees equal pay to all, including women. But the 1963 act contains an exemption for professional, executive, and administrative employees. Although title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act protects women in professional, administrative, and executive positions, it does not permit a complainant to withhold his identity as he can under the Fair Labor Standards Act. Many women who achieve high positions after years of struggle fear jeopardizing them and silently suffer the discrimination of a double pay standard. The Women's Equality Act amends the Fair Labor Standards Act so that women in those high status positions have a right to pay for equal work.

Sex discrimination in education is one of the most serious injustices borne by women. Many State and local laws deny them equal educational opportunity which results in unequal abilities and unequal employment opportunities. Statistics show that the percentage of women employed in a particular occupation goes down as the job qualifications go up. Women, for instance, make up only 3 percent of the lawyers in this country. Until the State of Virginia took legal action, the University of Virginia College of Arts and Sciences refused to admit women. In a similar case on a local level, Stuyvesant High School, a specialized public high school in the sciences, was forced to admit girls because of legal action taken against the New York City Board of Education. In addition to this form of discrimination in high schools and colleges, there is another form of unequal educational opportunity on the professional level. Only 6 percent of our law students and 8 percent of our medical students are women although, according to the Office of Education, statistics show that women tend to do better on admission tests. My amendment to titles IV and IX of the 1964 Civil Rights Act authorizes the Attorney General to bring suits in behalf of persons denied equal protection of laws by public school officials and requires the Commissioner of Education to conduct a survey on the extent of discrimination because of sex, not only in practices with respect to students, but also in employment of faculty and administration. In doing so, the bill merely secures the rights of women which probably already exist under the 14th amendment.

Discrimination against women in public facilities—restaurants, for instance—is less severe but in principle just as damaging. By amending title II of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the Women's Equality Act authorizes the Attorney General to initiate suits in cases of such discrimination and confers jurisdiction upon the district courts to provide for injunctive relief against sex discrimination in public accommodations.

Perhaps the greatest deterrent to securing improvement in the legal status of women is the lack of public knowledge. The Civil Rights Commission authorized by the Civil Rights Act of 1957, collects, studies, and distributes information on civil rights laws and policies. At present, the Commission's mandate does not include responsibility for women. The bill I am introducing amends the Civil Rights Act of 1957 to extend the jurisdiction of the Civil Rights Commission to include denial of rights based on sex discrimination. Thus, State laws punishing women with longer prison sentences for the same offense, practices which exclude women from State universities, and other laws and policies which deny equal protection of the laws to women will be studied and recommendations made to change them.

Mr. Speaker, I could go with an unending catalog of the injustices women presently suffer in this country. It is surprising and inexcusable that the quality of life Americans have sought for nearly 200 years is in many ways denied female Americans by law. At a time when our commitment to the democratic ideal is being questioned both at home and abroad, it is imperative that the Nation utilize the potential of all its citizens. Studies show that we are lagging behind some newly emerging countries in the role ascribed to women. This is an ironic oversight on our part. With nearly 40 percent of our labor force women we must amend the existing laws. Of that female working force, 64 percent are married. Because of the rising cost of living, family illness, or widowhood, many more women today must work to support families. I urge the attention of my colleagues to this important bill which will actualize enforcement of already existing rights, which will eliminate second-class citizenship in this country, and which will open up an untapped source of productivity. I hope that the Judiciary Committee will take immediate action on this bill to make sex, like race, an anachronism under the law as a basis for measuring people's rights or worth.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT SENT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS—JUNE 29, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, when the Continental Congress adopted the Declaration of Independence on July 4, 1776, the stage was set for a series of events which created a nation of incomparable energy and wealth. As we approach the 200th anniversary of that historic event, we still draw inspiration from the Declaration of Independence and sustenance from the Constitution.

When the Founding Fathers drafted the Constitution, they were determined to create a government which guaranteed:

The right to life, liberty, property, happiness and free conscience.

The freedom of speech, press, assembly, and petition of grievances.

The principle of consent, which is the key to the political obligations on each of us.

Most impressive, perhaps, was the fact that they were able to agree at so many points on the structure and the function of government. The Founding Fathers, made up of liberals and conservatives, northerners and southerners, east coast urban residents and frontiersmen, agreed:

Whatever the form of government, it must preserve maximum liberty and equality of the persons under it.

Government should be as plain, simple and intelligible as possible.

Government should be kept near the people, with frequent elections.

Office holders should be the servants of the people, not the masters.

Government must be constitutional, that is—of law, not of men.

A representative government is essential, but that system must be restrained by a separation of powers and checks and balances.

Just as importantly, they knew it would take more than an agreed set of principles and a plan of government to preserve order and liberty. They saw that in order to make our constitutional system work, people had to understand what the democratic process required of them as individuals.

The democratic process puts the individual at the center of things, but much depends upon the kind of individual. For government—for ordered liberty—to succeed, there must be a moral basis to government. The maintenance of freedom depends upon the quality of the individual's life.

As individuals, we must possess an attitude of tolerance, exposing our ideas, proposals, solutions to the analysis of others. We must adopt an attitude of confidence in our fellowman, since our Government is founded on the belief that each is given responsibility for his own destiny and his own community.

The democratic process also requires us to adopt an attitude of trust. We assume the other will obey the law. We do not police everyone, assuming each will fill out his income tax correctly, stop at the stop sign, obey the speed limit.

But, our system also requires us to respect the rules. Using the ballot, not the bullet; fair expression, not slander or libel, and peaceful redress of our grievances, not violence.

If our system is to continue to work, enough of us must meet these qualifications. We must possess the wisdom to discern, and the virtue to pursue, the common good.

We may not have succeeded in every respect in meeting the goals set by our Founding Fathers, but we have come closer to the ideals of freedom and liberty than any Nation in history.

America is not an achieved state or resting place. It is a building and a making, a process, a living tissue. And we must build with it.

WATER—ENVIRONMENT—REVOLUTION

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, one of the most dedicated and competent people in the realm of natural resources and environment is the director of the California State Department of Water Resources, William R. Gianelli. Just recently, Mr. Gianelli delivered an extraordinary presentation at the California Central Valleys Flood Control Association in Sacramento, Calif. Because his remarks are so pertinent to the critical problems confronting our environment, I would like to share them with my colleagues:

WATER—ENVIRONMENT—REVOLUTION

(By William R. Gianelli, Director)

Thank you for asking me to appear before you today. When John Luther issued your invitation, he suggested that I discuss the future: What lay ahead for flood control and water development.

To understand the future, one needs to examine the past, and in California of 1970, we need to take a good, long look at the present if we expect to have any future at all. For California is in a water battle today as demanding and as dangerous as any she has ever been through before. The names of the players have been changed, and some of the issues wear disguises, but the weapons have a sophistication and a shotgun power that we are just beginning to see.

California has always had water problems and is going to continue to have water problems as long as the majority of the water supply lies at one end of the State and the majority of the people at the other end. This initial problem is compounded by a seasonal climate which produces 80 percent of the precipitation from November through March and leaves the remaining seven months in almost drought-like condition. In the northwest corner of the State, rainfall averages 110 inches per season; in the southeast corner, as little as 2 inches per season.

The people of California have spent 200 years trying to balance this maldistribution of water supply and water demand. Early efforts were very effective, but could only be operated as individual solutions.

Our first water supply projects were essentially owner-diversions from a nearby stream or flowing course. When these were found to be insufficient to take care of needs, people introduced multiple diversions. Then, groups of owners banded together into districts, and moved on to cooperation between districts. With the merger of districts into metropolitan-wide organizations, the importation of water began in the first decade of this century.

Los Angeles went to the Owens Valley in the years between 1905 and 1920 for a water supply because her own supply was insufficient for her needs. In 1931, the voters of that city approved another large bond issue so that a cooperative water district could capture water from the Colorado River and transport it the 242 miles to Los Angeles.

The people of Oakland formed the East Bay Municipal Utility District to build the 75-mile Mokelumne Aqueduct and obtain water from Pardee Dam—again in the Sierra.

San Francisco, in 1934, tapped the Tuolumne River watershed in the Sierra Nevada to fill the Hetch Hetchy Aqueduct and provide her people with a firm supply of water.

The Federal Government soon began to play a significant role in water development, particularly for systems that were too extensive and too comprehensive for any local agency to finance. The Bureau of Reclamation constructed the All-American and Coachella Canals in the south to import water from the Colorado River to the Imperial Valley, which soon became some of the finest farmland in the United States. The Bureau also started the Central Valley Project to afford some means of flood control for the Sacramento and San Joaquin Valleys; to deliver irrigation water for those water-deficient areas; and, to provide power for the people in the region. The Corps of Engineers, long the flood controllers of the Nation, erected flood control dams in California and helped to reclaim land for the benefit of people who had elected to live in flood plain or sea level areas.

The State was a late arrival on the scene to conserve California's water resources and develop them to supply demands for water use. But, with the passage of the Burns-Porter Act in 1959, and approval by the electorate in 1960, construction of the State Water Project began.

The combination of local, state and federal efforts to balance California's maldistribution of supply and demand grew in accordance with the needs of the people until there are now some 4,000 organizations in California having something to do with water.

The Central Valleys Flood Control Association is a combination of many of the local groups. It has been most effective in bringing a unified voice before the Legislature for a large number of small districts, and in keeping those local agencies abreast of legislative allocations to flood control and water resources in the Valley.

One of the most important achievements of the Association has been the annual flood control conference. This is a vehicle which allows the State to go before Congress with a high degree of unity in seeking federal appropriations for flood control funding in California. In recent years, the Association has been joined at the conference by representatives of counties outside the immediate Valley, making California's presentations before Congress more unified than any time in history.

The value of this has been shown in California's share of flood control projects assigned to the Corps of Engineers.

As a result of the 1970 Conference, the California Water Commission proposed to Congress that additional money be appropriated for 12 projects in California. The House Appropriations Committee last week recommended the inclusion of additional funds for 9 of these 12 projects.

Single-purpose projects were primary during the historical period of our water development; each designed to fulfill a certain need, and each performing for its particular "master". But water projects are no longer single-purpose. Through experience, we have learned that the multiple-purpose project is the project that provides maximum beneficial development because it allows one construction to fulfill many requirements.

The water projects being built today can control floods; can irrigate dry lands; can provide the water which is necessary to operate the cities and run the industries; can turn the switch to "on" for the multiple electrical needs of people; can create a lake for swimming, water skiing, boating, and camping, can protect the fish and supply the needs of our wildlife population. Water projects, in short, are providing us with today's standard of living and, each day, improving that standard.

The Central Valley Project and the State Water Project are good examples of multiple-purpose water development. They also interact to avoid duplicate construction efforts.

The State Water Project, to date, has expended $1.78 billion of an estimated $2.8 billion construction cost. That construction of the facilities required to meet scheduled water deliveries to the Project's southern terminus in 1973, is already 91 percent complete or under construction. Only those facilities which will not be required until the late 1970s or the 1980s have not yet been scheduled for construction start dates.

The Central Valley Project began construction in California in 1937 and went into its first operation in 1940 with the Contra Costa Canal, supplying water from the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta to western Contra Costa County. The primary reason for this facility, believe it or not, was to offset ocean salinity intrusion into the Delta.

To date, the CVP has provided Californians with $2.5 billion worth of water projects which have been completed or are now under construction. Pending projects would bring the total up to about $5 billion. Auburn Dam and Folsom-South Canal are both now in the initial stages of construction; Tehama-Colusa Canal is under construction; and authorization has been granted for the construction of the Bureau's San Felipe Unit just west of San Luis Dam. And the East-side Project is in the wings.

California has come a long way in solving her water problem. But each day brings new problems and we have some added funds right now. One of these is the tremendous competition for funds.

Within the Federal Government, a new emphasis is being placed on urban renewal programs, water pollution programs, welfare programs, and—despite our declining participation in Vietnam—the military complex is still competing for its share of the apple. Less and less attention is being given to flood control or reclamation projects and the problem to make ourselves heard within the "gimme" din is getting more difficult each day.

In the competition for the state dollar, welfare and education have the loudest voices and are heard with the largest financial effect. I am sure that you are all aware of the pressures that have been brought to bear on state programs related to solving the flood control and water supply problems that exist in California. To counteract these pressures, and alleviate these problems, water-oriented people are going to have to make the people of California more aware of the benefits that they derive from water projects and are going to have to modify what has been a historical approach to balancing water supply and water demand.

As long as a man can get as much water as he wants whenever he turns on the tap; as long as he gets the amount of electricity he needs whenever he turns on the switch; as long as there is a lake for him to go to when he wants to go to a lake; a fish to catch when he wants to go fishing; and, as long as he is protected from the deluge when the floods come; he isn't going to spend one minute wondering how it all got there.

It is up to you and me to make sure that he understands all these benefits come from water projects that are already completed, or those that are underway. And, if we don't make sure he understands it, then we can't go whining about budget depletions.

Because we bear the responsibilities for providing these benefits, we must also accept the responsibility to be sure they are correctly understood.

Society is under so much strain these days, and suffers so many separate and collective frustrations from being pushed, pulled, stamped and key-punched, that mankind literally feels the only way he can make himself heard is to cry "Foul!"

His streams are polluted; his lakes are dying; his beaches are full of trash; his farms are too mechanized; his lands are covered with concrete; and, the "wide open spaces" of his school songs are moving further and further away from him.

He resents this and directs his cry of "Foul!" to the public works projects—inanimate servants that can't fight back. What he has failed to take under consideration is that man himself is the polluter, the trash depositor, the mechanizer, the concrete user, and the pigeon who flies to the crowded city where he can be protected or lost within the mass rather than brave the difficulties that face an individual.

Man has become a group animal and, in so doing, has tried to create a group atmosphere, a group environment. And, herein lies one of our most serious problems. A group environment; i.e., the same environment for all, is almost impossible to achieve with any measure of success. For man is also an individual and each man's environmental requirements are as distinct as he himself.

The man who lives in a ghetto in the city can't understand why money has to be spent for flood control projects. But the man whose house is located on a flood plain or who farms in the Central Valley can't understand why we have to spend so much money on welfare.

Yet, both these men have many things in common. Two of their needs are the basic human requirement for water to keep them alive, and electricity to make living more endurable. In this State, water projects are the only present effective means to supply both of these requirements—and many others besides.

Water projects have brought flood control to the Central Valley and built a farming area second to none in the Nation.

Water projects have created in the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta a valuable asset for food production, recreation, fishlife and wildlife.

Water projects have also protected the Delta from the natural ruination of salt water intrusion by providing an inflow strong enough to repulse ocean salts.

Water projects have reclaimed lands once inundated on almost an annual basis, and in addition, have brought the lifeblood of water to lands that were once so parched they were nonusable.

These lands are now productive enough to, one day, be the receptacle for a dispersal of our coast-hugging population. Some of the stresses that man is experiencing in his "group environment" might be alleviated through such methods . . . but only if it is done through man's choice; not under government edict. That would be almost a total relinquishment of individuality.

Water projects have also put water-oriented recreational facilities within the reach of the city dweller and the Valley farmer. The effectiveness of this benefit can best be illustrated by figures which show that, in 1969, State Water Project reaction facilities had a total of 1.5 million visitor-days of use and an additional three-quarters of a million visitors went by just to look. During the first five months of this year, there were more than half a million visitor-days of recreation use at these project-created water sites plus a third of a million other visitors.

And, water projects have provided available, and inexpensive, sources of electrical power to run everything from a factory to a shaver. Hydroelectric power is not, in 1970, the only source of electric power available to man. Electricity can also be generated by fossil fuel or nuclear powerplants. I guess if you were Benjamin Franklin and had a key, a kite and a bad storm, you could even generate electricity that way. But hydroelectric power does have advantages that others don't.

For example: Hydropower is "instant power." There is no waiting for the water to heat up. This gives hydropower outstanding operating flexibility, greater reliability, and powerful advantages for automatic operation to meet peaking requirements. Hydropower also has financial advantages over thermal power because once it is on the line, it is more resistant to inflationary trends and generally cheaper to operate. Hydro plants also have the distinctive advantage of being smog-free, and not likely to introduce pollutants into an already polluted sky.

Every effect that I have mentioned has been an effect on our environment, and each effect has created a benefit that has brought us a better environment, a better life.

We have accomplished much within the past 200 years, but there is still a great deal to be done. We have taken care of the immediate needs to maintain life, and given ourselves a pretty good life along the way. But with the urgency taken care of, and with the leisure time that these working projects have made possible for us, we still need more. Now that we know we can produce enough water to drink, enough food to eat, enough factories to produce the "necessities" and the means to keep these things from being flooded right out from under us, we are turning our attention to other areas.

We have created this environment within which we live and, for the first time, we have the time to criticize it.

We go for a drive in the country and the country isn't there anymore—and we don't like it.

We get up in the morning, but our factories got up earlier and the sky is filled with smoke and smog and dust—and we don't like it.

We go to the beach and it certainly doesn't look like it did 10 years ago. It's covered with aluminum beer cans and non-returnable pop bottles—and we don't like it.

We go to San Francisco or Monterey Bay and the shoreline is posted with "No Swimming" or "Polluted Water" signs—and we don't like it.

In desperation, we decide to save, to do without, to deny ourselves, and to build a little cabin retreat way up in the mountains where we'll be away from the grind of daily living and the pressures of people. And, when we get there, we find that a million other people have had the same idea and are banding together to form an organization which will bring pressures in to get a road into this back country that can support a truck, or a camper, and a trailer, and all the equipment we need to take with us. And, then, we need a guaranteed pure drinking supply of water, and we think it might be nice to have a lake so we can get a boat and water-ski. And, of course, we need electricity because we're certainly not going to sit around and mess with kerosene lamps or coal oil stoves—and, who cooks over a wood stove? The first thing you know, we're back where we started—and we don't like that either.

We are going to have to realize that technology can give us almost anything in the world that our imaginations can envision. But, in one way or another, we are going to have to pay for it—and the bill is not always in dollars and cents.

We can go back to a state of nature, if that is our ultimate decision. But we must be willing to give up our cars, our electrical appliances, our pension plans and our leisure time. Because it's going to take us twice as long to earn the money we need to support our families. The population pressures are not likely to decrease. Instead, the likelihood of an increase in pressure is obvious; we won't have the time to get away from each other, and what good is the "state of Nature" going to do us if we never get to experience it?

People are going to have to question themselves very thoroughly, and provide their own answers to these questions. If the public is willing to give up their present services to maintain a "state of Nature" then, so be it. But I, personally, don't see very many of

them giving up anything. What I do see is that the ones who shout the loudest are the ones who have the most—and intend to keep it.

Those who are worried about the present state of our environment range from the everyday concerned citizen who tries to effect change in a logical manner to the extreme preservationist who doesn't seem to be able to relate his demands to costs, to the actual needs of human beings, or even to face facts that are an integral part of his own life.

Governor Williams of Arizona recently received a letter from a constituent who objected to approval to construct a fossil fuel powerplant in southeast Las Vegas, and urged the Governor to use all the influence of his office to put a stop to this powerplant.

The Governor replied, and I would like to quote part of his reply: "My only comment on your plea to eliminate fossil fuel burning plants is summed up in the fact that the East is now experiencing power shortages. With the Sierra Club banning Dams and Hydro projects, and others opposed to Nuclear Plants, and you against the Fossil Fuel—we may have the clearest skies in the day time, and the darkest farms, villages and cities at night, the world has ever seen. There are only three ways of producing electricity and all three are under attack.

"The West needs electric Power.

"And it has to be produced in one of three ways.

"If all three attacking groups are successful, what do you suggest?"

Here in California, we have much the same type of extremist, who wants to put a stop to everything, but who offers no workable, concrete solution to problems that have to be solved. In effect, if the demands of the extremists were followed, this State would have more problems than it does now and nothing would be being done to solve any of them.

There's the group that decries the pollution in San Francisco Bay and reaches for the Peripheral Canal as the cause and creator of this pollution. The Peripheral Canal isn't even under construction—much less in operation—and the Bay is a polluted mess right now in many areas. If the extremist is sincere in his fear that San Francisco Bay will turn into another Lake Erie, then why isn't he doing what the people around Lake Erie failed to do? Why isn't he demanding a stop to the polluting and the waste discharging that is underway right now from the municipalities and industries that line the shores of the Bay? When an aircraft carrier with approximately 6,000 people aboard, parks in the Bay for a week, where does the extremist think all the waste discharge from all those people goes? San Francisco's usual reaction to the arrival of an aircraft carrier is to cheer wildly and watch pictures of it sailing proudly under the Golden Gate Bridge. It's the extremist who turns around and says that water projects are polluting the Bay and that we have to put a stop to them.

I am fast learning to identify these extremists groups and to give a little closer attention to their motives. I doubt that there is one person in this State who is not truly interested in improving his environment and most of them are dedicated, in some fashion or another, to the conservation of our natural resources. But the simple act of working to accomplish these goals is no longer sufficient.

Environment has become a political issue and the cudgels are being wielded by extremists and revolutionaries who see it as their golden chariot to whatever personal ends they are working toward.

College groups who want to "take on the establishment"—which is certainly the thing to do when you're of college age—are being led up the path of political influence with environment as the carrot. And, what is worse, being led by fright peddlers who are scaring them to death about the future while ignoring the real problems of the present.

Then, there is the approach of a man like Alvin Duskin, who pictures himself as the savior of San Francisco Bay and the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta when, in actuality, he has done no more for either one than to pay the bill for an ad agency that runs full-page newspaper advertisements in daily newspapers.

Mr. Duskin is a dressmaker. Since he runs a multi-million-dollar business and lives in a $70,000 house, I can only assume that he is a successful dressmaker. But, he is not a qualified expert in resources development or conservation.

When asked, at a recent press conference, about Mr. Duskin's most recent newspaper advertisement and the lawsuit which he had announced would be filed in federal district court against federal and state water agencies, Governor Reagan replied:

"If Mr. Duskin's dresses have as many holes as his arguments, his customers must have a lot of consumer complaints."

I wish I had said that.

To get a look at Mr. Duskin's motives, one has to do more than read his advertisements; one has to read some of the interviews he has given out for publication:

In the July 1970 issue of RAGS, a garment industry trade journal, Mr. Duskin discusses the United States:

"It embarrasses me morally and it embarrasses me politically to be part of this nation of pigs, which is just what we are. In the long run, the only way we are going to have peace is to lower the American standard of living."

When asked by the interviewer what he would do to lower the standard of living here, he replied:

"I would like to slow down the buying. I would like to slow down the whole economy in the United States, that would be a very happy thing. In order for me to be a powerful person politically, which is my personal ambition, I have to have an economic base. It would be a very silly thing to destroy my factory. Since this is a money oriented society, you have to win this fight in order to go into the next fight."

In another interview, title "Capitolism is Absurd" and published in the Good Times newspaper of San Francisco, May 29, 1970, Mr. Duskin was asked about his views on Proposition 7 and the State Water Project, and what we could do to avoid the disasters he had predicted. He replied:

"Get Bobby Seale out of jail. First things first. The man's life is worth more than a coral island or a redwood tree . . . there is a connection between the persecution of Bobby Seale and the panthers, the disintegrating coral islands and the junk (and "junk" is my translation, not Mr. Duskin's actual word) floating around Richmond."

Mr. Duskin used the same interview to attack everything in sight, including the President of the United States:

"The mutants have taken over the United States Government", he said. "Well, maybe Nixon isn't a mutant, but he's a neuter—neither man or woman. He's an android, a robot-man. He's without guilt for all his crimes. He's without emotional capacity, divorced from the whole moral tradition of civilization. After all, he grew up in Whittier and ingested smog with his mother's milk."

There is more—much more—and we need to do more than just read, or consume and accept, the publicity that groups represented by this type of extremist are putting out in our newspapers and on our radio and television stations. We need to examine every word, and question every statement, and attack every accusation until we have separated the real environmental issues from the phony issues that are being interlaced so cleverly.

California has done an excellent job in providing for the needs and the demands of her people, and she can continue that excellence, but only for so long as she has men and women to fight for all her people and not just for themselves.

It is up to each one of us to meet this challenge and we are going to have to do more than just meet it at the polls. The silent majority is very powerful once inside that polling booth but it hasn't made much headway on the streets. Either we get out there where the action is and use the truth we can prove to out-shout the shouters or we are going to find ourselves faced with an environment that man can't live in. If that happens, we are going to find succeeding generations blaming us for the degradation they have to live with. And, if we don't start doing something right now, we'll deserve every bit of that blame.

We may be the older generation, but we're the generation that fought our way out of the worst depression the world has ever known. We're the generation that fought and won a World War we didn't want and didn't create, and then turned around and fed, clothed, and housed all our fallen enemies. And, we're the generation that made it possible for our children to live a better life than any other generation before it had ever experienced, and receive a better education and a better chance at that life than had ever been possible before.

Now, if we could do all that, we've still got the backbone to handle a few revolutionaries who are playing with society as though it were their personal jigsaw puzzle.

I suggest we get started now. We've been patient too long.

VISIT SNEEDVILLE AND LEARN ABOUT MELUNGEONS

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, a splendid drama, "The Melungeon Story: Walk Toward the Sunset," is a major outdoor production in Sneedville, Tenn., Hancock County, which is in my congressional district.

The Melungeons pioneered the settlement of Newman's Ridge in Hancock County and the outdoor drama concerning their history is one of the most stirring stories ever told on an outdoor stage.

The Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel, a daily newspaper, sponsors a trip of the month and for July, the trip is to Sneedville and Hancock County for the outdoor drama. The trip is set for July 2, 3, and 4. A story concerning this trip appeared in the News-Sentinel on June 28, which briefly explains what is believed to be the history of the Melungeons, and I would like to submit it for the RECORD and urge everyone to see "Walk Toward the Sunset":

VISIT SNEEDVILLE AND LEARN ABOUT MELUNGEONS

(By Willard Yarbrough)

SNEEDVILLE, TENN.—The home of Monroe Collins isn't easily found, since he lives a distance from the main road, and it isn't easily reached either because four cattle gates block the private road on Lonnie Hugh Bowlin's farm.

The setting is picturesque. The farmhouse nestles in a bowl beside a small creek. Beside it runs Bunches Trace, a pioneer trail that crosses Clinch Mountain to the south just behind Collins' place. Knobs fore and aft remind of the Trail of the Lonesome Pine, not far away.

Collins wasn't home, explained pretty daughter Nadene, "he and Homer's down by the creek hunting groundhogs." One old groundhog was staked out on the lawn much like a cow, and had been caught by Collins along with two others. He pours water into their holes and forces them to surface.

"Papa!" yelled Nadene. "Somebody's here to see y'uns."

He and son Homer came quickly, glad to see visitors come to their isolated environment off the road between Treadway and Thorn Hill.

PEOPLE'S ORIGIN A MYSTERY

Monroe Collins is pure Melungeon and the fact that he lives across Clinch River from famed Melungeon Country—Newman's Ridge, Snake Hollow, Little Sycamore, Vardy and Blackwater—makes no difference.

The Melungeons are a living mystery. They live all over Hancock County, many of them professional and prosperous residents of county seat Sneedville.

They are copper-skinned, the men highly intelligent, the women beautiful, the children living dolls. Their origin is the mystery. Where did they come from. Were they Carthagenians? Phoenicians? Moors? Lost Tribe of Israel? Portuguese? How came they here?

They don't know. Monroe Collins doesn't know.

Nor does Mrs. Mattie Collins of near Sneedville, one of the oldest Melungeons of Hancock County. She turned 97 April 20.

But one thing is sure. The lovable Melungeons of Hancock have come into the 20th century. They aren't shy or evasive anymore, like to talk with strangers, offer hospitality to visitors.

This is why The News-Sentinel Trip of the Month for July is to Sneedville and Hancock County, the major attraction being the outdoor drama, "The Melungeon Story: Walk Toward the Sunset." The drama, described by Mark Sumner as a "miracle unto itself," tells the Melungeon story from its inception and the actors include Melungeons.

The Trip of the Month is set for July 2-3-4 and offers excitement and high adventure in a mountainous-valley county unspoiled by the march of industrialization. Only 1000 live in Sneedville, hardly 7000 in the county, according to the 1970 census first reports. The point is, News-Sentinel Trippers can have a fabulous time—and rewarding experience—coming here next Thursday, Friday and Saturday.

DRAMA BEGINS THURSDAY

The drama opens Thursday night and the first performance will be dedicated to Trippers. And here, where inflation has not infested a lovely land and people, a Tripper can have a ball on a small budget. There'll be an all-day horse-show and Rescue Squad demonstration July 4 (Saturday), ending with giant fireworks following the drama. Barbecue foods, as only Hancock Countians can prepare, will be served for a pittance. Overnight accommodations, both here and in area towns, may be arranged.

A major highlight will be a free bus tour of Melungeon Country—with a Melungeon guide and narrator!—which began during the 1969 Trip at the suggestion of the writer. This will be a two-hour tour.

There's too much to tell in this space about entertainment, but it includes Melungeon lectures at the courthouse, a display of medicinal herbs dug out of mountain soil by Melungeons and sold on the market, and Melungeon cemeteries that bear the trademark of graveports—much like carports—over the remembered dead.

But back to dark-eyed, witty, friendly, dark-skinned Monroe Collins. Yes, he eats groundhogs—but only in late fall when they are fat and juicy. Yes, he has a philosophy that sees him smiling through adversity.

Mrs. Dora Bowlin, president of the Hancock County Historical Association which stages "Walk Toward the Sunset," reminded Collins of a personal tragedy.

Not long ago, Collins drove up to his home in his old jalopy. Flames engulfed everything. And what did Monroe Collins say? "There's nothing I can do about it. Just take it easy." With that, Collins drove away and found a new home and furnishings on the Bowlin spread.

He doesn't get a penny from welfare, but may qualify July 1 for state old age assistance. He's 65 soon. No, he doesn't know about his ancestors; his father never talked about them. He has a garden. He hunts. He has nine children, all but one, Homer, gone from home. Nadene and pretty 2-year-old Susie are visiting now.

CAN'T STAND LEVEL LAND

Susie, with natural blond tresses, is typical of Melungeon children. One is dark-skinned, one is fair. Susie is fair. The Melungeon blood, according to researchers and experts on the subject, just doesn't mingle.

Homer is dark-skinned and intelligent. Nadene is dark-skinned and, like many Melungeon women, goes barefoot on the farm.

Why does Monroe Collins live in these hills? "Because I just love the mountains. I can't bear to stand on a lot of level land." Actually, the Melungeons of old left the valley and headed for the hills of Newman's Ridge when white settlers laid claims to their lands in the last century.

They don't have much, but owe nobody. They like jokes, like remembering old friends and family, and their humor is something to behold. Many of them don't worry about what they don't have, which means they don't fret about somebody taking their possessions.

Instead, Monroe Collins is bothered about the blight turning locust trees reddish-brown on Clinch Mountain, fears the locust will vanish like the chestnut tree.

Melungeons know each other well. So the writer went back across the ridge, from New Jersey Zinc operations and a neighborhood where Eunice Winstead Johns and husband Charlie live, to call on Mattie Collins—a distant kin of Monroe.

"Where did your grandfather come from?" Mrs. Collins was asked outright, in her small home reachable by a footbridge that spanned the creek on the Rogersville road.

FROM ACROSS WATERS

"He came from across the waters . . .," she said, but didn't know the country he came from. And how many grandchildren has she, this 97-year-old matriarch?

"She's got 42 grandchildren, 38 great-grandchildren and seven great-great-grandchildren," put in 22-year-old Beatrice, a grandchild herself and an actress in "Walk Toward the Sunset."

"Want to know something else?" Beatrice asked. "Granny threaded a needle for me the other day. And she doesn't even wear glasses!"

The second generation in this Melungeon household—all reddish-brown of skin—is Mrs. Minnie Collins, 51. She's Granny's daughter and Beatrice's mother.

The Melungeons—the word originates from a French word "melunge" which means mixture—have come out of "hiding" and now feel pride in their difference, thanks almost altogether to their drama which emphasizes discrimination their forebears suffered and News-Sentinel articles about their proud past.

Judge Lewis Shepherd discussed the Melungeons in his "Personal Memoirs." "In truth," he penned long ago, "these people belonged to a peculiar race, which settled in East Tennessee at an early day, and, in the vernacular of that country were known as "Melungeons" . . . It was proven by the tradition amongst them that they were descendants of the ancient Carthagenians; they were Phoenicians, who, after Carthage was conquered by the Romans and became a Roman province, emigrated across the Strait of Gibraltar, and settled in Portugal.

"They lived for many years and became quite numerous on the southern coast of Portugal, and from thence came the distinguished Venetian general, Othello, whom Shakespeare made immortal in his celebrated play, "The Moor of Venice.' They were the same people who fought the Romans so bravely and heroically in the Punic wars . . .

"About the time of our Revolutionary War, a considerable body of these people crossed the Atlantic and settled on the coast of South Carolina, near the North Carolina line, and they lived amongst the people of Carolina for a number of years . . ."

Later they "wandered across the mountains to Hancock County, East Tennessee. A few families drifted away from Hancock into other counties of East Tennessee, and now and then into the mountain section of Middle Tennessee. Some of them live in White, some in Grundy, and some in Franklin County. They seem to prefer living in a rough, mountainous and sparsely-settled country.

"One peculiarity of these people is that the dark color cannot be bred out of them; they do not miscegenate or blend in color."

MAY PREDATE COLUMBUS

One theory—and discoveries in South America in recent years seem to bear it out—is that the seafaring Phoenicians were blown off course in the Mediterranean Sea, thousands of years before Columbus discovered America, and wound up on American shores. Another is that a ship laden with Melungeons was taken by mutineers on the high seas and beached off the North Carolina coast. Still another is that the Melungeons are descendants of the Lost Colony of Roanoke, who mixed with Cherokees and Greeks, and migrated into our mountains to escape civilization and discrimination.

Even so, their eyes are not black like Indians but dark and squinty. There may be Cherokee blood somewhere, as witness some roundfaced Melungeons, but the purest stock remains without historic or genetic change—as witness Monroe Collins.

You can see and talk with these people—and they're anxious now to see and talk with you—during The N-S Trip of the Month here beginning Thursday.

ITEM 807 OF TARIFF SCHEDULES

HON. WILLIAM J. GREEN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. GREEN of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, item 807 of the Tariff Schedules of the United States has turned out to be a tax loophole for the export of U.S. production abroad. Most Americans do not understand item 807, but they know America needs jobs at decent standards and a better trade balance in 1970.

The attached material shows how item 807 works. The law merely provides that components shipped from the United States for assembly abroad may be reimported duty free on their return as part of an assembled product. For ex-

ample, parts of a TV set can be shipped to Haiti or Hong Kong, assembled, and only the value added—often only foreign labor—is charged a tariff on reentry. In time, the U.S. component is interspersed with other products until it becomes the smallest part of the import—as in the industrial countries of Germany, Sweden, and so forth.

The following material includes a letter from the General Assembly and Co. of San Juan, Puerto Rico, which shows how item 807 works in the lowest wage countries of the world and how big banks and firms promote this exploitation of labor.

It also includes newspaper clippings which show how people in these countries live and work and the kinds of benefits they receive, as well as the effects this method of bookkeeping under this transaction has on America's trade balance—with rich and poor countries alike.

Item 807 starts with assembly, with hand labor—moves to adding foreign product. It is a one-way street into the U.S. market for sweatshop labor in poor countries and sophisticated products in rich countries.

The United States has fostered policies of expanded trade for better living standards and building world markets. Item 807 merely promotes a competition between Hong Kong and Haiti for lower wage labor to serve this market—without building markets worldwide.

GENERAL ASSEMBLY & CO.
San Juan, Puerto Rico.

DEAR SIR: Our firm established in Haiti for 34 years in diversified business can probably save you ⅔ of your present labor cost on practically any assembly of components.

We are successfully assembling for many companies at present and are maintaining for one company a scheduled volume of 4 million items per month.

We are seeking companies who would like to reduce their labor overhead by ⅔ by assembling their products or components in Haiti with insured guarantees.

How it works. After we have visited you or you have sent us a sample (one finished item plus 12 unassembled items) plus (A) your average hourly wage; (B) estimated hourly overhead per labor hour; (C) average time it takes your worker to assemble one dozen items—we will give you an estimate or contract to produce what you are now assembling at roughly ⅔ less than your present cost (FOB Haiti).

How we do it. We receive your components through our New York or Miami "Forwarders." They take care of all the red tape both ways.

Air freight: Miami to Haiti, via Pan Am or Transcaribbean. 12 cents per lb. up to 1000 lbs. 8 cents per lb. over 1000 lbs.

By ship: New York to Haiti, via Grace Line. Per cubic ton (2000 lbs. or 40 cu. feet).

Upon receipt of your raw material:

1. Your products will be assembled and finished to meet your specifications as per your schedule by specially trained and skilled personnel. We maintain a quality control.

2. We ship the finished product collect to the U.S.A. via our forwarder who pays a duty of 28% of the Labor Cost only. (13% on electronic work).

3. We are paid by a manager check held by the Royal Bank of Canada in Haiti against certification that your finished product has been shipped back to you.

4. As we have obtained from the Haitian Government a franchise to manufacture for re-export, there are no local taxes or duties on raw materials or equipment.

5. Guarantees—All equipment and raw material will remain your property at all times and will be covered fully by U.S. Insurance companies established in Haiti. In case of damage or loss you are the beneficiary. Additional coverage or verification of the above can be obtained from U.S.-F.C.I.A. (Foreign Credit Insurance Association) created to help U.S. Businessmen obtain export credit and financing on assembly of products in low cost labor areas. This helps put you on a parity with foreign competition. They are located at 250 Broadway, New York, New York 10007.

Our References are:

First of all our present customers whose names and addresses we will furnish upon request.

United States Embassy, Port-au-Prince, Haiti—Attn. David Reynolds, Esq. or Mr. Andrew Tangalos.

First National Bank of Miami, Miami, Florida—Attn. Mr. J. Robert Devaux, Vice Pres. Latin American Div.

Royal Bank of Canada, Port-au-Prince, Haiti—Attn. The Manager or Mr. Raymond Thomas, Asst. Mgr.

So far, neither Hong Kong or Taiwan can compete with the $80 odd dollar executive trip to Haiti, the lower and faster freight rate, the proximity and friendly interest Haiti has in the U.S. In addition to your own savings you will be helping a developing country.

Please give us an interview with your firm.

Name _____
Address _____
Date_____ Time_____ Place_____

and a brief description of the assembly we might do for you. See check list page 1, paragraph 4. (To save time please answer here and return).

Yours sincerely,
JOHN A. FRANCISCUS,
Vice President,
New Products Division.

[From the New York Times, May 24, 1970]

RELAXATION OF RESTRICTIONS ON FOREIGN AID TO HAITI IS EXPECTED BY U.S. OFFICIALS IN PORT AU PRINCE

(By Juan de Onis)

PORT AU PRINCE, HAITI, May 23.—A relaxation of the virtual blockade of foreign economic aid to the regime of President Francois Duvalier is expected soon by United States officials here.

A first result of a more cooperative approach toward the Haitian dictatorship could be the granting of a $5.5-million loan by the Inter-American Development Bank to expand the water supply in this capital.

The loan has been held up because of opposition by the United States. The technical reason is that Haiti has fallen behind in paying a $1.5-million debt to the United States Export-Import bank.

The United States Ambassador, Clinton Knox, who has found Haitian officials rather inaccessible since coming here a year ago, said that an agreement in principle had been reached for the Haitian Central Bank to begin paying off the bank debts.

The major international lending institutions that provide development capital in Latin America tend to coordinate their positions, and Haiti has been in "bad risk" category ever since 1963, when President John F. Kennedy reportedly authorized the United States Central Intelligence Agency to work with Haitian exiles to bring down Mr. Duvalier. United States policy became neutral within a year, relations have been cold since then.

The repressive nature of the 13-year-old Duvalier regime, which has imprisoned and killed hundreds of political opponents, and the financial irregularities of the administration shut off nearly all development aid here.

Various feeble attempts to overthrow Dr. Duvalier have failed in the last three years. The most recent was a revolt last month by the small Haitian Coast Guard, the country's only naval force.

After firing about 50 small cannon rounds at the Presidential Palace, three rebel cutters sailed away to take asylum in the United States of 119 officers and men aboard, only one returned here, saying he had known nothing of the rebels' plans.

FORMER OFFICIALS HELD

Rameau Estimé, former Minister of Justice, and Col. Kesner Blain, former Army quartermaster, are under detention for questioning on the most recent plot.

Diplomatic sources said 22 persons had taken diplomatic asylum and were still in Latin American embassies, including the wife and daughter of Col. Octave Cayard, who was the Coast Guard commander.

The same sources said there had been no confirmed reports of killings of members of the families of the 118 rebel Coast Guardsmen, although some homes had been ransacked by officially condoned looters.

The political opposition is not considered strong enough to provoke a real crisis for the 63-year-old Mr. Duvalier, who has declared himself President for life.

An International Monetary Fund group made a survey here last month and reportedly found budget and taxation administration improved. It has recommended a stand-by balance-of-payments loan for Haiti.

ROCKEFELLER FAVORED AID

Governor Rockefeller of New York, who toured Latin America last year for President Nixon, has recommended that United States aid be resumed.

Ambassador Knox said in an interview that he would recommend that the United States finance an agricultural credit program.

The per capita income for Haiti's four million people is $75 a year, the lowest in Latin America, three-quarters of the people live off farming, fishing and forestry.

Mr. Knox said that an agricultural credit program would help relieve rural poverty and increase food production, which is primitive and inadequate.

A United States loan would also be symbolic of a new official attitude toward Dr. Duvalier.

There has been growing private investment here by United States enterprises that have found Haiti's abundant unskilled labor supply, ready to work at less than $2 a day, a major attraction.

Nearly 100 companies have been set up here in the last two years, mainly with United States capital, to turn out baseballs, electronic devices, hand-assembled tools, shoes, and apparel, using materials brought here from the United States. The products are sold primarily in the United States market.

[From the Business International, Jan. 31, 1969]

AS KOREAN LABOR COSTS SOAR, U.S. FIRM QUITS

International companies with an eye on investing in South Korea to tap its low-cost, easily trained labor may have to take a second look. Labor union problems and rapidly rising wages are fast eroding the clear labor advantages Korea once had over such rival Asian investment sites as Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Singapore. One foreign investor has already pulled out, and others are holding up expansion plans or investing elsewhere. Korean wages are still low, but increases of 15% to 30% have not been unusual in the past couple of years, and the already-extensive fringe benefits have increased as well. The Korean Government is clearly concerned, and is taking steps to solve labor difficulties and clear other obstacles to foreign investment.

The most dramatic evidence of serious labor trouble is the recent decision of Oak Electro/Netics Corp (OE/N) of the US to close down its $2.3 million electronic components plant near Seoul and to move its operations to OE/N's Hong Kong plant. OE/N's Korean employees, organized by the Metal Workers Union, demanded wage hikes of 60% in 1969 over 1968. The increase would have put Korean wages on a par with or above Hong Kong wages, and the prospect of future demands of the same magnitude made the outlook for economic operations in Korea very dim.

Fairchild, however, has signed a new labor contract and is doubling its plant size and labor force.

OE/N was one of ten US companies—including Motorola, Fairchild Semiconductor, Signetics Corp (a subsidiary of Corning Glass), and Applied Magnetics Corp—that had invested a total of nearly $15 million in electronics ventures in Korea since 1965, making the electronics industry an important user of labor and a significant new foreign exchange earner. The Oak Electro/Netics pullout, by calling the union's bluff and spurring the Government to take action against strikes and excessive wage demands, may benefit the companies still there. Employees of the other US firms have become less aggressive in their demands for fear of losing their jobs. And the Economic Planning Board (EPB) has ruled that unauthorized strikes against foreign-owned companies will be considered illegal, as against the public interest. The EPB has already been instrumental in settling a slowdown at Signetics.

Along with its intervention in labor disputes with foreign companies, the Government has promised to ease several other problems for foreign investors. The Foreign Capital Investment Law is being revised to waive the business tax on products sold in the Korean market (now 0.3–0.7% of gross receipts) for firms established with foreign capital. In addition, the Government intends to simplify procedures for importing machinery and raw materials through bonded warehouses and bonded processing systems, and to cut red tape on the issuance of licenses for plant construction and for the exit and entry of foreign nationals concerned with foreign investments. It also promises to aid foreign investors in obtaining telephone and power facilities.

While all the tax and other incentives the Korean Government offers to foreign companies are helpful in the short run, they may be creating a less favorable climate for foreign investment in the future. All these concessions—including the standard tax holiday incentives—are available *only to foreign investors*. In joint ventures, they are granted only in proportion to the foreign equity in the enterprise. There have already been some press attacks on the special status provided to foreign investors with respect to labor disputes, partly on grounds that US firms allegedly pay lower wages on average than Korean firms in the electrical field. This may be true to the degree that foreign firms in electronics hire female workers almost exclusively, and female wages average less than male wages. In any case, the resentment against special treatment of foreign firms in labor relations spells further labor difficulties, and the resentment may spread to other concessions.

[From the New York Times, May 12, 1970]

SOUTH KOREA'S ECONOMY BOOMING WITH CHEAP LABOR

(By Philip Shabecoff)

PUSAN, SOUTH KOREA, April 24.—Running 24 hours a day on three shifts, the big Tong Myung plywood factory in this port is a fitting symbol of South Korea's increasingly vital economy.

It also is a vivid example of how the Korean boom is supported by the willingness of South Korean workers to work long hours for little pay under harsh and sometimes dehumanizing conditions.

Tong Myung has a capacity of 140 million square feet a month and is said to be the world's biggest plywood producer.

Starting from no exports a decade ago, it now ships nearly $30-million worth of processed wood abroad annually—exports that play a key role in South Korea's rapid economic expansion.

Inside the cavernous plant, it is dimly lit, dank, and evil-smelling.

The air is filled with fine sawdust and reeks of formalin fumes. A visitor's eyes begin to burn and water uncontrollably within a few minutes.

The factory's 5,000 workers, many of them young girls, work 10 or 11 hours a day, six days a week. The work is hard and monotonous.

For their labor, the girls working at Tong Myung receive about $32 a month. Men, who do heavier work, get about $48 a month.

Jhong Jae Young, an 18-year-old girl with broad, pink cheeks and shy black eyes, joined the factory two months ago and works as a checker.

GRATEFUL FOR JOB

Pusan is far from her home in Chinju, but her father is dead and she had to help her mother and seven brothers and sisters.

Half of her $32 monthly wage she sends home and another $12 goes for her room and meals at a boarding house. The remaining $4 is for clothes and other personal items.

"The work is not so hard," she said. "I am glad that I can earn money."

What did she do for fun? she was asked. Dance? Go to the movies?

"No," she said, her voice barely above a whisper. "Nothing."

South Korea's evolving economic miracle is built largely upon the willing shoulders of workers such as Jhong Jae Young.

A rugged, mountainous land with few natural resources, Korea's most valuable commodity is manpower.

It is cheap labor, of course—cheap enough to produce low-cost products for competitive export markets and cheap enough to attract foreign manufacturers to set up plants here.

CONDITIONS OF LABOR

But it is also labor that is being increasingly recognized for its intelligence, ability to learn, literacy and capacity for hard work amid conditions that would be unacceptable in most industrialized countries.

George A. Needham, representative director of the Motorola Company's electronic component assembly plant on the outskirts of Seoul, told visitors to the bright, modern factory that total production costs in Korea were one-tenth of costs for similar production at Motorola's plant in Phoenix, Ariz.

He also noted that it took two weeks less time to train Korean girls to assemble semiconductors and transistors than to teach American girls the same job.

MOTIVATION FOUND

"The girls here are more motivated," explained Mr. Needham. "Life is tough in this country. These people really need this work."

South Korea's energetic workers have spurred an economic boom that has seen the nation's gross national product—the value of all goods and services—jump from $2.3-billion to $6.1-billion between 1959 and 1969.

In the last five years, Korea's GNP has grown by an average annual rate of 12.6 per cent, a rate exceeded not even by the vibrant Japanese economy.

But South Korea still is not a rich country. Per capita GNP is only $195 a year for the country's 31 million people.

Although South Korea's workers undoubtedly have improved their lot in recent years as far as material existence is concerned, they seem to have lost something, as well.

STUDIED IN AMERICA

Young Ok Ahn is a 38-year-old chemical engineer who studied in the United States and, like many other Korean scientists who could not have research facilities or a suitable salary in Korea, remained in America.

[From the Washington Daily News, June 22, 1970]

COZY PARTNERS: U.S. FIRMS, HAITI

(By Virginia Prewett)

Haiti's "Papa Doc" Duvalier and U.S. businessmen engaged in so-called "runaway" manufacturing have a cozy situation going in Haiti, say U.S. labor sources. And the AFL–CIO is pressing a campaign to expose their exploitation of Haitian workers under the repressive Duvalier dictatorship.

In the past two years, a number of U.S. manufacturers have started sending semi-manufactured components to Haiti for finnishing there by Haiti's very cheap, and strictly controlled, workers. The latter put in a 48-hour week for from 70-cents a day to "as high as" $2 a day.

The assembled and finished articles are shipped back to the U.S., paying a tariff on only 28 per cent on the labor costs.

"When these products are sold at U.S. prices, they yield a tremendous profit," says Andrew McLellan, AFL–CIO Latin American Representative. "Papa Doc has a finger in everything in Haiti and tho I don't know how much of the gravy he's getting, obviously he is getting his share."

The U.S. government stopped making sizeable development loans to Haiti under President Kennedy because Duvalier's political machine grafted so much of the money. It has been an open secret for years that to operate in Haiti, you must pay off Papa Doc.

The AFL–CIO has in its files letters from Haiti soliciting U.S. businessmen to join Haiti's new manufacturing community and they cite the low cost of labor and the local suppression of strikes as major attractions. There are no unions in Haiti.

One circular letter, from the General Assembly Co., of San Juan, Puerto Rico, reports it is successfully assembling in Haiti for one U.S. company alone over four million units monthly. It promises to save the U.S. manufacturer two-thirds of his labor costs and all red tape troubles. The firm's letterhead says "Anything by hand—electronic components, casetts, valves, switches, systems, woodworking, sewing, etc."

SPORTS EQUIPMENT

In addition to electronics, Haiti is today turning out large quantities of baseballs and bats. It is rapidly becoming the leading shoe manufacturing center in the Caribbean. All components are shipped in. For example, tho Haiti grows palms, the woven palm straps for sandals are shipped in. Haitians assemble imported parts on imported machinery.

Since the manufacturers do not sell in Haiti, they pay no Haitian profits tax. All materials come in duty free and pay a tiny export tax. One manufacturer revealed that the export duty on a 3,000 shipment of shoes was $30. U.S. import duties are minimal, since only the cost of Haitian labor is taxed.

But a hefty "invisible" tax or kick-back goes directly to Papa Doc, according to the AFL–CIO. And this helps support the terror machinery that keeps Haitian labor docile and cheap.

COMPANIES INVOLVED

Commerce Department sources report a number of firms in Haiti are operating for U.S. principals. There was no information to what extent, if any, these companies are engaged in the practices described here.

They include the Patrick Blanchet Co., a

subsidiary of Sutton Gold Co. of New York City; the Delmas Mfg. Co. a subsidiary of The Lady Marlene Brasiere Co. of New York, and Alan Turnier & Simon Grisman, with headquarters in Yonkers, N.Y. are making women's garments, embroidered and other; the Excel Electric Co. owned by Donald Ensigh of Plantation Road, Plantation, Fla. makes electric coils; and the United Mfg. Co., a subsidiary of the Caribbean Shoe Co. of Miami, Fla, makes shoes.

Listed as "making slugs for and sewing softballs and baseballs" are: the Hartier Mfg. Co., subsidiary of the Lannon Mfg. Co. of Tullahoma, Tenn.; and Claud Martin Jr. Co., subsidiary of Dudley Sports of Long Island, N.Y.; the Rex Mfg. Co. with headquarters in Chicago; the Tober Co. with headquarters in Rockville, Conn.; and Max Villard, subsidiary of H. Conwood & Sons of Natick, Mass.

[From the San Juan Star, June 15, 1969]

AMERICAN INVESTORS TURNING TO BACKWARD HAITI

PORT AU PRINCE, HAITI (AP)—Barefoot, rags and all, backward Haiti has made it into the electronics age and even into U.S. minor league baseball.

Television components are being made here by people who've never seen a television program. There's only one TV station, with a handful of sets in relation to the 4½ million population.

Others who have never watched a baseball game—the sport isn't played here—are making baseballs and softballs.

This little Caribbean republic, where 85 per cent of the people go about barefoot, may soon become the sandal and shoemaking capital of the Caribbean.

All this is because the industrial era has sort of backed up into the 18th century where Haiti got mired some time ago.

American investors, plagued by taxes and labor costs at home, are turning to Haiti where the minimum daily wage is 70 cents, labor unions are nonexistent and the work week runs to 48 hours. There are also tax and import duty exemptions and the U.S. market is almost next door—two jet hours to Miami, 3½ to New York.

Another factor, says Andy Andersen, president of Allied Industries, maker of electronics components, "is the Haitian. He's dexterous and willing to work."

Like most of the newer light industries operating in Haiti, Andersen's company is an assembler rather than manufacturer. Almost all raw material, even decorative woven palm strips for sandals, are imported. The Haitians put the imported parts together, using imported machinery.

These are the so-called "transformation" industries that are moving out of the United States to nearby countries—Mexico, Puerto Rico, Haiti—to escape the high domestic costs of hand labor.

Since the companies don't sell their products locally, there are no profits to tax. Raw material comes in duty free and the assembled goods pay a minimal export levy. On a $30,000 shipment of sandals, the duty will run to about $30, says one maker. U.S. import duties are also minimal because American-made components are used in the final product.

Besides TV components, baseballs, softballs, shoes and sandals, local plants are turning out toys, handbags, shirts, dresses and other garments for the U.S. market.

Andersen, 45, son of German immigrants who settled here when he was 2 years old, gave up a travel service business to get into electronics. His plant employs 110 people, almost all women, who daily turn out about 50,000 circuit breakers, transformers, variable resistors and other components for American TV makers.

He pays his employes $2 a day, he says, "because you can't get the kind of help we need for the minimum wage." That is an adequate income, he says, in a country where living costs are low. A hotel clerk comments that a small family "might just make it on $2 a day, but it's going to mean eating a lot of mangoes to stay alive."

Another German immigrant, Hugo Epstein, 50, manages the United Shoe Manufacturing Co., subsidiary of a Miami, Fla. firm, which turns out about 7,000 pairs of shoes and sandals a day. The sandals sell for $6 or more a pair in the United States.

"The equipment to go to 80,000 pairs a day is being installed," Epstein said, making it one of the biggest operations in the Caribbean. The plant employs 500 men and women and the average wage is $2.50.

Four years ago, Jules Tomar, 49, of Ventnor, N.J., was one of three baseball makers in Haiti. Now there are seven.

The inner parts of baseballs and softballs, wound by machines that require a minimum of human attention, are shipped here from Puerto Rico. Precut horsehide baseball covers, also imported, are handstitched on the balls by Haitian women.

The balls are for use in minor leagues and lower categories. Tomar says his plant is capable of turning out balls of major league quality, but the major leagues "with all their American traditions wouldn't stand for using a foreign-made ball."

The plants are part of a total U.S. investment in Haiti whose replacement value is estimated at $50 million.

The size of the payrolls is miniscule in terms of the staggering national needs, but they represent a respite for a people whose average income has now fallen below $70 a year.

ITEM 807 STATISTICAL TRENDS

Reported statistics on item 807 are employed to compare "imports" and "exports." But item 807 operations are a freakish kind of "trade," because the exchange usually takes place within a single corporation or its affiliates. The "trade" is more like "taking in your own washing" than "selling competitively in world markets." Thus the bulk of item 807 transactions are the reverse of "free market competition in international trade between companies or countries." By definition, the products are shipped out of the U.S. and re-imported. "Competition" between nations or between companies in different nations is therefore a false issue. Reported values depend on the company's own estimates—both for imports and exports—not on estimates by competitors from different nations.

1. Even if the available data are used, however, *there is a worsening trend in the U.S. trade balance under this item, a loss of about $809 million in item 807 trade since 1965, a worsening from —$501.2 million in 1965 to —$1.3 million in 1969.*

[In millions]

1965:	
Imports	—$577.4
Exports	76.2
Balance of imports	501.2

From 1965 to 1967, loss of $289.9 million; 1967 to 1969, loss of $524.7 million.

1967:	
Imports	—$931.7
Exports	146.6
Balance of imports	—785.1

From 1965 to 1969, loss of $808.6 million.

1969:	
Imports	—$1,649.2
Exports	339.4
Balance of imports	—1,309.8

2. *Rapid loss in the balance from the lowest wage countries since 1965:*

Mexico—up from —$1.8 million in 1965 to —$49.4 million in 1969.

Hong Kong—up from —$9 million in 1965 to —$40.0 million in 1969.

Other (mostly Caribbean, Far Eastern & Latin American countries)—up from —$17.9 million in 1965 to —$57.7 million in 1969.

3. *U.S. "Exports" and Balance of Foreign Value Imported Show Rising Trend Against U.S.:*

[In millions of dollars]

	U.S. "exports"	Balance of foreign value [1]
1965	$76.2	—$501.2
1966	113.3	—776.5
1967	146.6	—785.1
1968	225.3	—1,206.7
1969	339.4	—1,309.8

[1] All 807 imports less "U.S." parts.

4. *U.S. Share in Total Value is Highest Where Labor Cost is Imported.*

Example of this is Mexico. U.S. content in item 807 imports in 1969 was 66%. That means about 44% of what came in was 30–40 cent an hour Mexican labor. Other countries have even lower wages, but no U.S. firm is required to report to the U.S. government actual wages paid abroad, unless a special questionnaire is devised with industry help.

5. *Highest Proportion of Trade is in Mechanical, Electrical and Transportation Equipment.*

Example: in 1967 total 807 imports were $931.7 million; of this auto total was $511.8 million; of this U.S. value was $8.3 million.

In 1969 Total 807 imports were $1,649.2 million; of this auto total was $720.6 million; of this U.S. value was $4.2 million.

Query: Should there be a special tariff arrangement for $4.2 million worth of U.S. exports that are sent out and returned to the U.S. as part of a foreign car?

6. Tax Savings or Duty Savings on Item 807 Imports Amounts to 2.6% or the total of $42 million among all of the companies involved in 1969. In 1968, the amount was 2% of total value or about $24 million. Thus U.S. workers can pay higher taxes while firms escape having to pay duty, while jobs are being exported.

HELEN VLACHOS, GREEK PATRIOT

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, recently I had the privilege of meeting Mrs. Helen Vlachos, a charming and courageous woman, one of the "small, heroic minority" of Greek citizens working for the restoration of democracy in Greece. Newspaper accounts of her visit to Washington to promote her book, "House Arrest," reveal a woman of sharp wit and unflinching integrity. I am putting several of these stories, together with earlier accounts, in the RECORD and would like to call my colleagues' attention to her comments on how the Greek people and the world view the continuing U.S. support of the military junta. The close vote in the Senate yesterday on the amendment to cut off military aid to Greece indicates the growing appreciation in Congress of the self-damaging aspect of U.S. policy in Greece. I hope the administration will take note and will reassess its support of the junta accordingly.

The stories referred to follow:

[From the Washington Post, June 14, 1970]

A PUBLISHER WITH A SINGLE PAGE

(By Judith Martin)

All her life, Helen Vlachos was used to having a powerful newspaper in which to express her opinions. She was a contributor to and a film critic on her father's paper, Kathimerini, in Athens, Greece, and succeeded him as its editor and publisher while continuing to be a columnist.

Now, living in exile three years after she closed down her paper in protest against the Greek military takeover, she expresses herself through European newspaper and magazine articles, radio broadcasts, a book, "House Arrest," which has just been published, and word of mouth.

"It's just as if I had a newspaper," she said. "The only thing is that now I'm always publishing the same page, and its rather boring."

She says that while a smile which makes it clear that she is not tiring of her passion to free Greece from its present rule—but that she is only sorry she has to keep boring foreigners with the story of Greece's plight when there are so many other interesting topics to discuss.

And it must be boring to keep hearing the same cliche charges and questions about Greece, as she travels around America. (She came here to address the American Association of Newspaper Editors to promote her book, which is the story of how she was placed under house arrest in Athens and of her escape, to write about America for a newspaper syndicate, and to enlist the help of American politicians and newspapermen in the Greek cause.)

First there is always the question of whether the coup was necessary to prevent Greece from going Communist.

"No one's ever going to make me into a Communist," said Mrs. Vlachos, who has always been a staunch and powerful supporter of the conservative element in Greek politics.

"'I'm a real anti-Communist, not like you,' I tell people. I don't want to be put in a cage, whether it's a red cage or a blue cage. I don't want people saying, 'Mrs. Vlachos, we're going to put you in a blue cage, and that will secure you from ever getting into a red cage.'

"And then they say, 'It is not the same thing.' All right, I accept that leprosy is worse than cholera, but I don't care to have either."

Then there is the question of how the Greeks, who staunchly resisted attempts to subjugate them throughout history, have tolerated the present government if they find it so unpalatable.

"That's like asking the passengers of a plane why they let it be hijacked. It's not because they didn't like the pilot and wanted someone else to try. And there is a great irony in the people who are arming the oppressors asking why don't people rise up and defeat the oppressors. I have also been asked by Americans why we don't make the situation worse, so we get in your urgent box.

"There is as much resistance from the Greek people now as there was when the Germans were there—and there was less collaboration in Greece than anywhere else. There is always a small, heroic minority, while eighty per cent of the people are not in a position to hit anyone over the head. If there were not a strong resistance—why is there still martial law and a state of seige? Who is the enemy? The enemy is the Greek people."

Mrs. Vlachos shut down her newspaper (in addition to the powerful Kathimerini, she had an afternoon paper, Messimvrini, which was started in 1962) because she—alone of publishers in the whole political spectrum—refused to submit to press censorship. For five months, she used her office and influence to maintain a sort of talking newspaper briefing foreign correspondents and denouncing the regime on radio and television.

Then she and her husband, a retired naval officer, were put under house arrest in their Athens apartment. She was alternately begged to re-open her paper, and charged with insulting the government.

After King Constantine's abortive attempt to regain the government, Mrs. Vlachos and her husband decided that escape was the only answer, and she sneaked out of the country with dyed hair and false papers. Her husband, Constantine Loundras (she has always retained her maiden name, but uses the title of "Mrs."), remained behind to look after the interests of their relatives and former employes.

She bases herself in London because she feels that Europe is more responsive to her cause, and because she is able from there, to broadcast Greek news (obtained from emigres and exiles) in Greek to Greece. The Voice of America is not a possible avenue, she said, because "no one in Greece knows the wave length or the time—it's the Void of America, the way the Voice of Truth from Moscow tells only lies."

But the real problem, she believes, is the United States which has recognized and supported the military junta.

"If you knew the anti-Americanism you have unleashed in the world," she said. "It's just as Prague was the last straw for people who had known before that the Soviets were repressive, but couldn't quite swallow that. Europeans feel that way about Greece. There are people who always knew that America supported any military junta that pretended to be anti-Communist—but this they can't quite take.

"It does much more harm to the image of America in the rest of the world than it is doing to Greece."

And yet she finds American people sympathetic and American newspapers "magnificent—they give us perhaps false hope. But the people who make the policies—the Pentajunta, we call it in Greece—go right ahead with their policies.

"In Greece, we have a new saying: Even the ears have walls."

[From the Washington Star, June 10, 1970]

GREEK JOURNALIST

(By Barbara Kober)

A leading Greek journalist yesterday predicted that Italy will shortly be taken over by a right wing coup "just as her own country was in 1967."

And it will be partly the fault of the United States, said Helen Vlachos, who fled her homeland for London after being placed under house arrest in Greece for bucking censorship.

"The extreme Italian right at this moment knows it will probably get American help just as Greece did," Mrs. Vlachos declared in an interview during her visit here to promote her book, "House Arrest."

BITTERNESS

With an edge of bitterness toward the United States for its tacit support of the military junta in Greece, the editor and publisher of the suspended Athens newspaper Kathimerini claims the United States is "the only important ally of the junta in the whole world."

But, she added, not the entire U.S. administration supports the colonels. Congress does not support it, she said.

She characterized the regime as "absolutely inefficient in every kind of way except keeping a police state."

And she further described the colonels as "representatives of nothing but themselves and big business."

Mrs. Vlachos insists that if the junta would submit itself to "really free" elections, it would get no more than eight percent of the vote.

ACCUSES UNITED STATES

She outspokenly accuses the Pentagon of continuing to send arms to the Greek militarists—even though officially arms shipments have been shut off—"on the sly, by the side entrance."

Though she is here primarily to promote her book—the story of the military takeover, her confinement to her home overlooking the Acropolis and her escape to London—Mrs. Vlachos is conferring with several members of Congress, hopes to see officials of the State Department and has asked for a meeting with Vice President Agnew.

Of her future, she is confident that she will one day return to Greece under a democratic government.

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 23, 1967]

HOW MRS. VLACHOS ESCAPED

(By Alfred Friendly)

LONDON. Dec. 22—Helen Vlachos, renowned conservative Greek newspaper publisher, has been granted permission to remain temporarily in Britain, a Home Office spokesman announced Friday.

She slipped her Athens guard a week ago and made her way to London Thursday night.

Petite but tough-minded, Mrs. Vlachos had been under house arrest in Athens since Oct. 4. She told a news conference here today that the tension of waiting for the other shoe to fall—being brought to trial on charges of insulting the junta government and of disobeying military orders—led to her decision to escape.

THE GETAWAY

Deliberately vague about the details, Mrs. Vlachos intimated that her trip to London, once she had made her getaway from her sixth-floor Athens apartment, was negotiated on a false passport.

She related that she and her husband, a retired naval officer, had studied the habits of her two guards for three months. One was posted outside her door, the other on the street below. The former was accustomed to take the elevator down, when the guard was changed or in order to buy cigarettes.

On one of those occasions, she slipped out, walked down three flights, took the elevator to the ground floor and passed the street guard without looking at him.

The previous day, she had trimmed her grey hair and worked brown dye into it with a toothbrush. With contact lenses replacing her dark hornrimmed glasses, the disguise was apparently good enough not to attract attention.

She walked two blocks to await a pickup car. It was four minutes late, "the longest four minutes I can remember."

At her press conference, the 55-year-old proprietor of two newspapers and a magazine expressed concern over possible reprisals against her husband and their two sons, one 19 and the other 20. Later however, she expressed relief that the government had indicated from Athens that her husband would be allowed to leave the country.

Col. George Ladas, secretary general of the Ministry of Public Order, also indicated in Athens that the government did not contemplate depriving Mrs. Vlachos of her citizenship or confiscating her property. [The Ministry said she was released from arrest Friday and was free to leave, Associated Press reported from Athens.]

Observers here, however, were dubious whether that resolve would hold if she becomes active in speaking or writing against the government.

ANTI-JUNTA COMMENTS

Mrs. Vlachos had shut down her publications after the April 21 coup that brought the junta to power. She is said to have explained to a friend that she refused to publish under the junta's censorship rules because, having made a moral commitment

to her readers to serve them information, she would not breach it by delivering a daily dish of manure instead.

In an interview with a British reporter today, Mrs. Vlachos described the attempted countercoup by King Constantine as "brave but foolish."

"It is to his credit that he failed," she added. "I don't think kings are for conspiracy."

Mr. Vlachos said she was uncertain about her immediate plans, but hoped some day to return to Greece and publish her papers.

She added, "I don't want to start being a fanatic here. I also feel that with the security here it is not dangerous any more to speak against people. It is not half as much fun."

[From the New York Times, Sept. 28, 1967]

GREECE'S DEFIANT PUBLISHER

"Among all the editors in Greece, there was one man—who turned out to be a woman," an Athenian journalist remarked recently.

That woman was Mrs. Helen Vlachos, who stopped publication of her two daily newspapers and weekly picture magazine in Athens rather than submit to censorship by the military junta ruling Greece. Censorship, she said, made it "totally and absolutely impossible" to continue publishing.

That was in keeping with her philosophy, or long before the April coup she had declared she would never publish under censorship.

The decision has proved costly to her. Not only has she lost the income from the publications, but also she has been ordered by a court in Athens to pay the 385 employes she dismissed.

Mrs. Vlachos, a gray-haired and well groomed woman of 55, seems unworried, even though she faces a possible jail sentence of three years for "insulting authorities" and five years for "disobeying a military order."

Yesterday morning, when two plainsclothes security policemen arrived to arrest her, she turned to the Swedish journalist who was interviewing her and remarked calmly: "And now, my dear colleague, you've got yourself a scoop."

FATHER WAS OFTEN JAILED

Journalism and the serving of prison sentences for defiance of the Government are a Vlachos family tradition. Her father, George, who founded the newspaper Kathimerini, or Daily, was often in prison for political reasons. The police turned up so often at the house that Helen's Scottish governess took to flying the Union Jack for extraterritorial protection.

Kathimerini is one of the papers Mrs. Vlachos closed. The other was Messimvrini, or Noon, and the picture magazine, the first of its kind in Greece, was called Ikones, or Pictures.

Helen Vlachos was born in Athens on Dec. 18, 1911. Because of the unsettled political atmosphere in Greece she was sent abroad to complete her studies. After her return, she went to work for her father as a bookkeeper, but at 23 she became a reporter.

She made a six-month trip to the Far East and published her impressions in Kathimerini. On other assignments she went to Berlin for the Olympics, and to Libya, where she met Mussolini. In Greece she covered every disaster from floods to earthquakes.

PAPER CARRIED HER COLUMN

The Nazis seized the Vlachos paper, after they invaded in 1941, but George Vlachos refused to cooperate with them. When Kathimerini reappeared as a free paper in February, 1945, it carried a regular front-page column by Helen.

She kept giving her opinion on what was wrong with the Greeks, and the column became increasingly popular. In 1951, when her father died, she took over.

In that year, Mrs. Vlachos married Constantine Loundras, her second husband, who was a wartime naval hero; he manages her finances. Little is known of Mrs. Vlachos' first husband, from whom she was divorced.

In 1955 she founded Ikones, which was selling 50,000 copies at the time she closed it, and in 1961 she started Messimvrini. With a circulation of 80,000, it was Greece's second largest daily. Kathimerini, with 50,000, was in fifth place. The political viewpoint of the papers was conservative.

In normal times Mrs. Vlachos and her husband—they have no children—spend a summer month at their home at Mykonos, where she has had many notable guests, among them Winston Churchill and John F. Kennedy. In Athens they live in a penthouse about three blocks from the royal palace.

Last week Mrs. Vlachos told foreign colleagues that since the coup she has always kept a suitcase handy.

"If I am arrested," she added, "please note: My favorite dish is meatballs."

CHICAGO'S AIR POLLUTION LAWS TAKE EFFECT JULY 1, 1970

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Chicago has adopted some of the strongest air pollution control ordinances in the United States, and they go into effect today.

Hereafter, violators will be fined and possibly imprisoned for disregarding these new laws.

In order to illustrate the scope of these laws and their possible application to other American cities, I am enclosing a series of questions and answers about the new laws in the RECORD today.

Mr. Speaker, this information follows:

COLOR THE SKY BLUE—OBSERVE CHICAGO'S NEW AIR POLLUTION CONTROL LAWS EFFECTIVE JULY 1, 1970

Chicago's new air pollution control laws are effective July 1, 1970. Observance of these laws depends upon an informed citizenry. These questions and answers are prepared for your information.

Q. What can I burn in my boiler (furnace)?

A. Fuel that meets the new ordinance regarding sulfur limitations.

Q. If I can't burn garbage in my boiler (furnace), what can I do with it?

A. Dispose of your garbage by using: (1) the city service if you now receive it, (2) an established scavenger service or (3) an incinerator which has a valid certificate of operation from the Department of Environmental Control.

Q. How do I get a certificate of operation for a new incinerator or boiler?

A. Before installing new equipment, the manufacturer or contractor gets installation permit from the Department of Environmental Control. When equipment is operating, the manufacturer (contractor) or owner notifies the Department of Environmental Control. If equipment meets code requirements, a certificate of operation valid for one year is issued.

Q. Is there a fee for such services?

A. Yes, see fee schedule on back fold.

Q. What are the annual inspection fees?

A. Fees range from $5 to $20 depending on type and size of equipment.

Q. Can I burn garbage in an incinerator that is now new?

A. Yes, if it has a valid certificate of operation.

Q. If my incinerator does not meet standards for a certificate of operation, how do I bring it into compliance?

A. Ask the manufacturer if modifications can be made to meet present requirements.

Q. May I burn leaves outdoors?

A. No, but you may burn them in an incinerator which has a valid certificate of operation.

Q. Other than burning leaves in an incinerator how else may I get rid of them?

A. They should be placed in an *enclosed* container. They will be picked up with normal garbage collection.

Q. What are the sulfur limitations of fuel for *new* space heating?

A. Fuel must be limited to 1% sulfur content by July 1, 1970. This applies to heating plants for one room or for heating plants in the largest buildings.

Q. What are the sulfur content limitations of fuel for existing space heating units?

A. Users of existing space heating must reduce the sulfur content in fuel in three steps:—2% by July 1, 1970—1.25% by September 1, 1971—1% by September 1, 1972.

Q. What are the sulfur content limitations of fuel for industrial power plants?

A. Sulfur limitations are reduced to: —2% by July 1, 1970—1.5% by November 1, 1970—1% by September 1, 1972.

Q. What are the sulfur content limitations of fuel for process plants?

A. The same as for industrial power plants.

Q. What are the sulfur content limitations of fuel for electric power generating plants?

A. Sulfur limitations are reduced to—1.8% by July 1, 1970—1% by January 1, 1972.

Q. What are the penalties for not observing these laws?

A. $100 to $300—first offense. $300 to $500—second offense or subsequent offenses in any 180 day period; or six-month term in County Jail; or six-month term in County Jail in addition to fine.

Q. How can I be sure that the fuel supplied by my dealer meets the sulfur requirements?

A. Get a letter from your fuel company which states the sulfur content.

FEE SCHEDULE

1,000 B.t.u.	Filing fee	Installation permit fee	Original inspection fee
Fuel burning equipment:			
Less than 288	$5	$10	$25
288 less than 960	5	15	40
960 less than 2,880	5	20	55
2,880 and over	5	30	57
Refuse burning equipment—Grate area, in square feet:			
Less than 5	5	5	10
5 less than 10	5	10	20
10 less than 15	5	15	30
15 less than 20	5	20	40
20 and over	5	25	50

PROCESS EQUIPMENT

Each unit operation and unit process shall be assessed a permit fee based upon the following schedule:

Filing fee	
1 to 10 unit processes and unit operations	$5
11 to 100 unit processes and unit operations	10
101 and over unit processes and unit operations	15
Installation permit fee	
Per one unit operation or one unit process creating atmospheric pollution on any device controlling atmospheric pollution	10

THE CHANGING CAMPUS MOOD

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, with so much attention still given to disturbance and violent dissent by the "left" versus the "silent majority," I feel the following column by James Reston focuses more accurately upon the situation today.

The column, which appeared in the New York Times of June 12, 1970, outlines the emergence of an articulate, concerned segment of moderate students and their positive expressions in support of constructive political action:

CAMBRIDGE, MASS.: THE CHANGING CAMPUS MOOD

(By James Reston)

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., June 11.—There is something new in the air on the campuses of America at the end of this univerity year. All the same problems and arguments remain, but the moderates are beginning to challenge the extremists of the right and left and change the tone and maybe even the direction of the student debate.

Last year at this time, the battle in the universities was mainly between the militants on the left and the university administrators. This is still largely true, but now the moderate university students and faculty members are getting into the act and the debate therefore is also between the extremist students and the moderate students as well.

There seem to be three other changes; the campus debate is spreading across the nation—it is now extending to Kent State and Ohio State and other previously dormant or conservative campuses—the moderate faculty members are beginning to speak out against the more articulate teachers on the left, and the political movements in the universities are no longer isolated but are looking for alliances in the larger movements of national politics.

This year's commencement activities at Harvard University were not typical but they indicate the trend. They were interrupted by a bull-horn demonstration by about thirty Cambridge residents protesting against the expansion of the Harvard campus into a poor residential neighborhood, but they were also marked and even dominated by eloquent protests from the moderates against the extremists of the left.

PUSEY'S SPEECH

President Pusey, who has been a modest and hesitant public figure in the past, not only compared the tactics of the leftist students to the fascist tactics of Senator Joseph McCarthy of Wisconsin in the fifties, but condemned the Harvard faculty members who sided with the leftists in last year's attack on the university administration. The Harvard faculty, which has hesitated in the past to come out openly against the militants, voted against interrupting classes next fall to put student political activities ahead of academic studies, and the moderate students put up a commencement day spokesman from the graduating class who attacked the student militants.

"Our biggest mistake," said Steven J. Kelman of Great Neck, N.Y., to his Harvard graduating class, "has been to let the so-called 'new' Left emerge as our spokesman. . . . Can we wonder why the American people will continue to be hostile towards students as long as we allow the rock-throwers, the burners, the totalitarians to represent us? Do we have a right to expect anything else?

"There is only one way we can gain the respect and overcome the hostility of the American people. And that is by addressing ourselves to the unromantic and unexciting problems which just happen to be the problems which affect the ordinary American in his day-to-day life . . . for in the final analysis it can only be the American people, not a student élite pledged to one-party dictatorship [that can bring about change].

THE STUDENTS' CHOICE

"We as Harvard students can make the determination to overcome our isolation by speaking to the mundane problems of health care, jobs and taxes—or we can continue to acquiesce to the wreckers among us. We can be part of the solution or part of the problem . . . the choice is ours."

This, of course, is not a new theme. The new thing is that President Pusey and the moderate students like Steven Kelman are now saying aggressively and out loud what they were saying defensively and privately a year ago.

Maybe the best symbol of the change at the Harvard commencement was the title of the Latin dissertation by Kirsten E. Mishkin, a Radcliffe student speaking for the young women graduates—*"De Maturitate"*—"On Coming of Age."

She was not only arguing against what she called the "iniquitous male supremacy" of American life, but also for unity, and even civility toward other peoples and other generations, and she did it with a tenderness and generosity that has not been customary on university campuses in recent years.

"Together," she said, "let us establish a new society, the foundations of which will not be discrimination, but equality, not fear but good will; not war between the sexes, but loyal brotherhood and sisterhood."

So something is happening. There is now a critical pause when the majority of students are not only turning back from violence and isolation, but searching for a new theme and a new majority. Maybe it won't work, but there is at least a new and more hopeful tone to the campus debate at the end of this academic year, and it clearly should not be ignored.

WHY BOTHER?

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I have recently received a provocative letter from a schoolteacher in my district. She says:

I have almost come to believe that my efforts towards improving the educational opportunities for California's disadvantaged children are almost to no avail, if in a few years the boys become "cannon fodder" for some undeclared war in Southeast Asia.

Why, indeed, should we bother to educate our children, if they are going to be shipped off to Indochina at age 19, and brought back maimed or dead?

Why should we bother to have the most technologically advanced society in the world, if its principal product is the raining of death and destruction on a primitive society that could not threaten us in a million years?

Why should we bother to have the greatest military machine in the history of the world, if we use it not for defense but to attempt to impose our will on a foreign culture we do not understand?

And why should we bother to build the greatest economy on earth, if preoccupation with foreign adventures prevents us from using it to benefit our society?

I insert the letter to which I referred at this point in the RECORD:

SUNDAY, MAY 17, 1970.

Hon. ROBERT L. LEGGETT,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. LEGGETT: I feel deeply ashamed that it has taken me this long to write you a letter regarding my feelings. However, as a voter, taxpayer, mother, teacher, and a Christian, I earnestly feel that our country should re-evaluate its present war policies.

I am the mother of four children; three sons and a daughter. I am a typical middle-class college graduate, white, age 35, and am not a radical. I have been personally involved for the past four years as a Miller-Unruh Compensatory Reading teacher at Cacheville School in Yolo. I believe you are acquainted with the school, and the fine work we are doing there. However, I have almost come to believe that my efforts towards improving the educational opportunities for California's disadvantaged children are almost to no avail, if in a few years the boys become "cannon fodder" for some undeclared war in Southeast Asia.

Up until now, I have gone along with the idea that the military and the President, of whatever partisan party, must know more than I how to run the military policies of this country. However, at this time, I have committed myself to actively support the election of candidates who least support Nixon and who must oppose the Vietnam and Cambodian War.

Since Congress has the power to stop the expansion of the war, I hope that, as my representative, you will do all in your power to urge withdrawal of our forces.

Sincerely yours,

MARGARET E. BULLOCK.

CRITICISM OF THE CAMBODIAN INVASION

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, as President Nixon today announces the withdrawal of all American ground troops from Cambodia and proclaims the mission a military success, I find myself unable to justify even the dubious claims of military victories, in light of the polarization and dissent which the Cambodian invasion has wrought upon this country. Indeed, my skepticism is shared by not only the more liberal critics of the administration's policy in Southeast Asia, but also by moderate sources who have tended, until the invasion of Cambodia, to support President Nixon's questionable efforts to end the Vietnam war. In the June issue of Fortune magazine, which is generally recognized as a more conservative periodical, an editorial appears which points up the doubts as to the wisdom of the military's latest venture in Southeast Asia, emphasizing the wide span of criticism of the Cambodian invasion.

I find this Fortune editorial, in light of the conservative leanings of the maga-

zine, extremely significant. This editorial recognizes the precarious state of the national conscience, a state which the President failed to recognize. The editorial states:

It may ultimately be shown that Nixon had excellent military reasons for sending U.S. units into Cambodia. But Cambodia was not his main problem. The condition of the United States was his main problem. When he encased this announcement on Cambodia in the kind of simplistic and emotional language most likely to inflame antiwar dissidents, including the moderates, he invited a greater cost in American unity than could possibly be balanced by any success in Indochina.

The recognition of the ill effects of the Cambodian mission by such a traditionally proadministration magazine as Fortune is a significant indication of the fact that an evaluation of the Cambodian operation as a success is subject to a criticism which transcends the traditional critics of the Nixon administration's policies.

I therefore insert in the RECORD the following editorial, which appeared in the June issue of Fortune magazine, as an indication of the widespread disagreement with President Nixon's claims of a successful completion of the Cambodian operation:

THE PRESIDENT NEEDS OUR HELP BECAUSE WE NEED HIS

Six weeks ago this was a divided, frustrated, and anxiety-ridden country. Some people said, "Things have to get better because they can't get worse." Then, within a few days, the American situation deteriorated from serious to critical. Cambodia, Kent State, the killings of blacks in Georgia and Mississippi, along with all the protests, counterprotests, and counter-counterprotests that stemmed from these, plunged the nation to a level of bewilderment and fear that it had not reached in the depth of the great depression.

A measure of the present crisis was the last-minute refusal of the Illinois Constitutional Convention to let John W. Gardner make a long-scheduled speech. Gardner, a Republican who had served a Democratic President as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, is one of the most patiently reasonable figures in public life. The Illinois convention, stirred up by its own passionate argument over Cambodia, feared the effect of Gardner's warning that "the nation disintegrates." By refusing to listen, the convention, which is not composed of excitable students or nervous guardsmen, demonstrated that the nation was indeed disintegrating.

For the first time, it is no longer possible to take for granted that the U.S. will somehow survive the crisis that grips it. The land itself will survive, of course, along with the machines and the people—or most of them. But no nation is merely, or mainly, an aggregate of its geography, its material assets, and its warm bodies. At the core of the U.S., conferring identity, cohesion, and vitality, stands a Proposition: free men, despite differences of status, belief, and interest, can govern themselves. Upon the survival of that Proposition, confirmed by eight generations of superb achievement, depends any worthwhile future that an entity called the United States might have. And it is that Proposition—amazingly—which in the spring of 1970 has come to be at stake.

Our two most disruptive specific issues are Vietnam and race. Grave as these are, it is a mistake to believe that the fundamental U.S. political situation would return to "normalcy" if these two issues were miraculously whisked away. For the internal and external demands on this society have been multiplied by the sheer fact of its unprecedented power and prosperity. The demonstrated American capacity for rapid and radical change stimulates insistence upon other and greater changes. These demands conflict with one another. As the horizon of our choice has widened, we have moved into a new dimension of opportunity that is also—as we can now see—a new dimension of political danger.

There is no prospect whatever that our society can avoid issues, foreign and domestic, on which people will divide sharply. The only long-range hope lies in the possibility that we can improve our processes of discussion and decision to the point where such future challenges will not degenerate into crises like the present one.

There isn't going to be a long range worth bothering about, however, unless we cope immediately with the mess we're in. Improvement of the process has to start now and it has to be visible and quick—before the morale of the U.S., jolted by some unforeseen external or internal event, slides into another sickening descent like that of the last few weeks.

WHERE THE INITIATIVE LIES

The first and overriding goal of this torn country must be reconciliation. The burden of initiative in reconciling the country falls upon Richard Nixon, not because he is most to blame for the disruption but because he is—God help him—President. Neither his countrymen nor history would forgive the man who was in the White House while the ability of Americans to govern themselves came to an end.

In fairness to Nixon it should be remembered that for several years before he took office political passions had been rising. The Eisenhower-Kennedy-Johnson style of conciliatory, centrist politics had collapsed in 1966–67 under pressures of domestic and foreign issues.

On the domestic front, black militancy and white reaction against black gains rose simultaneously. Nixon not only failed to allay this rising discord, but contributed to it. Apparently despairing of conciliating black leaders and their allies in "the liberal establishment," his Administration seemed to court a reputation of being less than evenhanded. By two provocative Supreme Court appointments, by unleashing the Vice President to woo that large number of voters who were disgusted by demonstrations and riots, and by an equivocal statement on school desegregation, Nixon gave the impression—especially to blacks—that he was not really trying to pull the nation together.

It must be conceded that his tactics were within the conventional patterns of U.S. politics. When attacked, politicians are expected to strike back and to seek friends among the enemies of their enemies. But the underlying political situation had degenerated to a point where a conventional maneuver such as Nixon's was unworkable.

WHY CAMBODIA WAS A MISTAKE

Overshadowing domestic issues was the inherited dilemma of Vietnam. Nixon's contribution to Vietnam policy was defensible. Almost any imaginable man, taking office as President in 1969, would have wanted to end the American military commitment in Vietnam in an orderly way that would minimize the internal and external price of partial failure. A very wide band of public opinion, believing that Nixon meant what he said, supported his stated policy. Many moderates among the antiwar dissidents adopted a wait-and-see attitude.

Nixon should have placed a very high priority on deepening and extending this tentative acceptance of his promise to liquidate the war. Instead, attacks by the Vice President and others on antiwar dissenters revived doubts that his Administration really intended to expedite military withdrawal from Vietnam.

Cambodia pulled the plug. It may ultimately be shown that Nixon had excellent military reasons for sending U.S. units into Cambodia. But Cambodia was not his main problem. The condition of the U.S. was his main problem. When he encased his announcement on Cambodia in the kind of simplistic and emotional language most likely to inflame antiwar dissidents, including the moderates, he invited a greater cost in American unity than could possibly be balanced by any success in Indochina.

Now that he compensates for the Cambodian mistake by a precipitate withdrawal from Vietnam. If he accedes to that demand, he will risk provoking a different upheaval of U.S. protest as serious as that which greeted his invasion of Cambodia. If, on the other hand, he ignores vociferous dissent and relies on the belief that he has the backing of a "silent majority," he may find that many present supporters will turn against him on the ground that he allowed disruption to reach a point where the political and economic life of the nation has become grievously impaired.

WHAT'S THE DIRECTION?

Reconciliation does not mean attempting to suffuse the U.S. with sweetness and light. Reconciliation does not imply that dissent should cease on the ground that "the President knows best." Nor does it imply that policies, foreign or domestic, should be abandoned whenever they encounter vigorous internal resistance. Either of those paths to reconciliation is inconsistent with the central theory and the best experience of American democracy.

We are going to disagree. Never a homogeneous or conformist people, Americans have down the years achieved unity enough through their shared sense of forward motion, of hope. What now undermines the national confidence and cohesion is not the inevitable recurrence of dissension, but the weakening of belief that the nation is moving, despite its quarrels, in some worthwhile direction.

The President of the U.S. has a part to play in restoring a vision of the American future. After continental expansion had been achieved, after U.S. world power had been demonstrated, after economic growth came to be assumed, it was not surprising that Americans, especially the young, should more insistently ask, "What else? What next?" Nor was it either surprising or deplorable that this questioning should turn upon nonmaterial values such as those represented by civil rights and the moral aspects of the war in Vietnam.

To knead this new moral concern into some new sense of where the U.S. is going calls for a transformation in the style of presidential leadership. Through most of our history, Congress was the most important federal organ in a nation where the central political task was the resolution of conflicts between regions and economic interest groups. The challenge of the great depression, overshadowing such conflicts, ushered in forty years of presidential ascendancy. World War II, the cold war, and the prosperity that everybody wanted had confirmed the tendency to think of the policy-making power as concentrated in the White House, where national unity is symbolized.

That era has ended. In a room full of students watching Nixon's May 8 televised press conference, a girl said, "He speaks as if it's his country; it's our country, too." It is, indeed, and it is also the country of the flag-waving construction workers, the enraged blacks, and a hundred other factions whose viewpoints and demands will be harder to compromise than the traditional issues of economic rivalry.

The role of Congress, that instrument of

government intended to represent the people in the multiplicity of their political wills, is now more necessary than it ever was. Nixon has been—or has seemed to be—too isolated. Part of the shock of his Cambodian decision came from the public's sense that neither this specific action nor the whole Southeast Asia policy had been considered and decided on a sufficiently broad and representative base.

If Nixon does his part, if he moderates the embattled tone of the Administration, if he shows more of the kind of initiative embodied in his new Family Assistance Act now before Congress (see page 66), if he agrees that Congress has an important function in foreign and military policy, then a correspondingly heavy responsibility for conciliation will shift to the shoulders of his present critics.

WHAT OTHERS CAN DO

Among critics of the war are men who seem to have staked their reputations on the prediction that it must lead to disaster. They should stop speaking as if nothing short of disaster in Vietnam will satisfy them. Among critics of Nixon are some who are likewise committed to his failure. This kind of partisanship will impede the work of reconciliation.

Journalism, though not unfairly biased in the way Spiro Agnew says it is, does have a deep-seated and regrettable tendency to prefer the dramatic confrontation between extreme views to the less exciting processes of reasonable discourse and compromise. This preference has been a powerful factor in bringing about a sense of national disintegration—especially since protesters of all sorts have discovered the hunger of the TV screen for visually exciting political expression. Restraint of this appetite could be one of journalism's contributions to reconciliation.

The academic community, organized around value-free science, has been ill-prepared—and left the nation ill-prepared—for a present and future politics turning largely upon the intricacies of how moral values apply to practical policies. Correction of this defect will be a long-range process, but of immediate help would be a modicum of humility that at least recognizes the difficulty of applying purely idealistic criteria to the actual choices now before us.

All responsible citizens who may disagree with the President, and each other, on specific acts and policies must recognize the higher national necessity of defending the whole. And resolved into a kind of Committee of the Whole, taking his conciliatory statements at face value, we should give him the fullest possible support in his efforts to contain the fissioning forces of this country.

The President needs our help because we need his.—M.W.

THE CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY AND INFLATION

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, on June 24, a group of major national employers associations in the construction industry wrote a telegram to President Nixon on the critical problems of wage inflation in this country's largest industry. The telegram notes that wage inflation in the construction industry over the last 3 years has amounted to nearly 60 percent and no end is in sight. It goes on to observe in shocking terms that:

> Our huge industry, with its 3.8 million employees, is planting the seeds for an inflation which will far outstrip anything this country has yet experienced and every additional wage settlement made as the months pass will nurture those seeds.

The employers associations representatives conclude from this that:

> We need action now, not months from now, to control the wild inflation in this industry and this action must come from the government.

They go on to make a very constructive proposal, one which I feel should be given serious consideration by the administration in its continuing efforts to combat inflation. They suggest that construction wages be fixed at those in effect on January 1, 1970, and to accomplish the stabilization of construction wages and prices, an appropriate tax be levied upon the contractors' domestic construction operations to prevent any windfall profit by the employer as the result of redetermination of wages. During the period of control, management and labor would cooperate in developing a national stabilization agreement containing "no strike" and "no lockout" pledges with provisions that wage dispute arbitration be developed and implemented.

At this point in the RECORD I include the full text of the telegram to the President and the names of those who signed it:

[Telegram]

JUNE 24, 1970.

The PRESIDENT,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.:

We the undersigned representatives of major national employers associations in the construction industry, who are members of the Council of Construction Employers, believe, in the light of runaway wage increases for the building trades, that the restraint proposals in your address of June 17 fall far short of meeting the critical problems of wage inflation in this country's largest industry.

The construction wage inflation averaged a minimum of 14% in 1969, will add an additional 18% in 1970 and at least another 18% in 1971. This is far beyond the 6.7% increase for 1969 mentioned in the government analysis handed out at the White House last week and is in fact on a cumulative basis nearly 60% over three years.

These conditions result not only in increased economic burden to the owners of construction projects, public as well as private, but the entire economy is threatened by the spillover effects of exorbitant wage increases in construction.

The construction industry itself is suffering heavy economic loss as a result of employer attempts to resist the demands of organized labor. Increased construction costs threaten our markets. Finally, productivity, generally has tended to decrease as the rate of wage increases has accelerated.

Even more serious than the effect on our industry is the inevitable spread of these increased rates to other industries. Construction unions now are playing a gigantic game of leap frog; it is only a matter of time until others learn there are no effective limits and join the game.

These inevitably result in higher costs with less value added to construction buyers, which include the Federal Government with its major national construction programs in the fields of housing, health services, highways and urban renewal.

We are engaged in discussions looking toward improving the economic imbalance on the employers' side which now exists in collective bargaining in the industry. While we expect to move as rapidly as possible, our realistic view is that any tangible results will necessarily take time and will have no more effect on the immediate crisis than the proposals you made June 17. Meanwhile, our huge industry, with its 3.8 million employees, is planting the seeds for an inflation which will far outstrip anything this country has yet experienced and every additional wage settlement made as the months pass will nurture those seeds. We need action now, not months from now, to control the wild inflation in this industry and this action must come from government.

We respectfully request you to give favorable consideration to controls in our industry for such length of time as may be necessary to cool union demands and the resultant increases in prices and thus encourage labor and management at the local level to negotiate reasonable agreements. We request that construction wages be established as those in effect on January 1, 1970.

In order to accomplish this stabilization of construction wages and prices, we propose that an appropriate tax be placed on the contractors domestic construction operations to prevent any windfall profit by the employer as the result of the redetermination of wages.

During the period of these controls, management and labor, with government encouragement, should cooperate to develop a national stabilization agreement containing a no strike no lockout pledge with provisions that the arbitration of wage disputes should be developed and implemented. This procedure was used most effectively in previous emergencies.

The increase in construction wages is a threat to our economy which has been building for several years. Nevertheless, it is with us and its perilous thrust can easily be documented and verified. You showed great political courage in many other crises. This problem demands the same courage now.

Associated General Contractors of America, Inc.; By: Fred W. Mast, Chairman, Labor Committee; International Association of Wall & Ceiling Contractors, By: Jeremiah Burns, Labor Liaison Committee; Mechanical Contractors Association of America, By: Fred N. Estopinal, Jr., President; National Association of Plumbing-Heating-Cooling Contractors, By: James E. Curry, President; National Constructors Association, By: Philip S. Lyon, President; Painting and Decorating Contractors of America, By: Joseph Sansone, President; Sheet Metal & Airconditioning Contractors National Association, By: James H. Ferguson, Director, Industry Relations.

ROBERT E. McCORD

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, it was with great sadness that I learned of the sudden and untimely passing of Robert E. McCord, the senior staff member of the House Education and Labor Committee.

I had the privilege, as a member of the committee, to know Bob well and work

with him over most of the past decade. I learned very early that his knowledge of the legislative processes as well as the educational problems and needs of the Nation was unsurpassed.

He was in every way the ideal professional staff member—capable, loyal, understanding, dedicated and conscientious. To him must go a great deal of the credit for the impressive legislative record established by the House Education and Labor Committee, particularly the achievements of the past 10 years.

Bob's wisdom and experience will be missed in the months and years ahead. It is consoling, however, to remember that his imprint will remain forever on the landmark legislative achievements during the period he so ably served the committee.

I join with my other colleagues in extending my condolences to his wife and the other members of his family.

FREE PUBLICATIONS

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. It is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a copy of the letter which I am sending to citizens in my district to encourage all to take advantage of the availability of the excellent free publications listed for distribution by allotment to Congressmen from the Department of Agriculture.

The letter follows:

[Public Document—Official Business]

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C.

TO MY GOOD FRIENDS: It is a pleasure to write you personally to let you know about the excellent government booklets now available for our District. We have received the lists from the printer, and many people are asking for these booklets to help on their homes, economy meals for families and helpful advice on lawns, trees and gardens.

As you are on my personal list, I want you to know about these booklets and pamphlets early, as I am always surprised how *well written* and *popular* they are.

As our annual July allotment of 10,000 booklets does not go far in our big District of over 430,000 people, I am getting some help from several of my friends—Congressmen who are not running for reelection this year.

I believe these booklets will really help you to keep down food costs—as I have been concerned and *opposed* the Agriculture bloc moves to raise further the prices of foods and the already high cost of meats.

Check 5 choices only, as our supply is really limited, and I can only send this letter to a selected list in our District. I will be glad to see these are sent you without any cost or charge as an extra service from our office. We still have a few excellent Cook Books, (91 pages), by the U.S. Bureau of Home Economics, I can also get for you without charge, so let me hear on this, too.

These booklets, and the Cook Book are *good*. But *please* limit your requests to *5* booklets and *one* Cook Cook (G-1) "Family Fare—Food Management and Recipes" as I can only obtain a limited number for our District. If you have one or two friends who are not on my personal list, or who are new residents of our District, please give me their names and addresses, and we will be glad to forward them one of these lists, and will send them the same number of pamphlets as long as our supplies permit.

Be sure to print your name and address on back of list, place in a stamped envelope and *mail to me* in Washington, D.C.—2161 Rayburn Building.

Am always glad to be of help any time.

Best wishes,

JIM FULTON.

P.S.—If you don't receive your booklets within several weeks, write our Washington Office and we will be glad to check for you. *Do not mail* your list to U.S. Agriculture Dept., as these booklets are distributed without cost only through my individual Congressman's allotment. Sent as an added service to our District (*not* printed at Government expense). JIM.

KNOW ANYONE WHO CANNOT READ

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, education and the need to extend it into every American home is one of this country's most pressing problems. Solutions to the many varied questions in this field can only be found if private citizens help their Government.

An example of this citizen power is found in the Wetzel County Literacy Council which is teaching adults to read.

Their work is detailed in the following editorial in the Wetzel Republican, edited by Mrs. Hazel Ewald. I take great pride in reprinting it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for my esteemed colleagues to read:

KNOW ANYONE WHO CAN'T READ

Wetzel Countians are taking another giant step forward in advancing our rating of literacy, thanks to the efforts of 24 women who make up the Wetzel County Literacy Council.

These women recently attended a workshop sponsored by the local Lutheran Church women with the cooperation of the West Virginia Adult Basic Education Division of the Department of Education. They are ready and willing to help teach adults to read.

Can you imagine how frustrating it must be to look at words on a page and not have them mean anything?

Many people here in our county cannot read. In our state there are 319,741 adults who have less than an eighth grade education!

These people can now be helped by the Wetzel County Literacy Council. The teaching is on a one to one basis with the students and all books and supplies are furnished.

The Laubach Literacy Course was used in the workshop taught by Mrs. Norma Brookhart which is designed to teach adult men and women a method of teaching illiterate adults how to read. The aim of this method is to enable the adult to learn to read the language he speaks as quickly and enjoyable as possible.

Adults will find this method of reading meaningful and will see results from the very beginning.

This may be the opportunity that some of our people have hoped and prayed for to make their lives fuller and more satisfying.

If these 24 women are willing to give of their time and efforts to bring this gift to the people, the least we can do is help spread the word to those we think might be interested. Let's try for 100% literacy in Wetzel County.

Please call or write Mrs. John Ross, 134 Fairview Drive, New Martinsville, or Telephone 455-1813.

PROUD OF PEOPLE OF CRESCENT CITY, FLA.

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, in these times of strife and turmoil, when bad news seems to supplant the good—it is heartening to find a story such as is unfolding in Crescent City, Fla.

This community of 1,682, according to unofficial 1970 census figures, is a lovely and picturesque area, bountifully blessed with lakes and magnificent woodlands.

But, the story is that the people of Crescent City, Fla., are concerned about the people in Crescent City, Ill.

As you know, that small northeastern Illinois community of 700 persons was nearly blown off the map when a train carrying compressed butane gas derailed, setting off explosions and fires that raged across one-third of the town.

And so the people of Crescent City, Fla., determined to aid this disaster-ridden community with a "Let's Help Crescent City, Ill.," drive.

Mayor Bob Wiltcher, Mrs. Dan Roberts, and Ronnie Hughes, publisher of this Florida town's newspaper, the Courier-Journal, have outlined a plan for a door-to-door canvass for unwanted clothing, furniture, food, and money to help 24 homeless residents of Crescent City, Ill.

Courier-Journal publisher Hughes contacted the publisher of the daily newspaper in Watsika, Ill., about 10 miles from the stricken city, to obtain first-hand information concerning the mishap.

The Illinois publisher had informed him at that time that two cars full of butane were still burning and 75 persons had been injured.

Although no communication was available at that time, Mayor Wiltcher contacted the Illinois State Police and asked them to reach the mayor of Crescent City, Ill., Fred Sterrenberg, to find out what was needed.

My colleagues, this is the real story of America. We are a land of people who are compassionate and who want to help their neighbor.

I have made many trips to Crescent City, Fla., a part of my district, and I can attest to the fact that some of the finest people I ever met make their home in this beautiful area.

I think that Florida has a right to be proud of the people of Crescent City, Fla. I think the people of America have a right to be proud of the people of Crescent City, Fla.

I know that I am.

WE HAVE MUCH TO BE PROUD OF ON THE FOURTH OF JULY

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, this weekend marks the 194th anniversary of the signing of the Declaration of Independence, one of the most dramatic and far-reaching documents ever written. This Fourth of July will be unique here in Washington with a massive "Honor America Day" rally, which will be held on the Monument Grounds.

Although I will not be able to participate personally in these special activities on Saturday because of prior commitments in California, our thoughts certainly will be in the Nation's Capital as will those of all Americans as they observe the Fourth of July whether they do this with family gatherings or traditional patriotic celebrations, many of which will be held in the twenty counties of the Second Congressional District, for this is truly a day in which each year we do honor America.

The organizers of the Washington rally, the outstanding Americans, Rev. Billy Graham and Bob Hope, both of whom have long been known for their dedicated service to the Nation and to the people, are to be commended for the efforts they are undertaking on this special Fourth of July.

It was just 194 years ago when our forefathers declared that these United States of America "are, and of right ought to be free and independent States." These ringing words were preceded by one of the most beautiful sentences ever composed by man: "We hold these truths to be self evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness." In the body of the Declaration, clear, concise facts of how these rights were being denied were stated.

The final sentence indicates the deep resolve of Congress and is worth repeating today: "And for the support of this declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of divine providence, we mutually pledge to each other our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor." Then, each of the 56 delegates of the 13 Colonies signed his name. All of us today must pause to reflect upon the courage required to sign this document because, without the protection of the divine providence and the firm resolve of the citizens of the 13 Colonies, these signers stood to lose their liberty, their families, their personal possessions, and very likely, their lives.

On this occasion, the 194th birthday of our Nation, it is well that we recall the magnificent ideals and principles that emerged from the war of independence and how these ideals and principles have been maintained and expanded through many periods of trial and tribulation. Every generation since our Nation's beginning has been faced with seemingly unsurmountable problems. Each generation of Americans has met these problems as best it could and the Nation has emerged even stronger than before. All of us should know that we have the power to achieve the democratic goals of equal rights and equal opportunity. That was the purpose of the country in its inception. That is the purpose still.

With the continuous and unparalleled efforts of the political institution functioning as initially established under the Federal Constitution, our Government has exhibited an unequaled record of achievement. The wisdom, faith, and courage of the Founding Fathers, endorsed and readopted by the American people of each successful era, have promoted results unparalleled in history. We have much to be proud of on this the 4th of July, 1970.

STATE INVOLVEMENT IN WATER CHOICES

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I commend to the attention of my colleagues the first of a series of articles dealing with the critical matter of making choices in the allocation of our resources. The first article written by Robert R. Lee, director of the Idaho Water Resources Board, in the fall-winter 1969–70 issue of Water Spectrum, comments on the need for State involvement in decisions affecting water-use programs. The article follows:

WHEN WATER-USE CHOICES ARE MADE—IS YOUR STATE ON THE SIDELINES?

(By Robert R. Lee)

The recent move toward more State participation can alter the current balance of power in water planning and development. Today, as historically, public interest in water matters is largely determined by Congress. Opportunity for full State participation in making public interest determinations has been sorely inadequate.

Over a period of decades various institutions and committees of Congress have recommended water policy changes in an effort to insure that the public interest would be served. As catalogued by the U.S. Senate Interior Committee, these efforts began as early as 1908.

During that year, for example, the Inland Waterways Commission and the National Conservation Commission made recommendations looking toward comprehensive national water resource planning and development. Even at that time the need for coordination of the work of Federal and State agencies was obvious. In 1912, Congress created its own National Waterways Commission, composed of 12 Congressmen, which made numerous recommendations. These recommendations and others led to the creation of a seven-member Waterways Commission to be appointed by the President. The Commission was given the authority to formulate a comprehensive plan for development of the waterways and water resources of the United States for the purpose of navigation and for every useful purpose. [And some of us have presumed that the concept of comprehensive planning is new.] This legislation was never implemented, however.

In 1920, the Federal Power Commission was created, composed of the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of Interior and the Secretary of War. Later the Federal Power Commission was made an independent agency composed of five members appointed by the President.

Several solutions to agency coordination problems were tested, ranging from the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to the Pick-Sloan plan for the Missouri Basin which authorized the Corps of Engineers and the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation to join to construct projects in that basin.

The Flood Control Acts of 1936 and 1944 provided for interagency coordination on a nationwide basis and brought the States into the water resource planning process. Joint efforts were stimulated by a desire to reduce or prevent conflict between agencies since the agencies realized they would be injured by infighting.

Following World War II, field interagency coordination committees were formed in the Missouri and Columbia Basins under the direction of the Washington level Federal Interagency River Basin Committee, sometimes called "Firebrick."

Interagency planning efforts were authorized for the Arkansas, White and Red Basins; the New England-New York Basin; the Delaware River Basin; and the Potomac River Basin. In 1958, legislation created the Texas Basins Study Commission and Southeast Basins Study Commission, which were temporary organizations created to develop comprehensive water resource plans.

In the late 40's, the first Hoover Commission suggested that better coordination could be achieved by gathering all water resource agencies in one department. President Truman's Water Resources Policy Commission in 1950 recommended the establishment of river basin planning commissions for each of the major river basins.

The Hoover Commission in 1955 recommended a Federal Water Resource Board to develop policy and coordinate agency activities, and that project review functions of the Bureau of Budget be strengthened.

President Eisenhower's Advisory Committee on Water Resources Policy also supported the concept of river basin commissions and proposed an independent Board of Review for water projects in the Executive Office of the President.

The Senate Select Committee on National Water Resources in 1961 recommended that comprehensive water development plans be prepared by the Federal Government in cooperation with the States for all major river basins by 1970. In addition, the committee recommended that the Federal Government stimulate State participation in planning and development through water resource planning grants.

The Committee was in a better position to implement its recommendations than previous study commissions since its members were key members of each of the major Senate Committees which have responsibilities in the field of water resources.

President Kennedy's proposed Water Resources Planning Act of 1961 included the creation of a Water Resources Council composed of the Secretaries of: Agriculture; Army; Health, Education and Welfare; and Interior. It also proposed the establishment of River Basin Commissions, financial grants to States for water planning, plus miscellaneous items.

After several years debate and slight modification, these essential items were included in the Water Resources Planning Act of 1965, which became P.L. 89–80.

In 1967 at the request of the States of the Northwest, the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission was created as a Federal-

State planning entity as authorized by P.L 89-80. Since then three other river basin commissions have been created.

The most recent institutional innovation at the Federal level was the creation of the National Water Commission in 1968. The Commission is composed of non-Federal members and charged with the responsibility of making water policy recommendations to the Congress in 1973.

Historically, the decision-making process for water projects has proceeded in this manner. A local group interested in irrigation, flood control, watershed improvement, or other purposes would contact the principal Federal agency, their Congressmen or Senators to see if they could get a project studied to feasibility grade. Elected officials were usually anxious to please and the result was that an agency's planning program would be fragmented. Projects would, therefore, require several years to study.

Next, the existing water users would have to be satisfied that their water rights would not be damaged. (For instance, it took years to get existing irrigators in the Boise Project to agree to an exchange of water contemplated by the Southwest Idaho Water Development Project.)

Other Federal agencies having interests would have to be consulted, such as the Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, the National Park Service and other water agencies. A water right would be required. Next, the agency's regional office and the Washington office would review the project to see if it met agency standards before transmittal to the Bureau of the Budget and the Congress. State comments would be requested and public hearings held locally and at the national level. Official adverse comment by a Governor or serious local disagreement would generally result in a project delay or veto. Federal budget limitations would cause similar consequences. Projects having regionwide or national implications would have other hurdles to overcome. For example, preservationists were able to delete the Marble Canyon Dam from the Lower Colorado Project, since water would encroach on the Grand Canyon National Monument.

What are the characteristics of this process and how will the process be altered, if at all, in the future?

First, the State government was essentially bypassed in setting study priorities and project priorities. Poor use was made of Federal planning resources. Overlapping studies were caused by local agencies seeking to get the best financial break. Projects were planned in isolation without analysis of impact or relationship to other projects or other public resources. Other agencies, the Bureau of the Budget, and Congress were placed in the position of reacting to a specific proposal, not alternatives. Congressmen had little factual basis for determining planning practices.

The formation of river basin commissions presents an opportunity to the States to play a significant role in improving the decision-making process. A commission opens the way for direct State participation in the plan formulation process through staff analysis and by expression of what the State's water needs are. The States in the Northwest have insisted and the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission has agreed that the Commission's plan will be developed through subregional planning teams and will then be integrated into a regional plan.

The States can make their greatest input by participating first in the subregional planning efforts, then at the regional level. We believe that our State Water Plan can be formulated simultaneously as part of the Commission's Plan.

States are helping insure that the value judgments to be made such as development versus no development, irrigation versus fish, and wild river versus flood control are made by the public rather than water planning professionals. The States have insisted that plans for three objectives—national economic efficiency, regional development, and environmental quality—will be developed before integration into a single plan. The Commission has adopted this approach.

Why is this recommendation for multiple objective planning and a display of more information to the decision-makers needed?

First, I would submit that just as each individual has conflicting goals and is more than economic man, so does society have conflicting goals which must be reconciled, such as economic development versus preservation. There is an increasing realization that benefit-cost analysis as customarily conducted can lead to unreasonable conclusions. We are all aware of instances where the engineer's dedication to economic efficiency has resulted in proposals to build highways through redwood forests or dams that would encroach upon national monuments without showing alternatives for meeting the same objectives. Much of the benefit-cost analysis is nothing more than a rough requirements approach wherein the least costly alternative is selected to satisfy the forecasted requirements. Without an overview of requirements from a State, regional, or national viewpoint, nearly any purpose can be justified in isolation. Benefits for power, water quality, and municipal and industrial water supply are calculated in this way. The true economic benefits from these project purposes are not calculated.

Second, is recognition that more, not less, information is required by the decision-makers. The effort to distill all benefits and costs to a dollar figure to be included in a benefit-cost ratio is much like the search of alchemists to turn lead to gold. Our procedures for quantification are imperfect, and we need more not less information on the outputs from alternative plans.

Third, because of the difficulties of quantification of costs and benefits, water planning professionals are recognizing that justification of a single plan may not serve the public interest. The present system often forces the professional planner to make value judgments which are rightly the province of elected officials. The role of the professional planner is to indicate to decision-makers the menu of choices available. This is a new role for many planners and engineers, and sometimes they find it difficult to accept. Some engineers confuse their professional role with that of their own code of values and would like to impose those values on society. Yet value judgments are so much a part of water resource planning and development that the resolution of conflicting values must be left to representatives of the public.

Fourth, is growing realization that water projects can determine the growth patterns of our Nation, regions, and communities. Projects cannot be viewed in isolation as merely satisfying projected needs based on historic trends. We must know what the potentional is for water and related land resource development in the various regions of the country irrespective of allocation of historic shares of population or economic growth. In addition, we can learn from the experience of freeway planners who discovered that the freeways themselves caused traffic, population, and economic growth to take place in a fashion that would not have been realized without the freeways.

To a great degree, water facilities can determine the location and nature of population growth. There is currently a great debate as to whether water should be imported to the Southwestern United States. The first question to be answered should be what will happen if water is not imported to the Southwest. Will communities really stop growing; will the existing population experience thirst? I would guess that if water is not taken into the Southwest, the growth that could occur there would happen elsewhere, but that if water is imported to that area of the country, the recent growth trends will be perpetuated. Decision-makers at the highest level should be concerned with the question of whether it is desirable to continue to concentrate population in certain areas of the Southwest.

Fifth, is the recognition that there is no single national water policy and, therefore, no well defined national objective—but many policies and many objectives. The Water Resources Planning Act of 1965 recognizes economic efficiency, aesthetic consideration, and regional development, which in a given instance may be conflicting objectives. Moreover, we have federal acreage retirement programs versus other programs for putting land under development, policies for drainage of marshlands versus other policies for purchase of marshlands to provide wildlife habitat, a wild rivers policy versus a development policy. I would, therefore, submit that there is no national policy separate from State and regional policies which helps resolve conflicting objectives. The goals of the establishment of national policy, and the multiple objective planning approach make it possible for State policy makers to choose among the alternatives.

There are limitations to any planning approach, and this is true of the effort to define multiple objectives. Before spelling out what some of these limitations are, I wish to emphasize that I believe the new approach to be a significant step forward in the field of water resource planning.

The most obvious problem is that there will be substantial extra planning costs over the traditional way of looking at a single alternative. Unless the effort is funded over and above regular appropriations, the approach can result in a fragmentation of agency programs with resulting delay in completing project feasibility studies. Since projects are the staff-of-life of water agencies, they will be reluctant to assume this approach unless additional funds are provided.

The second problem is that a display of alternatives will undoubtedly supply special interest groups with verbal ammunition to support their particular viewpoints. There seems to be an ethic in our society which would lead us to avoid controversy, and displaying alternatives will likely promote controversy. Some would want to stifle this, but I believe full public discussion of various alternatives serves as an aid to the decision-makers and improves the decision-making process.

Third, it will be difficult to get an expression of State objectives at the outset of the planning process. You should be able to get agreement on alternative objectives to be studied such as national efficiency, regional development, or quality of the environment, but we cannot expect them to make choices among these objectives until the studies are completed. The very reason they will embrace the multiple objective approach is because they expect to learn more about what the choices are.

For example, our Idaho Water Resource Board cannot tell you what its position is with respect to development or non-development of the Salmon River Basin. This is because the consequences of development versus non-development have not yet been furnished to them. This is not to say that certain groups in the State have not expressed opinions on what should be done with the Salmon River, but the Board feels keenly its responsibility to serve the public interest as far as the State of Idaho is concerned. Therefore, the Board has gone on record supporting a study of the Salmon River Basin in all of its ramifications, ranging from no development through full development. I believe this example illustrates

why planners should not expect to get a prejudgment by the States as to what the States' objectives are until the results of the multiple objective study are available.

The key issue in multiple objective planning is who decides which plan best serves the public interest. I believe that in the search for the public interest the States can give very strong signals to the Federal agencies so that agencies are not put in the position of having to decide what plans should be recommended for adoption. I would suggest that it is not the function of Federal agencies to reconcile the divergent views as to how water resource development should proceed, but rather that this is a key responsibility of State government. At the first instance, the States can help in the area of communication with local people by requesting organization of county or subregional water committees composed of water leaders who are supported by technical subcommittees. These local organizations can review, evaluate, and contribute basic information. The State can act as liaison between Federal agencies and local interests.

We expect that our planning program will proceed in harmony with local, State, and Federal agencies through the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission. We expect to conduct interagency studies to formulate comprehensive subregional plans for the State of Idaho which will serve as input to our State Water Plan and as part of the Commission's Comprehensive Regional Plan. As plans to meet multiple objectives are formulated, these will be brought to our Idaho Water Resource Board that will evaluate them and adopt a tentative plan which will be presented to the public and hearings held. The Board will evaluate the information presented at the hearings before adopting a final plan. The Board's recommendations will then go to the Pacific Northwest River Basins Commission which will attempt to reconcile interstate problems before sending recommendations to the Water Resources Council and the Congress. We feel that State participation in providing service to local county water planning efforts and reconciling divergent interests will improve the planning process and insure the adoption of projects that meet the public interest.

Furthermore, I believe that the States can perform an important service in acting as chairmen of coordinated planning groups composed of Federal and State agencies. In the Pacific Northwest, the States of Washington and Oregon have been involved in Type II studies where they have assumed the chairmanship of the coordinated planning efforts. Reports are that this approach has worked well because the States can help coordinate planning activities when the Federal agencies themselves would be unable to do so. Although the procedure outlined may not be perfect, you need only consider how the system presently works to realize that the multiple objective approach holds promise.

In summary, I would submit that the greatest opportunity for improving water resource decisionmaking—so that it represents the public interest—rests with the States. Active, capable State water agencies are essential.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

HOW CAN THIS INFLATION BE STOPPED

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, the question of inflation has agitated the Nation for some time. I have joined some of my colleagues in suggesting legislative action, some of it presently pending.

However, I have received a copy of an address by the senior vice president of the Fidelity Bank of Philadelphia, Mr. E. Sherman Adams, that I believe merits our serious consideration. Mr. Adams is an economist and speaks knowledgeably and eloquently.

I insert this address at this point:

HOW CAN THIS INFLATION BE STOPPED

Today there is widespread concern about the future of the American economy. Business expansion has ground to a halt and we appear to be teetering on the verge of recession. Nevertheless, price inflation continues unabated.

Many people have become convinced that the inflation will go on indefinitely, that it has now become part of our way of life. They believe that the inflationary spiral could not be stopped by anything less than a severe depression, and this is plainly something this nation would not tolerate. On these premises, we could be headed for a long period of sluggish business with continuing inflation.

In contrast, some observers are optimistic. The official view in Washington is that a recession can be avoided and that a mere pause in business expansion will soon slow down the rising trend in living costs. Looking across the valley, Administration spokesmen forecast an early resumption of economic growth but at the same time a continuing slackening in the rate of inflation.

The question is whether this is actually going to happen. Will the Administration's policy prescription really work?

THE OFFICIAL SCENARIO

To date, the Administration has relied solely on general monetary and fiscal policies to restrict the demand for goods and services on the theory that this would suffice to cure the inflation. The party line has been that nothing else needs to be done.

There has never been any doubt that restrictive monetary and fiscal policies could slow down business activity and they have been doing exactly that, as advertised. But the real question is whether inflation can be brought under control simply by producing a mild business slowdown. As yet there is little evidence that this approach is going to succeed.

The recent annual report of the President's Council of Economic Advisers describes in some detail what the Council hopes will happen this year. By mid-year, after three calendar quarters of little or no increase in real output, businesses will find themselves selling in markets less receptive to price increases. This will influence their pricing policies and also stiffen their resistance to wage demands.

The Council contends that these pressures will continue to damp down inflation as long as output remains below its potential, even though output may increase. Thus, in the second half of 1970, it anticipates some relaxation of monetary policy to stimulate business recovery and holds that such an expansion would nevertheless permit a further reduction in the rate of inflation.

Thereafter, the Council envisions more of the same: continuing slow economic growth and a further gradual decline in the rate of inflation until it subsides to a tolerable rate, at which time it will be safe to permit output to rise to its full potential.

WILL THIS APPROACH WORK?

An appealing scenario, certainly. But is it realistic? What are the chances that all the players will play out their roles as written?

As highly competent economists and honest men, the members of the President's Council do not themselves evaluate these chances as 100 per cent. Indeed, their report is refreshingly candid in its recognition of dangers that lie ahead. It admits that the timing and magnitude of the effect of present policies on inflation is "somewhat uncertain."

The uncertainties may be even more uncertain than that. One question mark is what will happen to the Federal budget. Mr. Nixon's budget for fiscal 1971 is barely in balance. The precariously slim surplus it projects could quickly be erased by any one of a dozen different actions or inactions by the Congress. By year end, a sizeable budgetary deficit could be in prospect. That would be inflationary in itself and would tend to reinforce inflationary expectations, especially among businessmen.

But even if a budgetary surplus is somehow achieved, the question remains whether the official policy prescription will check inflation. Is the inflationary psychology likely to dissipate when the Government is assuring the nation that public policy will stimulate a business upturn before the end of the year? After all, if government economists can look across a valley, so can other people.

WHAT IF IT DOESN'T WORK?

There is a very real possibility, therefore, that some of the actors may not adhere to the roles assigned to them in the Administration's scenario. The wage-price spiral may continue to ignore its script. Also, Congress might intrude itself into the act again. And unless there is a significant deceleration of inflation over the months ahead, measures for stimulating recovery may have to be postponed.

This certainly does not mean that we are headed either for a severe recession or an upsurge of inflation. Chairman Arthur F. Burns has assured us that the Federal Reserve will do everything in its power to prevent a serious recession and that it is equally determined to combat inflation. But it is nevertheless possible that the inflation may prove to be more stubborn than the policy makers anticipate.

What if this turns out to be the case? If the inflation does not succumb to a brief dip in business, what then? Will we at that point have to choose between either a prolonged recession or resigning ourselves to perpetual inflation?

Or are there other things that could be done that might help stop the inflation? And if this is so, should we not be giving serious thought to these possibilities right now before we find ourselves in a worse mess than we are in already?

A NEW KIND OF INFLATION

It is important to recognize that our economy is presently experiencing a new kind of inflation. Not completely new, of course, but different enough to merit careful analysis.

In the past, inflations have been largely a matter of excess demand and they have come

to an end when demand subsided. For that matter, the present inflation was originally triggered in the mid-1960's by an upsurge in demand. But by now, it has assumed a different character. Demand is no longer excessive. To a greater degree than in any previous period, our present inflation is powered not by excess demand but by rising costs. It has changed from a demand-pull to a cost-push inflation.

Since 1965, prices and wages have been chasing each other upward at an accelerating pace. This wage-price spiral has now become the core of the inflationary process and has developed a considerable degree of immunity to the effects of monetary and fiscal policies.

Incidentally, when I use the phrase wage-price spiral, I do so simply because it is a matter of common usage, not because I wish to convey any implication as to which came first, the rise in prices or the rise in wages. That is an interesting question, to be sure, but it has little bearing on the problem that confronts us today. The urgent problem now is not how the spiral started but how it can be stopped.

The wage-price spiral is not a brand new phenomenon, of course. It played some part in earlier periods of inflation. But today it has acquired more momentum of its own than ever before. To a greater degree, it has become self-propelling, semi-autonomous.

IS MONETARY POLICY IN TROUBLE?

This raises the question whether general monetary and fiscal policies alone can effectively control this inflationary spiral or whether they need to be supplemented by additional measures designed to affect it directly.

Most economists in this country are particularly attached to monetary and fiscal policies because they are overall, conditioning controls which do not interfere with the interplay of competitive market forces. We are reluctant to admit that so many of our markets—including the labor market as well as the whole area of administered industrial prices—have developed so many imperfections and rigidities that monetary and fiscal policies may not always work the way they are supposed to. But if this is in fact the case, then the sooner we face up to it, the better.

Indeed, it is perfectly plain that in the world of industry, some of the rigidities are truly formidable. Once upon a time we used to say that what goes up must come down. But today, when industrial prices or wages go up, we know they will not come down. They are geared to a ratchet, which my dictionary defines as a mechanism which allows motion in one direction only. The old saying needs to be updated to read: What goes up goes higher.

Moreover, it has been apparent over the past year that monetary policy is no longer operating the way the textbooks say it should. Federal Reserve policies have made credit scarce for borrowers who are dependent on banks for credit but not for large corporations, which happen to be the big spenders. Interest rates have gone skyhigh but have had little deterrent effect on borrowing and spending by big business. As a matter of fact, higher interest rates have contributed to the rise in the consumer price index which is one of the main ingredients in the wage-price spiral.

So perhaps it is time we took a new look at this whole problem.

RULE OUT WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS

Let me reassure you right now that I am not leading up to recommending mandatory controls over wages, prices and profits. As you doubtless know, many persons, including a large number of businessmen, do think we should resort to this type of control. George Meany has stated his opinion that this would be the only way to stop this inflation. And among the academicians, J. K. Galbraith contends that our present-day economy—"The New Industrial State"—inevitably generates such persistent wage-price pressures that mandatory controls are now required.

Nevertheless, most of us, at this stage at least, would be strongly opposed to wage-price controls. Also, there is little indication that the American people would be willing to adopt such a distasteful expedient unless they should become convinced that there is no other way to stop inflation.

There are, however, various possible alternatives short of mandatory controls which are worthy of consideration. Let us examine some of them.

VOLUNTARY APPROACHES

Most of these alternatives can be classed as largely voluntary approaches to giving the public some voice in wage and price decisions that importantly affect living costs. Some of them, to be sure, might entail some governmental pressure but they would still be a far cry from a comprehensive system of mandatory controls. For that matter, some approaches would seek to utilize another kind of pressure, the weight of public opinion.

Such an approach would not be new. Over the past decade, the Federal government has on numerous occasions used its influence in various ways to moderate price and wage increases. To be sure, the results have not always made everyone happy, but neither does inflation. In our present predicament, the main question is whether action along these lines might help check this inflation.

It is natural to think at once of the Kennedy-Johnson wage-price guidelines. Many people seem to have the impression that the guideposts policy proved to be ineffective. Actually, for a number of years, 1962 through 1965, the guidelines worked amazingly well. Throughout that period, output and employment increased steadily and living costs remained stable. This might have been purely coincidental, of course, but there is fairly solid evidence which suggests that it was not.

WHAT HAPPENED TO THE GUIDELINES

Then, in 1966, two things happened that overwhelmed the guidelines. One, there was a sharp escalation of Federal deficit spending which set off a boom in the capital goods industries. Two, the Administration acquiesced to a wage settlement for the airline mechanics which flagrantly breached the guidelines.

So, the guidelines did not fail; they were scuttled. They were sound in principle and effective in action as long as they were not abused by the government itself.

Obviously, the old guidelines, in their original form, could not suddenly be imposed on our present inflationary situation. Living costs have been rising too fast too long, and while some workers have won wage increases which substantially exceed the rise in prices, others feel that they are still behind the parade. For that matter, the old guideposts policy would probably be politically unacceptable anyway.

Nevertheless, if we are to bring inflation under control, we must aim toward eventually reestablishing the basic principle which underlay the guidelines: the necessity for keeping wage increases in line with gains in national productivity. Today the urgent need is to figure out how we can make progress toward that objective.

DIVERGENT VIEWS OF COUNCIL CHAIRMEN

Last September the Council of Economic Advisors presented its views on this subject at a Congressional hearing. Dr. Paul W. McCracken, chairman of the Council, emphasized the difficulties of trying to devise guidelines or standards which could be applied to our present situation. He even voiced skepticism about the effectiveness of the guideposts policy during 1962–65, pointing out that there was slack in the economy during that period. He also expressed reservations about some of the ways the Government has at times used its influence in wage negotiations. His testimony constituted a sweeping reaffirmation of the Council's approach to date of relying exclusively on monetary and fiscal policies.

Needless to say, some economists disagree. Dr. Walter Heller, a former chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, has criticized the Administration's preoccupation with monetary-fiscal policy "to the neglect of other plausible, feasible, and reasonable things that could be done."

Another former Council chairman, Dr. Arthur Okun, has marshalled evidence attesting the effectiveness of the guidelines policy during 1962–65. He also testifies to the effectiveness of government influence in key wage and price decisions during 1967 and 1968, after the demise of the guidelines. Additionally, he documents the view, shared by many observers, that President Nixon's widely publicized pronouncement early in 1969 that his Administration would not attempt to influence price and wage decisions was partially responsible for the acceleration of the inflation last year.

It is most unfortunate, I think, that someone coined the term "jawboning" and that this inelegant epithet is now so commonly used to refer to any or all efforts on the part of government to persuade labor and management to refrain from unwarranted wage and price increases. I deplore the phrase because it disparages all such efforts and implies that none of them can amount to anything more than ineffectual haranguing. This tends to discourage thoughtful consideration of the various things that might be done. Yet this may be exactly what we need most at this point in time.

NATIONAL INCOMES POLICIES

Ten years ago the late John M. Clark, unquestionably one of the most distinguished economists this nation has ever produced, wrote a short but important book entitled, "The Wage-Price Problem." With prophetic foresight, Professor Clark warned then against "the subtle temptation to rely on fiscal and credit restrictions to do more in the way of restricting increases in the price level than they can properly and safely be called on to do."

At the conclusion of his incisive analysis of the wage-price problem, Professor Clark urged the establishment of a standing body of private personnel, equipped with staff which would make available not only arrays of factual material, but professionally competent economic analysis, carried to the point of showing its implications for policy. He recommended that special-interest groups be represented on this body, though not in control.

It is interesting that since the publication of Professor Clark's monograph in 1960, most of the advanced nations of Western Europe have done precisely what he recommended, whereas the United States has moved only tentatively in that direction. These European nations have developed what they call incomes policies. In essence, a national incomes policy is a joint effort by management, labor and government to work toward certain standards or targets for the shares of the growing national product that should go to labor and to profits.

In all the European countries which have experimented with incomes policies, special-interest groups, notably labor and management, have participated in defining these objectives. Only in America, this was not done.

I have recently been reading a voluminous volume which presents the papers and proceedings of a conference held last year in Stockholm which was devoted to the subject of national incomes policies. Over the past decade, European nations have been learn-

ing a good deal about incomes policies and their potentialities for curbing inflation. Some of their experiences have been disappointing, but in some instances, real progress has been achieved.

All of these countries have established standing bodies which have professional research staffs, as Professor Clark recommended. In the United Kingdom, for instance, the Prices and Incomes Board has issued dozens of reports which have had an impact on the industries concerned, on the productivity side and as well as on wages and prices. In some countries, the central board is an agency to which any apparently excessive wage increase can be referred.

NEEDED: A NEW INSTRUMENTALITY

I submit that we in this country today should be giving serious consideration to the establishment of a standing commission or board of the kind recommended ten years ago by John M. Clark. It might be called, for example, the Board on Prices and Wages. It should obviously be comprised of individuals of outstanding competence. Labor and management should be represented but in a minority role.

The Board's mission would be to develop a prices-and-incomes policy for this country designed to help to solve the wage-price problem. Its approach at the outset should be to enlist the voluntary cooperation of management and labor to slow the wage-price spiral. The objective would be to make the public interest an important consideration in wage and price decisions. To help achieve this, the Board would presumably try to bring to bear the full weight of an informed public opinion—informed by impartial fact-finding and analysis by the Board's staff.

Surely this would not be un-American. Certainly the American people have the right to some consideration in the making of decisions that so vitally affect their welfare.

Indeed, how would one otherwise define democracy? As a tug-of-war between management and labor with the American people denied the right to have a tug?

Cynics may argue that such an effort would be futile, that management and labor are incapable of considering anything except their own immediate, short-run interests. Well, perhaps I am naive, but this I cannot believe. I have greater faith in American management and labor than to accept such a premise.

In addition, it seems clear that the attitudes of both management and labor can be significantly influenced by public opinion. If only for pragmatic reasons, both are concerned about their public image.

It seems obvious that vague appeals to exercise self-restraint, whether emanating from the White House or even from Mr. Spiro Agnew himself, cannot be expected to have much effect. There is need for an instrumentality to translate the public interest into rather specific terms in particular circumstances.

Representative Reuss of Wisconsin has made a proposal somewhat along these lines. However, the mechanism he has suggested would involve the recommendation of annual guidelines by the Council of Economic Advisers plus subsequent review and final determination by both houses of Congress. It would seem that the chances of success would be far greater if this activity were removed from such close involvement both with the Administration and with the maelstrom of Congressional politics.

THE TIME TO ACT IS NOW

I see no reason for postponing the establishment of such an instrumentality. Even if the Administration's scenario for 1970 should prove to be completely successful, the Board might still make a useful contribution to price stability and increased productivity over the years ahead. And in the event that the inflation is not under control by the end of this year, then the Board will have been in operation for a while and on the basis of its experience, we can better decide whether it should be given more muscle.

The chances are that before this year is out, there will be some slackening in the rate of inflation. But if this does occur, the problem of cost-push inflation may not be licked but simply moderated. It may persist for years, a continuing drag on the economy and in danger of escalating again whenever output approaches its full potential. There is little likelihood that a Board on Prices and Wages would run out of problems.

Plainly, we should not expect any immediate results from the approach I have outlined. If this reason alone, the sooner we start, the better.

Maybe someone has a better suggestion. Perhaps the Government should revive the arm-twisting techniques employed on various occasions by Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. One recent suggestion is that all prices and wages be temporarily frozen, say for a period of six months. Another proposal is that an Industrial Court of Justice be established with final authority to pass on wage and price increases.

We obviously do not have time here today to analyze the pros and cons of these and other alternative courses of action. And for that matter, I would not claim the competence to do so anyway.

However, I would say this. Objections can be raised to any course of action that anyone can propose. But let us remember that there are objections to inflation too, very strong objections. And time is now running out. Within a matter of months, the classical monetary-fiscal prescription may prove to be inadequate, and if it does, we are going to be in a real pickle. Support for wage and price controls will probably increase, perhaps dramatically, and other drastic proposals are likely to be advanced. No one can say what might emerge from such a situation, but the outcome might be most unfortunate. There is no time to lose, therefore, in considering what more we should be doing right now to bring inflation under control.

AN OPEN LETTER TO A GRADUATE

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, a lot of young people today are having a difficult time getting a job. There are jobs available, however, but the ones that obtain them are those who groom both their attitudes and themselves in the interests of a prospective employer.

An interesting article on this subject took the form of "An Open Letter to a Graduate" that appeared in the June 24 issue of the Gettysburg Times, a prominent daily newspaper in my congressional district. I insert it into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and especially call its attention to those young people who are looking for employment today:

AN OPEN LETTER TO A GRADUATE

DEAR KID: Today you came to me for a job. From the look of your shoulders as you walked out, I suspect you've been turned down before, and maybe you believe by now that kids out of high school can't find work.

But I hired a teenager today. You saw him. He was the one with polished shoes and a necktie. What was so special about him? Not experience, neither of you had any. It was his attitude that put him on the payroll instead of you. Attitude, son. A-T-T-I-T-U-D-E. He wanted that job badly enough to shuck the leather jacket, get a haircut, and look in the phone book to find out what this company makes. He did his best to impress me. That's where he edged you out.

You see, Kid, people who hire people aren't "with" a lot of things. We know more about Bing than about Ringo, and we have Stone-Age ideas about who owes whom a living. Maybe that makes us prehistoric, but there's nothing wrong with the checks we sign.

Ever hear of "empathy"? It's the trick of seeing the other fellow's side of things. I couldn't have cared less that you're behind in your car payments. That's your problem and President Nixon's. What I needed was someone who'd go out in the plant, keep his eyes open, and work for me like he'd work for himself. If you have even the vaguest idea of what I'm trying to say, let it show the next time you ask for a job. You'll be head and shoulders over the rest.

You know, Kid, men have always had to get a job like you get a girl: Case the situation, wear a clean shirt, and try to appear reasonably willing. Maybe jobs aren't as plentiful right now, but a lot of us can remember when master craftsmen walked the streets. By comparison you don't know the meaning of "scarce".

You may not believe it, but all around you employers are looking for young men and women smart enough to go after a job in the old-fashioned way. When they find one, they can't wait to unload some of their worries on him.

For both of our sakes, get eager, will you?

"THE BOSS."

MODERNIZING MEDICINE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the American Medical Association held its convention in Chicago last week and WGN radio and television gave extensive coverage to the deliberations.

In addition, WGN carried a very penetrating editorial commentary on a number of resolutions adopted by the house of delegates to the AMA. I believe the emphasis in the editorial is very effective analysis of the subject. It follows:

MODERNIZING MEDICINE

The House of Delegates of the American Medical Association resolved at its Chicago convention this past week that it is the basic right of every citizen to have available to him adequate health care . . . and that the medical profession, using all the means at its disposal, should endeavor to make good medical care available to each person. The AMA, long viewed as one of the most conservative organizations, representing one of the most conservative professions, should be commended for this new attitude.

We feel this to be a step, the first step, toward a radical overhaul in the entire system for delivering medical services to consumers, people. The profession knows it is not large enough to meet all of today's needs. It knows, too, medical training is not keeping pace with the population. A system of health care now serving some two million people, mostly on the west coast may hold the answer. It makes great use of paramedi-

cal people . . . mostly technicians and therapists, and a computer, freeing doctors to work at their highest level of skill, with people who need them most.

The key to the system is a health-testing and referral service, operated by paramedical personnel under the supervision of physicians. Patients who are well could be referred to a health care center, manned by supervised paramedicals. Patients who are sick, or whose computerized medical profiles indicate they may be getting sick, would be referred to sick-care centers, for treatment by physicians. Another unit, also staffed by paramedical personnel under physician supervision, would handle long-term medical maintenance for chronic conditions.

Another AMA resolution calls for talks with appropriate federal agencies, other medical organizations and health insurance spokesmen . . . talks aimed at the improvement of medical service.

We think systems similar to those described above should be the first order of discussion.

FOR 45 YEARS SHE CARED

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, Miss Marjorie Dowling, an elementary school teacher in the Winneconne school system, is retiring after 45 years of service to the community.

Miss Dowling has made an invaluable contribution to three generations of my constituents and is a model of talent and dedication in the teaching profession.

The following article, written by Polly Zimmerman, which appeared in the May 23–24, 1970, edition of the Paper, Oshkosh, Wis., shows the great esteem in which Miss Dowling is held by all those who know her:

FOR 45 YEARS SHE CARED

(By Polly Zimmerman)

WINNECONNE.—A gentle lady with a leprachaun twinkle in her eye will close the door to her primary classroom for the last time at the end of the present school term.

Marjorie Dowling has taught in the Winneconne School System for 45 years. And she's a little surprised at the stir her retirement is causing.

Recognition by the local PTA organization came first of all. Fellow teachers and administration of the Community School District began mysterious picture-taking forays and quiet planning sessions. A certificate of appreciation signed by Gov. Warren Knowles and State Superintendent William Kahl cited her for 45 years of dedicated service to the State of Wisconsin.

Perhaps the only acclaim with which she is completely comfortable is the outspoken affection of the hundreds of students who have passed through her classroom in those years.

A Main Street businessman watched day after day as Miss Dowling, surrounded by small children vying for the place of honor next to her, walked back and forth to school. He stopped her one day as she walked past his store.

"Miss Dowling, I guess you must be the mother of the town!"

Teacher-mother that she has been, every child who stammered his way through a primer or learned is first sums under her tutelage was sure of his place in her affection.

"I guess sometimes my discipline wasn't as good as it should be. But I always felt that if I had to punish a child, I had to let him know as soon as I could that I cared about him."

So she mended trousers and bandaged knees. She chided an imp and laughed when she was alone at the way a six-year-old had outwitted her. And she worried through annual epidemics of childhood diseases.

She has taught the sons and daughters of earlier pupils, and now she is teaching grandchildren of some of her first class members.

After she graduated from Oshkosh Normal School in 1925, Marjorie Dowling returned to the village in which she had grown up. Her first teaching assignment was in the west side elementary school which she had attended as a student. Her father, William Dowling, had been a masonry contractor for the building which now houses the Wagner Industrial Products Co.

When the elementary grades were transferred to the red brick building on the east side of the village, Miss Dowling moved into the primary room on the third floor. As the system grew, and rural districts closed one-room schools and bussed children into the village, the primary department moved into temporary quarters in hastily constructed quonset huts on the school property.

Even when a new school was built (following a fire which gutted the red brick building), the moving was not at an end.

The "Annex"—a building which she remembered had sheltered horses ridden to school by rural youths in her high school days—was turned into classrooms and housed the kindergarten and music departments during the early forties. And when crowded conditions in the fifties forced two later building programs, primary rooms were located there.

The Annex has made way for playground space now, and Miss Dowling has been ensconced in the sunny, efficient, well-appointed classroom in the kindergarten-primary wing of the Central School. She is retiring at a time when school population problems are again pressing. And it is difficult for her to understand why the district has rejected two bond issues which would have provided the space she believes is so badly needed.

"Everyone should understand that's it's really less expensive to have fewer children per teacher. They need individual help. In order to give children the education they must have, we must have space to do it. I wish people would come to school and visit. I wish they would watch the children crowded in the classrooms and passing through the halls in droves!"

Looking back over 45 years Miss Dowling sees a change in children.

"How have they changed? Oh, they're exposed to so much more. They have so much more to learn, and the facilities for learning are so much greater everywhere in their lives. The children are more outgoing, too. They express themselves more easily."

She feels the pressures that are exerted on children, and she counters excessive pressures with affectionate concern.

During her teaching career, Miss Dowling has taken additional academic work through extension courses and at the institution from which she graduated in 1925.

"I've gone to school there under four kinds of administrations: State Normal School, Oshkosh State Teachers College, Wisconsin State College, and WSU-O."

She has watched the Winneconne School grow from a village system to a sprawling community school district. She recalls initiating the leveling systems of reading groups in the primary school in 1936. And she looks back with pleasure on her contacts with fine educators within the system and those who have worked closely with it through special state studies and carefully monitored experimental programs.

"I'm especially glad to see John Reukauf back. He's a fine elementary principal. He's dedicated and understanding—and he loves children. He listens to them!"

Her concern has spilled out into community affairs, too. The first Bluebird group in the village was one which she organized and led in 1930. In the early years of the March of Dimes, she was first chairman for an area drive. For many years she taught catechism at St. Mary Church. She did private tutoring during summer months and established an informal lending library in her home for the children of the neighborhood. And she has been a member of the Civic League for 45 years.

In her first 36½ years of teaching, Miss Dowling recalls that she missed less than 10 days of school. Then a heart attack took her out of her classroom for many weeks. As soon as she was able to resume teaching, she was back with her small charges and she's proud that she has missed only about 10 days of school since her recovery.

Closing the classroom door will not be easy for Marjorie Dowling.

She is sentimental about the hundreds of schooldays and the hundreds of children. But retirement will not end her immersion in the world of education, for too many new and wonderful things are happening in the exciting world and Miss Dowling plans to remain very much a part of it.

SO WE CAN HAVE A VOICE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, young people today want to be counted—and they should be. The law passed recently lowering the voting age to 18 is a milestone toward giving the young a voice in choosing public officials.

During the recent efforts to obtain passage of this law, Allen Ord, of Baldwin Park, Calif., wrote a song for use in the campaign. Allen had just turned 18.

I urge my colleagues to read the words of this song, carefully, and—as the song title asks—"Listen."

The song is especially significant because a few days after he had written the song—never knowing the eventual outcome of the campaign for the 18-year-old vote—Allen was killed in an automobile accident.

The song is as follows:

LISTEN

I got to live today
  I may be dead tomorrow
And all I want to say
  Is I don't want any sorrow

I've got a lot to say
  But I just can not say it
These thoughts I put away
  All I can do is play it

If you could comprehend
  Just what I'm talking about
I can't tell you face to face
  I've got to shout it out

There are darker days ahead
  Alone . . . we can not make it
The world will soon be dead
  With no one left to fake it

If you'll invite me in
And let my words get to you
Then we can live as friends
And maybe pull it through

For the first time in history
We simply have no choice
We've got to stick together
You and me
So we can have a voice

CONCERN FOR AMERICA

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, many citizens within the Fourth District have expressed concern to me about some of the things that are happening in America today. Mr. Herb Maffett from my district, has forwarded two editorials from the Leader, Jacksonville Beach newspaper, expressing his concern. One editorial states the confusion of the American people about what is happening on our campuses and states the resentment many people feel:

There's nothing idealistic about university administrators abandoning their responsibility to parents and the public by allowing radicalized faculties to leave their classrooms and parade in the street. . . .

There's nothing idealistic about shouting 'academic freedom' when that freedom is used to shatter young citizens' belief in their country, its constitutional principles and free enterprise system. . . .

The genuine idealism of America is vested in our Constitution, and in the traditional principles of our national life: faith in God, belief in country and respect for family and community. This idealism is deeply rooted in the hearts of the vast majority of Americans. But their beliefs are scorned by effete intellectuals and bitterly attacked by the New Left revolutionaries who want to burn down America.

The protestors who talk of peace while breaking glass windows and lighting torches, have no program but destruction and national paralysis. They must be contained, separated and prevented from closing universities and otherwise halting the normal and essential processes of our society. The protesters must not be allowed to delude the people and destroy a great and free republic. (By Thurman Sensing.)

The other editorial which expressed concern by our people lists rules laid down by Communists over the years and exhorts the readers of the Leader to read these words and remember them. This is the list:

(1) Corrupt the young, get them away from religion. Get them interested in sex. Make them superficial; destroy their ruggedness.

(2) Get control of all means of publicity, and thereby get people's minds on their government by focusing their attention on athletics, sexy books, plays and other trivialities.

(3) Divide people into hostile groups by constantly harping on controversial matters of no importance.

(4) Destroy the people's faith in their national leaders by holding the latter up to contempt, ridicule and obloquy.

(5) Always preach true democracy, but seize power as fast and as ruthlessly as possible.

(6) By encouraging government extravagance, and destroy its credit; produce fear of inflation, rising prices and discontent.

(7) Foment strikes in vital industries; encourage civil disorders and foster a lenient and soft attitude on the part of the government toward these disorders.

(8) By specious argument cause a breakdown of the old moral virtues, honesty, sobriety, continence, faith in the pledged work, ruggedness.

(9) Cause the registration of all firearms on some pretext with a view of confiscation of them and leaving the population helpless.

Mr. Speaker, publications such as the Leader deserve the praise of all of us in Congress who recognize the dangers they have cited in these editorials. Here is an example of free press, used in a free manner, in an effort to preserve the freedoms we hold in this country.

"LIGHGHT"

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, many years ago a large ash tree was being cut down in my neighborhood. I heard an elderly gentleman quote:

"Woodman, spare that tree!
Touch not a single bough!
In youth it sheltered me,
And I'll protect it now."

Days later, I heard the same voice speak of the dignity of labor and the worthiness of strong brown, toil-worn hands, and of the weakness of soft white hands:

"The rich man's son inherits cares;
The bank may break, the factory burn
A breath may burst his bubble shares,
And soft white hands could hardly earn
A living that would serve his turn;
A heritage, it seems to me,
One scarce would wish to hold in fee."

And speaking of the fear of death, the elderly scholar quoted from the Bard of Avon:

"But that the dread of something after death,
The undiscover'd country from whose bourn
No traveller returns, puzzles the will
And makes us rather bear those ills we have
Than fly to others that we know not of?
Thus conscience does make cowards of us all;
And thus the native hue of resolution
Is sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought,
And enterprises of great pith and moment
With this regard their currents turn awry,
And lose the name of action."

Yesterday, on this floor we were told that poverty would not produce poetry or art. And I was reminded of the poor man's poet, Bobbie Burns, from whose heart welled the most lyrical and touching words ever uttered by mortal man.

In his youth, Burns suffered cold, hunger, and untold hardship. Yet from his pen we have "Flow Gently, Sweet Afton:"

"Flow gently, sweet Afton, among thy green braes!
Flow gently, I'll sing thee a song in thy praise!
My Mary's asleep by thy murmuring stream—
Flow gently, sweet Afton, disturb not her dream!

"Thou stock dove whose echo resounds thro' the glen,
Ye wild whistling blackbirds in yon thorny den,
Thou green-crested lapwing, thy screaming forbear—
I charge you, disturb not my slumbering fair!"

What a contrast is portrayed in the American Literary Anthology published under a grant from the National Endowment for the Arts.

Our taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, paid $700 for a one-word poem, "Lighght." The meaning of this word, if it has a meaning, has not been interpreted to me. The award was made, I understand, by that paragon of virtue and peerless connoisseur of art and literature, Gorgeous George Plimpton.

In glancing through this anthology, three- and four-letter words of the guttersnipe variety were found in profusion. This anthology constitutes the rankest compound of villainous smell that ever offended human nostril.

To think that elected representatives of the American people would throw away tax dollars wrung from the sweat of our citizens' brows on such prurient mouthings is most deplorable.

Literature has been defined as thoughts expressed in words of such enduring charm that men treasure them and will not let them die. When the Commission on Arts and Humanities stimulates literature reflecting this interpretation, I will support it. But for the sake of the youth of our country, I cannot support any person, group of persons, commission, or group of commissions who publish such prurient filth at public expense.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE H. R. GROSS

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I join, gladly, with my colleagues in wishing my good friend from Iowa, the Honorable H. R. GROSS, a very happy birthday. I have known this distinguished gentleman for a little more than 20 years now and they have been memorable years. I would recount some of the more memorable events of those times here but I would not want to risk the gentleman's ire since I know he is keenly aware of the cost of each page of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. I shall try to take no more space than a quorum call or two would take. Seriously, Mr. Speaker, I think there can be no doubt that the House of Representatives is a better body for having such a man as H. R. GROSS as a Member. We do not always agree, which is perhaps a good thing for everybody concerned, but even so one cannot help but have the highest regard for H. R.'s capability for work and his integrity. The gentleman from Iowa came here some 20 years ago following a distinguished career as a

newspaperman and a radio newsman. As they say, he met a lot of interesting people including even one sports announcer nicknamed "Dutch" who reportedly now runs a State somewhere west of the Mississippi. But I digress; I merely wanted to wish my truly long time and valued good friend the happiest of days and I hope that before too long we can both get to that undone fishing.

SENATOR DOLE'S ROLE

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, the junior Senator from Kansas, the Honorable ROBERT DOLE, has received well-deserved commendation these days for his role in bringing the Gulf of Tonkin resolution up for repeal in the Senate. Fulton Wilkins, general manager of KEX radio, Portland, Oreg., sees this as a senatorial baseball game from which Senator DOLE could emerge as the "Rookie of the Year."

In whatever context it is placed, Senator DOLE's prowess in knowing what to do when it is his "turn at bat" speaks volumes for his effectiveness in the U.S. Senate.

I think my colleagues will find this KEX editorial amusing and interesting. Under leave to extend by remarks, I wish to place it in the RECORD at this point:

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 fields 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 enough to duck. The ball comes back much harder and straighter than it is thrown.

RALPH NADER OFFERS STRINGENT ANTISMOG PROPOSALS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, existing smog-control legislation is a joke.

The words are blunt, but then, they should be.

Despite all the rhetoric, all the promises, all the beautiful language, the dismal truth is that air pollution continues to worsen.

Unfortunately, prospects for improvement remain dim. And smog is no laughing matter.

A valuable perspective on the whole situation—and especially legislative ramifications—was given recently in a letter from Ralph Nader to the chairman of the Senate Subcommittee on Air and Water Pollution, Mr. MUSKIE.

Ralph Nader's involvement with the smog crisis is long standing. Nader was instrumental in the beginning steps which led to the landmark antitrust suit filed last year charging major automobile manufacturers with a 15-year conspiracy to retard development of air pollution controls. Nader and his co-workers at the Center for the Study of Responsive Law have undertaken intensive analysis of existing smog legislation, and in the letter to Senator MUSKIE, a series of important new programs and policies are suggested.

I am proud that already I have offered new legislation similar to half the Nader proposals. Last October I introduced H.R. 14579 which would amend the National Emissions Standards Act by eliminating the requirement that established standards take into account economic costs. H.R. 15613, introduced this January, calls for increasingly stringent standards by 1975. And H.R. 16775, submitted in early April, would penalize companies cited for pollution violations by not allowing them to compete for Government contracts.

I agree with Mr. Nader in his biting criticisms of the clean air bill just passed in this body. I believe that the Nader letter to Senator MUSKIE is an important document, and I am now inserting it in the RECORD at this point:

JUNE 24, 1970.

Senator EDMUND MUSKIE,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR MUSKIE: On May 12, 1970, a detailed Task Force Report on Air Pollution was issued by a group of students and young lawyers which I brought together for that purpose. That Report documented a dismal picture of broken promises, governmental paralysis at all levels and rampant corporate irresponsibility—all taking place against a backdrop of legislative failures. Among other things, the Report explored the following alarming developments:

Deaths and diseases related to air pollution are rising to epidemic levels;

Air-borne contaminants are responsible for billions of dollars of economic losses annually;

The majority of identified pollutants are not being systematically monitored, much less controlled;

NAPCA and State agencies are hopelessly underfunded and understaffed to bring about effective abatement;

Automotive emissions have not been reduced and may even have increased, despite a federal "regulatory" program spanning the last three model years; and

Emissions from stationary sources (such as factories and powerplants) continue unabated and in many cases have increased.

Existing laws have failed to have a perceptible impact on the growing violence of air pollution. The Air Quality Act of 1967 has yet to bring about the reduction of emissions from a single smokestack in the nation. Emission standards for automobiles have been set for only two pollutants—carbon monoxide (CO) and hydrocarbons (HC)—while emissions of equally dangerous nitrogen oxides have increased. Other automotive pollutants such as lead, asbestos, rubber particulate and gaseous matter may be dealt with at another time, if ever. Furthermore, the Task Force disclosed that the failure of "control" systems for CO and HC is the general rule and that the government has shown an unwillingness or incapacity to enforce the law against automobile manufacturers.

This legislative and administrative breakdown has been perceived more clearly by the American public than by the Congress; unquestionably—as the burgeoning environmental movement testified—the nation is far ahead of its legislators with regard to its demands for forceful, immediate cessation of environmental hostilities. Forceful action is required more this year than ever before. The House of Representatives, despite the valiant efforts of a handful of members seriously committed to clean air, has enacted a bill which closely follows many of President Nixon's ill-considered proposals. Your leadership at this critical juncture will be measured in part by your efforts to undo the damage that could be wrought by the final enactment of the House amendments to the Clean Air Act. More specifically, an adequate response on your part seems to require that you champion legislation based on the following principles:

(1) Pollution control—both from motor vehicles and stationary sources must no longer be impeded by the pernicious phrase, "economic and technological feasibility." This stricture on the power of the Secretary to move expeditiously against contamination of our environment caters to the corporate strategy of deception and delay. With regard to issues vitally affecting the quality of life—indeed the very length of human life—the nation cannot pause to decide whether the effort is "feasible," a term which in industry parlance is construed to mean "convenient" and "profitable."

(2) Closely related to this is the need to establish legislatively a national timetable for cleaning up the environment. The Secretary

should be required to immediately do the following: (a) ban the emission of extraordinarily hazardous materials (e.g. beryllium); (b) set standards which are national in scope and tailored to areas with the most serious problems for *all* identified pollutants. The Secretary should require the states to quickly develop plans to implement these standards by mandating the application of the best available control or foreseeable technology. Where control cannot be achieved by this method or by fuel substitution, industry has no business using our atmosphere as a free raw material to contaminate.

Quite simply, such operations should be banned. With this prospect facing industry, you may be astonished to observe the rapidity with which control technology is "discovered." In short, it is time to call a halt to the inverted procedures which permeate the air pollution laws—procedures which require the public to prove a danger to health before action can be taken. Enough evidence has been developed by eminent scientists to indicate that air pollution presents a health hazard to present and future generations of Americans; and yet, under present laws, administrators maintain that they cannot move expeditiously because they have not "proved" health effects. This approach is enshrined throughout the House-enacted bill and must be discarded if the 1970 air pollution legislation is to be something better than a fraud on the public. One of the many examples of this twisted thinking is contained in the fuel regulation provisions of the bill which would require the Secretary to meet a tortuous burden of proof before he could ban an obviously dangerous pollutant such as lead. HEW officials have privately confided that the provision is totally unworkable.

(3) Production-line vehicles must be tested in numbers large enough to assure statistical validity. In view of the abundant evidence that production cars have poorer emission characteristics than the hand-coddled protoypes tested by NAPCA, it was dismaying to note your failure to address this problem in your own proposed legislation. I hope that this omission will be rectified. Furthermore, I hope that you will move beyond the House bill to: a) require that NAPCA test large numbers of vehicles in use at 5,000-mile intervals up to 50,000 miles and, b) require that manufacturers install, *at no cost to the consumer*, control devices on used cars, and c) require that manufacturers warrant the operation of all control devices for a minimum of 50,000 miles.

(4) Standards-setting and more intensive surveillance of automobiles propelled by the internal combustion engine must be declared to be no more than interim national policy. The Secretary should be ordered to establish emission standards to be effective for no later than the 1975 model year which are at least as favorable as the presently feasible Rankine Cycle engine.

(5) Industrial secrecy is perhaps the best single weapon for keeping the forces of environmental clean-up at bay. The various proposals for visitation and inspection rights must be supplemented by full subpoena power and a requirement that polluters monitor and report their emissions under guidelines prescribed by the Secretary.

(6) The new law should prevent the purchase by the federal government of products manufactured by any company cited for violation of the air pollution laws. This would simply be an extension of the principle embodied in other laws and regulations which deny the right to do business with the federal government to corporations which violate various public policies.

These legal requirements will be illusory unless supported by civil and criminal penalties which are designed to provide realistic deterrence to violations, adequate funding and manpower for NAPCA (or its successor agency) and a strong provision for private class actions to enforce rights created under the law in order to assure that lapses in administrative vigilance may be corrected by affected citizens.

I have attempted to outline the steps which are indispensible for a modest start on the path of controlling the contamination of our atmosphere. I would be pleased to testify before your Subcommittee at your request, regarding a more detailed approach for controlling and preventing air borne pollutants. Your response to the fore-going would be welcomed.

Sincerely,

RALPH NADER.

"BLOODBATH" SEEN IF REDS WIN

HON. KEITH G. SEBELIUS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, a recent study of Vietcong terrorism should be required reading for all those who naively assert that the Communists could peacefully come to power in Vietnam, or be brought into a coalition government without reprisals and repression being directed toward the South Vietnamese people.

This study, made by the Rand Corp. under Dr. Stephen T. Hosmer, is discussed in a June 16 editorial from the Washington Daily News. I commend both this editorial and the Rand study to the attention of my colleagues:

"BLOODBATH" SEEN IF REDS WIN

(By Mike Miller)

A private study of Viet Cong terrorist tactics commissioned by the Defense Department has concluded that at least 100,000 South Vietnamese would be executed if a communist regime ever should gain control there.

"Indeed, it might well be considerably higher," said the study by the Rand Corp. of Santa Monica, Calif. Titled "Viet Cong repression and its implications for the future," the study was prepared for the Pentagon's advanced research projects agency.

The report, compiled by senior staff member Dr. Stephen T. Hosmer of the Rand Washington staff, was based on extensive study of captured enemy documents and other intelligence data. It generally supports the argument a bloodbath would follow any communist rise to power in South Vietnam.

Critics of U.S. policies in Vietnam who favor faster or immediate troop withdrawals dispute the bloodbath theory.

But Dr. Hosmer concludes the communists after a takeover probably would decide to "deal severely" with such groups as defectors from the Viet Cong, South Vietnamese intelligence and counterintelligence personnel, government officials, national police and other security personnel and military officers and noncommissioned officers.

Given the number of South Vietnamese in these categories, Dr. Hosmer wrote, "this author finds it difficult to believe that the number (to be executed) would be much less than 100,000."

The Rand report stressed that any predictions of communist reprisals are "highly speculative" and the extent of executions could depend on how the Reds took power.

But he also noted: "A communist regime might, at some time, attempt a radical and rapid transformation of society (including collectivization) by fostering in the South the kind of grass-roots violence that was employed in the north during the land reform campaign of the 1950s . . . if this were to happen, the likelihood of an extensive bloodbath would be very great indeed."

The Rand survey found that Viet Cong leaders see a series of general offensives and uprisings as one of the most likely routes to a Red victory and takeover. Should this occur after all U.S. forces are withdrawn, "one could expect a bloodbath of very large proportions simply in the process of their assuming power," the report said.

But if the Reds should gain power thru gradual subversion and eventual capture of a coalition government negotiated under an international agreement, "the likelihood of widespread violence, at least during the takeover period, might be significantly smaller," the study added.

"HANDS ACROSS THE BORDER"

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Canadian-U.S. Interparliamentary Conference, I feel it altogether appropriate to call attention to an article in the June 27 issue of Business Week. The article deals with the dedication June 15 and 16 of a $110 million coal-mining and shipping complex of Kaiser Resources, Ltd. Kaiser Resources is a subsidiary of California's Kaiser Steel Corp.

I call attention to this article because of the uniqueness of this "hands across the border" project in British Columbia.

Kaiser Resources is to be commended for its forward-thinking approach to community relations involving the project. The article deals primarily with the economic benefits that will accrue to both Canadians and Americans. I feel it should also be noted that Edgar F. Kaiser, chairman of the board of Kaiser Steel, and Jack J. Carlson, president of Kaiser Steel, have committed Kaiser Resources to total ecological responsibility in the project. This will involve rehabilitation of mined land, including reforestation. In addition, portions to two towns, Natal and Michel, will undergo urban renewal projects and a new town, Sparwood, will be created by Kaiser Resources, all at the expense of Kaiser Resources.

It is this type of "good neighbor" policy on the part of private U.S. industry that helps make our continuing program of improving still more our relationships with Canada a much easier task.

The article from Business Week follows:

It was hands-across-the-sea as well as hands-across-the-border in British Columbia last week as Japanese customers and Canadian officials joined Kaiser Resources, Ltd., in inaugurating the company's $110-million coal-mining and shipping complex. In pomp, glitter, and duration, the two-day dedication outshone the opening of a U.S. supermarket. Even Prime Minister Pierre Elliott Traudeau hopped over from Ottawa to cut the ribbon and impart his benediction.

The coal mine at the center of the ex-

citement was not even a new one. Yet the reasons for the fanfare were not hard to find:

The world steel industry desperately needs coking coal. Canada has a good deal of it. And Kaiser has fashioned a mechanized system for mining and shipping it on a gigantic scale that sets new standards for economic management of resources.

Japan's need for coking coal is acute and growing more so. The Japanese steel industry more than tripled production in the last 10 years and hopes to double it again in the next 10, perhaps even dropping the U.S. to second place in the non-Communist world. But Japan is very short of all fossil fuels and will have to import 90% of its coal.

That is why President Chujiro Fujino of Mitsubishi Shoji Kaisha, Ltd., and Vice-President Hisao Makita of Nippon Kokan K. K. headed a large delegation of Japanese steel and shipping executives at the British Columbia ceremonies. Kaiser is committed to sell them 75-million tons of coal at $12.85 a ton (FOB Vancouver) over the next 15 years.

BILLIONS

The Kaiser complex is in two parts. One is a 108,000-acre tract in the Rockies at Fernie, B.C., that contains proved reserves of 135-million tons of high-quality metallurgical-grade coal in the first 20,000 acres to be explored. A royal commission 25 years ago estimated 7.4-billion tons of coal may lie within a 50-mi. radius.

The other part is a 55-acre "island," man-made from dredged silt, in the Strait of Georgia. It is 3 mi. off the coast near Vancouver and is linked to the mainland by a narrow strip of land, also dredged silt from the tidal flats. The causeway, in turn, supports a 24-ft. roadway and a single-line railroad track.

Kaiser Resources, a subsidiary of California's Kaiser Steel Corp., owns the Elkview Mine property, but rents the "island," Roberts Bank, from the Canadian government as a deep-water shipping terminal—known as a superport in maritime jargon because it will take bulk carriers up to 125,000 tons.

A 685-mi. ribbon of railroad track joins the two. On it, the Canadian Pacific Ry. operates a fleet of three unit-trains to provide a virtually continuous flow of coal from mountain to sea. The objective, after the present shakedown period, is to maintain such a flow that the big carriers can be bulk-loaded, either from huge stockpiles or directly from CP's specially designed gondola cars, at 6,000 tons per hour. The railroad designed the trains for as many as 100 cars each, hauling as much as 10,000 tons at a clip on the 36-hour one-way run. If the system hits its target of 97,000 ton-miles per round-trip hour, it will be the most efficient unit-train operation in North America, according to Kaiser.

Kaiser's coal deposits are not in virgin soil. They were mined as far back as the turn of the century, and their previous owner, Crows Nest Industries, Ltd., continued to mine them until a few years ago. But rising transportation costs, obsolete mining technology, and radical changes in energy sources made the operation economic suicide.

TITANS

Massive scale is the key that Kaiser President Jack J. Carlson expects will open the treasure chest. By assuring Canadian Pacific sufficient tonnage to justify a $48-million capital outlay, Kaiser was able to negotiate a freight rate of $3.50 a ton. To strip-mine tonage of that magnitude, the company custom-designed such equipment as a 54-cu.-yd. walking dragline and giant trucks that can handle 200-ton loads of coal. Mechanization at the superport includes a machine that seizes a loaded gondola car and without uncoupling it, turns it over to discharge its load, then sets it back on the track and pulls the next car into position for dumping—all in 100 seconds.

"Sometimes," says Carlson, "I get the feeling that the international steel business is really the transportation business because transportation costs loom so large in the finished product. Shipping costs can represent from one-half to two-thirds the delivered cost of steel-making raw materials."

Carlson has maneuvered Kaiser Steel into a position to cash in three ways from the exploding worldwide demand for steel that saw production jump from 340-million tons to 630-million tons in the 1960s and is forecast to reach 900-million tons to 1-billion tons by 1980. Ranking 10th among basic steelmakers in the U.S., Kaiser earns a moderate return on its bread-and-butter activity ($25.7-million after taxes on $420-million sales last year). It is now increasing its 2.9-million-ton steel capacity by 500,000 tons.

Kaiser Steel and the related Kaiser Aluminum & Chemical Corp. jointly own a steamship transportation company that has barely got started but can be expected to compete for some of the long-haul ocean commerce that both companies generate. In addition to shipping coal from Canada to Japan, the steel company ships coal from Utah to Japan and iron ore from California and Australia to Japan and Europe. Kaiser Aluminum ships bauxite and alumina from Jamaica and Australia to New Orleans and Tacoma—and, oddly enough, iron ore from its own mine in Canada to the same Japanese steel companies that buy Kaiser Steel's coal. Muscle in raw materials is a Kaiser family hallmark.

MR. NIXON REDEEMS HIS PROMISE

SPEECH OF

HON. CLARK MacGREGOR

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, once again President Nixon kept his promise to the American people by removing the American troops from Cambodia by the end of June. This is an important fact which the President's critics would do well to remember, and it is enhanced by the tremendous military success of the Cambodian operation.

An editorial from yesterday's Chicago Tribune discusses the gains from this venture, from both the military standpoint and from the view of turning the war over to the South Vietnamese military should the Communist side continue to reject our peace moves. I insert this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

MR. NIXON REDEEMS HIS PROMISE

When President Nixon announced on April 30 that he was sending American forces into Cambodia, he pledged that they would be withdrawn once enemy forces were driven out of their sanctuaries and once their military supplies were destroyed. At his news conference of May 8 Mr. Nixon stated that all Americans would be out of Cambodia by the end of June.

The President has made good on his promises. The last Americans crossed back into South Viet Nam yesterday. All the gloomy talk that the war was being expanded and that the United States had plunged into another quagmire proved exaggerated.

Mr. Nixon said that the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong base camps in Cambodia, some within 33 miles of the South Vietnamese capital of Saigon, threatened American forces in South Viet Nam and jeopardized his plans to withdraw 150,000 additional Americans from that country within the next year.

"These communist-occupied territories," he told the nation April 30, "contain major base camps, training sites, logistics facilities, weapons and ammunition factories, airstrips, and prisoner of war compounds."

Unquestionably the joint American-South Vietnamese operation attained a high degree of success. Our casualties were limited, while estimates of communist stockpiles destroyed or captured range up to 50 per cent. With Sihanoukville closed to enemy shipping under the new Cambodian government, these arms and supplies will not be easily replaced. The only other avenue of supply is overland and it is subject to air interdiction.

Mr. Nixon's policy of turning the war over to the South Vietnamese military will also be enhanced by the Cambodian foray. It has seriously set back the enemy and has provided perhaps six months of time for South Viet Nam to train its forces. The morale of South Vietnamese troops who engaged in the fighting in Cambodia is high. They have proved to themselves that they could meet the enemy on his own terms and carry the fight to him.

It took a high degree of political courage for the President to make his difficult decision. He was aware of the storm that would brew in Congress, among the student ranks, and among large segments of the public which oppose the war. But he said, "I would rather be a one-term President and do what I believe is right than to be a two-term President at the cost of seeing America become a second-rate power and to see this nation accept the first defeat in its proud 190-year history."

Of course, the carping will continue. Sen. Mike Mansfield, the Democratic leader, while admitting that militarily the operation was successful, contends that politically, it was a mistake, as North Viet Nam has reacted by grabbing more of Cambodia than it already occupied. In Mansfield's mind, this converts the war in South Viet Nam into an "Indochina war."

Mr. Nixon, however, has never made any promise to defend the present Lon Nol government of Cambodia. His primary purpose in crossing the border was to hurt the enemy and thus secure if not hasten United States withdrawal from Viet Nam. He can justifiably report to the nation tonight that this aim has been accomplished and that both South Viet Nam and Cambodia have benefitted by stripping the Communists of a considerable part of their war-making potential.

CONFERENCE OF STATE SANITARY ENGINEERS SUPPORTS RYAN BILLS TO COMBAT LEAD POISONING

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the problem of lead poisoning has become one of great concern to many Americans. This needless environmental disease afflicts children between the ages of 1 and 6 who live in dilapidated pre-World War II housing.

Such housing has usually not been repainted for a long period of time, and the original lead-based paint is still on its interiors. The children get their hands on pieces of paint or plaster, which has fallen from the walls and ceilings or

which has come off the window sills, and eat them.

As a result, they contract lead poisoning. Unfortunately, the symptoms of this disease are similar to virus or the flu. It is not until it reaches its most acute stages that the disease is detected. When it gets this far, however, it can result in permanent brain damage, mental retardation, cerebral palsy, epilepsy, and sometimes even death.

Last year, I introduced a package of three bills aimed at combatting and terminating this disease. Since then, some twenty of my colleagues have cosponsored or introduced similar legislation.

In the Senate, Senator EDWARD KENNEDY has introduced with 19 cosponsors a similar bill, and Senator SCHWEIKER and 18 cosponsors have introduced legislation forbidding the use of lead-based paint.

H.R. 9191 deals with the detection and treatment of the disease. It establishes a fund in the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare from which the Secretary could make grants to local governments to develop programs to identify and treat individuals afflicted by lead poisoning.

H.R. 9192 and 11699 deal with the source of lead poisoning—dilapidated housing.

H.R. 9192 authorizes the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to make grants to local governments to develop programs designed to detect the presence of lead-based paints and to require that owners and landlords remove it from interior walls and surfaces.

H.R. 11699 requires that a local government submit to the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development an effective plan for eliminating the causes of lead-based paint poisoning as a condition of receiving any Federal funds for housing code enforcement and rehabilitation, and that these plans must be enforced.

I am inserting in the RECORD a resolution passed by the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers on May 28. It supports the passage of this legislation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in this fight against this needless and cruel environmental disease. I hope that hearings will soon be held on the legislation, and that we can expeditiously make the bills law and start the campaign against lead poisoning.

The resolution follows:

CONFERENCE OF STATE SANITARY ENGINEERS

RESOLUTION NO. 7—LEAD POISONING IN CHILDREN

Whereas it has been estimated that over 200,000 children between the ages of 1 to 6 are victims of lead poisoning as a result of eating chips of lead-based paint from peeling window sills, door frames and walls, and from crumbling plaster, in residential environments; and

Whereas lead poisoning results in serious health effects, including neurological disorders, brain damage with mental retardation as a sequalae, and, at times, death; and

Whereas the environmental causes, and the techniques of prevention, of such lead poisoning are known; and

Whereas three bills—HR 9191, HR 9192, and 11699—are pending in the Congress, which would provide for Federal financial assistance to communities for the detection and treatment of such lead poisoning cases, and for the elimination of the related causes;

Be it therefore resolved that the Conference of State Sanitary Engineers strongly endorse the aforementioned legislation, and that this endorsement be conveyed to the Congress.

SPEECH OF HON. ANCHER NELSEN

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, speaking before the Drug Information Association June 12 in Washington, Congressman ANCHER NELSEN, of Minnesota, gave an excellent speech on the proposed legislation requiring the Government to prepare and publish a compendium of all marketed drugs.

As a member of the Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee of the House Interstate Commerce Committee, I have observed Congressman NELSEN'S valuable contribution and know of no other person as well qualified to speak on this subject.

Because of our mutual concern about the pharmaceutical industry I would highly recommend that my colleagues read this most valuable speech:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE ANCHER NELSEN

Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen—

It's a great privilege to participate in this meeting of distinguished members of the health professions, of the government, of the public, and of the pharmaceutical industry, who are exploring the complex questions that surround the long-standing drug compendium issue.

Some time ago, Dr. James W. Long, Director of the Health Services, National Science Foundation, stopped in at my office and invited me to be here with you today.

He emphasized to me the need to obtain the point of view of Members of the Congress, particularly those who deal with this area of drug information and work with the health team of our country. In our conversation, I pointed out to him that none of us in Congress are experts. We need and like to get information from those who are experts. We also need information from firms who are in the business of manufacturing drugs for the health needs of the people. These firms rise and fall on the quality of the product that they make available to the public.

There is always a disposition on the part of some people in the political field to seize on excuses for headlines and sometimes properly so. It has always seemed to me that the responsible segments of the industry have a good deal at stake in building and protecting a proper image of the industry.

Responsible people will suffer if irresponsible segments are permitted to proceed unchecked. Therefore, I have repeatedly suggested that the industry through ad hoc committees or organizations such as here represented make every effort to be sure that careful attention is given to proper ethics and to working as a team with the Food and Drug Administration to see that proper conduct is pursued.

It is through free and open discussions like this symposium among those who make and distribute drugs, those who prescribe or administer them, those who dispense them, those who regulate them, and those who take them to prevent or cure their ills that the solutions will ultimately come.

By the end of these two days of discussion, I hope you will be measurably closer to answers to some of the vexing questions—Is there a need for a new compendium? What should it include? Who should prepare and publish it? How should it be financed?

As a member of the Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee of the House Commerce Committee, I am familiar with the proposed legislation that would require the government to prepare and publish a compendium of all marketed drugs.

Our Committee would have the responsibility for handling this drug compendium legislation, if a need for federal action in this field should be established.

If such a need is established, I hope that conferences such as this one will have helped to identify common ground among professions, industry, government and public, as well as differences where they continue to exist. We in Congress would then be much better able to legislate responsibly, if and when the time comes.

But it may be that actions already being taken by you in the medical and pharmaceutical fields have removed some of the urgency from federal legislative proposals of a year or two ago.

I refer particularly to expansions in prescribing information and other improvements which have been made in that valued drug volume *Physicians' Desk Reference*, or *PDR*, and to the major project of the American Medical Association now nearing fruition—publication of the comprehensive drug volume *AMA Drug Evaluations*.

I understand that editing of all sections of the new AMA compendium, a 1,000-page volume, has now been completed, that preparation of the index—essential for easy use of this kind of massive material—is now in progress and that publication of the first edition is scheduled for the fall.

This important new reference volume, developed under the leadership of the AMA Council on Drugs, will cover about 1,400 drugs, it has been stated. This represents, as I understand it, virtually all drugs, both new and not so new, marketed nationally by any pharmaceutical manufacturer.

It may well be that this voluntary effort to prepare and publish *AMA Drug Evaluations*, along with existing drug information services, will fully serve the needs of the public health and welfare for readily accessible, accurate and comprehensive information about prescription pharmaceutical products.

The AMA and its council on Drugs are to be congratulated for the completion of this impressive work in the field of therapeutics, as are all who cooperated with them in this project.

If a federally-managed, federally-distributed drug compendium, financed with the taxpayers' money, is to be avoided, and I hope that it can be, the cooperation of everyone in the health professions and in pharmaceutical manufacture and distribution will be required. I urge all concerned to pitch right in and help.

Everyone in the health field, including those of us in the federal government with legislative or regulatory responsibilities, will be waiting to see how *ADE* works out.

If it does go well, the patient, the professions, industry and government alike will benefit. Surely a compendium developed by voluntary cooperative effort of health professionals in the private sector is to be preferred to a monolithic governmental compendium put together by our already hard-pressed federal health establishment.

The American Medical Association developed highly useful experience in this field some years ago in the preparation of an earlier guidebook on chemotherapeutics, *New Drugs*. This volume, however was limited in scope, as its title reflects. *ADE* is designed to correct that.

I understand that the pharmaceutical industry cooperated fully with the medical pro-

fession in the preparation of *New Drugs* by submitting full information about its products to AMA at the same time that New Drug Applications were filed with the Food and Drug Administration to obtain approval for marketing.

I hope that the same kind of participation can be expected from drug manufacturers as the medical profession goes forward with *AMA Drug Evaluations*. *All* information about *all* the products described in this comprehensive new volume and in its succeeding editions should be willingly turned over to *ADE*'s editors.

It seems to me there are a number of essential elements that must be provided for if this promising experiment is to be a success. These same elements would be essential, of course, to the success of any drug compendium—no matter who its sponsor. I might describe them as follows:

The medical and scientific commentary about each listed product must be prepared by competent professionals who maintain fair balance in their appraisal of the benefits and risks.

There must be a mechanism for competent professional updating of information about each product, as such information becomes available, so that each succeeding edition contains the latest data. (Supplements would be used between editions to update specific drug commentaries.)

There must be good organization of these masses of drug data, with cross-referencing to facilitate use.

There must be extensive, national distribution.

There must be continuing surveys to make sure that the volume *is useful* in the delivery of health care and *is being used*. Wherever shortcomings are identified, they should be corrected.

One of the more complex problems, it seems, is how to finance the printing and distribution of the volume to hundreds of thousands of physicians, hospitals, pharmacies, medical schools and other health professionals and institutions where it will be needed. This will require extensive cooperation at all levels, and among all sectors.

As we progress toward more effective management of drug information, another thought occurs to me as a member of the Public Health and Welfare Subcommittee, and it has its disturbing aspects.

With publication and widespread use of *AMA Drug Evaluations* or any other compendium, the medical and pharmacy professions may turn more than they have in the past to the prescribing and dispensing of pharmaceuticals by their established or generic names, with no specification of manufacturing source.

If this in fact should occur, it could create an even greater need than already exists for stepped-up government and industry programs to assure the general safety and effectiveness of the nation's drug supply, reregardless of whom a drug is made by or where it is dispensed.

This brings me to another disturbing question involved in preparation of a drug compendium. We all recognize that under present federal laws and circumstance, the Food and Drug Administration, which has responsibility for drug safety and efficacy, lacks the capacity to assure such safety and efficacy in a general and meaningful way.

Pharmaceutical manufacturers can engage in their life-and-death business by the simple act of registering with the FDA. No pre-production inspection is required by law, and though the Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act does require FDA inspection of drug establishments at least once every two years, this is not being done. We in the Congress have to assume some of the blame, of course, when we don't provide the Agency with sufficient manpower.

At present, the safety and efficacy of the nation's drug supply rests primarily on the competence and integrity of the pharaceutical industry. The FDA's regulatory and supportive role is limited.

In these circumstances, when a new compendium is about to be introduced, is it perhaps time for Congress to consider whether a drug manufacturer should be required to get a federal license?

Should there also be pre-production inspection by FDA before a plant could ship its products?

Should there also be requirements that a manufacturer demonstrate he can consistently meet official standards for his products before he is permitted to ship them?

Should there also be more attention paid by FDA and industry to proving the biological availability of the active ingredients of drugs now being reviewed in the National Academy of Sciences/National Research Council Drug Efficacy Study?

Except for the original products which were cleared by FDA for safety, none of the thousands of pharmaceuticals now under efficacy review by the NAS/NRC and FDA were ever subject to FDA scrutiny in a New Drug Application.

I raise these questions, and would welcome your thoughts on them, and on any other matters bearing on the safety and effectiveness of drugs. I believe they must be answered fully before the health professions can place complete confidence in any new drug compendium, even the *ADE*.

In closing, I would like to suggest that however the debate is resolved on the issue before you today—"A New Drug Compendium: Why? What? How? When?"—*a continuing consortium of competence* will be required to get the job done in the public interest.

That array of talent and skills representing government, industry, and the medical profession will also be available to make other major contributions toward drug safety and effectiveness. And that goal, of course, is what this conference is all about.

I commend you for setting up this valuable conference and urge you to continue the good work which you have started.

SENATORIAL RESPONSIBILITY

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, for many years, although the Congress authorizes appropriations and appropriations must originate in the House, the Presidents have maintained the right of that office to spend or not to spend.

A recent editorial in the Evening Star of Washington, D.C., explains the necessity of maintaining this prerogative and why the President's veto of H.R. 11102 should have been sustained.

I enter the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

SENATORIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Tomorrow the Senate will decide whether or not to complete the process of overriding President Nixon's veto of the hospital construction bill. The general expectation is that the Senate, which originally passed the bill by a vote of 79 to 0, will follow the lead of the House and provide the first reversal of a presidential veto in a decade. The hope is that the general expectation is wrong.

The bill as passed by Congress is, for the most part, sound. There is little doubt that, in light of the escalating crisis in medical care, the administration proposals for federal contribution to the construction and modernization of medical facilities were unduly close-fisted. Congress was quite right in upping the ante.

But then Congress went one step too far. It wrote into the bill a requirement that all of the money must be spent during this fiscal year for which it is appropriated. This provision would deny the administration any discretion in the management of federal spending in the area of health programs during the three-year life of the bill, regardless of changing economic conditions.

Mr. Nixon made it clear that his veto was based primarily on the mandatory spending provision, not on the increase in grants and loans. He labeled the provision "a long step down the road of fiscal irresponsibility." And he was right.

If there is any one thing that can be clearly foretold about the years immediately ahead, it is that we are in for a period of fiscal uncertainty, in which the administration's skill at fine adjustments to the economy can spell the difference between order and chaos. The responsibility lies, in large measure, with the President. The means to carry out that responsibility must remain with him as well.

The Senate can best execute its responsibility by sustaining the veto. Congress should then move without delay to present Mr. Nixon with the same bill, minus the attempt to diminish the administration's control over the federal budget.

LITHUANIA'S 39TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a most impressive and sobering exhibition of historic interest was the Lithuanian genocide exhibit which was staged the week of June 15 at the Sheraton-Chicago Hotel in conjunction with the 30th anniversary of the subjugation of Lithuania by the Soviet Union. The main speaker at the banquet held in conjunction with the exhibition was our distinguished minority leader, GERALD R. FORD, whose address I insert at this point:

30TH ANNIVERSARY OF LITHUANIA

My dear friends, we are gathered here to mark the 30th anniversary of a day of international shame, the day when the Soviet Union robbed the proud nation of Lithuania of its independence and plunged its people into political slavery.

Lithuania fell under the yoke of totalitarian dictatorship on June 15, 1940, and was annexed to the Soviet Union. This was an act of infamy which must never be acceded to by the Lithuanians themselves or by any of the freedom-living peoples of the earth.

Today I voice my earnest support for the just efforts of Lithuanians everywhere to reestablish their country as an independent state and to free their homeland from Russian control.

It is my view that any man who is dedicated to the principles of freedom and justice and informs himself of the manner in which the Soviet Union subjugated the Lithuanian people cannot help but be a Lithuanian ally in a continuing struggle to free them.

As a student of Lithuanian history, I am aware of how Lithuania first emerged as a nation in the 12th and 13th centuries, be-

came known as the Grand Duchy of Lithuania and dominated Eastern European affairs for several hundred years only to fall under Russian domination for a period lasting until World War I.

It was a glorious day, that February 16th of 1918, when Lithuania declared its independence. And it was a tragic event when in 1939 Communist Russia and Nazi Germany divided Eastern Europe between them. We know that in the summer of 1940 Lithuania was overrun by Red Army troops and was subsequently absorbed into the Soviet Union—and that except for a three-year period of German occupation it has remained under Soviet control ever since.

What many Americans do not know is that more than 400,000 Lithuanians were swallowed up in Russian and Siberian slave labor camps through mass deportations between 1941 and 1950, ripped from their homes by Soviet terrorists—Soviet murderers.

What many Americans do not know is that about 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters were killed in guerrilla warfare, resisting the Soviet occupation.

What some Americans have forgotten is that Lithuania and 21 other countries are captive nations which were pulled behind an Iron Curtain of slavery and terror by Russian Communist leaders in a pattern of occupation, annexation and tyranny.

Too few Americans are aware of Lithuania's proud history as an independent nation. Too few Americans recall that the Russians on July 12, 1920, signed a peace treaty with Lithuania which stated that "each nation has the right of self-determination, and becoming entirely independent from the state which it is now part of, without any reservations Russia recognizes Lithuania's independence and self-government with all its due jurisdictional rights, and with good will renounces for all times, all rights of Russian sovereignty which she had over the Lithuanian nation and its territories."

Too few Americans recognize the crime against an entire people that was committed when the Russian Communists took over the Lithuanian nation in June 1940.

My heart cries out when I think of how, with one stroke of the pen, Russian laws became immediately effective in all of Lithuania, how the Soviets substituted their entire way of life for that of the Lithuanians and swept away all of their modes of living, how they banned the teaching of religion from school curricula and dismissed the chaplains from the army and the prisons, how they shut down the faculty of theology and philosophy at Kaunas University, how they closed down the monasteries, expelled the monks, and branded all members of the clergy as enemies of the people.

The same terror techniques that were practiced within the Soviet Union itself were applied to Lithuania, and on June 14, 1941, the first mass deportation was carried out. It is reported that Moscow had reached a decision to deport one-third of the Lithuanian nation—and my information is that approximately 25 per cent of the people actually were deported.

Why hundreds of thousands of Lithuanians were sent to Russian slave labor camps we will never really know. It must have been fear that prompted the Soviet masters to do this—the fear that springs from occupying a free nation by force of arms. After all, the Soviet Union had violated her treaties with Lithuania.

The Russian Communists had reason to fear their Lithuanian subjects, for in 1940 there began a period of fierce guerrilla resistance to both Soviet and Nazi occupation—a resistance that lasted for 12 years.

The general revolt against Soviet rule which broke out in Lithuania on June 22, 1941, was a complete repudiation of the Soviet lie that the Lithuanians had renounced their independence of their own free will.

It is most unfortunate that after the three-year Nazi occupation Lithuania could not be reconstituted as an independent state but fell again under Russian rule—a second and harsher Soviet occupation.

Too few Americans today know that this second cruel Soviet occupation resulted in an undeclared war between the Lithuanian people and the Soviet Union which demonstrated to the entire world the gallantry and independent spirit of the Lithuanians.

Although there is some question about the exact number, it is estimated that from 30,000 to 50,000 Lithuanian partisans lost their lives fighting the Soviet security forces.

Moscow had reason to be alarmed by the partisan movement in Lithuania. From 1945 to 1952, historians tell us, the partisans put to death about 4,000 Communist activists and killed about 100,000 MVD, NKVD and Soviet Army troops in battle.

I marvel at the spirit and tenacity of the partisans, fighting as they were against overwhelming odds. Despite those odds, I cannot believe that the spirit of the Lithuanian partisans is dead today. It still lives in the fierce nationalism that the Soviet Union will never be able to crush.

I am not surprised that Lithuanians consider themselves betrayed by the agreement entered into February 11, 1945, at Yalta by President Franklin D. Roosevelt, Prime Minister Winston Churchill and Joseph Stalin. There is no question that the Yalta Agreement appeared to seal the fate of all the nations of Central and Eastern Europe.

The Government of the United States had clearly closed its eyes to aggression by the Soviet Union after fighting a bloody war to cleanse the world of aggression by Nazi Germany and Japan.

However, the fact remains that the United States has never formally recognized Soviet annexation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia and has officially condemned "the devious processes" by which the Soviet Union "annihilated" the three Baltic Republics.

Although the western democracies were victorious in World War II, they did not win the peace. But it is a fact of historic importance that they have never recognized the validity of Russian occupation of the Baltic nations. And in this there is hope not only for Lithuanians, Latvians and Estonians but for the entire world. It means that the concept of freedom still lives—that it can never be extinguished by force of arms or the brutal suppression of a people. It means that there comes a time when the forces of freedom rally to turn back the forces of darkness and oppression.

There are many potential captive nations in the world today—in Indochina, in the Mideast and in Latin American.

The United States is at war in Indochina—at war with the North Vietnamese but also at war with the Soviet Union by proxy.

In the Middle East we are engaged in a power struggle with the Soviet Union which gives its military support to the Arab states while gallant Israel strives valiantly to maintain its independence. The Soviet Union is seeking to replace the United States as the dominant power in the Mediterranean. The Russians are seeking to dominate the Mediterranean, undermine the southern flank of NATO, and spread Communist influence from the Indian Ocean to the South Atlantic.

At the same time the Soviet Union is underwriting the Communist regime of Fidel Castro in Cuba, from whence it hopes to export communism to the assorted nations of Latin America.

Some Americans yearn so desperately for peace that they close their eyes to the Captive Nations—both actual and potential. But the nightmare will not go away just because of the wishing.

The hard facts are that the Soviet Union today is still playing the game of world expansionism, the game of imperialist aggression—but is applying far more sophisticated procedures than in the crude days of World War II and the immediate postwar period.

And so now we have Cuba, and Israel, and Vietnam.

Why do I say we are at war with the Soviet Union by proxy in Vietnam? Because the Soviet Union is supplying the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong with 80 per cent of their weapons. Because the war in Vietnam could stop if the Soviet Union would stop supplying arms to Hanoi.

Yet we have thousands of students and other Americans shouting at our own government leaders, "Stop the war." Whose side is justice on? On the side of the United States and the Captive Nations or on the side of the Soviet Union and the North Vietnamese?

The protesters are said to be highly idealistic. They view Vietnam as a moral issue. They believe the war in Vietnam is wrong. Yes, the war in Vietnam is wrong, but the sins are on the other side. The Communists today are committing the same sin of genocide in Vietnam that they committed in Lithuania 30 years ago. What a bloodbath we would see in Vietnam if the United States were to precipitously withdraw all its troops there! And yet this is what the self-righteous moralists who yell "Stop the war" are demanding.

If the moralists on Vietnam want to be on the right side of an issue they should be demanding that Russia withdraw its troops from Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia, free them from Soviet control, and return all of the living deportees to their homes from Soviet prison camps.

Who is in the right? Whose side is justice on? The Soviet Union recognized the independence and sovereignty of Lithuania by peace treaty in 1920 and confirmed this by other treaties in 1926 and 1939.

Instead of shouting "Stop the war" in Vietnam the moralists should be concerned that still another nation—South Vietnam—is in danger of becoming a Captive Nation. Instead of shouting "Stop the War in Vietnam the moralists should be pounding at the Iron Curtain in an effort to free Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia.

We know who the international criminals are. We know who brutally slew the freedom fighters in Hungary. We know who ruthlessly crushed the people of Czechoslovakia.

We must never tire of telling this story to the world. We must never give up in our fight to free the Baltic peoples. It is groups like the American Lithuanian Council that must provide the leadership. And I will certainly stand shoulder to shoulder with you in your struggle.

While the Soviet repression in Czechoslovakia was a demonstration of strength, it was also a confession of weakness—and this is the lesson we must carry forward in our continuing struggle for Baltic liberation today.

The Soviet's Czechoslovakian campaign pointed up the insecurity felt by the Russian leaders—an insecurity they feel regarding all of the Captive Nations.

The more we in America concentrate on the issues of the Captive Nations the more we exploit the insecurity the Soviet Union feels. The more we preach the doctrine of self-determination the more we stir the fires of nationalism in the Captive Nations.

The Soviet Union is a federal state in name only. The spirit of independence burns fiercely among the non-Russian nation-states within the Soviet system.

There is no solidarity in the Communist empire. The inner conflicts within the Communist camp are many. We have witnessed the deviations of the Yugoslav, Czechoslovak and Rumanian Communist parties from the Moscow line. These developments have reper-

cussions within the Soviet Union. There is ferment in Russia itself against the Soviet dictatorship. Latent conflict continues to fester between the Soviet Union and Red China.

I do not despair for Lithuania. I shout with you, "Lithuania for the Lithuanians," and I believe the day will come when we will together toast a Free Lithuania.

There is a spirit of independence that burns in the hearts of all Lithuanians—in the hearts of free men everywhere. The Communist criminals may crush the bodies of their victims in slave labor camps but they will never succeed in blowing out the lamp of liberty.

Lithuania's national anthem urges her sons to draw strength from the past. All Americans can find strength in that past but let us also look to the future and make a firm and fervent pledge—that we will never rest until Lithuania is once again an independent nation, free of the Russian oppressor.

Another major address was delivered by Petras P. Dauzvardis, Consul General of Lithuania which follows:

ADDRESS BY CONSUL GENERAL OF LITHUANIA PETRAS P. DAUZVARDIS

This historical Exhibit portrays the tragedy of Lithuania and the Lithuanian nation in this, the 20th century. It depicts the brutality of, and the crimes committed by, the occupant of Lithuania and oppressor of the Lithuanian nation.

In the modern history of Lithuania, the month of June is truly a month of great suffering and tragedy. In this month in 1940 the Soviet Union occupied Lithuania by military force and immediately began terrorizing and annihilating the country and its people. In June of 1941 the Nazis declared war against the Soviet Union and forced their way into Lithuania and simultaneously, the Soviet regime ordered and carried out the murder and deportation to Siberia of some 40,000 Lithuanian citizens.

In June 1944 the Russians began to force their way back into Lithuania a second time and totally re-occupied it by the end of that year. They still occupy and are still annihilating the nation to this day. To date, Lithuania has been deprived of approximately one million of her inhabitants.

Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia are the most tragic victims of World War I. Former African and Asian colonies have become independent states. The formerly independent states of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia have been forcibly made into factual new colonies—of the Soviet Russian empire.

The three Baltic States are the most telling proof of Soviet imperialism and duplicity. The leaders of the Soviet Union say one thing, but act entirely differently. The Soviet Union had treaties of peace, non-aggression and mutual assistance, as well as a convention for the definition of aggression with Lithuania, all of which provided for the respect of sovereign equality, territorial integrity and the principle of non-intervention in one another's affairs. All these solemn Soviet pledges were broken. On September 28, 1939, the Soviet Union entered into a conspiracy with Hitler to seize and divide Lithuania, and forcibly seized and occupied Lithuania and the other two Baltic States in 1940.

The United States of America and many other free countries have never recognized the forcible and illegal incorporation of Lithuania, Latvia and Estonia by and into the Soviet Union. However, non-recognition alone is not enough. It would be appreciated by the victims of oppression if the non-recognition policy would be transformed into a policy of liberation.

Lithuanians urge the free world to bring about the Soviet Union's obligation to abide by its treaties and declarations, to respect international law, and to withdraw its troops and colonists from Lithuania.

Lithuanians fervently appeal to the United Nations and the Governments and peoples of the free world for help in restoring freedom and independence to Lithuania.

Both Mr. Ford and Mr. Dauzvardis dramatically emphasized the tragedy and suffering that is still afflicting the Lithuanian people. Keeping in mind that the Soviet Union is the world's only major colonial power, I believe their addresses have tremendous significance.

DISABLED VETERANS

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last weekend to attend the 19th annual convention of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of Hawaii, together with the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, the Honorable OLIN E. TEAGUE of Texas.

Chairman TEAGUE delivered an inspirational address that was most informative and extremely well received.

I was particularly impressed, however, with the zeal and dedication, not only to the cause of the disabled veteran, his widow, and orphan, demonstrated by the members of this fine organization, but also by their dedication to the cause of 100 percent Americanism. Under the outstanding leadership of Department Commander Ah Kee Leong, the members of the Disabled American Veterans have set an outstanding example for all Americans in civic responsibility, community action, and pride in our Nation.

Typical of the projects of the DAV in Hawaii is the annual "Ability Counts" Survey Contest jointly sponsored by the Disabled American Veterans; the Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped, and the AFL–CIO. Miss Rose Marie Tamura, a 17-year-old high school senior from Kilauea, Kauai, Hawaii, was the winner of this year's contest.

Miss Tamura's survey, entitled "The Disabled Veteran as a Manpower Resource in My Community," as well as Department Commander Leong's inspirational remarks follow:

THE DISABLED VETERAN AS A MANPOWER RESOURCE IN MY COMMUNITY

(By Rose Marie Tamura)

The wars that have raged for too many years have drawn much manpower from the national labor resources. Some men return alive and well, some draped in mourning and the rest hampered by service-connected disabilities. The concern, then, is for the disabled veteran who faces the problem of readjustment and acceptance into the working force of his community.

Kauai, Hawaii, in the last few decades, has experienced a decline in population—an especially critical decrease in the 20–40 age bracket. This group represents Kauai's labor force for the sugar plantations, the pineapple canneries, the skilled and service businesses, and the rapidly expanding visitor industry. There are presently 2,192 hotel units with an estimated increase of 100% expected by 1972 through the Blackfield Corporation and Eagle County Development Corporation resort development projects. With the acute labor shortage, hotels and their supplementary services are in great need of people to man necessary positions. The disabled veteran, then, with his skills and desire, has a valuable potential contribution for Kauai.

Since 1920, the Disabled American Veterans (DAV) has been organized (and congressionally chartered in 1932) "to work for the physical, mental, social, and economic rehabilitation of the more than 2,000,000 wounded and disabled veterans who have returned from battlefields since World War I."

With the DAV, the Veterans Administration, and other state and federal agencies including the State Employment Service and the Department of Vocational Rehabilitation, anxious and ready to serve him, the disabled veteran has much guidance and counseling for his transitional period of readjustment into the community. When he is desirous to contribute his abilities, his "veteran preference" assures him extra help in location of a suitable position. Rehabilitation Unlimited of Kauai also works to help him through employment and training relating to his interests and capabilities.

Motivation is essentially the major contributor to the disabled veteran's desire to work. It is more important than monetary gains for he is already awarded by the federal government. When he realizes that he is wanted, that he is needed and that, moreover, he is appreciated, the disabled veteran faces a more personally meaningful life. His work brings dignity and he triumphs over the challenge of a handicap. With understanding and respect, he will produce to his utmost. Employers have discovered that the handicapped are not more delinquent in areas of sick leave and absences than normal employees. All rests in motivation and a real desire to work.

Statistics from records of the State Employment Service on Kauai reveal that there are disabled veterans in the community that are willing to face the new life of employment. Below are listed the numbers of disabled veterans interviewed and placed by the Employment Service.

1965:	
Number interviewed	13
Number placed	9
1966:	
Number interviewed	19
Number placed	13
1967:	
Number interviewed	12
Number placed	5
1968:	
Number interviewed	19
Number placed	6
1969:	
Number interviewed	32
Number placed	4

Figures on the number placed do not include those who sought and gained their employment or those who were referred to other agencies.

There is a need and a place for the disabled veteran on Kauai. His manpower contribution is of increasingly vital importance to the economy of an island that lacks the substantial human resources. Although the disabled veteran receives financial compensation for his disabilities, he shall never meet the challenge of overcoming his weaknesses until he has the chance to exercise and emphasize his strengths.

Employment and work are means of personal, spiritual compensation that teach men to accept their capabilities and produce their best by accenting their assets. Financial comfort and social dependability are a dear price to pay for the rewards of independence, self-sufficiency, and victory over total disability and uselessness. The future is bright and rewarding for the disabled veteran that takes his life into his own hands and lives it as a challenge!

ADDRESS OF COMMANDER AH KEE LEONG, DEPARTMENT OF HAWAII, DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS

Mr. Goto, Distinguished Guests—The Honorable Olin E. Teague, The Honorable William H. Ayres, Admiral John S. McCain, Jr., the Very Reverend John Joseph Morrett, and National Commander Raymond P. Neal:

My comrades all; Ladies and gentlemen:

When you conferred upon me the office of Department Commander it was the greatest single honor that could come to a member of the DAV in the State of Hawaii. For this, and for *all* the DAV has meant to me, I am most grateful.

I hope I have fulfilled your confidence as shown by a record of results, accomplished with efforts similar to those that we *Americans all, but of varied ancestry* put forth as comrades during military service. If this past year's administration was successful it was because of the many sincere members among you who were officers, and members of various committees. I am more proud than I can tell you of each one of you, but enough said if I repeat "Life is what you make it" and that whatever we achieved was only because we followed the Golden Rule to *"Do unto others what you would they do to you."*

Many of you have grasped my hand in comradely affection and wished me well in the years that lie ahead. I tell you, that the DAV was made real and vital for me by the giving of just a little more of myself than required and that always I will remain ready to aid and assist any disabled comrade, or to serve the DAV wherever I can be of help, in discharging the duties we owe to God, our neighbors and ourselves.

To the incoming officers I wish for each of you, my comrades, every success and hope, that your DAV duties as *American veterans of different ancestry,* will be tempered with the bonds of brotherhood, and that you will achieve the community service to your fellow veterans and their survivors which is the basis of this organization.

Finally, I feel a warm glow as I look at our distinguished guests and see friends who have done all in their power to help me in my obligations as a DAV in years past, *and now gather in this farewell.* To them and to you, my comrades, I speak from the heart with happiness when I say—Aloha.

May the Almighty be with you and yours always.

BROTHERHOOD AWARDS

HON. JOHN W. WYDLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, on May 20, 1970, three distinguished residents of Nassau County, N.Y., received the annual Brotherhood Award of the National Conference of Christians and Jews. The awards are presented each year to members of each of the three major religious bodies for outstanding service to our community and for dedication to helping their fellow men.

The presentation of the Brotherhood Awards was first sponsored by the Nassau Chapter, National Conference of Christians and Jews, in 1960, and the recognition of these men in this time of tension and confrontation is particularly appropriate. Their service to improve our communities is the hope for the future of our Nation.

The three men honored by the National Conference of Christians and Jews this year include a banker, an engineer, and a physician as representatives of each of the three major religions. I would like to take this opportunity to extend my congratulations to each of them and to tell my colleagues a little bit about these prominent citizens.

Harold Gleason, a resident of Massapequa, is chief executive officer of the Franklin National Bank. He has the responsibility for serving the thousands of Nassau County families who use the services of the Franklin Bank throughout our county. Born in Brooklyn, N.Y., Harold Gleason holds a degree from the Rutgers Graduate School of Banking—1954. He has been with the Franklin National Bank since 1956.

Arthur E. Poole, also born in Brooklyn and now a resident of Hewlett Harbor, is president of the Poole Construction Co., in Island Park, N.Y. He has always been active in community affairs and presently is serving as chairman, Federal Affairs Committee of the Long Island Association. He also serves as public works commissioner for Hewlett Harbor and as trustee of St. Andrew's Episopal Church in Oceanside, N.Y., and director of South Nassau Communities and South Shore General Hospitals.

Dr. Milton H. Stapen is president and executive officer of Hempstead General Hospital, a proprietary medical center which contains 425 beds and he is the first physician to receive the Brotherhood Award. A graduate of the University of Maryland School of Medicine—1936—Dr. Stapen was employed by the Department of the Interior as physician in charge of Government hospitals in Alaska and New Mexico prior to his service in World War II during which time he was stationed at Guadelcanal and Guam. Dr. Stapen's activities in the health field are recognized at local, State, and national levels. They include his service as president of the Association of Accredited Private Hospitals of Nassau and Suffolk Counties, member of the board of trustees of the Long Island Health and Hospital Planning Council and a founder and member of the board of Federation of American Hospitals, the national association of investor-owned hospitals.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud of the achievements and dedication of these fine citizens, whose work and community activities have benefited the residents of the Fourth Congressional District and Nassau County. On behalf of my constituents, I extend my thanks to them for their efforts to make our society a better place to live and I wish them continued success in their activities on behalf of true brotherhood and cooperation among people of all religious backgrounds.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 2, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

FIGHTING INDUSTRIAL POLLUTION UNDER THE 1899 REFUSE ACT (PART II)

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, on April 2, 1970, I inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—pages 10040–10041—a list of 149 Wisconsin industries apparently violating the 1899 Refuse Act which I have filed with the U.S. attorneys for the easttern and western districts of Wisconsin.

On June 30, 1970 I filed with Wisconsin's U.S. attorneys an additional list of 121 industries apparently violating the 1899 act, which prohibits the dumping of refuse—all industrial pollution—into waterways, except under permit issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

The names and addresses of the 121 industries, the nature of the refuse deposited, the water into which the refuse has been deposited, and, where issued, the number and date of Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources pollution enforcement orders follow:

INDUSTRIAL POLLUTERS IN EASTERN WISCONSIN

1. American Can Company; Green Bay; pulp and groundwood discharge causing odors, colors, high B.O.D., and toxicity; Fox River and Lake Michigan; Order 4B–68–11a–1, May 14, 1968, Dec. 16, 1969.

2. Baker Laboratories; East Troy; high B.O.D. discharge in cooling waters; Honey Creek Branch of Fox River; Order 4B–68–2–1; June 4, 1968.

3. Beloit Box Board Company; Beloit; paper waste; Order 6–64J–9, 1964.

4. Bergstrom Paper Company; Neenah; waste water from de-inked pulp, Fox River; Order 4B–68–11a–3, May 14, 1968.

5. Borden Foods Company; Waukesha; 3 outfalls leave stalagmitic deposit at mouths of boiler bowdown, resulting in discoloration, high ph and fungus growth in water; Fox (Illinois) River; Order 4B–68–2–2; June 4, 1968.

6. Brookside Cheese Factory; Menasha; cheese waste; Kankapot Creek; Order 4B–68–11a–4; May 14, 1968.

7. C. & D. Duck Company; Franksville; slaughtering lagoon waters discharge to stream; Root River via Duck Farm Tributary; Order 4B–68–4–2; June 11, 1968.

8. Casey's Locker and Meat Service; Union Grove; effluent from septic tank waste; Root River; Order 4B–68–44; June 11, 1968.

9. Charmin Paper Products; Green Bay Division; Brown County; evaporated and condensated spent sulfite liquor, also paper saveall effluent; Fox River; Order 4B–68–11a–6; May 5, 1968.

10. Combined Paper Mills, Inc.; Appleton; paper saveall; Fox River; Order 4B–68–11a–8; May 14, 1968.

11. Consolidated Papers, Inc.; Appleton; high strength sulfite pulping wastes; Fox River; Order 4B–68–11a–9; May 14, 1968.

12. Crystal Springs Cheese Factory; Plymouth; cheese and whey waste; Pigeon River; Order 2–64J–11, Jan. 31, 1964.

13. Dairyland Poultry, Inc.; Endeavor; poultry wastes from food and slaughtering; Buffalo Lake marsh and Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-51; June 7, 1968.

14. Daisy Dairy Company; Poy Sippi; dairy waste seeping through septic tank; Pine River; Order 4-65J-30; August 30, 1965.

15. Desoto Chemical Coatings, Inc.; Fredonia; inadequate treatment of wash waters from tanks and equipment; Milwaukee River; Order 4B-68-5-6; June 12, 1968.

16. Fohr's Meat Service; Caledonia; water from slaughterhouse plant; Root River; Order 4B-68-4-5; June 11, 1968.

17. Fort Howard Paper Company; Green Bay; pulp and de-inking waters; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-11; May 14, 1968.

18. Foremost Foods, Inc.; Adell; wash water and condensate of such strength as to cause anearobic conditions in pond; North Milwaukee River; Order 4B-68-5-8; June 12, 1968.

19. Fox River Valley Co-op; De Pere; dairy waste seepage to Ashwaubenon Creek; Lower Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-13; May 5, 1968.

20. Genoa City Co-op Milk Assocation; Genoa City; milk station effluent; Nippersink Creek; Order 4B-68-2-5; June 4, 1968.

21. Gehl Guernsey Farms, Inc.; Germantown; cooling waters and condensate overflow a lime quarry; Menomenee River; Order 4B-68-5-10.

22. Gilbert Paper Company; Menasha; excess saveall effluent; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-15; May 14, 1968.

23. Green Bay Packaging, Inc.; Green Bay; spent chemical liquor; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-17; May 14, 1968.

24. Green Giant Canning Company; Ripon; Sanitary sewage and canning process waters; Silver Creek; Order 4B-68-11a-56; June 6, 1968.

25. Green Giant Canning Company; Rosendale; cooker water and boiler blowdown, causing high B.O.D.; Fond du Lac River; Order 4B-68-11a-57; June 7, 1968.

26. Hamilton Manufacturing Company; Two Rivers; bonderite, phosphoric and chromic acids and caustics; East Twin River; Order 10-66J-6; July 14, 19, 1966.

27. Harry Hansen Meat Service; Franksville; wastewater tanks and beds seepage from slaughterhouse; tributary of Root River Canal; Order 4B-68-4-11; June 6, 1968.

28. Hickory Grove Sanitorium; Depere; sewage treatment plant effluent; Lake Michigan; Order 4B-68-11a-18; May 14, 1968.

29. International Harvester Company; Waukesha; cooling and hydraulic slagging water; Frame Park tributary of the Fox River; Order 4B-68-2-7; June 4, 1968.

30. John Strange Company; Menasha; weak paper waste; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-22; May 14, 1968.

31. Kimberly-Clark; Neenah Division, Neenah; paper saveall effluent; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-27.

32. Kimberly-Clark; Lakeview Division, Neenah; paper saveall effluent; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-26; May 14, 1968.

33. Kimberly-Clark; Badger Globe; Neenah; paper saveall; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-24; May 14, 1968.

34. Kimberly-Clark; Kimberly; spend sulfite wastes; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-25; May 14, 1968.

35. Krier Preserving Company; Random Lake; runoff from inadequate spray irrigation system causing high B.O.D. in Silver Creek, organic material (peas) seen floating there; Random Lake; Order 4B-68-5-16; June 12, 1968.

36. Mammoth Springs Canning Company; Sussex; cooling and organic effluent; Sussex Creek, tributary to Fox River; Order 4B-68-2-10; June 4, 1960.

37. Mishicot Modern Dairy; Mishicot; inadequate sewage treatment causing overflow and seepage; East Twin River; Order 10-66J-5; July 14, 1966.

38. Neenah Foundry; Neenah; high solids content effluent through storm sewer to Neenah Slough; Order 4B-68-11a-32; May 14, 1968.

39. Nicolet Paper; West De Pere; saveall paper water; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-33; May 14, 1968.

40. Oconomowoc Canning Company; Sun Prairie; organic canning wastes and contaminated cooling waters; Koshkonong Creek; Order 6-64J-15; October 28, 1964.

41. Oconomowoc Electro-Plating Company; Waukesha; cyanide into storm sewer outfalls; Fox River; Order 4B-68-2-12; June 4, 1968.

42. Paper Converting Machine Company; Green Bay; raw sewage through an outfall pipe; Dutchman's Creek; Order 4B-68-11a-34; May 14, 1968.

43. Pleasant View Cheese Factory; Appleton; cheese wastes; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-35; May 14, 1968.

44. Riverside Cheese Factory; Bear Creek; septic tank overflow to swamp; Embarass River; Order 4-65J-18; August 30, 1965.

45. Riverside Paper; Appleton; saveall treatment water; Fox River; Order 4b-68-11a-36; May 14, 1968.

46. Rogersville Cheese Factory; Rosedale; processing waste runoff from inadequate ridge & furrow field; West Branch of the Fond du Lac River; Order 4B-68-11a-75; June 7, 1968.

47. St. John's Military Academy; Delafield; inadequate absorption field for septic tank causing seepage and overflow of human and laundry wastes; Bark River; Order 6-64J-11; 1964.

48. Scray's Cheese Company; Depere; cheese waste overflows from septic tank; East River; Order 4B-68-11a-38; May 14, 1968.

49. Shilling Fish Company (Swaer Fish Reduction); Oconto; fish processing wastes; Green Bay; Order WP-13-42-117-201; Sept. 5, 1967.

50. Shirley Co-op Cheese Factory; Depere; organic wastes, can washings, press drippings, polluting stream so as to cause cattle deaths; Bower Creek; Order 4B-68-11a-39; May 14, 1968.

51. Thilmany Pulp and Paper; Kaukauna; disc filter water and saveall waste; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-41; May 14, 1968.

52. U.S. Paper Mills; West Depere; suspended solids and high B.O.D.; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-42; May 14, 1968.

53. Geo. A. Whiting Paper Company; Menasha; saveall water; Fox River; Order 4B-68-11a-14; May 14, 1968.

INDUSTRIAL POLLUTERS IN WESTERN WISCONSIN

1. Alma Dairy Products; Alma; dairy waste; Buffalo River; Order 4-66J-1; May 10, 1966.

2. Amphenol-Borg Electronics Corporation; Delavan; latex wastes from fabric manufacturing processes; Rock River; Order 6-64J-23A; 1964.

3. Antigo Rendering Works; Antigo; rendering effluents; overflow from septic tank; Springbrook Creek; Order 3-65J-41; July 28, 1965.

4. Banner Cheese Factory; Highland; dairy waste runoff from inadequate spray irrigation system; Wisconsin River; Order 4-B-68-17a; April 12, 1968.

5. Brill Co-op Creamery; Rice Lake; dairy waste inadequately handled; Lower Chippewa River; Order 2-65J-32; April 2, 1965.

6. Brunkow Co-op Cheese Company; Darlington; cheese wastes; Otter Creek into Pecatonica River; Order 4B-68-19-4; March 21, 1968.

7. Brush Hollow Cheese Factory; Viroqua; spray irrigation runoff; Kickapoo River; Order 4B-68-17a-7; April 12, 1968.

8. Buena Vista Cheese Factory; Lone Rock; cheese waste; Bear Creek to Wisconsin River; Order 4B-68-17a-8; April 12, 1968.

9. Calamine Cheese Factory; Mineral Point; treatment pond overflow; Pecatonica River; Order 4B-68-19-5; March 21, 1968.

10. Camp Ground Cheese Factory; Byron; inefficient operation of spray waste irrigation system resulting in dairy waste runoff; East Branch of the Fond du Lac River; Order 4B-68-11a-47 and 48; June 7, 1968.

11. Carr Valley Cheese Factory; La Valle; dairy wastes due to inefficient operation of irrigation equipment; Baraboo River; Order 5-65J-15; October 11, 1965.

12. Cloverdale Cheese Factory; Dorchester; dairy wastes inadequate treatment lagoons; Eau Pleine River; Order 1-61J-1; April 17, 1961.

13. Connorsville Co-op Creamery Association; Downing; dairy waste; Lower Chippewa; Order 2-65J-35; April 2, 1965.

14. Consolidated Papers, Inc.; Wisconsin Rapids; saveall and sulfite liquor; Wisconsin River; Order 3-65J-22AA; 1965.

15. Dairy Maid Co-op; Augusta; dairy waste from inadequate treatment facilities; Lower Chippewa; Order 2-65J-21; April 2, 1965.

16. Eastman Creamery; Eastman; dairy wastes; Pecatonica River; Order 4A-68-17a-1; May 16, 1969.

17. Eau Galle Cheese Factory; Eau Galle; dairy wastes; Lower Chippewa; Order 2-65J-38; April 2, 1965.

18. Elk River Cheese Factory; Phillips; dairy waste; Upper Chippewa; Order 1-65J-11; Feb. 2, 1965.

19. Erickson Transport Company; Coon Valley; washing runoff; Bad Axe River; Order 8-66J-5; 1966.

20. Farmer's Creamery Company, Inc.; Bangor; dairy waste runoff; La Crosse River; Order 766J-5, May 11, 1966.

21. Flambeau Paper Division-Kansas City Star; Park Falls; paper machine waste; Upper Chippewa River; Order 1-65J-5; Feb. 2, 1965.

22. Foster Co-op Creamery Company; Osseo; dairy waste runoff; Lower Chippewa; Order 2-65J-24; March 2, 1965.

23. Fuhrman's South Shore Dairy; Iron River; dairy waste: inadequate holding tank overflow; Iron River; Order 1-68-9; Feb. 21, 1968.

24. Frankfort Cheese Factory; Edgar; cheese wastes due to inadequate handling facilities; Eau Plaine River; Order 1-61J-8; April 17, 1968.

25. Genoa Co-op Creamery; Genoa; dairy effluent to Mississippi River; Order 8-66J-1; June 10, 1966.

26. Gillingham Cheese Factory; Gillingham; dairy wastes inadequately spray irrigated; Wisconsin River; Order 4B-68-17a-16; March 12, 1968.

27. Grand Meadow Co-op Creamery; Stratford; gross dairy effluent; Little Eau Des Pleine River; Order 3-65J-45; July 28, 1965.

28. Green Valley Co-op Dairy; Auburndale; dairy wastes; Upper Wisconsin River; Order 3-65J-46; July 28, 1965.

29. Grinnel Cheese Company; Monroe; effluent from nitrate septic tank to Little Sugar River; Order 7-64J-11; Dec. 1, 1964.

30. Hillside Co-op Cheese Manufacturing Association; Stratford; untreated dairy wastes; Eau Plaine River; Order 1-61J-6; April 17, 1961.

31. Jackson County Iron Mine (Ireland Steel Co.); Jackson County; iron ore wastes; Levis Creek and Black River; data on file with Jackson County District Attorney, Black River Falls.

32. Johnson Welding and Manufacturing Company; Rice Lake; wash waters; Chippewa River; Order 2-65J-27; April 2, 1965.

33. Knowlton Cheese Factory; Mosinee; dairy wastes; Order 3-65J-14; July 28, 1965; Wisconsin River.

34. Lamont Central Cheese Co-op; Darlington; excess factory wastes causing cattle death; tributary of the Pecatonica River; Order 4B-68-19-14; March 21, 1968.

35. Liberty-Clifton Cheese Factory; Stitzer; overflow of dairy waste from inadequate lagoon; Preston Creek; Order 1-66J-10; Feb. 2, 1966.

36. Loyd Cheese Factory: Cazenovia, whey spillage and wash water, also overflow from

irrigation field; Willow Creek; Order 4B-68-17a-19; April 12, 1968.

37. Marathon Cheese Factory; Marathon; dairy waste overflow from ridge and furrow field system; Four-Mile Creek; Order 3-65J-43; July 28, 1965.

38. Marathon Division-American Can Company; Rothschild; sulfite liquor; Upper Wisconsin River; Orders 3-65J-10 and 10A; July 28, 1965, Oct. 7, 1966.

39. Mosinee Paper Mills Company; Mosinee; paper machine effluent; Order 3-65J-12; July 28, 1965.

40. Nekoosa-Edwards Paper Company; Nekoosa; suspended solids and saveall; Wisconsin River Order 3-65J-25; July 28, 1965.

41. Nekoosa-Edwards Paper Company; Port Edwards; Suspended solids, saveall water; Wisconsin River; Order 3-65J-24; July 28, 1965.

42. North Star Dairy; Bruce; septic tank effluent with high coliform count; Chippewa River; Order 1-65J-3; Feb. 2, 1965.

43. Netex Mink Foods, Inc., Eleva; poultry wastes to pond of Big Creek; Order 4-66J-6; May 10, 1966.

44. Pabst Farms, Inc.; Belleville; untreated dairy wastes; Sugar River; Order 7-64J-1; Dec. 2, 1964.

45. Patrons Pride Cheese Factory; Athens; dairy wastes; Wisconsin River; First Order iss. 1954, Second Order 3-65J-37; July 28, 1965.

46. Pecatonica Cheese Factory; Hollendale; dairy waste overflow from inadequate land irrigation system; Dodge Branch of the Pecatonica River; Order 4B-68-19-17; March 21, 1968.

47. Penn Hollow Cheese Factory; Avoca; dairy wastes; Penn Branch of Otter Creek, then to Wisconsin River; Order 4B-68-17a-25; April 12, 1968.

48. Pet Milk Company; Belleville; dairy wastes; Sugar River; Order 7-64J-3A; July 25, 1966.

49. Platteville Dairy; Platteville; dairy wastes; Roundtree Branch; Order 1-66J-11; Feb. 2, 1966.

50. Potosi Brewing Company; Potosi; cooling water and organic wastes; Potosi Creek; Order 1-66J-8; Feb. 2, 1966.

51. Dreston Co-op Creamery Association; Blair; dairy wastes; Order 5-66J-8; May 5, 1966.

52. Rhinelander Paper Division; St. Regis Company; Rhinelander; chemical and fiber pollution; Wisconsin River; Order 3-65J-1; July 28, 1965.

53. Sanitary Creamery; Mineral Point; spillage of buttermilk wastes and poor maintenance; Pecatonica River; Order 4B-68-19-18; March 21, 1968.

54. Schurman's Beetown Cheese Factory; Beetown; dairy waste due to inadequate use of spray irrigation equipment; Beetown Branch.

55. Sherry Dairy; Sherry; ridge and furrow treatment field floods and overflows; Milk Creek to Wisconsin River; Order 3-65J-47; July 28, 1965.

56. Silver Spring Gardens; Eau Claire; inadequate treatment facilities; Chippewa River; Order 2-65J-25; April 2, 1965.

57. Sterling Pulp and Paper Company; Eau Claire; sulfite liquor; Chippewa River; Order 2-65J-8; April 2, 1965.

58. Stitzer Cheese; Lancaster; dairy wastes seeping from a lagoon into ground water and reappearing in a spring some distance away; Grant-Platte River; Order; Special; June 1, 1967.

59. Soldier's Grove Farmer's Co-op; Soldier's Grove; dairy wastes; Kikapoo River; Order 4B-68-17a-34; April 13, 1968.

60. Steubens Co-op Cheese Factory; Steuben; wash water and whey. Kikapoo River; Order 4B-68-17a-35; April 12, 1968.

61. Tennyson Cheese Factory; Potosi; whey discharge; Tennyson Branch; Order 1-66J-9; Feb. 2, 1966.

62. Town Hall Dairy Co-op; Monticello; inadequate septic tank causes effluent to reach West Branch of the Sugar River; Order 7-64J-10; Dec. 2, 1964.

63. Tomahawk Paper Company, Inc., Tomahawk; saveall; Wisconsin River; Order 3-65J-30; July 28, 1965.

64. Tomahawk Power and Pulp Company; Tomahawk; suspended solids; Order 3-65J-2; July 7, 1965.

65. Union Tank Car Company; Superior; sanitary sewage to ditch; St. Louis River, Order 1-68-29; Feb. 21, 1968.

66. Western Condensing Company (Foremost Foods); Stratford; Organic Waste; Eau Plaine River; Order 1-61J-9; April 17, 1961.

67. Wiota Dairy Co-op; South Wayne; wash water, whey, and sanitary sewage to an overflowing septic tank; Feather Creek; Order 4B-68-19-21; Mar. 21, 1968.

68. Wyandotte Chemical Co.; Wood County; mercury; Wisconsin River; data on file with Wisconsin Attorney-General, Madison.

A FIRST STEP

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the June 29 issue of the Washington Post featured a first-page article by Robert Maynard entitled "Omaha Pupils Given 'Behavior' Drugs," which reports on a current program now in use in the first six grades to calm down hyperactive students by the use of drugs. As far as I can ascertain so far, some of the drugs used could be dangerous to the health of the children. I am checking with the Food and Drug Administration to make sure that the drugs listed in the Post article have been approved for use on children. This, of course, is only the first step. In the larger view, the use of drugs as a behavior modification vehicle is open to serious question. In recent years complaints have been lodged by parents in various sections of the country concerning some of the programs to which their children have been exposed in the schools. Extremes in sex education, sensitivity training, and other experimental programs have raised a clamor of protest from city to city, and taxpayers are asking just how much of their taxes, through Federal funding, is furthering these programs. When most of the States require school attendance by law, it is their responsibility to oversee and eliminate questionable programs. When Federal funds are involved, Congress, of course, comes into the picture.

The case of Omaha should be a first step in ascertaining why so many parents have in recent years been at loggerheads with their local educational systems over some new, innovative programs. Every detail of the Omaha program should, and will be made public to effect proper evaluation and possible correction or elimination.

I include at this point the above-mentioned article by Robert Maynard which appeared in the June 29 issue of the Washington Post:

OMAHA PUPILS GIVEN "BEHAVIOR" DRUGS

(By Robert Maynard)

OMAHA, Neb., June 28—Between 5 and 10 per cent of the 62,000 school children in this city in the American midlands are taking "behavior modification" drugs prescribed by local doctors to improve classroom deportment and increase learning potential.

The children being given the drugs have been identified by their teachers as "hyperactive" and unmanageable to the point of disrupting regular classroom activity. Virtually all are in the first six grades.

Five drugs are commonly prescribed, principally Ritalin, the CIBA brand name for methylphenidate hydrochloride, a stimulant. The others are Dexedrene, Deaner, Aventyl and Tofranil, according to Dr. Byron B. Oberst, the Omaha pediatrician who was instrumental in introducing the "behavior modification" drug program to the public schools here a little more than one year ago.

"Ritalin," Dr. Oberst said in an interview here one recent morning, "increases the ability to concentrate. How it works is still the sixty-four dollar question. On any of these, even Dexedrene, nobody precisely knows the mechanisms of how they function. But at the other end of the line, we know these children become more successful. They become more self-confident."

Dr. Richard Burack, physician and author of "The New Handbook of Prescription Drugs," says that Ritalin was first developed "in an effort to find a substance with the 'mood elevating' effects of amphetamine minus its drawbacks."

But the drug has been a disappointment, Dr. Burack states, because "it begins to appear that Ritalin might not achieve a full separation of amphetamine's desirable and undesirable effects; amphetamine abusers are beginning to ask for it. Sweden has banned its sale."

The United States Food and Drug Administration has urged physicians to exercise extreme caution in prescribing the drug because of the danger of addiction and because its side effects include marked anxiety, tension and agitation. Merle Musselman, chairman of the Department of Surgery at the University of Nebraska College of Medicine and president of the Omaha School Board, said he knows little about Ritalin.

"But I did learn recently," Dr. Musselman said, "that it has a paradoxical effect on children. Where it would stimulate an adult, it works on the central nervous system to calm children."

Dr. Musselman also said he knows little about the "behavior modification" program and has made no attempt to find out more because "I have great confidence in the competence of Dr. Oberst. He's a very competent man."

A graying, baldish man of medium build, Dr. Oberst arose at 6 a.m. one day last week to accomplish his morning rounds in time to keep a 9 a.m. appointment with Don Warner, the retiring assistant superintendent of the Omaha Public Schools; Rena May Gibson, supervisor of health services in the city school system; and a visiting journalist.

In December of 1968, Dr. Oberst said, he attended a seminar at Syracuse University on the problems of children who, for a variety of physiological and psychological reasons, "can't sit still for two minutes, let alone long enough to learn anything."

"He said several prominent physicians at the Syracuse seminar described the positive results they had achieved by using such drugs at Ritalin and dexedrene with hyperactive students. And a film, "Why Billy Can't Learn," was shown.

Dr. Oberst returned to Omaha, he said with a new mission—to spread among his colleagues and school personnel this new knowledge about how to help with a problem that he said besets and frustrates "eight to 10 per cent" of the student population.

After the physicians were made aware of the new possibilities, they turned to the school personnel, seminars were held, the film was shown again and a new organization was born with the acronym STAAR, which stands for Skills, Technique, Academic

Accomplishment and Remediation. It includes parents in its membership.

NOT A SCHOOL PROGRAM

Although the object of interest is the child in school and the person who would in all probability identify the problem child is the teacher, the STAAR program is not considered a school program.

"The medical context of the program," Dr. Oberst explained, "is to keep medical problems in the hands of the family doctor. The medicine prescribed has to be in the control of the family physician."

As a result, the Omaha Public school system has no firm idea how many of its children are taking behavior modification drugs, Assistant Superintendent Warner said.

Dr. Oberst was asked if he could estimate how many pupils in the Omaha system are on some form of "behavior modification" drug.

"Only the family physicians has those records," Dr. Oberst replied. But he agreed with other estimates that the number is betwen 5 and 10 per cent of the school population, or 3,000 to 6,000 children.

Many of them are poor, some of them are black, but school system officials say the program in not limited to the poor and black.

"It's all over the city," Warner said. "There are at least some kids on these drugs in just about every school."

No limit seems to have been reached yet in the application of drugs to the problems of behavior.

"I would say it's a growing field," one educator here said.

"Ten years ago," said Warner, "There were a couple of hundred kids in the Omaha school system on phenobarbital for restlessness associated with some disorder."

After the pediatricians began spreading the word in December of 1968, more and more teachers began identifying students they felt could benefit from the drugs.

After the 1969–70 school year opened, some cautions that some educators expressed began to grow to sounds of quiet alarm.

PILL SWAPPING

By November of last year, the school administration found itself swamped with problems that grew out of the fact that thousands of elementary school children were walking around with potentially dangerous drugs in their pockets and lunchpails.

"They were trading pills on the school grounds," said Warner. "One kid would say, 'Here, you try my yellow one and I'll try your pink one.' "

Parents were asking the schools to take responsibility for the dosages, thus bringing the school system into conflict with state laws that prohibit school personnel from administering drugs to children.

In March, three months after Warner's letter, the Omaha Medical Society agreed to ask its members to send instructions to the schools when children were being placed on drugs that would be administered during school hours and to try to prescribe long-acting medications that could be taken at home.

Medical society members were advised at the same time that legally "the responsibility of the prescription was not that of the doctor, but rather of the parent. The parent then vests the responsibility in the teacher," according to the society bulletin of last March.

Dr. Oberst was asked in the interview if there were any citywide records that would establish the effectiveness of the program. Again, he said, "the family doctor has those records and only he would know."

As for himself, Dr. Oberst said his young patients show "marked improvement in handwriting and fine motor co-ordination problems."

BRAIN WAVES CHECKED

And insofar as the dangers of the drugs are concerned, Dr. Oberst said, "my mothers are calling me every two or three weeks to tell me how the child is doing. I see them every three to six months and we check their brain wave pattern yearly until they revert to normal."

Dr. Oberst was asked what side effects Ritalin produced in his pupil-patients.

"The same as with dexedrene," he said. "It might agitate them. Some lose their appetites, some have trouble dropping off to sleep. Those are the major ones.

"If the child loses his appetite too much on Ritalin," the doctor continued, "we would go to dexedrene."

He said of the general problem of reported side effects in children, "You have to balance what you see and what is reported by the mother."

Parents pay for the prescriptions if they can afford it or have them filled free at one of the medical clinics here if they cannot afford to pay, physicians and school officials said.

"I would certainly hope," Dr. Oberst said, "that this would be beneficial to the low income family," because when poor children cannot make use of the educational process "it handicaps their ability to make their way."

DANGERS SEEN

When that happens, Dr. Oberst said, only three avenues are open to the child, in his view:

"First, self-destruction by alcohol, drugs, suicide or personality fragmentation . . .

"Second, the road to vandalism, riots and anarchy against society.

"Finally," Dr. Oberst said, "the road to juvenile delinquency by breaking and entering, thefts, promiscuous sex and other acts of taking from others what he wants."

He is convinced, he said, that "once the problems of school learning difficulties are totally understood, prevented or corrected, many of today's emotional conflicts in children will dissipate."

And although many medical authorities are deeply concerned about the possible addictive qualities of amphetamine-style drugs, Dr. Oberst said he is not worried on that score in the behavior modification program because:

"We try to get two years of experience and then try to taper it off and we seem to be able to do that. I don't know what other people's experience is."

For the most part, the behavior modification program has been quietly received in Omaha. Some school personnel rumble quietly about the possibility that Omaha is raising "a generation of junkies and speed freaks" but they keep their reservations very much to themselves.

One school official was asked why he didn't express his reservations in a louder voice and he said simply:

"Look, if I bucked the medical profession in this town, I'd be dead, useless. They are pretty powerful here."

Omaha is rare among cities of less than a half million population in having two large medical training centers, the Nebraska University College of Medicine and Creighton University School of Medicine.

"This gives the medical profession quite a voice in the affairs of Omaha," one young physician said. "And they use it."

"Which also means," said another doctor who also chose to remain anonymous, "that the drug companies, which subsidize a lot of medical education and research, also have a great deal of power."

But a school official said the drug companies have played a minimal role in the behavior modification program. "Oh, they come around and address meetings on the subject, but it's always pretty much of a soft sell. They mention the products and the claims, but they don't push too hard in public, or too well, for that matter," the school official said.

The same official was asked if there has been any organized opposition and he answered, "just from a few militants."

The first protests are coming from Omaha's north side, where about 50,000 black people live, a little more than 10 per cent of the nearly 400,000 in the city.

At a school board meeting recently, black parents and a couple of community organizers charged that Omaha was trying to drug black children into quiet submission.

Mr. and Mrs. Howard Curtis, whose children attend Franklin Elementary School in the black community, said the teacher of their 10-year-old made repeated entreaties to them to have their son examined for possible behavior modification drugs.

"We didn't want to do it," Mrs. Curtis said, "because we didn't see where our child needed any drugs."

But the teacher persisted until the family finally took the child to a black physician and broached the subject.

"He hit the ceiling," Mrs. Curtis said. "He said our child didn't need any drugs."

Dr. Claude Organ, a black surgeon and the man the Curtis family consulted, said he didn't remember the incident, "but I probably did hit the ceiling." He said that since his own specialty is far afield from behavior modification, he would not comment further.

PILLS FOR MACK JR.

Another family, Mr. and Mrs. Mack Thornton, said they gave in to the idea of obtaining drugs for their son, Mack Jr., 10, last year after "the teacher badgered us on the phone for a month and a half. She called every night."

But the Thorntons were uneasy with the idea of Mack having to take drugs. Mrs. Thornton said she obtained the prescription from a local doctor after taking her child to Creighton Clinic, where "they said Mackie didn't need any drugs."

After obtaining the drugs, she at first didn't give them to the child, but she told the teacher that she had. Mack's teacher noted with pleasure on his report card that the grades improved, the improvement in Mack's performance occurred because "you helped the school."

Sometime later Mack took some of the pills. He explained why to a visitor:

"I'd be acting crazy fooling around at the board and stuff and the teacher said, 'Mack, do you have one of your pills?' I say, 'Yeah.' So I took one and we went out and played and I came back and I felt more like doing my work."

He worked for a few minutes, he said, "But my stomach started feeling acidy." So I told the teacher I felt sick. She said, "Put your head down on your desk. So I did."

Ernest Chambers, a friend of the family and a black candidate from Omaha for the state's unicameral and non-partisan legislature, was present when the Thorntons were being interviewed. Chambers has charged in a letter to the school board that children were being used as "guinea pigs."

He asked Mack, "What made you say you were acting 'crazy'? who told you that you were acting crazy?"

Mack wasn't sure.

"But the teacher told you that you were a good boy after you took your pills?"

Mack said, "Yes."

"So," said Chambers, "other people put the idea in your head that you were 'acting crazy' unless you had a pill?" Mack nodded agreement.

Mrs. Thornton interrupted:

"You see, that's just what I'm afraid of with these kids being given these pills. I don't want my child to grow up believing

that as soon as things aren't going right, they can take a pill to make it better."

Miss Gibson, the head of health services for the Omaha schools, said little during the interview with Dr. Oberst and Warner, the assistant superintendent. But when the subject of the value of behavior modification drugs arose, Miss Gibson said, "It makes them happier."

Dr. Oberst then said:

"They are definitely happier. One of my mothers came home from a meeting and found her child's homework finished on the table. And the child had written a note saying, "Thank you, mother, I feel much happier".

THE CAMBODIAN DECISION

HON. MICHAEL J. HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, June 30, 1970

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, the decisionmaking process of the Government, particularly the Presidency, has intrigued and exasperated many people in this country for a long time. Lately, there has been renewed discussions about the loneliness of the Presidency and the difficulties which a President encounters in obtaining enough information to make a rational and proper decision on important issues. Presidents seem to run into particular difficulty in making foreign policy decisions, especially in a crisis atmosphere.

Hendrick Smith has written an article which appeared in the New York times today entitled "Cambodian Decision; Why President Acted." Mr. Smith traces the events leading up to the decision by President Nixon to invade Cambodia. This article is most alarming.

For instance, many advisers to the President simply were not consulted until the decision had been made, or, if they were consulted, it was on a rushed and inconclusive basis. Smith writes:

Despite his preference for orderly procedure, President Nixon, like his predecessors, reacted in crisis with rump-group meetings, late phone calls, an out-of-channel message to the field and other activities that bypassed planners at the State and Defense Departments.

The White House became so worried about security leaks that even members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were late to learn of some critical discussions. State Department lawyers were not told to prepare the legal case for invasion until four days after it began.

Mr. Smith also states that Mr. Nixon, due to advice from the Defense Department, during a National Security Council meeting on April 27 came away thinking he had a choice of doing nothing or involving Americans troops. Besides the President was determined to prove that he could meet force with force.

The President's ostensible reason for going into Cambodia was to protect the lives of American troops in Vietnam during the withdrawal period. Recently, however, it has become apparent that our invasion of Cambodia was in part an attempt to prop up the Lon Nol government and Smith states that the survival of the Lon Nol regime has become intimately linked in Nixon's mind with American success in Vietnam. If this be the case, what may happen if this government fails?

I commend this article to my colleagues for its incisive and grim portrayal of the events leading up to the announcement of our invasion of Cambodia.

The article follows:

CAMBODIAN DECISION: WHY PRESIDENT ACTED

(By Hedrick Smith)

WASHINGTON, June 29.—President Nixon's venture into Cambodia is ending with proclamations of unprecedented military gain, but it was launched for the broader purpose of rescuing Cambodia from sudden Communist domination and that purpose is still unrealized.

A reconstruction shows that the survival of an anti-Communist Government in Cambodia came to be seen by Mr. Nixon as essential for the defense of Vietnam and the American stake in Indochina. As pieced together by correspondents of The New York Times in Washington, Saigon and Phnom Penh, Mr. Nixon's handling of his most serious crisis also involved the following main factors:

The President, believing that Communist nations had long been trifling with him in Indochina, Korea and the Middle East, saw Cambodia as the first feasible opportunity to demonstrate that he could meet force with force.

Mr. Nixon was haunted by intelligence reports that enemy commanders were moving against Cambodia, confident that American hands were tied by war-weariness at home.

Before attacking, the Nixon Administration tried to signal circuitously to Hanoi that it would accept an accommodation—which the Cambodian Goverment was seeking—provided that Cambodia's principal port remained closed to Communist supply shipments. The overtures collapsed over the port issue.

Once he felt himself militarily challenged by the enemy in Cambodia, Mr. Nixon pushed the pace of decision-making here—so much that one senior adviser cautioned him that the generals in Saigon might be giving the President only the advice they thought he wanted to hear.

Repeated and forceful opposition to the use of American troops in Cambodia from Secretary of State William P. Rogers, stressing the risks of domestic discontent, caused Mr. Nixon to delay the operation 24 hours.

Once decided, Mr. Nixon also ordered four heavy bombing raids against North Vietnam, despite the year-and-a-half-old cessation of United States raids on the North—with the purpose, officials now acknowledge, of warning Hanoi against counterattacking across the demilitarized zone into South Vietnam. The four attacks appeared to be a violation of the private understandings with Hanoi prohibiting bombing of the North.

LIKE PREDECESSORS, UNEASY

Formally, the Cambodian operations began with a Presidential announcement on April 30. But for Mr. Nixon, the beginning was well before that.

Like President Kennedy in the Cuban crisis and President Johnson in Vietnam, he felt Communist forces crowding and testing him. He had contained the frustration of not retaliating when the North Vietnamese shelled Saigon early in his term, when North Korea shot down an American intelligence plane, when the Paris peace talks bogged down. Now the Soviet Union was moving combat pilots into the United Arab Republic and Communist forces were threatening another nation in Indochina.

Of all these situations, Mr. Nixon felt, Cambodia offered the first opening for effective military reaction that would carry his larger political message. As the President confided to a senior adviser: This is a risk, but this is the kind of thing I have been waiting for.

Mr. Nixon's objectives in Cambodia centered on staving off Communist domination. Survival of Premier Lon Nol's Government, for a time, at least, appeared essential. It's survival was needed to assure the defense of South Vietnam and the process of American withdrawal, to spare Saigon the blow of seeing a neighbor collapse while the United States did nothing and to deny Hanoi a gain that would tempt it, in the words of one senior adviser, to "go for all the marbles" in Indochina and forever spurn negotiation.

LIFT FOR THE PREMIER

An American attack from the rear, Mr. Nixon thought, would divert and disrupt the enemy forces threatening General Lon Nol and also give the Cambodian Premier a badly needed political lift. But it required no open commitment.

Dsepite his preference for orderly procedure, President Nixon, like his predecessors, reacted in crisis with rump-group meetings, late phone calls, an out-of-channel message to the field and other activities that bypassed planners at the State and Defense Departments.

The White House became so worried about security leaks that even members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff were late to learn of some critical discussions. State Department lawyers were not told to prepare the legal case for invasion until four days after it began.

The gestation process for Mr. Nixon's decision was much longer than Administration accounts suggested. It began almost immediately after General Lon Nol and others deposed Prince Norodom Sihanouk on March 18.

TWILIGHT ZONE OF WAR

For years, Cambodia was a twilight zone of the Vietnam war. Prince Sihanouk balancing between the belligerents, had let the North Vietnamese create a dozen base areas to shelter 40,000 to 60,000 troops for use against South Vietnam.

American generals had periodically pressed the Johnson Administration for permission to attack these sanctuaries, but President Johnson had refused. The Nixon Administration grudgingly tolerated the situation. Its plans for a gradual troop withdrawal from Vietnam assumed that the enemy bases in Cambodia would remain intact.

Within the last year, however, even Prince Sihanouk began to worry about the expanding enemy activity on his soil. He allowed American B-52's to bomb the base areas. For a time, he curtailed the enemy supply shipments to the bases through the port, then Sihanoukville, now Kompong Som.

Prince Sihanouk's ouster, described as a surprise in Washington, posed an opportunity. All foreign-policy agencies quickly drafted proposals for dealing with the new situation. In this process, Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird invited the generals in Saigon to submit contingency plans.

ABRAMS'S OPTION

By April 1, Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, the United States commander in Vietnam had offered the Pentagon several options:

First, to let South Vietnamese troops harass the enemy across the border.

Second, to help the south larger attacks over a period of months to disrupt the enemy bases.

Or third, to let American forces join the South Vietnamese in a swift full-scale assault on the bases.

Using the American forces General Abrams did not formally recommend any course.

Washington was still looking for diplo-

matic ways to contain the Cambodian situation. Perhaps Hanoi, with its forces now less secure in Cambodia, would show interest in negotiation—if not on Vietnam alone then in the context of an international conference on all Indochina, which France proposed on April 1.

General Lon Nol tried to work out live-and-let-live arrangements with the North Vietnamese, first in direct talks and then through Chinese and other Communist intermediaries. He asked North Vietnam to reduce its military presence in Cambodia and its reliance on shipments through Sihanoukville. Hanoi refused.

Washington made no direct approach to Hanoi, but passed word to Asian Intermediaries that it would respect any deal General Lon Nol made. It got no diplomatic reply.

ONE DIPLOMAT UNSURE

One diplomat said the American approach was so feeble and casual that he was not sure the intermediaries understood that the messages were meant for Hanoi. American officials, moreover, were sure that Hanoi suspected the United States of having ousted Prince Sihanouk and could not, therefore, credit Washington with good faith.

South Vietnamese forces, meanwhile, were staging sporadic raids across the Cambodian border, against the advice of American officials in Saigon. The United States increased bombing raids against enemy concentrations in Cambodia, but General Abrams's contingency plans, now sent by the Joint Chiefs of Staff to the White House, were in limbo. Secretary Laird, talking with President Nixon in the second week of April, opposed an American assault because he feared heavy casualties—as high as 400 to 800 dead in the first week alone—and a public outcry.

In mid-April the combat situation changed. Starting April 13, enemy forces were detected moving westward into Cambodia from the border areas, cutting roads, blowing up bridges, harassing military posts and towns. The White House interpreted the reports "leniently"—as reliable on the location of enemy actions, but not on their size, seriousness or intent.

In Saigon, however, General Abrams was particularly struck by the thinning out of enemy forces in the Fishhook, a Cambodian salient that juts into South Vietnam 75 miles northwest of Saigon, which was considered the most important enemy refuge area.

General Abrams and Ellsworth Bunker, the American Ambassador, met privately for several nights and about April 15, sent parallel recommendations to the Departments of State and Defense. They urged an American attack into the Fishhook and joint attacks with the South Vietnamese against other bases.

ARGUMENTS SUMMARIZED

High military sources summed up General Abrams's arguments as follows:

One of the two American divisions standing guard against attacks from the enemy bases in Cambodia was going home soon under President Nixon's withdrawal program, shifting a major burden to Saigon's forces. With the rainy season approaching and the Lon Nol Government unlikely to survive until fall, the time was right. An attack would help the South Vietnamese and assure further American withdrawals. With a third of the enemy forces moved west, the risks of American casualties were reduced.

The general's argument envisioning benefits for the Vietnamization program, impressed Secretary Laird. The promise of lower casualties convinced him, and he endorsed the proposal.

But at the White House, the military possibilities were still offset by the fear of pushing the war deeper into Cambodia and the fear of spoiling the chances for negotiation.

The prospects for diplomacy had unexpectedly improved when the Soviet Union said that it, too, was interested in an Indochina conference. "Only a new Geneva conference could bring a new solution and relax tension," Yakov A. Milik, the Soviet representative at the United Nations, said on April 16. The Americans got private indications that this as a deliberate initiative and assumed that the Russians had cleared it with Hanoi.

PRESSURES STILL RISE

Still, the pressures in Cambodia were building up. Premier Lon Nol pleaded with greater urgency each day. Mr. Nixon did not want another state in Southeast Asia, dependent on the United States, but neither did he want to stand idly by. High officials felt the whole rationale for defending South Vietnam would collapse if they acquiesced in a Communist take-over of Laos and Cambodia. Also, the President feared Prince Sihanouk, with Hanoi's aid, might be returned to power.

So Mr. Nixon set out to help Premier Lon Non clandestinely. He let Saigon's forces increase the scope and frequency of their attacks into Cambodia. The purpose, one high official said later, was "to put pressure on the enemy forces so they wouldn't turn toward Phnom Penh."

American advisers were told to help plan the enlarged raids, but not get into combat inside Cambodia.

By April 17, the President had also approved a secret shipment of 6,000 captured AK-47 rifles of Soviet design to the Cambodian Army. The United States first tried to use Indonesia as a cover for this aid, but for reasons of diplomacy, shifted to South Vietnam.

Plans were also made to assemble a force of 2,000 Khmer Krom troops to stiffen the Cambodian Army. These mercenaries fighting in South Vietnam for the American Special Forces were later flown secretly to Phnompenh.

PRESIDENT DISTRACTED

President Nixon evidently hoped that these measures would win time. He was, in any case, distracted by the battle over his Supreme Court nominees, the Apollo 13 astronauts and the need to announce another troop withdrawal.

General Abrams was pleading for a 60-day delay in withdrawals. Secretary Laird wanted a cutback of 50,000 by Aug. 15. With the issue unresolved, Mr. Nixon went to greet the returning astronauts in Honolulu.

He finally hit on a compromise, surprising even some senior advisers: to delay withdrawals for 60 days but to hide that fact in an announcement of a full year's pullouts—150,000 men by May, 1971. Mr. Nixon flew back to San Clemente, Calif., to make the announcement April 20—a long and, as it turned out, fateful day in his perception of the situation in Indochina.

The speech emphasized his terms for a political settlement in more flexible terms than ever before.

HE REITERATES WARNINGS

He did point with concern to "the enemy's escalation in Laos and Cambodia" and repeated warnings that if "increased enemy action jeopardizes our remaining forces in Vietnam, I shall not hesitate to take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation."

There was no real hint of the internal discussions about Cambodia.

Officials insist that Mr. Nixon's optimism did not disguise any secret calculations. Press dispatches had already reported the fall of Saang, a district capital 18 miles from Pnompenh, but official confirmation did not reach the traveling White House until late on April 20.

On that day, too—although it was probably unknown to Mr. Nixon as he spoke—Hanoi's spokesman in Peking indicated that Prince Sihanouk was joining a new united military front for the "liberation" of all Indochina; the Russians backed off their interest in a Geneva conference, and the Lon Nol regime submitted a request for more than $500 million in military aid.

Mr. Nixon was restless that night—"wound up," his wife said—and after his speech, abruptly flew back to Washington. One aide said afterward that the President might have sensed "something was up."

CONFIRMED BY INTELLIGENCE

By morning, intelligence reports had built up a picture of steady deterioration in Cambodia, but the problem hit Mr. Nixon with sudden force.

From that day on, Mr. Nixon got daily briefings from Richard Helms, Director of Central Intelligence. Details were sketchy, but the Communists were attacking Saang, Takeo and Angtassom, south of Pnompenh and Snoul and Memot, to the north.

The State Department surmised that the enemy was using hit-and-run maneuvers to create an impression of civil war. The Pentagon view, more persuasive to the White House, was that the North Vietnamese had decided to overthrow Lon Not by isolating his capital, or taking it.

Mr. Nixon summoned the National Security Council to meet on April 22, the group's first consideration of the contingency plans. The talk centered largely on a proposed South Vietnamese offensive into the Parrot's Beak, an enemy position jutting into Vietnam 35 miles from Saigon. There was some discussion of an American attack into the Fishhook.

CRISIS SCHEDULE ENFORCED

The next morning, the President seemed bent on some kind of action. He called for operational plans for the Parrot's Beak, forcing a crisis schedule upon the Washington Special Action Group—a body headed by Henry A. Kissinger, his special assistant for security affairs.

The group, which is called WASAG, was created in April, 1969, when North Korea shot down an American intelligence plane. It played a central role in the Cambodian venture from late March onward by assembling and refining all contingency plans, assessing their consequence, and managing the execution of Presidential orders.

At the peak of crisis, the group's members were Mr. Kissinger, David Packard, Deputy Secretary of Defense; U. Alexis Johnson, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs; Mr. Helms; Gen. Earle G. Wheeler, then Chairman of the Joint Chiefs; Adm. Thomas H. Moorer, his successor, and Marshall Greene, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian Affairs.

The group met twice on April 23, again on April 24. In Saigon, the South Vietnamese generals were hesitant about a major strike without the Americans. General Abrams and Ambassador Bunker met with President Nguyen Van Thieu, after which Saigon finally geared for action while General Abrams pressed Washington to use American advisers in the Parrot's Beak operation.

NIXON IS IRRITATED

Mr. Nixon was now pushing the process of making decisions, irritated that the enemy appeared complacent. American intelligence confirmed anew that the enemy command was telling its troops to push west without fear of an American attack from the rear. The White House denounced the enemy moves as a "foreign invasion."

On Friday morning, April 24, the President called for operational plans for the Fishhook operation to be delivered from Saigon within 24 hours. He called a secret meeting of the National Security Council for Sunday, pointing toward a final decision Sunday night. This would give the generals the 72 hours they said they needed to at-

tack on April 29, which would be dawn April 30, Saigon time.

The President flew to Camp David, Md., Friday afternoon. Mr. Kissinger brought the plans on Saturday and the two men studied them. In Washington that evening, they conferred with Secretary Laird and Attorney General John N. Mitchell aboard the Government yacht Sequoia on the Potomac. They then attended a private showing of "Patton," the film biography of the defiant general, which Mr. Nixon was eager to see for a second time.

TWO MEMBERS ABSENT

Secretary of State Rogers returned from New York on Sunday morning and, with Secretary Laird, heard a Pentagon briefing on the Fishook plans. Thus all participants in the afternoon meeting of the Security Council were prepared for the main topic of debate.

The two Secretaries joined the President, the Attorney General, General Wheeler, Mr. Helms and Mr. Kissinger at the Executive Office Building next to the White House. Two statutory members of the Council, Vice President Agnew and George A. Lincoln, director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness, were not present.

Mr. Nixon said that he had decided "to do something." The Parrot's Beak operation had his tentative approval, with American air support but not American ground advisers. The Fishhook was the problem at hand.

The Pentagon representatives argued that a full assault, with American troops, was essential. Military analysis showed the enemy seeking either to topple the Lon Nol regime or to clear a supply corridor to the sea in eastern Cambodia. Either prospect jeopardized the defense of South Vietnam and American withdrawal. The Parrot's Beak alone would serve only as a warning. Using the South Vietnamese in the Fishhook would require a major reshffle of armies, and might prove too difficult for them. With the heavy rains due in a month, and Lon Nol unlikely to survive until fall, it was now or never.

Secretary Rogers carried the principal burden of opposition. The use of American troops in Cambodia meant widening the war. The risk was grave of becoming entrapped, as the Johnson Administration had been. The President won wide popular support for gradual withdrawal and should not risk losing it. The allies' military objective could be achieved by South Vietnamese forces alone.

THEY MEET FOR 3 HOURS

The debate lasted three hours, ranging over other enemy base areas. Mr. Nixon came away thinking he had a choice of doing nothing or involving American troops. An attack in the Parrot's Beak alone seemed unlikely to bring much military advantage. To use only South Vietnamese ground forces would be a pretense, for American air and logistical support was deemed essential. It was a line of thinking Mr. Kissinger appears to have shared. Besides, the President was determined to prove that he could meet force with force.

Mr. Nixon withdrew to his hideaway office and ordered a tray of dinner. On a pad of yellow legal paper he summarized the pros and cons. As disclosed by Stewart Alsop in Newsweek and later confirmed officially, the President's doodling showed how intimately the survival of the Lon Nol regime had become linked in his mind with American success in Vietnam.

In reviewing whether there should be some action in Cambodia, Mr. Nixon listed only arguments in favor: "Time running out" was followed by "military aid" to Lon Nol could be "only symbolic." Then came a scribble saying inaction might tempt Hanoi to install a puppet regime in Pnompenh and a final entry saying that inaction by both sides would leave an "ambiguous situation" with time favoring the Communists.

LIABILITIES LISTED

The President then listed the pros and cons for American action in the Fishhook and for a South Vietnamese attack alone in the Parrot's Beak. He recognized that the Fishhook move would bring a "deep division" of the American people. He feared that it might provoke a collapse of the Paris talks, an attack on Pnompenh or a major North Vietnamese attack across the DMZ.

Mr. Nixon seemed determined to attack, but the opposing arguments of Secretary Rogers evidently led him to break his own deadline. He called another meeting for Monday morning, April 27, with Mr. Rogers, Mr. Laird, Mr. Kissinger and H. R. Haldeman, his chief of staff, but without the military or intelligence chiefs.

Someone—apparently still Mr. Rogers—suggested that the military might be telling the President only what it thought he wanted to hear. The suggestion haunted Mr. Nixon. Out of that meeting came his personal, out-of-channels message to General Abrams demanding "the unvarnished truth," man-to-man.

That afternoon, Mr. Rogers testified at a closed session of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and ran into a storm of opposition to possible American involvement in Cambodia. Without directly disclosing the contemplated use of United States troops, he tried to hint at the imminence of a military decision. Mr. Rogers recounted the Senators' objections in a long telephone report to the President that evening.

WROTE HIS TV SPEECH

From Saigon, General Abrams replied that an American assault was necessary. With that message and new memos from other advisers, and after one more call to Mr. Laird, Mr. Nixon withdrew to make his decision. The next morning he conveyed it, first to Mr. Kissinger and then to Mr. Rogers, Mr. Laird and Mr. Mitchell, whose advise, always important, to the president is not known in this case.

Having decided to attack in the Fishhook, the President said that he was also sending American ground advisers into the Parrot's Beak and ordering consecutive attacks on a number of enemy base areas. As the operation unfolded, he also approved the four raids on North Vietnam.

Ignoring some advice that he treat the event in a low key, the President prepared his own television address, working it through eight longhand drafts on Tuesday and Wednesday night, staying up till 5 A.M. Unlike Presidents Kennedy and Johnson, he never submitted it for editing by his main cabinet advisers. All of Mr. Nixon's senior aides still wince at some of his rhetoric.

Some of Mr. Nixon's senior aides, were troubled by the President's apocalyptic vision of the stakes. Others found some military points overdramatized.

The President's assertion that the enemy was massing in the sanctuaries to attack South Vietnam contradicted Secretary Laird's support of the American assault because of the enemy's movement the other way. It also contradicted the latest intelligence that the enemy forces had sensed what was coming and were dispersing faster than before with some of their arms caches.

The generals felt uneasy that Mr. Nixon to give importance to his move, led the American public to expect the capture of top enemy commanders by announcing an attack on "the headquarters for the entire Communist military operation in South Vietnam." They knew the enemy command unit—the Central Office for South Vietnam, called COSVN—was always on the move and doubted they would catch its 200 men in Fishhook. Their troops were ordered to "neutralize the COSVN base area"—meaning arms caches, supply dumps and other facilities.

CABLE OFFICE CLOSED

Notice of the President's speech reached Premier Lon Nol only after it was over, because the Pnompenh cable office was closed. Although he had agreed in mid-April to deeper raids by the South Vietnamese and more recently to the Parrot's Beak operation, his consent was not sought for the Fishhook. The White House believed if he said "no," it was in trouble; if he said "yes," he might be.

In the days following Mr. Nixon's speech, what the Congress and the public took to be limitations of time and scope on the invasion were only firm definitions of the Administration's private intentions: six to eight weeks and a limit to penetrations of about 20 miles. Some field commanders even found the time limit a welcome surprise; they had expected two to four weeks.

But other rules of engagement had to be adjusted to the enemy's spreading attacks throughout Cambodia. To help Premier Lon Nol defend himself in the months ahead the Administration agreed to leave South Vietnamese troops behind after June 30 and tried to arrange Thai support as well.

American planes now fly tactical air support for the Cambodians under the guise of raids against enemy supply lines. American ships blockade Cambodia's coastline. And new military and economic aid is being prepared. Thus, the operation, now formally ended is, in fact, far from over.

NATURAL GAS: PRICE REGULATION VERSUS SUPPLY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, often the sheer weight of the agenda of running a country as vast as ours decrees that Government jump from one stop-gap measure to recoup one crisis to another stop-gap measure in an ensuing crisis. It takes a tremendous expenditure of energy, and often of political capital, to forestall a crisis even at the edge of the cliff. It takes even more effort to attack a problem when the first warning signs make themselves clearly visible. But the energy expended in such efforts, when they have been taken, have proved economical in the long run. For it is at this earlier stage that we have the greatest range of alternative paths open to us. It is at this earlier stage that we can take steps which will protect the public from the needless expense turmoil, and possible catastrophe ready to descend on them if we hesitate to act.

Such an issue is that of our natural gas supply. And alternatives here are fast disappearing.

During the first postwar decade, production increased much more rapidly than proved reserves; however, since the ratio of reserves to production was comfortable, there was no immediate concern about future supplies. Since that time, however, this ratio has been declining steadily. For the first time in the history of the United States, proved reserves declined in 1968 and in 1969.

This problem in declining supply is ex-

acerbated by a skyrocketing demand for this key fuel.

The problem seems to lay not so much in the earth's supply of natural gas as in getting to that supply.

John E. Hodges of the College of Business Administration, the University of Texas at Austin, has prepared an extensive study of this problem. He credits the impending crisis to excessive price controls placed on suppliers of gas. He is careful to distinguish the problem relating to the field production of natural gas from any problems relating to the urban distribution of such gas. He also is careful to note, "it would be less than fair to assume the regulators' mistakes arose from incompetence."

His remarks are timely and instructive. An adaptation of his report follows:

REMARKS OF JOHN E. HODGES

On the surface, it appears that the outlook for natural gas is extremely bright. Production is at an all time high and current forecasts indicate that gas demand will increase by as much as nine or ten per cent per year for the foreseeable future. It should be noted, however, that growth in demand will not be translated into consumption unless there is an adequate supply, and the adequacy of future supply is very much in doubt.

If statistical indicators are of any value at all in foretelling the future, it is clear that the United States is now facing a major shortage of natural gas. As a consequence, the general public, interstate pipelines, distributing companies, and Federal regulators are now recognizing a problem that has concerned the producers of natural gas for some time.

HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Prior to 1930, the petroleum industry (and the general public) paid little attention to natural gas which was regarded as a byproduct of little economic value. Prohibitively high transportation costs limited the distance that natural gas could be moved from the wellhead to the consumer. Some gas produced in the Pennsylvania-West Virginia area reached northeastern markets, but most produced gas was flared, vented, or used in the oil and gas fields themselves.

By the 1930's, the center of gravity of gas production had shifted to the Texas-Oklahoma-Louisiana-Kansas area, as eastern fields declined in relative importance. This intensified the geographical imbalance between production and market areas. With gas transport still uneconomical, many large Gulf Coast gas fields were underdeveloped, and non-associated gas discoveries were often shut-in.

A number of factors contributed to the unprecedented growth of natural gas consumption following World War II. First, advances in pipeline technology lowered transportation costs and permitted gas to be moved economically to distant markets. Second, the petroleum industry had accumulated a large backlog of undeveloped gas reserves which was awaiting market opportunities that would justify development and production. Third, the general price inflation of the late 1940's and early 1950's was reflected in the price of oil and coal but the price of natural gas remained relatively depressed because of excess supply. Fourth, residential demand increased because of the construction of new homes in the early postwar period which were equipped with gas furnaces. Fifth, gas pipeline companies were successful in developing new industrial markets by providing gas on an interruptible basis which would permit peak residential demands to be supplied without having excessive pipeline capacity during the remainder of the year.

As gas consumption by residential users became more and more common throughout the nation, field prices of natural gas became a national issue rather than merely a regional concern, and political pressures for price regulation multiplied. Such consumer-oriented pressures were beyond doubt responsible for the ensuing regulation of natural gas field prices.

Natural gas became subject to price regulation at the field level in 1954 as a result of the Supreme Court's decision in the case of *Phillips Petroleum Company* v. *Wisconsin*.

FUTURE PROSPECTS

In the event that higher prices are not forthcoming in the near future, serious gas shortages will develop. If prices are not increased, supplies will continue to decline and some sort of rationing will be imperative. The ultimate outcome of a long-run shortage will very likely be the pyramiding of pressures for end-use rationing. Such controls would probably be applied first to the elimination of industrial sales, but this would result in excess pipeline capacity and would raise costs to residential gas users.

The entire controversy over end-use controls implies that gas, rather than being monopolistically over-priced, has always been under-priced.

What are the possible solutions to the present supply crisis? There are three ways in which supplies may be augmented: (1) imports, (2) production of gas from synthetic sources, and (3) stimulation of greater domestic production. To look first at prospects for importation, the most obvious sources are Canada and Mexico, with supplies of liquefied natural gas from Venezuela, Africa, and the Middle East a possibility. Large reserves exist in Canada, but they are only partially developed. High transport costs will limit the marketability of much of the gas produced in the more distant Canadian fields. Furthermore, Canada may well need most of its own gas since Canadian demands are increasing steadily. In any event, export restrictions currently in force will prevent any substantial increase in Canadian exports for at least the next few years.

Reserves in Mexico are quite small compared to United States needs. About 95 per cent of Mexico's energy is supplied by oil and gas, and gas consumption is increasing at about ten per cent per year. It seems certain, therefore, that the export potential of Mexico will remain small. In addition, relatively high transport costs would be incurred for pipeline shipments to the major consuming centers in this country.

Although the potential supply of liquefied natural gas in Venezuela, Africa, and the Middle East is quite large, high costs would deter importation.

Furthermore, increasing gas imports would further deteriorate the nation's balance of payments position.

Gas could be produced from coal, oil shales, and tar sands. Coal hydrogenation appears at present to be the most promising process, but studies indicate that present costs are about 60 cents per Mcf, and these costs must be reduced by 10 to 15 cents to be competitive with natural gas at expected future prices. These cost estimates are based on current prices for hydrogen; but if the process was undertaken on a commercial scale, the demand for hydrogen would increase dramatically, and costs would increase unless there was a breakthrough in the cost of hydrogen production. Even if these estimates are approximately correct, it should be noted that gas from these sources will not be available for at least eight to ten years.

Potential gas recovery from oil shales is on the order of ten quadrillion cubic feet, but technology is untested and costs are likely to be quite high.

Domestic production of natural gas can be increased both by finding new gas and by increasing recovery from existing gas fields. Potential increases in supply from the latter source are likely to be limited. Nuclear stimulation of existing fields with poor recovery factors should result in increased production. However, little is yet known about costs, the effect on recovery factors, or the degree of radioactive contamination of the gas produced. Conservationist efforts may block widespread use of nuclear stimulation techniques even if economically feasible.

This leaves the stimulation of increased exploration for undiscovered domestic natural gas reserves as the most promising means of increasing supply. Enormous volumes are judged to await discovery. Probable undiscovered reserves are currently estimated at 260 trillion cubic feet, possible reserves at 335 trillion cubic feet, and speculative reserves at 632 trillion cubic feet (392 trillion cubic feet of this last amount being located in Alaska). The necessary and sufficient incentive for discovery and development of these potential reserves is a higher, and contractually assured level of natural gas prices.

INDEPENDENCE DAY FOR ALL NATIONS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, from First Corinthians 10, verses 29 and 30, we read:

Conscience, I say, not thine own, but of the other: for why is my liberty judged of another man's conscience? For if I by grace be a partaker, why am I evil spoken of for that for which I give thanks?

A fitting and timely patriotic contribution from Miss Lena G. Doll of Arlington, Va., has come across my desk. It is especially appropriate as we approach the Fourth of July—the 194th anniversary of the Declaration of Independence. In her poem, "Old Glory—Our Flag of Freedom," Miss Doll reminds us of our duty to keep our hard-won freedom and of our role as benefactor of freedom in the world.

I have also received Fourth of July congratulations from Dr. Walter Becher, Member of the Free German Bundestag, who lauds the United States as the one mighty counterbalance for the free world to resist the pressures from the Soviets.

I feel that Miss Doll's poem and Dr. Becher's letter will be of interest to all the Members; they follow my remarks:

OLD GLORY—OUR FLAG OF FREEDOM

Raise Old Glory high unto the sky
The greatest banner ever to fly—
Unfurled in the cause of Freedom.

No people ever, anywhere on earth
Had benefaction of greater worth—
The benediction of Freedom.

With our lives in hand, our minds and souls
We pledge to achieve victorious goal—
To keep our hard-won Freedom.

This is our Destiny, we can't forswear
The charge that binds us in loving care.
Bless'ed God-given Freedom.

—*Lena G. Doll.*

JUNE 24, 1970.

Hon. JOHN R. RARICK,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE RARICK: On the occasion of July 4, the American Independence Day, I would like to send you the best wishes and congratulations.

In a time when many voices in the world criticize the U.S.A. because it has stood up for freedom, this Day is a special occasion for me to greet your great country. Nobody in the free world could resist the pressure coming from the Soviet side if there were not the mighty counterbalance by the United States.

As a Member of the Foreign Relations Committee of the German Bundestag, I appreciate the efforts by your country to keep the peace in alliance with the free nations. Nobody can claim these efforts only for Europe, and—as many have done also over here—condemn them as far as Asia is concerned.

The right for freedom is indivisible. July 4 is therefore the Independence Day for all nations.

With best personal regards and wishes for you and your great country,

Yours very sincerely,

Dr. WALTER BECHER,
Member of the German Bundestag.

THE GUARANTEED STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, if you and other Members of Congress have received letters from students or their parents telling of difficulties in obtaining guaranteed student loans or otherwise inquiring about this remarkably successful program, you will want to read the following column by Sylvia Porter and an article from the Wall Street Journal:

[From the Washington Star, June 18, 1970]

A "SALLY MAE" FOR COLLEGIANS

(By Sylvia Porter)

We're now into the peak hunting season for guaranteed student loans. June-July is when the vast majority of college students and their parents are shopping among banks, savings institutions and other lenders for commitments to finance the fall semester in colleges, business, trade, technical and vocational schools.

Under the federal-state guaranteed loan program, 2,500,000 loans totaling $2.25 billion have been made since fiscal '66. In fiscal '70 alone, an estimated $840 million will have been loaned, the highest to date. Involved have been close to 20,000 lenders and students attending 7,000 educational institutions. It has been and it is a magnificent program designed especially to help the oft-forgotten middle-grade student from the middle-income family.

But as of this day, the program is in great trouble. Caught in a bitter money squeeze themselves, many of the nation's banks are severely cutting back the volume of guaranteed student loans for the coming school year. In some states the program is being abandoned altogether.

Many lenders have announced they will make no new loans to students just entering college or other approved schools but will aid only those already attending school with the help of guaranteed loans. And this year, as well as last, much of the available money will be channeled to favored customers and will by-pass non-customers.

The full extent of the cutbacks won't be known until next month—although you, the student and parents—already may have been rebuffed by all lenders in your area. But from testimony and other information received by the House Special Subcommittee on Education, headed by Oregon Democrat Edith Green, the crisis is here.

How can the program be kept alive?

The solution being pushed, as part of the Administration package, and by the original sponsor of the program, Undersecretary of the Treasury Charles Walker, lies in the creation of a new federal government corporation—the National Student Loan Assn. In essence, "Sally Mae" would sell its own government-guaranteed obligations at interest rates demanded by the open market to raise money. It would then use these funds to buy student loans from private lenders, and by so doing it would give the lenders new money to make new loans.

"The problem with these student loans has been the liquidity squeeze," said Walker last week. "Freshmen who borrowed as long ago as 1966 still haven't paid off one dime of principal, and so each year the money tied up in the loans has just grown. The creation of a 'secondary market' for the loans via 'Sally Mae' will relieve the pressure points and let lenders keep making the loans."

A bill to create the new corporation (similar to the Federal National Mortgage Assn. and its operations in the mortgage market) has been introduced. While it probably will be weeks before Congress votes on the legislation, "The need is indisputable," said Walker and he emphasized that "all sources, schools, banks, savings institutions, etc., seem to favor this as the answer."

To give you the key loan details, you, the student in good academic standing at an approved institution are eligible in most cases if your family's adjusted gross income is not more than $15,000. You may borrow up to $1,500 a year at a maximum rate to you of 7 percent plus an insurance premium of ¼ percent prepaid on each loan. The U.S. Government pays the total interest while you're in school. You pay the full interest during your repayment period which begins between nine and 12 months after you leave school and normally stretches from five to 10 years.

This program is a superb financial source for the non-scholarship student and it must not be permitted to die. Add your pressure on Congress; make sure it approves the Sally Mae bill soon. Don't flunk this one.

[From the Wall Street Journal, June 18, 1970]

LOANS FOR STUDENTS

College students find shopping for educational loans a bit harder this year.

Many bankers dislike the loans, which tie up funds for many years, produce less income than other types of consumer loans and require extensive paper work. "Education loans," says a Philadelphia banker, "are just to pacify senior management who worry about the bank's image." Now with money tight, many banks are tightening up on such lending. First National Bank of Boston stopped making new loans to students in February. City National Bank in Detroit anticipates rejecting "many more (applicants) than we would in looser times." Some banks start restricting college loans to regular customers.

But First Pennsylvania Banking & Trust in Philadelphia says it has "a little more money to lend" this year. National Bank of Detroit says it has "no limitations upon allocations" of funds for educational loans. Manufacturers National Bank in Detroit actually has fewer applicants for college loans than last year.

The American Bankers Association, others, press for a secondary, or resale, market for educational loans to make more funds available for students.

Mr. Speaker, both of these articles point out the need for a secondary market facility to relieve the liquidity problem of the guaranteed student loan program. On April 23, 1970, Congressman DON CLAUSEN and I introduced H.R. 17198 for this purpose. The Student Loan Marketing Association—Sally Mae—which our bill would establish would function with regard to student loans in much the same manner as does the Federal National Mortgage Association—Fanny Mae—with home mortgages.

Recognizing the need for this facility, as urged by these newspaper accounts and by witness after witness in testimony before the Education and Labor Committee's Special Subcommittee on Education, 12 of the committee's members—Congressmen QUIE, DENT, SCHERLE, PUCINSKI, DELLENBACK, DANIELS of New Jersey, ESCH, HATHAWAY, COLLINS, GAYDOS, LANDGREBE, and HANSEN of Idaho—joined us yesterday in cosponsoring an identical bill, H.R. 18264.

We are hopeful that the committee will soon act on this legislation and that this body will then support its enactment, so that loan funds will be available for those young people who need to borrow to go to college.

PCB'S—THREAT TO THE ENVIRONMENT

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, Americans have recently begun to realize that compounds in products on the market are dangerous to life. These compounds are injurious to the earth itself and the wildlife on it. Several of these have been discovered to be dangerous to the unborn child.

In a recent article in the New Yorker magazine, "Department of Amplification," Thomas Whiteside has written about the effects of various compounds on the fetus.

In his article, written in the form of a letter to the editor, he includes polychlorinated phenolic compounds as fetus deforming, and polychlorinated biphenyls—PCB's—as the most prevalent of these compounds accumulating in the human system.

I have been extremely concerned about the danger of PCB's to our environment. Two months ago, I asked various departments in the Nixon administration to take action against this ecological threat. I requested that the Agriculture Department ban the use of PCB's in insecticides; the Food and Drug Administration label all products containing PCB's and study to see if they should be completely banned; and the Department of Interior insure that fish and wildlife no longer be endangered by PCB's.

At the same time, I asked the Monsanto Co.—sole producer of PCB's in the United States—to detail its efforts to prevent PCB's from escaping into the environment.

PCB's continue, however, to be an unchecked threat to our environment.

I am inserting the New Yorker article

in the RECORD. I am sure that my colleagues will agree that fetus-deforming compounds must be immediately removed from the market. I hope they will join me in the fight against PCB's and the other compounds which are destroying us and our environment.

The article follows:

[From the New Yorker magazine, June 20, 1970]

DEPARTMENT OF AMPLIFICATION

NEW YORK,
June 7, 1970.

The Editors,
The New Yorker.

DEAR SIRS: In the issues of February 7th and March 14th of this year, I presented in *The New Yorker* some of the mounting evidence regarding the dangerous teratogenic, or fetus-deforming, effects of the herbicide 2, 4,5-T, which has been used in huge amounts over the past decade as a defoliant in Vietnam and as a weed killer here at home. What seemed particularly alarming, as I reported, was the seemingly unavoidable presence in 2,4,5-T of a highly toxic and teratogenic contaminant belonging to a group known commonly as dioxins. I also pointed out the reluctance of the government, despite its apparent awareness of the dangers, to eliminate or drastically restrict the use of this herbicide.

On April 15th, the Surgeon General of the United States, Dr. Jesse L. Steinseld, appeared before a Senate subcommittee, headed by Senator Philip A. Hart, of Michigan, that was investigating the safety of 2,4,5-T and announced, on behalf of the Secretary of the Interior, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, a number of measures that were being taken to limit the use of 2,4,5-T in this country. These measures included the immediate suspension of the Department of Agriculture's registrations of liquid formulations of 2,4,5-T used around the home and of all formulations used for killing vegetation around lakes, ponds, and irrigation ditches. The Surgeon General also announced that the Department of Agriculture was about to cancel its registrations of nonliquid formulations of 2,4,5-T for use around the home and on food crops, including corn, barley, oats, rice, rye, apples, and blueberries. On the same day, Deputy Secretary of Defense David Packard announced the immediate suspension of the use of 2,4,5-T in Vietnam.

Against a background of evidence accumulated since 1966 that 2,4,5-T, or material with which it is ordinarily contaminated to some degree, exerts a fetus-deforming effect on the offspring of experimental animals, and a background, too, of extraordinary reluctance on the part of government agencies, including the office of President Nixon's own Science Adviser, Dr. Lee DuBridge, to inform the public in a forthright manner about the potential hazards of 2,4,5-T to human health, the statement by the Surgeon General appeared to signal clear and unequivocal action at last against the widespread use of 2,4,5-T. Federal law requires that all pesticides and herbicides be registered with the Department of Agriculture before they can be marketed in interstate commerce, and the conclusion that citizens could reasonably be expected to draw from the Surgeon General's statement was that cancellation and suspension of these registrations had put an immediate stop to the sale and use of 2,4,5-T here.

That conclusion, I regret to say, is not justified. The word "cancellation," which has such an air of finality about it, and which seems to signify drastic action, is really one of the weaker words in the federal-regulatory lexicon—far weaker than the word "suspension," which the Department of Agriculture has applied to its action on the registrations of liquid formulations of 2,4,5-T used around the home and around lakes, ponds, and irrigation ditches. To illustrate one of the powerful distinctions implicit in this upside-down bureaucratic language, when the Department of Agriculture *suspends* the registration of a product for certain uses, the suspension takes force immediately, and under federal law shipments of the product in interstate commerce must stop; in effect, the flow of the product from manufacturer to ultimate user is immediately pinched off at a point reasonably close to the source of supply. When the Department of Agriculture *cancels* the registration of a product for certain uses, however, the movement of the product in interstate commerce is brought to no such automatic halt. A company given a cancellation order is told that after thirty days it can no longer ship its product across state lines, but the company has the right to appeal the order, and if it does appeal, this action has the effect of staying the order. During the lengthy process of appeal, the company can continue to produce, ship, and sell the cancelled product. A company whose product's registration is suspended has no such recourse.

Approximately six weeks after the Surgeon General's announcement concerning 2,4,5-T, I stopped in at several garden stores in the New York area. I found that a number of 2,4,5-T formulations—weed killers, poison-ivy sprays, and lawn food—were still on sale. Since the Surgeon General had cited as one of the primary reasons for federal actions against 2,4,5-T the government's wish to afford "maximum protection to women in the child-bearing years" by preventing them from being exposed to the herbicide, this state of affairs startled me, particularly since May and June are the months of maximum use of herbicides. The disturbing fact is that the Department of Agriculture has no power to compel manufacturers to recall from retail stores products whose registration for certain uses the Department has either cancelled *or* suspended. There is no federal law against a retailer's selling such a product or against a customer's buying it. The law does provide that stocks of it can be seized by Department of Agriculture inspectors. However, the number of retail establishments selling herbicidal formulations for home use runs into the scores of thousands, whereas the number of retail-store inspectors employed by the Department of Agriculture, I recently discovered, is exactly thirty-two. On a practical level, then, the power of the Department of Agriculture to prevent the retail sale of such products is almost nonexistent. Furthermore, not only is it legal under federal law for a homeowner to buy a product whose registration for certain uses has been officially cancelled or suspended but it is legal for him to use it, and use it in any way he pleases. Without breaking any federal law, he can dump concentrations of 2,4,5-T on his lawn in such a way that some of it enters his or his neighbors' water supplies.

Similarly, a farmer can continue to use 2,4,5-T on his crops without breaking any federal law even though that use has been the subject of a Department of Agriculture cancellation order. The only risk he faces is that of seizure by Food and Drug Administration inspectors of any of his crops shipped in interstate commerce that are found to have detectable amounts of 2,4,5-T residue on them. The risk isn't a very great one, since these inspections take place at retail outlets—supermarkets, and so on—where F.D.A. inspectors collect samples of foodstuffs and send them back to the F.D.A. for analysis, which takes time. The bureaucratic machinery is creaky, and if any detectable residue of 2,4,5-T is found on the foodstuff—say, blueberries that the farmer has sprayed with 2,4,5-T—the chances are that by the time the Department is ready to seize the stock of blueberries in the store (which, after all, is probably only one of many stores to which berries from this batch have been shipped) the blueberries have been bought and eaten. In any event, only the blueberries can be found guilty—not the farmer or the shipper. And the farmer can go right on using 2,4,5-T as he pleases, because the cancellation powers and suspension powers of the Department of Agriculture apply not to the basic chemical compound of 2,4,5-T as such but only to the formally registered *uses* for which it is intended. In effect, this means that there is federal control only over the wording of labels on the cans, bottles, or drums of these chemicals. It is true that the Department has asked manufacturers of 2,4,5-T products whose registration for certain uses has been cancelled or suspended to recall the products from retailers, but this will have to be done strictly on a voluntary basis if it is done at all. Even if it actually is done, and the products are back in the manufacturers' hands, the recall does not mean that the 2,4,5-T will be destroyed. For the most part, it means merely that the 2,4,5-T formulation will be relabeled, with the cancelled uses deleted, and sold over again in the same form, and even in the same containers. And since the label on the container has no binding force on the purchaser, there is no guarantee at all that 2,4,5-T will not continue to be applied in ways that the public might reasonably suppose to have been stopped dead by the government.

Further examination reveals that the measures against the use of 2,4,5-T that appear to be so sweeping actually apply to about ten per cent of the total amount of 2,4,5-T used in this country—that is, only to 2,4,5-T used around homes, gardens, and aquatic areas and on food crops. And since 2,4,5-T products are still being sold freely in garden-supply stores, I estimate that so far the cancellation and suspension orders have affected no more than two or three per cent of the total amount. About ninety per cent, in any case, is used for the control of woody plants in such areas as rangeland and pastureland and along railroad and electric-line rights-of-way. These uses remain unaffected by the new federal orders because the Departments of Agriculture, H.E.W., and the Interior agreed that in such areas, many of which are remote from dense population, 2,4,5-T does not constitute an imminent hazard to women of childbearing age.

I believe that this conclusion deserves reexamination. As studies with experimental animals have shown, 2,4,5-T is a fetus-deforming agent both in its relatively pure form, which has so far been formulated only under laboratory-test conditions, and in the form in which it is ordinarily sold to users. Because certain factors are apparently impossible to eliminate in its production, the latter form is a contaminated one, the contaminants being present in amounts that have up to now been considered tolerable. The name of the principal contaminant in 2,4,5-T is symmetrical 2,3,6,7-tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin, and it has been found to be both extremely toxic and, in certain tests on living creatures, teratogenic. In tests on chick embryos, this form of dioxin, in a pure state, has the capacity to deform embryos at levels of a trillionth of a gram per kilogram of the egg—a level only one-millionth as great as that required to achieve a comparable effect in chick-embryo experiments with the notorious teratogen thalidomide. And in tests involving a mixture of dioxins in which the symmetrical tetrachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin predominated, conducted by the Food and Drug Administration on pregnant hamsters, a dosage of 9.1 millionths of a gram per day (for five days) per kilogram of the mother's body weight produced an incidence of eighty-two per cent mortality and eighty-

two per cent abnormality among live offspring.

Dioxins are also known to have untoward effects on human beings. In factories where 2,4,5-T is produced, the dioxin appears as a contaminant in an intermediate stage of the manufacturing process, and some of it remains in the finished product. In 1964, workers in a Midland, Michigan, factory of the Dow Chemical Company, one of the largest producers of 2,4,5-T, contracted an illness through exposure to the dioxin contaminant. The symptoms of this illness were described as follows by Dr. Julius E. Johnson, a vice-president of Dow Chemical and its director of research and development, in testimony he gave in mid-April before the Senate subcommittee investigating 2,4,5-T.

"The most sensitive toxic reaction observed in humans to this impurity (the tetra dioxin) was manifested by a condition known as chloracne, a skin disorder mostly prevalent on the face, neck and back. It is similar in appearance to severe acne often suffered by teenagers."

The way Dr. Johnson described chloracne before the Senate subcommittee, it does not sound like a very serious condition. However, the way he described it before the subcommittee is not quite the way Dr. Benjamin Holder, the director of the medical department at Dow's Midland Division, had described it two months earlier during a meeting with government chemists. According to a memorandum originating in one of the regulatory agencies involved, Dr. Holder said that about sixty people had contracted the disease at the Dow plant, and that its onset had been slow—four to six weeks. The memorandum continued:

"Early symptoms (according to Dr. Holder) include fatigue, lassitude and depression, and early signs include the appearance of comedones on the face and body . . . and weight loss. . . . Severe exposure results in effects involving internal organs and nervous system disorder (polyneuritis). . . Dr. Holder discussed the examination and treatment of exposed workers. He said that six months were required for marked recovery to begin, and complete recovery required up to several years."

According to a paper published in a German scientific journal a year before the Dow people made these observations, the symptoms of chloracne associated with the intermediate stage of manufacture of 2,4,5-T include mental depression, reduced power of recall and concentration, disturbed sleep, irritability, reduced libido, and impotence. And another scientific paper, so far unpublished, on an outbreak of chloracne that occurred in another 2,4,5-T factory (not a Dow factory) in the United States, describes the continued existence of serious mental disturbance among affected workers some six years afterward. The reason I emphasize the presence and the extremely hazardous nature of the dioxin contaminant in 2,4,5-T is that while the Dow people claim that 2,4,5-T is readily decomposable in soil and by the action of sunlight after it has been applied, neither they nor anyone else has ever shown that the dioxin contaminant, as distinct from a theoretically pure 2,4,5-T, is biologically degradable; that is, that it does not persist in the environment or accumulate in animal tissue. On the contrary, the characteristics of dioxin-related chloracne poisoning, far from resembling those of the transient acne of teen-agers, include effects that are surely indicative of a serious toxic influence that is stubbornly persistent in the human body and its central nervous system. And, according to Dr. Jacqueline Verrett, of the Food and Drug Administration (Dr. Verrett's chick-embryo studies contributed to the discovery that the cyclamates widely used as sugar substitutes were carcinogenic substances), studies of the effects of dioxins on chicks and small mammals indicate that dioxin may very well accumulate in animal tissue more or less as DDT does—the difference being that dioxin is infinitely more toxic.

In the absence of positive proof that dioxin is not persistent and cumulative, the continued virtually unrestricted spraying of 2,4,5-T on pastureland and rangeland seems to me to constitute a serious potential hazard to human health. In spite of manufacturers' claims, there appears to be no evidence that the dioxin contaminant does not persist in the sprayed area long after the 2,4,5-T itself has broken down. The amounts of dioxin that would thus remain would, admittedly, be very small in relation to the amount of 2,4,5-T originally laid down—the Dow people, for example, claim that the dioxin content of their 2,4,5-T is less than one part per million—but the potency of dioxin is so extreme that a serious question arises whether traces of dioxin remain on sprayed pastureland and may be ingested by beef cattle, dairy cows, and sheep, with the result that dioxin builds up in the tissues of these livestock and enters the human food chain through meat or milk. The relentlessness of the cumulative process involving DDT and other pesticides is well known by now, when human milk contains more DDT than federal law permits in cow's milk crossing state lines, and when virtually every sample of drinking water tested throughout the country by the Environmental Control Administration has contained traces of pesticide. The only precaution recommended by the Department of Agriculture against possible contamination of dairy cattle feeding on pastureland sprayed with 2,4,5-T is that the land not be grazed for seven days after a spraying. Since the Department's own calculations of the persistence of 2,4,5-T—calculations that take no account whatever of the persistence of the dioxin contaminant—are that 2,4,5-T takes about five months to break down in soil, these precautionary measures as they relate to grass growing from the soil or water holes on its surface hardly seem adequate for the ultimate protection of the public against a herbicide that has been demonstrated to be a serious potential health hazard even in a laboratory-purified form. As for precautions against the ingestion of dioxin, there simply aren't any, because as far as federal regulations are concerned dioxin does not exist. In the case of grazing beef cattle, the Department of Agriculture does not recommend withholding the land from use for as much as a day after a 2,4,5,-T spraying. In Texas alone, more than a million acres of rangeland and pastureland are being sprayed with 2,4,5-T this year; probably at least a quarter of a million head of cattle will graze on that sprayed land; and the cattle will produce something like a hundred and fifty million pounds of meat that will be sold to Americans as edible—all in the absence of a solitary meaningful restriction imposed by the federal government on either the spraying or the grazing, and also in the absence of a solitary scientific study, either by industry or by any government agency, concerning the stability, the persistence, and the cumulative capacity of the dioxin contaminant in the bodies of living creatures.

Next year, the total area sprayed with 2,4,5-T throughout the country may well be greatly increased rather than decreased. The use of herbicides in this country has been increasing at a considerably greater rate than that of pesticides, and it is only because military priorities for defoliation programs in Vietnam cut the available supply of 2,4,5-T quite drastically that this country has been spared the much more extensive use of 2,4,5-T on rangeland and pastureland. In Vietnam, a total of about forty million pounds of 2,4,5-T has been dropped on the countryside. The suspension, under public pressure, of the use of 2,4,5-T there will probably bring about the release in the coming year of huge amounts of it in the domestic market, and a logical target of chemical-company salesmen for disposal of the surplus would be the cattle industry and the United States Forest Service.

Also, to my knowledge, no proper investigation has ever been made of the possibility that, quite aside from the dioxin already present in 2,4,5-T sprayed on vegetation, *further* amounts of dioxin may be created, and released into the environment, through the breakdown process of 2,4,5-T as it is affected by sunlight and by heat. Heat strong enough to create new dioxin can occur under conditions that are not highly unusual. Brush that has been killed, whether by 2,4,5-T or other means, is certainly a fire hazard, especially in a hot, dry climate, such as that of Texas, where so much 2,4,5-T spraying is going on, and a brush fire over a large sprayed area containing 2,4,5-T residues could conceivably generate considerable quantities of dioxin and release it into the atmosphere.

It seems most likely that the hazards of pollution of the environment by dioxins extends far beyond the use of 2,4,5-T. This herbicide is only one of many products derived from polychlorinated phenolic compounds that contain dioxins or are the precursors of dioxins. These products range from pesticides to deodorants. It appears that when any chlorophenol is heated sufficiently it can be converted into a dioxin. This fact raises questions about the release of dioxins into the environment merely through the burning of many commonly used products. For example, one of the polychlorinated phenolic compounds, pentachlorophenol, is widely used as a fungicide and as an antibacterial preparation. It is used in preserving wood and in controlling slime in the manufacture of paper. In 1968, more than twenty-seven million pounds of pentachlorophenol and its salts were used in the United States to preserve wood. Since the fate of most timber is to be burned sooner or later, and since it is reported that when five grams of pentachlorophenol is heated at a temperature of three hundred degrees for twelve hours it is capable of generating one and a half grams of octachlorodibenzo-*p*-dioxin, the possibility that considerable amounts of dioxin will be released into the atmosphere from wood treated with this preservative presents a potential health hazard of very alarming dimensions. The same thing may be said of the burning of paper that has been treated with pentachlorophenol. Aside from any hazard created by burning, the extreme toxicity of pentachlorophenol was discussed some years ago in an article in the *British Medical Journal* on some sawmill workers in Borneo who handled wet timbers that had been freshly treated with a solution of sodium pentachlorophenate, a salt of pentachlorophenol. The people involved, who are described in a Monsanto Chemical Company manual on pentachlorophenol as "nine undernourished, scantily clothed native workers," were not wearing protective garments—a circumstance that the Monsanto manual calls a "complete violation of safety precautions for handling Penta [a Monsanto trade name] materials." They died as a result of handling the timbers.

Pentachlorophenol is used in a wide variety of products, including paints and shampoos. It is put in laundry starches as a preservative, and it has been used in other laundry products. The extreme hazards posed by the injudicious use of this chemical, which is buried in so many consumer products, can be perceived in a scientific paper that appeared in the *Journal of Pediatrics* last August, entitled "Pentachlorophenol Poisoning in a Nursery for Newborn Infants." The paper describes the cases of nine infants between six and fourteen days old who were all born in a small hospital for unmarried mothers in St. Louis and who were all admitted to St. Louis Children's Hospital with a severe form of an

unusual and undiagnosed illness marked by excessive sweating, increased heart rate, respiratory difficulty, and enlargement of the liver. Two of the infants died shortly after being admitted to Children's Hospital; the rest were given blood transfusions and other treatment and survived. The cause of the poisoning was traced to an antimicrobial laundry neutralizer that had been used in excessive amounts in the laundry of the hospital where the children were born. The neutralizer contained sodium pentachlorophenate, and traces of pentachlorophenol that remained in diapers and other clothing after laundering had penetrated the skins of the infants and entered their systems. The insidious nature of pentachlorophenol can be illustrated further by the fact that after the use of the rinse was discontinued, traces of pentachlorophenol continued to be found in the blood of newborn children and of expectant mothers. It turned out that although the infants were no longer directly exposed to pentachlorophenol, the mothers-to-be had continued to use linens that had been rinsed with it. There is speculation that the pentachlorophenol traces in the linens used by the expectant mothers became absorbed into their systems and crossed the placental barrier into the systems of the unborn babies.

Such facts led me to become curious about other commonly used products that contain polychlorinated phenolic compounds. One of these is the household disinfectant Lysol, which contains a chlorophenol compound. Another polychlorinated phenolic compound that is widely used is hexachlorophene. The basic material for hexachlorophene originates in 2,4,5-trichlorophenol, which is also the precursor of 2,4,5-T in the manufacture of the herbicide. Hexachlorophene is very widely used as an antibacterial agent, and is an ingredient of toilet soaps, of skin lotions for babies, and of cleaning powders used for washing diapers and infants' laundry. It is used in deodorant creams and sprays, and it is a principal active ingredient of pHisoHex, a sudsing antibacterial agent for the skin that is universally used in hospitals and widely used in homes. (In hospitals, it is used in scrubbing up before surgery.)

A relatively small number of people appear to be sensitive to such hexachlorophene preparations when they are applied to the skin, but the undoubted benefits of the preparations are generally considered to far outweigh this known disadvantage. Manufacturers of soap claim that hexachlorophene does not readily penetrate the natural barrier of the human skin. However, it may be another matter when hexachlorophene preparations are used where the natural skin barrier has been broken down. In 1965, at the Shriners' Burns Institute, a hospital in Galveston, affiliated with the University of Texas, that is devoted to the treatment of severe burns, nine children had their wounds cleansed with a three-percent solution of hexachlorophene in detergent in preparation for skin grafts. Six of the children soon developed generalized convulsions. To determine the cause of the convulsions, a study was subsequently made in which hexachlorophene was sprinkled into skin incisions in rats. All the rats died.

More recently, Dr. Verrett has made studies of the effects of hexachlorophene on chick embryos, and her observations concerning one of her experiments have led her to conclude that hexachlorophene is so toxic that when it is injected into the embryos in a concentration of half a milligram per kilogram of egg it kills sixty percent of the embryos. In another study, in which hexachlorophene was injected into the eggs at this same concentration, Dr. Verrett found signs of teratogenicity—including a significant incidence of cleft palate, eye and beak defects, and an incidence of leg deformations and edemas, or body-fluid swellings—similar to the teratogenic effects she had found in comparable chick-embryo studies of 2,4,5-T, of the dioxin contaminant, and of 2,4,5-trichlorophenol.

Hexachlorophene has been manufactured for commercial purposes for about thirty years, and last year between two and three million pounds was produced in this country; much larger quantities are expected to be available in 1970, again because of the suspension of the use of 2,4,5-T in Vietnam. The Food and Drug Administration places no restrictions on the use of hexachlorophene in such consumer products as toilet soap and deodorants. Yet, as far as I can determine not one single series of formal tests has ever been completed either by any corporation or by any government agency to determine whether this chemical is teratogenic, whether it causes mutations, or whether it produces cancer in experimental animals. Regardless of this lack of data, the Department of Agriculture permits the use of hexachlorophene in certain pesticides used on farm produce. It is sprayed on certain fruits and vegetables to cut down bacterial action that might encourage spoilage. Its use is permitted in quite high concentrations in water drunk by livestock, as a means of preventing liver flukes in cattle. If it is effective against liver flukes in cattle, it presumably penetrates to the liver, and since beef and calf's liver winds up on the dinner table, one wonders about other ways in which hexachlorophene might possibly be ingested by humans. One route might be through drinking water. With the huge amounts of hexachlorophene used in soaps and such consumer products, regardless of whether, as soap manufacturers claim, very little of the hexachlorophene is absorbed into the human body through the skin, the hexachlorophene that remains outside the skin is for the most part drained away in waste water. Since much waste water in this country is reused, after treatment, as drinking water, it seems reasonable to question whether traces of hexachlorophene are ingested by human beings in this way.

Both the ubiquity of polychlorinated phenolic compounds in the environment and their apparent ability to accumulate in the systems of living creatures are suggested by the contamination caused by a group of polychlorinated phenolic compounds known as polychlorinated biphenyls, or, more commonly, PCBs. These materials, which are known to be highly toxic, and are potential sources of dioxins in themselves, are used for a wide variety of purposes. They are used in rubber products and insulating materials, in paper coatings, in brake linings, in asphalt tiles and other asphalt compounds, in paints and varnishes, in inks for highspeed presses, in waxes, and also in pesticides. In this country, PCBs are manufactured by the Monsanto Chemical Company under the trade name. Aroclors. According to a recent article by Dr. Robert Risebrough, of the Institute of Marine Resources of the University of California at Berkeley, in the magazine *Environment,* PCBs have been found in North American peregrine falcons in amounts as great as 1,980 parts per million parts of body fat, and, in Sweden, in the fat of the white-tailed eagle in the amount of 17,000 parts per million. Traces of PCBs have been discovered in fish in Lake Michigan, and it may therefore be assumed that PCBs have found their way into the human food chain. In tests of samples of mothers' milk from Los Angeles and Berkeley that were analyzed late in 1968 by Dr. James Enderson, of Colorado College, every sample tested contained traces of PCBs.

Of the polychlorinated phenolic herbicides used in the United States, the most widely used is 2,4-dichlorophenoxyacetic acid, or 2,4-D. In 1968, approximately fifty-seven million pounds of 2,4-D was used in this country, in compounds that ranged from agricultural sprays to lawn foods and preparations for removing dandelions. As far as the Department of Agriculture is concerned, 2,4-D may be sprayed on virtually any crop or area—with minor restrictions as to intervals before harvesting, and so on. Last year, probably fifty-seven million acres of agricultural land was sprayed with it, and probably more than a million pounds of it was used on turf alone. Over the past ten years, close to half a billion pounds of 2,4-D has been laid down on vegetation in this country, and today every garden store is full of compounds containing it; about a hundred and seventy-five companies produce 2,4-D preparations, and the chemical appears in somewhere between five hundred and eight hundred products currently in use. In spite of the Department of Agriculture's almost completely permissive attitude toward the use of 2,4-D, this herbicide has never been proved to be non-hazardous to public health. Last year, 2,4-D was characterized in a report by the Bionetics Research Laboratories, in Bethesda, Maryland—the original discoverer of the teratogenic qualities of 2,4,5-T—as "potentially dangerous" and "needing further study." Recently, a screening study conducted by Dr. Verrett on the effects of purified 2,4-D on chick embryos showed the 2,4-D to have teratogenic effects. And preliminary observations in a study, also made within the F.D.A., of the effects of commercially produced 2,4-D given orally at high dosage levels to pregnant hamsters are said to show an incidence of birth abnormalities, including skeletal abnormalities, higher than that in studies of the effects of purified 2,4,5-T given to pregnant hamsters at comparable dosage levels. But the Department of Agriculture has made no move either to warn the public of these ominous findings or to restrict 2,4-D's registered uses.

The potential hazards of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D were further underlined this spring by a report concerning the fate of a herd of six hundred reindeer on government rangeland near Luleå, in northern Sweden, which had been sprayed last July with a mixture of one part 2,4,5-T and two parts 2,4-D at the rate of a little less than two pounds per acre. A few weeks after the animals had eaten large amounts of sprayed foliage, a hundred of them died and another hundred and fifty disappeared—the presumption being that many of the missing ones also succumbed. Among the surviving animals, forty females had miscarriages. Analysis of the reindeer carcasses by the National Swedish Veterinary Institute showed significant residues of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T in their kidneys and livers. In view of this report, the almost complete lack of restrictions by our Department of Agriculture on the use of 2,4,5-T and 2,4-D on rangeland and pastureland seems particularly disturbing.

The acute effects on human beings of high dosages of PCBs are evident from a series of outbreaks of poisoning, traced to cooking oil extracted from rice hulls, that occurred two years ago in western Japan, in which at least ten thousand people were affected. The outbreaks involved both an abnormal incidence of miscarriages and stillbirths among women in the affected population and abnormally dark skin pigmentation in infants. The victims of the poisoning showed the classic symptoms of chloracne, and in several very serious cases they also showed symptoms of jaundice and other liver damage. Polychlorinated phenolic compounds are known to be used in Japan as herbicides on paddy fields, and the causative agent of the poisoning was identified as a PCB. Yet our Department of Agriculture permits the use of PCBs as additives in between thirty and forty registered pesticide products and has taken no action to protect the public against the dangers of these additives.

It seems to me clear from all this that the whole family of polychlorinated phenolic compounds is one that, scientifically speaking, consistently produces very bad news. In spite of this, the federal agencies charged with regulating the use of such substances to protect public health have taken virtually no effective steps either to investigate the harmful potential of these compounds or to protect the public from such possible harm. The Department of Agriculture, which has jurisdiction over the pesticidal and other non-drug uses of all sterilizing, disinfecting, germicidal, and antibacterial chemicals sold in this country—and most of the polychlorinated phenols are in one or more of these categories—has not, during all the years in which it has permitted the use of these substances, completed one laboratory study of dioxin contamination or of dioxin generation by any polychlorinated phenol. After almost a quarter of a century during which the Department has authorized the virtually unrestricted use of a herbicidal agent as powerful as 2,4,5-T, and in the face of well-established facts about the alarming teratogenicity both of 2,4,5-T and of its dioxin contaminant, none of the scientists employed by the Department have completed a single working experiment on the prevalence and generation of dioxins. Although they have gone so far as to draw up a list of seventeen polychlorinated phenolic compounds that they believe should be studied, they do not know, at the time this is written, even how many formulations of these compounds are on the market, what quantities of them are being sold, and what uses they are being put to. I became aware of this when, before writing this letter, I called the Pesticides Regulation Division of the Department of Agriculture and asked for a list of registered products containing polychlorinated phenolic compounds. According to the assistant director of the Pesticides Regulation Division, the Department has no such list and no list of formulators in whose names the products have been registered, nor has it a list of the uses to which the compounds in interstate commerce are being put. No one had ever before asked for such a list, he said, and the only way the Department could compile one for me would be by making a manual search through files containing some fifty thousand pesticidal-product registrations—which would, of course, be very expensive and complicated.

Clearly, in the polychlorinated phenolic compounds, we are confronted with substances in our environment that, even though we may be exposed to any of them in almost undetectable quantities, cumulatively and collectively pose frightening potential hazards to public health and involve the serious question of possible effects on the unborn. Considering the striking contrast between the urgency of the problems and the apparent inability of federal regulatory agencies to take prompt action to protect the public against these hazards, it seems to me that a drastic change in methods is essential. The existing pattern of inertia is attributable to a complex set of circumstances that includes inadequate statutory authority to deal with potentially hazardous products on the necessary environmental scale—all the way from their creation in factories, through their movement in interstate commerce, to their use and their eventual disposal or decomposition. A second factor is the very inadequate funding by Congress of the regulatory agencies. The Food and Drug Administration, for example, is supposed properly to regulate various activities of businesses that gross some three hundred *billion* dollars a year on an annual departmental budget of sixty million dollars, while the Department of Agriculture, as I have pointed out, has those thirty-two retail-store inspectors to cover the whole country. These conditions account, in part, for the passive attitude that agencies often take toward the industries they are supposed to regulate. Once a product has been registered as acceptable for use in interstate commerce, it tends to acquire such status that if subsequent questions arise about its safety, the burden of proof concerning this is really placed upon the federal regulatory agency rather than on the producer of the product. Since the agency too often does not have adequate facilities, money, or manpower to offer such proof, general foot-dragging or tired surrender to industry pressure by the agency people is naturally encouraged. It seems to me grossly improper that doubts raised about the safety of complex chemical substances put out by large companies for extensive public use should be so often resolved by federal regulatory agencies in favor of the welfare of these companies rather than of the welfare of the public. It does appear to me that in the case of the present uses of 2,4,5-T, 2,4-D, and other polychlorinated phenolic herbicide or pesticide compounds, such doubts can best be resolved by simply imposing a full suspension of all uses of these chemicals until it has been shown, as clearly as science can demonstrate through the necessary chemical, biological, and environmental testing, that the employment of these substances or their contaminants or breakdown products will not be hazardous to public health.

Sincerely,

THOMAS WHITESIDE.

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a letter from a constituent of mine who lives in Haysville, Kans., who has pretty well stated the general feeling of the people in my district. I include his letter in the RECORD today. I do this because I want the Members of this body to know the attitude of the people of my district. I wish that other Members would do likewise so that each one of us can get the feeling of districts other than our own.

The letter follows:

HAYSVILLE, KANS.,
June 29, 1970.

Hon. JOE SKUBITZ,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SKUBITZ: I have been born and raised a Republican and remain one at heart but Mr. Nixon is about to change the last part!

I am one of the many that have been laid off in the aircraft industry. I will soon have my 29th anniversary in the aircraft industry. Jobs are just naturally scarce now. We believe this is all due to the high interest rates.

Maybe the government does not control the economy but they could go a long way by influencing it by seeing that the interest is dropped. Who wants to pay 9-10% for 30 years buying a home? People will not and cannot afford to finance airplanes or for that matter business loans at this rate. It has ruined business!

It is not fun to look at the future and wonder if we can keep our house and car with no steady job.

We need action and action fast! We need jobs where we can make a decent living.

Some claim the loss of jobs has influenced the crime rate. Mr. Nixon wants to fight crime. I am all for that. Let's fight this inflation in another way. I favor controls over no jobs. Controls are not good, but we can at least maintain our homes and other needs with them.

Mr. Skubitz, I am 50 years old and have always believed in my government. I believe the majority should rule, not the minority. Yes, I think we should be influenced by their desires, but not stampeded. I believe the blacks should be treated fairly, not separated, but I don't think they should be forced to integrate with us or we with them. They will congregate together as they feel more comfortable that way as do the Chinese or any other group. I also think the colleges should be tuned to the honest desires of the students, but should not let a roving band of radicals rule. Our nation has become great by changing in tune with the times and not with holding on to old ideas.

But, please, we have always been taught to look up to our law-making and governing bodies. Now they appear to be sorely divided. Our country appears to be very decidedly divided now, more than ever. Please fight for unity. We have a great nation and I hope and pray we can keep it that way. We are counting on you.

ASSISTANT HUD SECRETARY JACKSON SPEAKS ON THE NEW TOWN JONATHAN

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently Samuel C. Jackson, Assistant Secretary for Metropolitan Planning and Development of the Department of Housing and Urban Development spoke before the Institute on Comparative Urban Systems at Macalester College in St. Paul, Minn. His speech centered on the problems of an urban growth policy and he used as a chief illustration, the new town of Jonathan, Minn. This community is now being built near Chaska, Minn., in the Second Congressional District which I represent.

Jonathan has been awarded the first guarantee under the 1968 New Communities Act, and it will offer innovation in many areas of urban existence. It will mix incomes and races. It will have a variety of population densities. It will use a variety of construction methods. It will be self contained and it will have industry to supply jobs.

Assistant Secretary Jackson pointed out that by building the new town of Jonathan we are demonstrating our "discontent and frustration with life in the congested, blighted, and impersonal cities of yesterday and today."

Mr. Jackson is not afraid to tell us of the sacrifices that must be made to solve the problems of burgeoning urban growth, but he has candor enough to refrain from promising that the Federal Government can perform miracles by tomorrow.

For the reference of the Members, I am including Mr. Jackson's remarks in the RECORD at this time:

THE TOUGH ISSUES IN AN URBAN GROWTH POLICY

(Remarks by Samuel C. Jackson)

Not far from here, just north of Chaska, is the site of a new community—a completely new human settlement, totally planned from beginning to end to provide the housing and environment for a more pleasurable, hopefully more meaningful life, for people of all income levels, and all races.

The name of this new community will be Jonathan, in honor of Jonathan Carver, one of that hearty breed who pioneered the first settlements in Minnesota. The new community of Jonathan deserves its name—it is also in its own way a true pioneer. It is the first proposed new community in the Nation to receive a commitment for Federally guaranteed financing under the New Communities Act of 1968. That commitment of $21 million, made by Secretary Romney last February, will help a group of private developers build a unique community designed to serve the total needs of its people.

Jonathan, like other new towns and communities being planned and constructed in this and many other nations of the world, is a symbol of the worldwide discontent and frustration with life in the congested, blighted, and impersonal cities of yesterday and today.

It also symbolizes the urgent need for a national urban growth policy—and there are a number of bills in Congress right now that would aid the formulation of this policy. Such a policy would serve as a strategic guide for building the housing, the towns, and the cities of tomorrow. For the sad fact is, that the United States is among only a few remaining developed nations that have yet to articulate such a policy.

Today, I want to discuss the nature of an urban growth policy—the forces that demand its formulation and some of its components. But my emphasis will be on the many dilemmas that must be resolved and the tough decisions that must be made if any policy, regardless of its substance, is to be truly effective.

What is a national urban growth policy—or its synonym, a national urban land use policy?

A group of us discovered recently that at the end of a full day of discussing various aspects of an urban growth policy, we had failed to define it. Probably, we never will develop a precise definition; indeed, we may never articulate the policy itself. Conceivably, we will formulate a series of policies and programs linked together for common goals.

However, two basic goals of most European growth policies may contribute to an understanding of the "creature." These goals are: (1) a national redistribution of urban growth—people and economic activity—by channeling most of it away from the massive metropolitan areas into smaller towns and new towns; and (2) the channeling of the remaining metropolitan growth into satellite new communities. This is perhaps an oversimplification and certainly, in the case of the United States, a variety of domestic conditions will dictate the substance and goals of an urban growth policy.

It is also clear that one of *our* goals must be to ease the pressures of our existing core cities so that rebuilding can be done.

The conditions that create for many of us a sense of urgency and a sense of need for some unifying policy are well-documented. They are essentially the facts of life in today's urban America:

The core cities of our metropolitan areas have become the decaying and festering ghettos of an intermittent stream of rural-urban migrants.

The flight of the higher income families to the suburbs has contributed to suburban expansion at a rate approaching complete disorder.

Small towns in rural areas are losing their people and with them their vitality and ability to survive.

The natural environment is being all but destroyed; land, air, and water are being systematically ravaged.

Transportation systems have become clogged; declining in physical capacity in the face of increasing demands.

And all too many of our citizens still live in housing that is indecent by any reasonable standard.

The underlying cause of these harsh realities is the pressure of expanding urbanization fed by a constantly growing and shifting population.

This is a worldwide phenomenon: in the 40 years from 1920, world population increased 61 percent but the urban population more than tripled that growth, 198 percent!

Increasing urbanization necessitates the intensive use of more and more land. Every year, at least one-half million acres of land is added to urban areas in the United States.

The prospect of a rising rate of conversion of land to urban uses, the growing number of people living in urban areas, and the increased production of our factories, will only further aggravate the already unprecedented befouling and polluting of air and waterways. Already, one-third of the land area of Los Angeles has been absorbed by cars and trucks together with the facilities to serve them. And motor vehicles account for some 60 percent of the air pollutants in cities! We pay for this increased urbanization with our lungs, with our irritation and ultimately with our hospital bills.

The inadequacy of the housing inventory is perhaps the most visible casualty of such rampant growth. For example, some 50 to 100,000 people in Calcutta literally live on the sidewalks. Certainly we are more fortunate. Yet our "crises" are related to different standards, and housing production in this country in the past four years has been more than one million units short of the volume needed to keep pace with the nation's growing population and the concurrent losses of existing dwellings.

It is these kinds of housing and urban problems, then, that give rise to current demands for a growth policy. In the words of President Nixon:

"I propose that before these problems become insoluble, the nation develop a national growth policy. Our purpose will be to find those means by which federal, state and local government can influence the course of urban settlement and growth so as positively to effect the quality of American life."

The quality of American life involves one aspect of growth that is unique to our diverse society in comparison with many other developed countries, and it is more complex than the simple deterioration of our housing inventory. Our growth has produced a widening gap between the races: physical—between city and suburb; economic—in the sense of unequal job opportunities; and cultural—in terms of accessibility to good educational and related facilities.

Can a single policy, or interlinked series of policies, be created to guide growth in such a way that all of these issues and problems can be significantly ameliorated if not resolved altogether?

Let me offer a word of caution. A simple yes or no will not suffice. There is a tendency to oversimplify the nature and role of an urban land growth policy. We sometimes seem to be seeking a policy that is a simple, magic, cure-all for the frustrations involved in coordinating the multitude of daily decisions—public and private—that affect the direction and substance of urban growth. Such policy will probably remain elusive for some time to come; the issues are much too complex, our objectives much to imprecise, and the conflicting interests too plentiful. The task of landing a man on the moon was relatively simple when compared to the problem of providing an opportunity for every American to lead a rewarding and productive life here on earth—clearly, the major goal of any national policy.

To return to my question—yes, I do believe that we can develop an effective urban growth policy, but it will be effective only if we as a nation are prepared to accept certain basic changes in our institutions and in our traditional ways of managing urban growth. However, there are major obstacles to this kind of institutional change. And, if we naively ignore these very real impediments, planning for a national growth policy is doomed to oblivion.

First, there is the problem of recognizing the seriousness of problems. We are a pragmatic people and little short of a crisis will sway us to modify our institutional heritage. Although you or I may see the elements of a crisis in the present urban growth trends, it is most difficult to excite the general public. "Urban sprawl" is not a term to stir the hearts and minds of men.

In designing national programs and getting them adopted by the Congress, there is evidence of this pragmatism in our efforts to prove the merits of the programs in reduced costs, taxes, or both. Thus, urban sprawl, though ugly and often depressing to the human spirit, is attacked more as a wasteful user of land resources and an extravagant user of public facilities and services.

We are compelled to support our policies and programs with cost/benefit analyses. New communities, for example, though I believe them to be delightful and stimulating places to live—and work—receive much of their official support from the fact that they save development costs when measured against urban sprawl patterns of growth.

Yet, I think that many of the benefits of new communities—or any pattern of orderly development—will always remain elusive of the economists' attempts to measure and price them. What is the dollar value of a decent environment, of being able to walk to work, of the freshness of open space, of social interaction and neighborliness among people of different incomes and races? These are emotional values and to me they are perhaps more valid objectives of an urban growth policy as more readily measured benefits.

Indeed, the genesis of our present concern with urban growth policies is probably the 19th century garden city movement of Ebenezer Howard. His vision of "energetic and active town life, with all the beauty and delight of the country" has continued to infuse the British national growth policy as much as later economic analyses.

An urban growth policy will remain inert and partial unless we show more willingness as a people to make decisions, not only on the basis of all available facts, but on the basis of our hopes, desires, and innate convictions. One can point to the harsh economic truths of the market place to prove that many small communities are doomed to decline while metropolises will continue to burgeon. Yet the Gallup polls reveal that many of us prefer small town life and a national growth policy should maintain and expand this choice.

We often cite the preservation of choice as the goal of urban policies, and there are certain truths in this principle of choice, as well as some flaws. Certainly, none of us has the wisdom to determine the ultimate conditions and design of *the* good urban life. A national policy cannot treat people as pawns; it must preserve options for people to choose for themselves. Not all people, for example, want to live in rural, small towns, or even in satellite new towns; some prefer the excitement, the challenge, and the competitiveness of the city.

We must recognize the need to preserve and enhance choice in urban life styles but we must, at the same time, provide assurance that all people have the opportunity to make those choices. Obviously, a sparkling new town in the suburbs provide no choice for the city ghetto resident if all of the housing is priced beyond his reach. A recent study disclosed a related condition that denies many of us the right to choose. I quote from an interim report of the National Committee Against Discrimination in Housing:

"For almost two decades, this large-scale shift of industrial and service occupations from city to suburb has steadily accelerated. It has been accompanied by a massive exodus of freely-mobile whites who, in keeping with American tradition, have moved to live in areas offering good jobs and economic and social advancement. Meanwhile the American workingman's traditional option to "move where the jobs are" has been denied millions of Americans of color. Indeed, this option increasingly is unavailable to all low-income families."

A dilemma that often emerges from a policy of choice is illustrated by our concept of citizen participation. This concept holds that those who are to be affected by a proposed public action should have an effective role in planning that action. But, the ultimate choice of an affected group of citizens may seem in conflict with a broader "public interest." The current controversies in our highway and urban renewal programs center on these conflicts between the vital and immediate interests of local minorities and the often longer-range interests of a larger public.

These conflicts in the development and redevelopment of our cities, must ultimately be resolved within the framework of government. And it is to this end, that an urban growth policy must include a component for strengthening the ability of State and local governments to be responsive to the needs of all its citizens—to seek the public good with proper regard for the rights of the minorities.

The advantages of our Federal system—its openness to creative efforts and its ability to respond to a wide variety of conditions and needs—must be paralleled by continued improvement in the effectiveness of State and local governments which must be chiefly responsible for implementing any national growth policy.

This means many things—improvements in communication between governments and citizens; more complete and timely information on which to base decisions; improved training programs, and a more equitable sharing of fiscal resources among governments.

I should emphasize the critical role of the states, for they have much of the basic authority needed to reshape and redirect growth. They have a primary role in highway planning, a key determinant of the distribution of jobs and people. The states also are the source of the basic powers of zoning, building codes, and other land development regulations that are sorely in need of new and creative approaches.

Several States have already developed innovative means of implementing growth policies. Massachusetts has established an appeals board with the authority to overrule local zoning and other regulations that effectively block the construction of housing for low-income and moderate-income families. New York State has created an Urban Development Corporation that can acquire land and construct housing—or entire new communities—anywhere in the State. The Corporation has sought to work cooperatively with localities in resolving their housing and development problems. Other States are establishing similar corporations.

The Massachusetts appeals procedure is one attempt to overcome the zoning barriers in many communities. The Administration's proposed Housing and Urban Development Act of 1970 would provide another means for overcoming the arbitrary use of local regulations to exclude certain groups by excluding the housing that they can afford. Secretary Romney testified on the impact of the proposal:

"This provision would prohibit a local government from using zoning, subdivision controls or similar powers to prevent the reasonable provision of low- and moderate-cost housing in undeveloped or predominantly undeveloped areas which are in the path of development if the exclusion of such housing would be inconsistent with state or local comprehensive or master plans applicable to the areas. It would also prohibit local discrimination against low- and moderate-income housing solely on the basis of its eligibility for Federal aid."

Creativity is the essence of progress and it is no less required in formulating a national growth policy. Yet reluctance to accept innovation and change will be the most imposing obstacle to carrying out such a policy. Most of us are capable of understanding the nature of our urban land problems. We readily agree to the need for planning solutions, but the acid test is whether we are prepared to swallow the seemingly bitter pills of change needed to implement them.

I note, for example, that many of the current crop of urban policy bills emphasize Federal grants to the States for more land use planning. Such planning is needed; indeed, present Federal programs already offer some support. But, we are mindful that planning all too often leads to inaction because we are unwilling to accept those changes in our institutions or traditional ways of doing business that are required to convert plans to programs.

One of America's leading new community builders has noted that high school students could prepare better land use plans for metropolitan growth than the non-plans that we are following. The trick is to implement them—in the face of a multitude of objections by individuals, private industry, civic officials and ungained public attitudes—all of which must be subordinated if public plans are to be more than paper designs. A prominent scholar of urban planning has stated:

"Land-use plans in American cities are not designs for action, unlike those in centrally controlled New Towns and unlike construction plans for building, bridges, and machines. They express the authors' opinion of a desirable future state, but offer few guides for getting there, and fewer clues about the possibilities of ever getting there. In the absence of authoritarian controls, their most important function is hortatory in character."

No, planning is too often considered to be an end in itself. As valuable as it is as a means it cannot substitute for action-oriented decisions—many of which, will require basic changes in our institutions.

At this point, I would like to discuss briefly a few of the institutional changes that seem indicated by the very nature of the objectives of a national growth policy.

Foremost, is a need for urban land reform—reform, in the way land is controlled, developed, taxed, and, perhaps, bought and sold. Land is the obvious key to urban growth and the land component of a growth policy must seek to achieve at least four objectives.

1. A reduction in the cost of land as a basic component of housing construction and urban development.

2. The elimination of land as a barrier to social goals—such as open communities and housing close to employment.

3. The achievement of more orderly urban growth and development while conserving the natural environment.

4. An increase in the return to the public on its investment in facilities and activities that increase land values.

These objectives are to some degree novel in themselves. Consequently, they cannot be achieved without considerable innovations in the institutions of land ownership and control. We need to think through the possibility of creating a better balance between urban land as a public resource basic to all our urban programs and objectives, and land as a private commodity to be traded in the market place for its "highest and best use," which may sacrifice some long-range public benefits for immediate profits.

Traditionally we have looked upon land as a commodity. John Ise, a Kansan, expressed this heritage in these words:

"Americans are land value animals. For three hundred years they have been moving westward seeking titles to land they hoped would rise in value; for three hundred years they have been following the lure of the unearned increment, the beacon light of something for nothing."

I am impressed with the benefits that Sweden has achieved in creating new towns and satellite suburbs on public land reserves—land purchased many years in advance of need. The Stockholm region certainly has determined its own destiny through control over the timing and location of development and the leverage of mass transit facilities. I am not suggesting that we need to imitate Sweden, but its success certainly warrants our study. And its experience shows, that some increase in public ownership of land for purposes of orderly urban development is not at all inconsistent with a democratic society.

Of particular concern to me, is the way we control the development and use of our urban land. Local regulations that were formulated to enhance orderly growth and preserve property values have had the unfortunate result of preventing the construction of housing for low- and moderate-income families. In this connection, I have already noted the need for an intensive reappraisal by the States of the institutions of land control.

Other institutions subject to change if a national growth policy is to work, are indicated by such questions as:

Are we willing to accept some additional control over the location of economic growth, perhaps at a cost of some public subsidy, if this were necessary to inject new life into small cities and towns?

Are we willing to give up some part of our sacred home rule rights in the interest of creating stronger metropolitan or State institutions, institutions that may be a prerequisite to more orderly growth?

Will we accept a change in our traditional segregated social patterns to seek a pattern in which rich and poor, black and white, live together in one community, as one people?

As these questions imply, a national growth policy may require some losses of personal privileges in the interest of the public good. But Professor Lynton K. Caldwell reminds us:

"Any American who fears his rights and freedoms threatened by responsible, democratic, public planning should ask himself these questions: What are the real constraints upon my personal freedom to obtain secure predictable employment; to live unmolested in a neighborhood unthreatened by deterioration, invasion by incompatible activities, or exhorbitant tax increases; to travel to work, school, worship, or recreation over safe uncongested streets; to have access to open skies, open beaches, woods, fields and uncluttered roadsides? Millions of Americans are today denied these freedoms by the unintended, inadvertent consequences of our planless patterns of land use. How free can we truly claim to be when we permit our past investments to be depreciated,

our present life experience to be impaired, and our future opportunities to be jeopardized by failure to create institutions and procedures that could help to safeguard these values?"

Perhaps the best summary of the whole national urban growth issue is the old saying: "You can't have your cake and eat it too." As much as we need a national urban growth policy, its development will be little more than an academic exercise if we expect to make it work while retaining all of our traditional ways of managing—or not managing—our urban land resources, resources which underlie many of the most pressing human and social issues facing this nation, indeed, the world.

MEASURE YOUR TOWN

HON. ROBERT H. MOLLOHAN

OF WEST VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. MOLLOHAN. Mr. Speaker, let me pose a question to my esteemed colleagues: Are the towns and cities in your districts progressive?

It might be easy to say "Yes" but the Star News of Sistersville, W. Va., edited by Adam Kelly, recently ran a sure-fire questionnaire to determine a town's progressiveness.

I present it for you now in hopes it may revitalize some areas which thought themselves progressive only to discover after answering these questions that they are lacking in many respects.

I invite my colleagues to send this questionnaire to their district newspapers and let them ask themselves just how progressive they really are.

The questionnaire follows:

MEASURE YOUR TOWN

Here are 31 "virtues" of a progressive town. Compilers of the list say that if a community can answer "yes" to 24 "virtues," then citizens can take pride in their town. If there are more no's than yes's, then somebody should start working.

Most high school and college graduates stay in town.

The local paper constantly pushes civic improvements.

There's a place to swim within easy reach.

Young couples have little trouble finding a place to live.

The head of your city government is a "get-things-done" man.

Teachers' salaries are better than the state average.

There's a library with a good collection of new books.

Service clubs and women's organizations team up on projects.

A modern hospital is within your trading area.

There's a hotel or motel you would enjoy, if you were a visitor.

It's easy to find a parking space in the business section.

Prompt, reasonably priced ambulance service is available.

Street's throughout the community are well-lighted.

There's as much interest in local as national elections.

There's an active Parent-Teachers' Association.

Citizens have a positive outlook and attitude about their town.

Firemen must take regular training courses.

There's an annual Clean-up, Paint-Up, Fix-Up Week.

More than half the church congregations are under 40 years of age.

Local speeders pay the same fines as out-of-towners.

Newcomers quickly feel they're a part of the town.

Schools have plenty of room for students.

All streets are paved and sidewalks are in good condition.

At least one restaurant serves outstanding meals.

It's easy to get volunteers for any worthwhile project.

There's a livewire Chamber of Commerce.

There's at least one doctor for each 800 people in your county.

Well-Stocked stores keep shoppers in the town.

There's an ample supply of good drinking water.

The sewer extension programs keep pace with new housing.

Good zoning keeps commercial firms away from residential areas.

ADDRESS OF GEN. HAMILTON H. HOWZE

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, a constituent of mine, whose son was a member of the graduating class this year at the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, attended the class of 1970 graduation banquet and was favorably impressed with the address of Gen. Hamilton H. Howze. He has suggested that General Howze's message be brought to the attention of our colleagues, and I am glad to comply with his suggestion by including the text of the address as a part of my remarks in the RECORD.

The address follows:

Cadet Brown, Gen. Knowlton, Gen. Walker, Gen. Jannerone, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen.

I think it is probably a safe assumption that all 50 states are represented in this gathering tonight and therefore it gives me great pleasure to bring you greetings from Texas. This is a state which we, who live there, identify now since the admission of Alaska as the largest glacier-free state of the Union.

I think it is also my duty to bring you a Texas joke. The setting is a small rural school in the southern part of Texas, down in the Rio Grande Valley where most of the students were of Mexican descent. But one of these was an eager little chap in the front row who was not of Mexican descent and he was trying his best to gain recognition during a session in which the teacher was drilling the students on American history and the teacher would ask, for example: "Who said, 'In time of peace, prepare for war.'?" And the little boy in the front seat raised his hand and shook it vigorously but she would look past him and pick out Manuel behind him to answer the question and then she would ask, for example, "Who was it that said, 'I regret that I have but one life to give for my country.'?" And again the little boy would raise his hand and again she would look past him and pick out Juanita to answer the question. This went on and on and finally the exercise came to an end, and the little boy never had been asked to answer and he was sitting dejected in the front row because he had studied so hard and knew all the answers. The teacher then turned her back to the class and started to write the next assignment on the blackboard and behind her she heard loud and clear this little voice say, "The heck with all these Mexicans." She looked around and said, "Who said that?" And he said, "Davy Crockett at the Alamo in 1836."

I understand that Bob Hope was the graduation banquet speaker last year and also that within the Class of 1970 Rachael Welch was a heavily favored candidate this year. I seriously suspect no vote was taken or else I wouldn't be here! In my talk I've got to guard against conflict or overlap with what the graduation speaker will say tomorrow. The selection of the Vice-President, Mr. Spiro Agnew, couldn't be better, in my opinion, for that job. I don't know how you feel about it, but I can hardly wait! In the last few days since I knew Mr. Agnew was going to speak I've been tempted to slip down to New York City to see if I couldn't stir up something there for him to take off on. Where I come from down in Texas the biggest market in bumper stickers is the one that says "Sic-em, Spiro."

Many years ago in this country when it was customary for the Vice-President to remain distinctly in the background, Mr. Tom Marshall who was Vice-President at the time said that once upon a time there were two brothers, one ran away to sea and the other became Vice President of the United States, and neither one was ever heard of again. This is hardly true any longer—everybody wants to hear what the Vice-President has to say. As a matter of fact, Agnew is the sort of person that I think Rudyard Kipling had in mind when he said "If you hit a pony over the nose at the outset of your acquaintance, he may not love you but he will take a deep interest in all your movements forever afterward." Whatever else Mr. Agnew may discuss, it is a safe bet that he will address the graduation class on what the future holds for that class and what the country and the Army expect of it. So, I'll not do that. I will address my brief words not to the graduating cadets, but to their families that are here tonight. But first, of course, I want to congratulate them. Every family has the right to be proud of the fine young man who has measured up to an exacting curriculum and survived impressive challenges to his body, mind and character. But in addition to that, I have a message and I should warn you, I suppose, that it is a heavy one and that message concerns the Armed Forces of the United States and their place in this country's future. And when I address you, whose sons and brothers are about to graduate from the Military Academy on this subject, I am obviously preaching to the choir, so to speak, but I ask you to take the message home; combined, you and I may be able to reach at least a part of the congregation.

The Armed Forces of the United States have more than 3 million men in them, broadly scattered over the face of the earth. It is an enormous, complex organization which directly or indirectly has entered the lives of most of our citizens. A major part of it's membership is temporary and some part it, of course, is forced through the draft It is a youthful organization in which adrenalin runs high. It is engaged in a huge and incomprehensible almost, variety of activities, many of which are unusual in civil life and sometimes, of course, very unusual. On such an organization, tremendous as it is, things sometimes go wrong. Those particularly vulnerable to error are the ground forces. Why is this true? It is because of the nature of the Army and Marine tasks—how their forces are committed in a military campaign. When one thinks of it, one knows that the Navy in the presence of the enemy is represented by a comparatively small number

of cohesive, close-knit, geographically confined entities. Ships, on which all the personnel live and work in a confined environment under close supervision of their officers.

The Air Force is somewhat similar because their personnel are mostly on fixed bases which are highly organized installations with ample and complex facilities, but again under close supervision of officers up through the echelons of Command. Both the Air Force and the Navy, of course, send aircraft against the enemy, but these are on short missions for only an hour or so and they are manned by individually trained and disciplined officers. But, in contrast, take the Army. For weeks and months small units are deployed, widely separated, under very difficult circumstances, and often in great hardship. These units in Viet Nam literally disappear beneath the jungle canopy. I am not apologizing for the Army, by any means. It is doing a courageous, honorable, and commendable job, face-to-face with the enemy, thereby suffering, as always, by far the largest number of casualties. I merely point out that the opportunities for error and indiscipline are far greater in the widely dispersed, independently operating, units of the ground force. Far from apologizing I would say that in this time of turbulence among youth and a manifest distaste for the war so frequently and vitriolically expressed by many elements here at home, the Army has done remarkably well in preserving it's tradition of faithful service under the trying and dangerous conditions in which it must operate.

But, really, that's not my principal point. Of really fundamental importance is the fact that the military in general, and the Army in particular, constitutes an indispenable strength within our society. A strength on the side of moderation and, I would also say, on the side of the common virtues which much of society now rejects as old-fashioned and inapplicable. I speak of simple courage, self-discipline, courtesy, and a consideration for others, honesty and, I would be constrained to point out, neatness of dress and personal cleanliness. The military preaches these virtues endlessly within its own ranks but it's quite true that a small minority of soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines is not convinced. But the fact does not diminish the importance of the effort as a counterinfluence in these days of rejection and dissent. But the military is very vulnerable to one thing, and this is what I would like you to carry home, and that is attack by public opinion. This sort of attack is growing, particularly in the Congress, but also in the so-called liberal press, and it hurts.

It is my earnest hope that everyone in the Class of 1970, here at West Point, at Annapolis, and at the Air Force Academy in Colorado Springs—all tremendously patriotic, great institutions—that they make the Service a permanent career and heaven knows the country needs them in that service, but they can be most easily driven from it by destructive criticism and distrust expressed not of them as individuals, but of the forces they serve. And believe me, the military services do not merit blanket condemnation, but rather intelligent though not undiscerning support. But, of course, I do not suggest that the Armed Forces not be properly criticized when criticism is due. I feel I know the Service well—I grew up in it, as Cadet Brown told you. As a member of the fourth generation in the Army, I served in it myself a total of 39 years, counting four as a cadet. I, therefore, know that the professional officer and non-commissioned officer Corps of the military are, with rare exception, composed of intelligent, honest and, most especially, devotedly partiotic men. They are the hard central core of national defense and it is these professionals—not the two or three year enlistees—which suffer heavy blows to their pride when the Services are unfairly degraded and it is largely pride in their profession that keeps them in it. Remove that, and they'll get out!

So I ask you this question "Should American military leadership be destroyed?" Be assured that it can be by you, the citizen. All you need do is attack it. Attack its fundamentals, subvert its power to discipline itself and the men it commands; blacken its reputation and remove its prestige; and when the military is properly humiliated by these acts the country will stand largely impotent against its enemy—enemies within as well as without. I don't mean to be improperly alarming about enemies within, but it is desirable that we remember the words of Nikolai Lenin, the real architect of Bolshevism and its scheme of world conquest: "And when we come to that last great bastion of Capitalism, United States," said Lenin, "we shall not have to attack it—it will fall like a ripe plum into our hands."

Therefore, my fellow Americans, I think our duty in this respect is plain. This country is not dead, as some people preach, but certainly it cannot deprive itself of any of its sources of decency and strength. I do not suggest blind, witless, automatic acceptance of everything the military might do. I do suggest that you keep faith, and ask your friends and neighbors to keep faith with a great, very hard-working, far-flung organization deriving directly from the people in which, despite its faults, is powerfully devoted to the perpetuation of all that is best in America—the well-being of its citizens and the preservation of our independence against the forces, some foreign, some here at home, who under the protection of a benign and temporarily permissive society preach, and sometimes practice, anarchy, murder, and revolution. All bent on the destruction of the greatest, most generous, most beautiful and, by the grace of God, the noblest nation that mankind has thus far been able to devise.

Thank you.

BOB McCORD

HON. WILLIAM H. AYRES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 24, 1970

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Speaker, the sudden passing of Bob McCord, chief clerk of the House Committee on Education and Labor, has saddened all of us who were privileged to be his friend.

As the ranking Republican member of that committee, I had occasion to have almost daily contact with Bob McCord over the course of the 14 years that he served on its staff. I early learned to respect his integrity and ability, and found that, though I was of the opposition party on some legislative matters, I could always rely on his guidance.

He brought to his committee work that objectivity that had so characterized his work as a fine reporter and managing editor. This, plus his great executive ability, has caused our committee to reach a great degree of efficiency. He chose most capable staff members to work with him on the majority side of the committee.

While his passing is a great loss to all of us who worked with him and relied upon his counseling, it is as a friend that we mourn him the most.

STUDENT RECOMMENDATIONS ON U.S. FOREIGN POLICY

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to place in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent report and recommendations on U.S. foreign policy which has been sent to me by the sophomore class of Montour High School of our South Hills, 27th Congressional District of Pennsylvania.

These young people devoted a great deal of time and effort to this study of U.S. foreign policy and they are to be congratulated for their excellent work and recommendations. At this point I include the following material:

JUNE 22, 1970.

SOPHOMORE CLASS,
Montour High School,
McKees Rocks, Pa.
(Attention: Paul Diehl, Ed Blazer, Martin Rodgers, Ken Morton).

Have now received excellent report and recommendations of your fine sophomore history class. Hearty congratulations to your hard working students on this progressive foreign policy report which I am calling to attention of United States Department of State and my Pennsylvania colleagues in Congress. Am also placing this report in CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by unanimous consent so that it will receive the widest coverage in the U.S. Congress and the American people.

Congratulations to each and every student on his hard work and devoted attention to these difficult problems which face the Nation and challenge the world to make a peaceful and just solution.

Congressman JIM FULTON.

MONTOUR INTERMEDIATE HIGH SCHOOL,
McKees Rocks, Pa.

DEAR MR. FULTON: We are a sophomore history class at Montour High School in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. For approximately one month we have been working on what we believe is an efficient and feasible foreign program. Our class divided into groups for the purpose of studying and researching different sections of the world. This made it possible to evaluate each situation and determine what action we feel is best to use in each area. The groups gave their reports and advice to our simulated President and Secretary of State. The President then made the decision on what policies he would follow. In turn, a group was assigned to examine his report and debate his ideas. The final program was reached by a class vote on each item, after both sides were considered.

We worked very seriously on this policy and therefore would highly value your opinions and thoughts on the results of this endeavor. Our class found this to be a rewarding and educational experience. However, we feel it would be even more valuable to us, if we could receive your professional ideas on our opinions as to what we view as America's role in world affairs. We know that it is difficult for you to reply quickly, but we have worked very hard on this and have taken a serious interest in your reply. This is a small project, but to us it is important because it is a way in which we are contributing to our country's betterment by voicing our opinions while educating ourselves. Therefore, since time in school is short, we would like to express our appreci-

ation for all attempts made by you to answer this letter as soon as it is convenient to you. We thank you for your concern and request that you mail your reply to the following address:

Ed Blazer, 83 Bellview Circle, McKees Rocks, Penna. 15136.

Latin America: Dan Hucho, Dirk Horstman, Nick Dudash, Steve Dykeman, Randy Stripp.

Africa and the Mideast: Kathy Devlin, Sherry Shaw, Lori Smith, Kim Morris.

Europe and the Mediterranean: Debbie Dunn, Peggy Karns, Anita Sommers.

Asia and the Pacific: Lorraine Hartman, Jean Allison, Anne Belov, Karen Tessicino, Marcia Baronsky.

Defense: Bruce Bivert, Bill Burda, Rich Lorenzi, Chris Scarantine.

Russia: Linda Hnat, Kathy Rebeberg, Leslie Torek, Leslie Kasmar.

President: Paul Diehl.

Secretary of State: Ed Blazer.

Opposition: Martin Rodgers, Ken Morton.

FOREIGN POLICY

The first issue discussed was whether or not to form a professional diplomatic corps. We decided on two programs: Those who wish to be a diplomat and work with the government and those who want training to work with the people in a program such as the Peace Corps. These two programs are combined in one school. For a period of four years they attend the school in which they receive a college degree after this time. An internship of three years is then required in the area that they studied. This is to help give them a better understanding of the country's customs, the people, in language, and how the government of that particular country operates. After the internship they are eligible for a higher position in foreign relations.

Along with this idea we decided to make the Peace Corps international by allowing our allies to join. We feel both of these ideas will bring the countries closer to each other and help promote world peace.

The next issue was our foreign student exchange program. We voted to keep the program the same and no federal funds would be provided to aid the program. We feel if the program is paid for by the government, people would take advantage of it and defeat the purpose of the program. Also, the family the exchange student is staying with will feel closer to that student because they are paying for him as if it were their own member of the family. We also proposed a program of student exchange with Russia and other Communist-bloc countries, but by a large majority was overruled.

We feel we are spending too much money on foreign aid and that it is not going to the people but to the leaders. In this event we decided to cut total foreign aid by 10%. To see that the people and the local programs receive more money, the United States government will control one-half of the foreign aid given to each separate country enabling us to see that the people are not being cheated by their government. The 10% cut back will then be put into what we devised as the program of American aid. The money will be used for local programs in the United States.

With the problem of the draft we proposed the idea of a professional army by the mid 70's with exception to allow draft in time of war by two-thirds vote in Congress. This professional army will receive pay and have an education program and the opportunities offered as the enlisting program now.

We feel that the time we've been in Vietnam the number of ground troops being sent is far too many. We feel if we cut troops to logistics it will lower the number of deaths and possibly help to de-escalate the war. We voted to send no military support to Cambodia. If any acts of overt aggression take place by North Vietnam we will retaliate and send help.

Our European forces will remain the same, no withdrawals.

To improve relations with Red China recognition of their government was decided. However, we still do not wish to admit them to the United Nations, although the vote was very close.

We are spending too much money in the Vietnam crisis. In order to cut the amount of money in this and at the same time cut the country's entire budget, we will cut the amount of money spent in Vietnam and unchannel it, hoping to pay off a part of the country's national debt.

In the Israeli-Arab crisis the six major powers involved; Russia, France, Israel, England, Arabia, and the United States should meet and try to come up with a satisfying solution to everyone. We will not give aid unless Russia does. This is just to keep a balance of power. (Present Policy)

At this moment we have a trade embargo with certain African nations. We would like to abolish these and encourage other countries to trade with these African nations. We hope this new program will improve relations with the African people and keep neutrality leaning in our favor.

Since World War II we have had land troops in Japan. The war ended 25 years ago and we feel in that time they were capable of developing their own defense. Therefore, we decided to remove our land troops but continue to leave our nuclear bases on the island and keep control.

In Latin America, we feel the only thing to do is to keep them progressing. We will increase trade but want them to build themselves up alone. We will also stay out of their government affairs and the aid that we send them will be used for the welfare of the people. With this new method of foreign aid our actions will be more efficient. We will also keep our control of the Panama Canal for the United States' national security.

Considering the nuclear weapons issue, we will give no nuclear weapons to our allies. This would just spread nuclear power and make the issue worse. We will invite all countries including China, as they are a major nuclear country, to the SALT talks to try to achieve a total nuclear test ban treaty, allowing each to visit the nuclear bases of the others without warning. This may create a sort of trust between the nations allowing it to be considered as one step in preventing a nuclear war and the achievement of world peace.

In trade with Russia we will limit direct trade, as indirectly we are trading with Red China and North Vietnam. We are also helping to enhance the economy of Russia, this must be stopped. We also don't want to help them industrialize by our trade.

This is our foreign policy. We hope you consider and read this seriously. We are not criticizing the present policy as we agree with it in some ways. We hope you think this as worthwhile as we did. Thank you again for your time.

FOREIGNERS SEE MAIN STREETS OF AMERICA BY COURTESY OF WOMAN AMBASSADOR OF GOOD WILL

HON. H. R. GROSS

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the account of how one woman, Mrs. Clark Mollenhoff, of Washington, D.C., without benefit of a Federal subsidy or help of the State Department, is acquainting foreigners with the heartland of America and the people who produce more than their share of the world's food and fiber.

The excellent article is written by Donnie Radcliffe, a staff writer for the Washington Evening Star and appears in the June 28 issue of that newspaper.

I am pleased to note that Georgia Mollenhoff, as she is known to her many friends, and her husband, are natives of the Third Congressional District of Iowa which I have the honor to represent and I am particularly pleased that this is the area Mrs. Mollenhoff has chosen to acquaint foreign visitors with the American way of life, urban and rural.

The article follows:

SELLING MAIN STREET, AMERICA

Out where the pigs are pinker, the corn is greener and the flag sometimes seems red-white-and-bluer than anywhere else, a Washington housewife is selling America to foreigners while nobody is looking.

Not the slick Madison Avenue way or with the clocked precision of Foggy Bottom.

She sticks to Main Street simplicity and kitchen table intimacy, exposing her charges to marshmallow salads and chicken divine, milking machines and combines, Rotary Clubs and honorary citizenships.

"They should put a bust of Georgia in the Capitol," half-seriously suggests a Rhodesian woman of Mrs. Clark Mollenhoff, a displaced Iowan who since 1966 has been showing the tall corn country of her native state to wives of Washington diplomats.

"I never think of myself as a pioneer," replies Georgia wondrously. "I always say I'm a combination top sergeant and den mother."

IOWA'S BEST SALESMAN

She neglects to add tour guide extraordinaire and Iowa's best salesman since Meredith Willson's "Music Man" sang and danced his way into America's hearts more than a decade ago.

Though Willson set his reminiscences of the good old days in his hometown of Mason City to rousing tempos and nostalgic ballads, Georgia Mollenhoff rattles hers off in uncluttered Midwestern prose.

"Those lush green cornfields and fat cows do something" to this woman who has seen more of the world than most people, whose husband has been—and until mid-July will be—an insider at the White House and who has moved in some of Washington's most sophisticated, glamorous circles.

None of it appears to have spoiled the Webster City girl who married a beau from her high school journalism class, saw him go on to capture the coveted Pulitzer Prize and laughs off her own writing talents with "I've never done anything more than write notes to the milkman."

She feels she is immune to Washington's social and political whirlpool, even the most recent episode involving her husband. Critics claim that hard-charging Clark Mollenhoff went too far in pursuing his job as the President's investigator.

"I don't care if people like Clark or disagree with him, but when they base what they say about him on false facts it makes me mad."

She says happily she will be seeing more of him now that he is returning to newspapering as chief of the Des Moines Register's Washington bureau.

And she will probably be seeing more of Iowa, too, an experience she felt for four years she should share with others to prove

there is something else to America besides the French provincial drawing rooms of the Nation's Capitol.

Working with her brother Brad Osmundson and, subsequently the Webster City Rotary Club, she focused her message to foreign guests on the "middlest" (at least in size) of Middle America that feeds so much of the world.

DRIVES VIA TURNPIKE

Four years ago she invited one woman each from South Africa, the Netherlands and India, packed them into the family's new 1966 sedan (which she still drives), fed them at turnpike coffee shops and bedded them down overnight at a wayside motel.

When she turned up in Webster City, 1,100 miles and a day and a half later, she was convinced that "if I had chosen three of my closest friends, I couldn't have had more fun."

What ensued was a week of turning Webster City (pop. 9,000) upside-down and inside-out, a pattern which has varied little in the four trips since. Staying with different families each night ("I didn't want them to know only the most successful"), the visitors gobbled up hearty helpings of food and thought persuasively served by their hosts.

In exchange, the women talked freely about their own countries, for according to Georgia "while their embassies forbid them to make political speeches, they may answer any questions raised."

"You're really on the hot seat," says Mrs. John Hooper of Rhodesia who remembers being asked on the 1968 trip about her country's gross national product and the size of its largest farms.

WELL INFORMED

"I said 30,000 acres and then I began to worry. 'For Pete's sake,' I said to myself, 'I'd better telephone my husband.'"

Mrs. Wallie Meyer of South Africa, cross-questioned vigorously this spring on apartheid, found a few of her interrogators exceedingly well informed.

"A doctor told me later that he had made a special study so he could put tricky questions to me," she laughs.

While none of the talk has ever turned hostile, some of it shows how much hosts and guests have to learn about each other.

Mrs. Kofi Poku of Ghana, resplendent in turban and long cotton print dress, was struck by repeated references to Kenya in conversations last fall with school children.

DODGE OPINIONS

"All the time they say Kenya ("It's true," interrupts Mrs. Meyer). I say I don't know all about Africa, but there are four divisions and your teachers should teach you that."

Some of the wives, such as quiet, pretty Mrs. Ted Woodfield of New Zealand who with Mrs. Meyer and Mrs. Pauli Opas of Finland are back from the 1970 trip to Fort Dodge, Iowa, avoided observations on America's domestic affairs.

"To those asking me about New Zealand's reaction to what is happening here, I said I hadn't been home for 2½ years."

Attitudes and political philosophies are part of the fascination, but none overlook the warmth and hospitality of a small midwest town.

They are lastingly impressed, too, with the surprising realization, as Mrs. Hooper put it, "that these people aren't parochial. Many have traveled and know about the world."

Swiss-born Mrs. Ernest Andres, "class" of 1969, came back to Washington awed by the size of Iowa farms and the men who run them, sometimes almost singlehandedly.

LITTLE ESCAPES

For her, they were not farmers but "agricultural-industrialists" whose wives with college degrees operate efficient farmhouses and take active part in community affairs.

Little escaped her gaze whether it was carpeting on kitchen floors, gleaming yellow school buses covering 400 miles every day or fat pink pigs.

"I couldn't believe that anything so sweet and pink could be dangerous. But a farmer told us to be careful because a short time before a neighbor had been found dead in the pen—half eaten!"

The only "singing" the visitors have to do for their expense-paid trips underwritten by the Webster City and Fort Dodge Rotary Clubs is a brief speech at a banquet the last night they are in town.

Rehearsing becomes a Georgia Mollenhoff-imposed discipline because, according to Mrs. Pauli, "we read our speeches every night before going to sleep and even at the hairdressers."

When Antoinette Meyer noticed a man in the front row who appeared to be sleeping (though she later learned he was partially deaf), she almost panicked.

TRIPLET RECITAL

"If this man is sleeping," she thought to herself, "what will the rest be doing?" Up on the dais "like a mother whose triplets are in a recital" sits a beaming Georgia, relieved once again that she has found a winning combination of women.

"I try to strike a geographical balance in the continents they represent plus pleasant people to travel with who will get something out of it all."

Up at 5 a.m. the day of departure, the women climb sleepy-eyed into Georgia's waiting automobile. Most come laden with souvenirs, such as Mrs. Ertugral Koprulu of Turkey who crammed giant pumpkins for her children into the trunk.

SOME LESS

Some are less encumbered. When Mrs. Hiroshi Doi of Japan emerged from a Webster City store last fall, she complained to Georgia "I look and look but everything is 'Made in Japan.'"

The return to Washington goes quickly as confessions and sometimes hidden "talents" begin to emerge.

Mrs. Doi ate marshmallow salad at three Webster City homes, uncertain whether it was meant to be dessert or salad. Another wife was locked in a bathroom with her host when he inadvertently shut the door, then couldn't find the key.

One wife turned out to be a sleep-walker when, the last morning in the motel, a roommate turned back the covers to find her companion fully-clothed.

"I now ask if anyone sleep walks," chuckles Georgia of her advance screenings for the trip.

She might like to see her "tours" expanded a bit but she is cautious to do so if it would alter what she calls "the intimacy" her tiny groups of three always attain.

Her aims are revelation, harmony and international camaraderie.

Says Mrs. Andres as testimony: "I come younger back."

IS HARPING CRITICISM THEIR DUTY?

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, there are some strange things going on in network journalism these days. After reading a verbatim transcript of CBS radio network's commentary after President Nixon's address on June 3, I would have to agree with the editorial which appeared in the Topeka (Kans.) Sunday Capital-Journal, "Is Harping Criticism Their Duty?" It is a sad day when our network news commentators automatically feel compelled to take the opposite side from the President on reports of this kind. The editorial makes this point with clarity. I commend it to the study of my colleagues, as follows:

IS HARPING CRITICISM THEIR DUTY?

During an "instant analysis" of President Nixon's speech on the Cambodian operation, a Columbia Broadcasting System commentator made a remark which certainly is open to debate.

Robert Pierpoint, speaking a minute or two after the President addressed the nation by radio and television, asserted that "we perhaps have to take the other side."

And then he and two other CBS commentators proceeded to tear the President's speech apart. In doing so, they implied several times Nixon did not know what he was talking about in portions of his speech and even indicated that he was attempting to hoodwink the public in others.

Bruce Morton, one of the commentators, called one paragraph of the President's speech "deliberately fuzzy"; Pierpoint termed another of Nixon's statements a "kind of doubletalk," and the third commentator, Alexander Kendrick came near calling the President a liar when he asserted the administration had been losing "credibility with all those conflicting stories and second thoughts about what was actually happening in Cambodia."

All this and much more within a matter of minutes after Nixon finished his speech. Doubtless copies of the address had been distributed to broadcasters and newsmen about an hour before the President went on the air, but even so it was hardly sufficient time for the CBS commentators to dig very deeply into it.

Pierpoint toward the end of the comments by the three ready-made experts asserted, "I would say that we as broadcasters are trying to answer the President's claims, and trying to show a bit of the other side of the picture, and I think it's incumbent upon us to do so."

It is this line of thinking that is debatable. It is especially so, when the commentators—and CBS is not alone in this—automatically oppose the President on almost everything he says or does.

Is it the function of the broadcasters, who purportedly are news broadcasters, not editorialists, to riddle the President's every word and action?

Wouldn't it be better if some other spokesman would analyze a presidential address after sufficient time had elapsed for careful study? He could be a member of Congress or someone else equally prominent, who is well versed on the subject under discussion.

This would put him more on a par with the President and be less a travesty of the functions of news broadcasting.

Good newspapers scrupulously separate news and editorials, with the former containing unbiased, straightforward reporting. Editorials, on the other hand, by their very function, state opinions.

It is fitting the networks have opinions, but to combine reporting and editorializing—as the commentators did after the Cambodian speech and so frequently do after Nixon speaks—is to slant the news. Moreover, it frequently is ill-mannered and even rude to the nation's chief executive.

This is not to say that President Nixon or any other public official should be immune to criticism. Far from it. In this democracy

every citizen has a right to express his opinion on anything their public officials say or do. But for news commentators automatically to take the side opposite from the President and feel impelled to do so is something else again.

Sometime it would be refreshing to hear a radio or television commentator say, "That was a good speech."

Do you think you ever will?

OPERATION COOPERATION

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 1, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the RECORD the ninth in the Christian Science Monitor's series on international narcotics traffic. This particular installment deals with the flow of drugs from Mexico into the United States, and the efforts to limit that flow. The difficulties of achieving this end are enormous given the common border between our countries; and once again the prime weapon to limit this traffic is the voluntary cooperation of the growing and producing nation—in this case, Mexico. Such cooperation is absolutely essential if these drugs are to be cut off at their source.

I am pleased to be able to bring this fine article to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, June 26, 1970]

UNITED STATES AND MEXICO FIGHT TRAFFICKERS: OPERATION COOPERATION NOW UNDERWAY—PART IX

(By John Hughes)

MEXICO CITY.—In the communications center, warning lights flicker. Electronics sensors, sown along the border, have detected infiltration across an isolated sector.

At the same time, a blip shows up on the edge of a radar screen. It is an unidentified aircraft, coming in fast and low in the darkness. Buttons are punched. Telephones jangle. Messages are flashed to the Air Intelligence Center. A helicopter is sent clattering into the air to check the ground probe. A pursuit plane is launched to try to force down the incoming aircraft.

Vietnam? Not at all. All this is happening on the American side of the Mexican-United States border. The infiltrators are not North Vietnamese guerrillas, but Mexican "burros," or smugglers, trying to make it into the United States with an illicit load of narcotics.

The plane, chartered by narcotics traffickers and flown by an American mercenary, is trying to evade the border patrol's radar net. If it succeeds, it will put down at a remote airstrip with a full load of smuggled drugs for American addicts.

RUNNING FIGHT WAGED

Incursions like these are routine today along the United States's 1,800-mile border with Mexico. U.S. customs officers, border guards, and narcotics agents are waging a running war against traffickers intent on maintaining a massive illegal flow of drugs across America's southern border.

The contest is mostly uneven. Despite heightened effort and tightened security, the lawmen are spread thin. Wild terrain favors the smugglers. Much of the time it is the smugglers who win.

American and Mexican authorities seize some shipments and their increased effort has forced traffickers to vary their methods. As the heat is put on land and air routes across the border, there are indications that traffickers are making greater use of the sea-lanes.

Thousands of pleasure and fishing boats operate in the coastal waters off Southern California and in the Gulf of Mexico. Besides fish and weekend sailors, some carry narcotics.

One boat owner on the Mexican side of the border was propositioned recently by a California syndicate to run five tons of marijuana up the coast.

But for every shipment detected, many more get through. Across the Mexican border, narcotics flow into the United States like water through a broad-gauged sieve.

Fifteen percent of all heroin used in the United States comes from Mexico. All of Texas and California are served from Mexico. In the Mexican states of Sinaloa, Durango, Sonora, Nayarit, and Chihuahua, some 2,000 peasants grow opium illegally.

Converted into heroin in clandestine laboratories, it is smuggled across the border at such crossing points as San Ysidro, Calexico, Nogales, El Paso, Eagle Pass, and Laredo. From the American border towns it is quickly moved on to San Diego, Los Angeles, Denver, Phoenix, Albuquerque, Houston, Fort Worth, and Dallas.

Mexico is also a transshipment point for heroin from France en route to the United States. European heroin comes in by sea through the eastern part of Veracruz, or by air through Mexico City. Then it is smuggled north and on to cities on the U.S. Eastern seaboard, usually New York.

Mexico supplies most marijuana, or "pot," used in the United States.

Marijuana grows everywhere in Mexico, but particularly in the states of Guerrero, Jalisco, Sinaloa, and Tamaulipas. More potent than American-grown marijuana, it finds a ready market. Some experts say as much as 1,000 tons a year floods across the border.

A presidential task force concluded recently that the "ready availability" of Mexican marijuana has "significantly affected the increase in drug abuse" in the United States.

Major road route for narcotics on the Mexican side of the border is via Route 15 to Santa Ana in the State of Sonora. Then the traffic moves on up Route 15 to Nogales or via Route 2 to western Arizona and California.

DISTRIBUTION SKETCHED

In the United States, San Diego and Los Angeles have become marijuana distribution points for the rest of the country.

Mexico is also a transit point for cocaine shipments to the United States from Latin America, primarily Bolivia and Peru. Also in the narcotics package moved across the border are amphetamines and barbiturates. Sometimes these are produced in Mexico itself. Ironically, some are made in the United States. Exported legally to Mexico, they are being illegally smuggled back into the United States for use by addicts.

Despite increased vigilance by law-enforcement officers, narcotics traffickers are still moving most of their merchandise over land routes into the United States.

Much travels blatantly by car through regular checkpoints on main highways across the border. Thousands of American tourists and thousands of Mexican workers cross the border each day. They are impossible to screen.

Says one top narcotics agent:

"You can't search every truck and car. What you need is inside information about a specific shipment. Without it, a lot obviously gets through."

Thus the innocent-looking weekend camper, the visitor to a Mexican bullfight, the serviceman heading for Tijuana could each carry a couple of kilos of heroin back to the United States, or even a trunkload of marijuana.

Other loads are carried across the border on foot by Mexican "burros," or smugglers. They choose remote, unfenced sectors and slip through under cover of darkness. These, however, are lowly couriers considered expendable by the big-time traffickers. They have little inside knowledge of the organizations for which they work. Their capture rarely imperils the major racketeers.

The traffickers have a much heavier investment in drug cargoes slipped across the border by private aircraft. These planes are generally rented or leased in the United States and flown to makeshift air-strips in Mexico to pick up shipments of narcotics.

Their pilots weave their way through mountain passes, or fly low at night, in an effort to evade detection. Once back in the United States, they land on highways, or at little-used country airports, or air-drop their cargoes at prearranged points.

The U.S. Immigration and Customs services operate a number of aircraft along the lengthy border, but most are for observation, and only a few have pursuit capability. However, dossiers on suspect pilots are continually updated at the Air Intelligence Center in Yuma, Ariz., where files are kept on more than 73,000 private aircraft and pilots.

RESOURCES CALLED INADEQUATE

Now there is a new factor. This is the prospect of increased smuggling through coastal waters. Thousands of pleasure boats clutter harbors in southern California. They are difficult to police and slip back and forth between Mexico and their home ports with little hindrance.

Alarmed by the drug flow from Mexico, the Nixon administration last year launched a campaign to cut back the traffic. A top-level task force presented President Nixon with a somber report. Narcotics smuggling across the Mexican border, it warned, was "increasing at an alarming rate." The problem, it said, was becoming "more serious and of greater magnitude."

Despite American encouragement, declared the task force's report bluntly, Mexican resources and effort "continue to be inadequate in the face of the problem."

The task force made several recommendations for increased security and surveillance along the U.S.-Mexican border. Soon after, the United States Government launched Operation Intercept, a much-publicized experiment in which travelers to the United States from Mexico were subjected to intensified search at the border. Cars were stacked up for hours on end. Normal traffic was disrupted.

The experiment was short lived. Clearly no professional traffickers sent shipments through the checkpoints when they were under such close scrutiny.

But the object of Operation Intercept was not so much to arrest drug-smuggling amateurs, as to jog the Mexican Government itself into action. In this respect, it succeeded.

Operation Intercept was quickly superseded by Operation Cooperation. The United States and Mexican Governments agreed on a bilateral program to cut back the drug traffic. Government liaison at high level has continued since.

While the United States has tightened security on its side of the border, the Mexicans have pledged to hunt traffickers on their side and step up campaigns to eliminate their opium and marijuana crops.

Since the agreement, Mexican police have publicized a number of seizures. Public bonfires of captured marijuana have been ostensibly lit. Mexican Attorney-General Julio Sanchez Vargas said recently 165 tons of marijuana have been confiscated since the start of Operation Cooperation.

Mexican police smashed a heroin ring in Tijuana and put a heroin laboratory out of business.

The Mexican Army has launched drives, with up to 10,000 soldiers sweeping through the mountains in search of illicit marijuana and opium plantations. Planes have dropped leaflets to farmers in remote areas, warning them to get out of the narcotics business.

LONG STRUGGLE SEEN

The United States is making available aircraft, sensing devices, and various other kinds of equipment to help the Mexicans in their drive.

All this is welcome progress. But the flow of drugs across the border has to date shown no appreciable decline.

Experts believe Mexico faces a long, hard, struggle against the narcotics producers and traffickers. Despite the penalties, marijuana and opium are cash crops for Mexican peasants hard put to make ends meet.

One problem is the slender size of the police force dealing with narcotics offenders in Mexico. Enforcement of federal narcotics laws is the responsibility of the Federal Judicial Police, or Federales. These number some 250 men, and only a handful of these are on narcotics duty. Local police forces sometimes refuse to cooperate with the Federales on narcotics cases.

As with many poor countries, there is the problem of corruption among the police. Some policemen, though ill paid, wear well-cut suits and own luxurious houses which clearly could not have been financed on their official salaries.

Says one high-placed Mexican: "If you've got money in this country, you can carry on any racket. And if you get caught, you can get off. It depends who you know, and how much you can pay."

Another problem is political uncertainty which is hindering implementation of the antinarcotics program. In January, Luis Echeverra is expected to become Mexico's new president. But in the meantime there is hesitation in government circles about launching Mexico on a program which could undergo major revision and change in January.

Personnel trained now might well be replaced early next year by other appointees. The program's direction and emphasis could shift.

Despite Mexico's declared good intentions, factors such as these make experts skeptical of any dramatic cutback in the flow of drugs across the United State's southern border.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—*Monday, July 6, 1970*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Trust ye in the Lord forever: for in the Lord God is everlasting strength.—Isaiah 26: 4.

Our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for our brief recess, for the rest of the nights, for the refreshment of the days, and for the beginning of another week. As we face the tasks and trials of these hours help us to trust Thee completely and strengthen us to do what we ought to do.

Bless these Representatives and protect our country, keeping them all in Thy love and peace, through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, July 1, 1970, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolutions of the House of the following titles:

H.J. Res. 224. Joint resolution to change the name of Pleasant Valley Canal, Calif., to Coalinga Canal; and

H.J. Res. 746. Joint resolution to amend the joint resolution authorizing appropriations for the payment by the United States of its share of the expenses of the Pan American Institute of Geography and History.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, bills of the House of the following titles:

H.R. 16595. An act to authorize appropriations for the activities of the National Science Foundation, and for other purposes;

H.R. 17070. An act to improve and modernize the postal service, to reorganize the Post Office Department, and for other purposes.

H.R. 17619. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 17711. An act to amend the District of Columbia Cooperative Association Act.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 15733) entitled "An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a temporary 15 per centum increase in annuities, to change for a temporary period the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts, and for other purposes"; disagreed to by the House; agrees to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. EAGLETON, Mr. PELL, Mr. NELSON, Mr. HUGHES, Mr. SMITH of Illinois, Mr. SCHWEIKER, and Mr. SAXBE to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate insists upon its amendments to the bill (H.R. 17619) entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes," request a conference with the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Mr. BIBLE, Mr. BYRD of West Virginia, Mr. MCGEE, Mr. BOGGS, and Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 531. An act to establish the Capitol Reef National Park in the State of Utah;

S. 532. An act to establish the Arches National Park in the State of Utah;

S. 3074. An act to provide minimum disclosure standards for written warranties and guaranties of consumer products against defect or malfunction; to define minimum Federal content standards for such warranties and guaranties; and for other purposes;

S. 3366. An act to make banks in American Samoa eligible for Federal deposit insurance under the Federal Deposit Insurance Act, and for other purposes;

S. 3600. An act for the relief of Kyung Ae Oh;

S. 3649. An act relating to the rental of space for the accommodation of District of Columbia agencies and activities, and for other purposes; and

S. 3777. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to enter into contracts for the protection of public lands from fires, in advance of appropriations therefor, and to twice renew such contracts.

HON. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from California, Mr. JOHN H. ROUSSELOT, be permitted to take the oath of office today. His certificate of election has not arrived, but there is no contest, and no question has been raised with respect to his election.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROUSSELOT appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JULY 1, 1970.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on June 30, 1970, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate agree to the Report of the Committee of Conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17868) entitled "An Act making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of said District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes."

Respectfully yours,
W. PAT JENNINGS,
Clerk, U.S. House of Representatives.
By W. RAYMOND COLLEY.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

JULY 2, 1970.

The Honorable the SPEAKER,
U.S. House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: Pursuant to authority granted on June 30, 1970, the Clerk received from the Secretary of the Senate today the following message:

That the Senate passed without amendment the Concurrent Resolution (H. Con.