carry out a study and investigation of the Federal Meat Inspection Act; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOLD:

H. Res. 1133. A resolution to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII,

419. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to Fort Polk, La.; to the Committee on Armed Services.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

534. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Barry Dale Holland, Portsmouth, Va., relative to the validity of certain State laws under the 14th amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

WOMEN'S EQUITY ACTION LEAGUE

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, with further reference to the efforts of the Women's Equity Action League in fighting sex discrimination which exists in our colleges and universities, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD copies of three letters of the organization, which were sent to the Secretary of Labor, the Honorable James D. Hodgson. I urge Secretary Hodgson to take action on these matters.

The letters follow:

SILVER SPRING, MD.,
July 5, 1970.

Hon. JAMES D. HODGSON,
Secretary of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please consider this letter as a formal charge of sex discrimination against PHI DELTA KAPPA under Executive Order 11246 as amended, which specifically forbids sex discrimination against women by Federal contractors.

The charge is based on the fact that Phi Delta Kappa, an honorary organization in the profession of education is solely limited to men. No matter how distinguished a woman may be, no matter how brilliant her accomplishments, she can under no circumstances become a member of Phi Delta Kappa, purely on the basis of her sex. Such exclusion is a violation of both the spirit and the letter of the Executive Order.

It is unthinkable that the Federal Government would give contracts to an all white organization that forbade blacks from joining; similarly any organization that forbids women from joining should be prohibited from obtaining any Federal funds whatsoever. Nevertheless, Phi Delta Kappa completed a $61,000 contract in February, 1970 for the U.S. Office of Education.

We ask that Phi Delta Kappa be declared *ineligible* for any further government contracts until such time as it ceases to be a sexist organization, and that current contract negotiations, if any, be suspended at once.

Sincerely,

BERNICE SANDLER, Ed. D.,
Chairman, Action Committee for Federal Contract Compliance in Education (WEAL).

SILVER SPRING, MD.,
July 5, 1970.

Hon. JAMES D. HODGSON,
Secretary Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please consider this letter as a formal charge of sex discrimination against Brooklyn College, under Executive Order 11246, as amended which specifically forbids Federal contractors from discriminating against women.

The charges are based on the enclosed report that was printed in the *Congressional Record* of June 3, 1970. As a former student and graduate (cum laude, 1948) I was shocked and dismayed to learn that in 8 departments (anthropology, art, geology, music, philosophy, physics, psychology and sociology) no woman has *ever* been appointed to the rank of full professor. In five of these (art, music, philosophy, physics and sociology) no woman has *ever* been made an associate professor. These figures are even more appalling when compared with the number of doctorates in these fields that go to women nationally: In psychology, women receive 23% of the doctorates; in Fine and Applied Arts, 34% of the doctorates; in anthropology, 24% of the doctorates; in sociology, 19% of the doctorates; in philosophy, 9% of the doctorates (Figures from the U.S. Office of Education, *Earned Degrees Conferred,* OE–54013–68–A).

The charges are also based on the by-laws of the college which create a hardship for women faculty who become pregnant. These by-laws are in violation of the recent guidelines on sex issued by the Dept. of Labor (Sect. 60–20.3(g)). A woman must notify the President of the college immediately upon learning that she is pregnant and begin a leave of absence at the end of that current term. In practice, this means that, although she may be in good health and able and willing to carry on with her duties, she must go on a *forced* leave for one year, during which time she loses all income and vacation benefits, accrued time toward sabbatical leave, pension contributions, etc. Even if the child is anticipated during the summer months, she is not permitted to carry out her teaching duties while pregnant. In essence, these by-laws punish women for becoming pregnant. It is of interest to note that the by-laws concerning pregnancy leave for administrative personnel permit the woman to adjust her leave in any way acceptable to her immediate superior. The discrimination in question here specifically applies to the woman faculty member and has been rigorously applied at Brooklyn College, although not with the same vigor at other branches of the City University.

We request that a compliance review be scheduled immediately; that such a review include an investigation of admission policies, financial support to women students, placement of graduates, hiring and promotion policies for both staff and faculty, and salary inequities. We further ask that all current contract negotiations be suspended immediately until such time as *all* inequities are worked out and an acceptable plan of affirmative action is implemented.

While we have not investigated the factual nature of this complaint, we are forwarding it to you in accordance with our usual policy of bringing these matters to your attention. Please notify me when the compliance review begins.

Sincerely,

BERNICE SANDLER, ED.D.,
Chairman, Action Committee for Federal Contract Compliance in Education, WEAL.

PART 3: PROMOTIONAL PRACTICES AT BROOKLYN COLLEGE 1930–1970 SHOWING DISCRIMINATION AGAINST WOMEN IN PROFESSIONAL ADVANCEMENT WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO DISCRIMINATION AGAINST DR. BABEY-BROOKE

A statistical analysis of promotion in the ranks of full, associate and assistant professor in the teaching faculty, including men and women, at Brooklyn College of the City University of New York from the inception of the college in 1930 to 1970 is the subject of this report. At first the year 1964 was chosen because it was at that time that Dr. Anna M. Babey-Brooke, an assistant professor in the department of English, protested, among other charges, "that discrimination against her as an individual and against women existed at promotion time in Brooklyn College." Due partly to her case, to the activities of the Ad Hoc Committee, and to the Report of the Committee of Rank, the college administration made a gesture to correct this injustice and promoted women in wholesale numbers in 1966. This study has therefore, included an analysis of promotional practices in 1966–1968. The Brooklyn College Bulletins which are a matter of public record, were used for this study.

The names, dates of appointment of individuals together with the years required for promotion to the next rank are all enumerated. The rate of promotion for each rank is given in a departmental as well as on a college wide level. The record speaks for itself; there is no doubt about discrimination against women. Statistical tables provided in a memorandum from Deans Mais and Stroup to President Gideonse, February 21, 1962 and reissued April of 1964 by the Office of the Dean of Students as "Conference on the Status of Women" substantiate this report.

From the beginning when the College was first set up from the faculties of Hunter College—for women—and from the College of the City of New York—for men—discrimination against women existed. The men's division sent in all men as faculty; the women's division sent in both men and women: the major ranks filled exclusively by men. In 1932, 8 men were professors, but no women; 10 men and 4 women were associate professors; 21 men and 7 women were assistant professors. This trend continued so that in 1964, 34 men but no women were appointed full professors; 39 men and 5 women were associates. In the total count from 1930 to 1964, 151 men were made full professors in contrast to 16 women; 104 men were associates in contrast to 48 women.

The Bulletin of 1966–1968 shows the continuation of this trend: 145 men were full professors to 20 women; 125 men associates to 35 women; and 153 male assistants to 62 females. In the years 1966–68 the women gained 4 full professorships at the expense of 13 associate professorships and the men lost 6 full professorships but gained 21 associate professorships. The senior ranks for females showed a net loss of 9 and for males showed a net gain of 15.

The latest Bulletin 1968–1970 lists 143 men as full professor to 17 women; 135 men associates to 25 women and 158 men assistants to 52 women. In two years from 1968 to 1970, men lost 2 professorships to 3 for women. Men gained 10 associate professorships and

women lost 10; men gained 5 assistant professorships and women lost 10 assistant professorships. In the senior ranks, men gained 8 and women lost 13. The figures speak for themselves.

In the following eight departments: anthropology, art, geology, music, philosophy, physics, psychology, and sociology, no woman has ever been appointed to a full professor. This figure comprises more than half of the departments as listed in the statistical tables that follow in the departments listed on page 38 of the report published in 1966.

In the following four departments: art, music, philosophy, physics, and sociology, no woman has ever been made an associate professor.

Only on rare occasions have women held the rank of chairmen of the department. This fact also is a form of discrimination, for it is the chairmen of the departments who make up Personnel and Budget, the Committee at Brooklyn College which votes on the candidates to be promoted. If the President concurs, the recommendations goes to the Board of Higher Education of the City University of New York.

In the Babey-Brooke case—a pilot case in higher education—it was brought out in the hearings by the Board of Higher Education that the Committee on Personnel and Budget consisted of 18 men and 2 women, one of whom was the wife of the then-Dean of Administration who later became President of the College (Kilcoyne). At the hearing, it was further brought out that President Gideonse admitted that he had appointed at least 14 chairmen (of 14 different departments). This figure was a *small number* in his opinion. One of his appointees was Professor George Peck to the chairmanship of the Department of English. He went on to become Dean of Administration and then Acting President, Babey-Brooke in her capacity as an elected member of the Appointments Committee, to which she had been elected by her collagues for fourteen successive years voted against the appointment of Mr. Peck in 1955. Although President Gideonse called her into his office and asked her to change her vote, she refused.

The statistics for the spring of 1967 reported by the registrar of Brooklyn College were 12,330 women and 9,965 men for the total enrollment of 22,295 of the college; 5,246 women and 4,487 men out of that total represent the matriculated students in the day session. In this college where women predominate, a woman with a Ph. D. who has been an associate dean for over ten years was passed over for the post of Dean of Administration which was given to a man—an acting dean—who had an A.B. degree, no administrative experience, and certainly no scholastic accomplishment. The administration must have realized its mistake, for it then gave the post to Mr. Peck (March 1967, *Faculty Staff Note Book.*)

When Mr. Peck was acting president, the acting dean with a B.A. degree was appointed as an associate dean (so that he could get his full professorship).

What follows in the report is a summation of each department of the college in regard to discrimination against women in the promotional practices prevailing at Brooklyn College.

SECTION II: PROFILE OF DR. ANNA M. BABEY-BROOKE'S PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES SINCE HER PROMOTION TO THE RANK OF ASSISTANT PROFESSOR IN 1953

I. RECORD OF SIGNIFICANT ACHIEVEMENT IN FIELD OR PROFESSION

1. Guest Lecturer at International Congress of Acupuncture, Paris, France, 1969.

2. Guest Lecturer at International Congress of Acupuncture, Tokyo, Japan, 1965.

3. Lecturer to Medical Societies and colleges in Japan, 1965.

4. 1963–64: Senior Fulbright Grantee, Professor, English Graduate Studies, Lady Doak College, Madurai, South India. She was the head of the Graduate Department in English of this college, an affiliate of Madras University.

5. Guest Lecturer at the following colleges in India: American College, Theogarajen College, Theorgararajan College of Preceptors, Maural College.

6. Lecturer for United States Information Service on its various American cultural affairs programs at the following Universities in India: Annamalai, Karnatak, and five colleges associated with Calcutta University.

7. Special Public Lecturer for the Annual Address promulgated by the Vice-Chancellor of Madras University on "The Search for the Self in Eastern and Western Cultures."

8. Participant, American Studies Center, Hyderabad, Osmania University, Photostatic copies of letters, unsolicited, from four government officials will provide insights into her contributions.

N.B. Other Fulbrighters at Brooklyn College have been promoted for their governmental awards. Babey-Brooke was bypassed even thought she was one of two Americans invited to represent the United States at the International Congresses in Tokyo and in Paris.

II. RECORD AS ADMINISTRATOR

1. Educational Director and Chairman, American Association of University of Women, 1966-present.

2. Member, Steering Committee, International Congress of Acupuncture, Tokyo, 1965.

3. Chairman, Graduate Studies, Lady Doak College, India, 1963–64.

4. Coordinator, Division of Written Communications, Division of Vocational Studies, 1955–1969 except for leave to teach in India.

5. Deputy Chairman, Division of Graduate Studies, English, Brooklyn College, 1958.

6. Faculty advisor to school *Landscapes,* a student publication.

III. RECORD OF SERVICE TO THE COMMUNITY—ABROAD AND AT HOME

1. Lecturer at various social agencies in India: Y.W.C.A., Y.M.C.A., Lions' Club; Hindu Relief Organization; Hindu orphanages and Christian orphanages on fund-raising campaigns; maternity centers in local villages on outskirts of Madurai on an educational program.

2. Lecturer at College of Religious Science and the First Church of Religious Science and its clubs on the following: Plato, Aristotle, Great Truths, Buddhism, Taoism, General Semantics, William James, Existentialism, *The Upanishads, BhagavadGita,* Swedenborg, Boehm, Confucius, Lao Tse etc.

IV. EVIDENCE OF CONTINUED GROWTH

She is the first American woman to receive the degree of Doctor of Acupuncture, a Chinese medical degree, signed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs and verified by the courts of Taiwan, Free China. This was awarded in June of 1964. (In the Sung Dynasty, Acupuncture was one of the three main subjects taught in the government medical schools.)

2. The State Department interviewed her in Washington about her experiences and contacts in India and Formosa.

3. She is a member of the International Committee on the Standardization of Nomenclature.

4. She is co-author of "The Pulse in Occident and Orient: It's Philosophy and Practice in India, China, Iran and the West," Dawson of Pall Mall, London; and Santa Barbara Press, N.Y., 1966.

5. Two articles published in International Journal of Acupuncture at the two different congresses—in Japan and France—and translated into other languages.

V. RECORD OF SERVICE TO THE COLLEGE

1. Her publications of various career manuals which are listed on the college special form—known as Form D—of her academic record require this explanation: She approached the dean in 1951 with preparing vocational brochures of interest to English majors and she prepared this material and edited a General Manual. These two Manuals were followed by the establishment of a college-wide committee on Employment and she became a Counsellor in the Division of Personnel Services. In 1954, the Minutes of the English Department reported that she had obtained a sum of money to defray the publication costs of a 16 page booklet. In 1954, 5,000 copies of this manual were distributed and in 1956, 2000 additional copies were sold.

2. Member, Faculty-Student Committee on Employment, 1951–53.

3. Chairman, Faculty Committee on Economic Services to Students, 1953–55.

4. Member, Committee on Career Publications (College-Wide) 1953–57.

5. Member, Committee on Scholarships and Awards, 1955–56.

6. Elected Member of Faculty Council, 1955.

7. President, Faculty Club, School of General Studies, 1958–59.

SILVER SPRING, MD.,
July 5, 1970.

Hon. JAMES D. HODGSON,
Secretary, Department of Labor,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Please consider this letter as a formal complaint of sex discrimination against the University of Wisconsin, under Executive Order 11246 as amended. This Order specifically forbids all Federal contractors from discriminating against women.

The charge is based on the enclosed data which gives detailed figures concerning the number of women at each rank compared with the number of men at that rank in various departments. The data show a shocking absence of women on the faculty, even in those departments where women receive substantial number of doctorates. For example, women earn 23% of the doctoral degrees (nationally) in psychology. But at the University of Wisconsin, there is only one woman in the entire faculty of 35 (less than 3%). In History, women earn 13% of the doctorates; yet the History department which even has an endowment to hire a woman has not yet hired a woman at all among its 60 faculty members. In Art education, women earn 34% of the doctorates yet in the Dept. of Art in the School of Education, there is only 1 woman among the faculty of 36.

We request that a compliance review be scheduled immediately; that such a review include an investigation of admission policies, financial support to women students, placement of graduates, hiring and promotion policies for both staff and faculty, and salary inequities. We further ask for the immediate suspension of all current contract negotiations until such time as *all* inequities are worked out and an acceptable plan of affirmative action is implemented.

While we have not investigated the factual nature of this complaint we are forwarding it to you in accordance with our usual policy of bringing these matters to your attention. Please notify me when the compliance review begins.

Sincerely,

BERNICE SANDLER, Ed.D.,
Chairman, Action Committee for Federal Contract Compliance in Education, WEAL.

UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN MADISON CAMPUS, 1969-70 [1]
COLLEGE OF AGRICULTURAL AND LIFE SCIENCES

	Men		Women	
	1 appointment	Split [2]	1 appointment	Split
Department of bacteriology:				
Professors	3	6	1	0
Associate professors	3	2	0	0
Assistant professors	3	3	0	0
Department of entomology:				
Professors	9	4	0	0
Associate professors	5	0	0	0
Assistant professors	0	2	0	0
Instructors	1	0	0	0
Department of genetics:				
Professors	5	9	0	0
Associate professors	1	0	0	0
Assistant professors	1	2	0	0
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION				
Department of art:				
Professors	11	1	1	0
Associate professors	12	1	0	0
Assistant professors	8	2	0	0
Department of educational psychology:				
Professors	6	1	0	0
Associate professors	3	0	0	0
Assistant professors	8	0	0	0
COLLEGE OF LETTERS AND SCIENCE				
Department of botany:				
Professors	9	5	0	
Associate professors	0	1	0	0
Assistant professors	5	2	0	0
Department of economics:				
Professors	22	13	0	0
Associate professors	5	3	0	0
Assistant professors	16	0	1	0
Department of English:				
Professors	20	2	2	0
Associate professors	12	3	1	0
Assistant professors	27	0	2	0
Department of history:				
Professors	35	7	0	0
Associate professors	11	1	0	0
Assistant professors	6	0	0	0
Department of psychology:				
Professors	19	1	0	0
Associate professors	4	0	0	0
Assistant professors	10	0	1	0
Department of sociology:				
Professors	16	9	1	0
Associate professors	9	4	0	1
Assistant professors	15	4	1	0
Department of zoology:				
Professors	15	1	1	0
Associate professors	6	0	0	0
Assistant professors	2	2	0	0
SCHOOL OF MEDICINE				
Department of anatomy:				
Professors	4	0	0	0
Associate professors	1	0	1	0
Assistant professors	7	0	0	0
Department of physiological chemistry:				
Professors	4	2	0	0
Associate professors	1	2	0	1
Assistant professors	1	3	0	0
Department of physiology:				
Professors	5	3	0	0
Associate professors	3	1	0	0
Assistant professors	0	0	1	0

[1] These data can be checked against the enclosed lists of faculty. [2] The appointment is between 2 departments.

WOMEN'S EQUITY ACTION LEAGUE (WEAL)

Percentages of doctorates awarded to women in selected fields in 1967–68

General Biology	29.0
General Zoology	14.8
Bacteriology, Virology, Mycology, Parisitology, and Microbiology	18.0
Biochemistry	22.3
Pharmacology	14.1
Educ. of Mentally Retarded	44.4
Educ. of Deaf, Speech, & Hearing	23.8
Art Education	34.0
Music Education	11.0
Early Childhood Education	100.0
Elementary Education	42.4
Secondary Education	17.0
Adult Education	21.4
Educ. Administration, Supervision & Finance	8.2
Counseling & Guidance	20.9
Rehab. Counselor Training	23.0
History & Philosophy of Educ	19.2
Curriculum & Instruction	24.5
General Education	18.7
Educational Psychology	28.4
English & Literature	27.4
Journalism	15.6
General Arts	25.0
Music	14.5
Speech & Dramatic Arts	18.5
Fine and Applied Arts	34.5
Linguistics	20.6
French	38.1
Italian	18.0
Spanish	31.7
Philology & Literature of Romance Languages	35.8
German	23.9
Pharmacy	10.0
Library Science	31.8
Mathematics	6.0
Philosophy	9.1
Chemistry	8.0
Psychology	22.5
Anthropology	23.9
History	13.0
Political Science	11.3
Sociology	18.5
Social Work	22.0

(Source: Earned degrees conferred: Part A—Summary Data, Office of Education, OE–54013–68–A.)

BACH ON STEEL DRUMS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, today, I was privileged to join my colleague, the Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, the Honorable Jorge Córdova, in presenting an exciting young group from his part of the world—the Bender brothers.

These amazing young men truly bring a rare dimension to the classical mastery of Bach via the supple sounds that emanate gently from their steel drums. For those who listened and enjoyed at noon, it was a treat beyond compare.

Hundreds of Capitol visitors lined the walls of the rotunda in the Cannon Building today. The crowd grew as the boys played. After each rendition, the applause was more than before. And these young men captivated their audience at Capitol Hill. I wish it were possible for everyone in America to hear these young men play.

Mr. Speaker, in a recent review, one of the most noted critics in Puerto Rico, Francis Schwartz, very aptly described the talents of the Bender brothers and I would submit his comments at this time:

BACH ON STEEL DRUMS

(By Francis Schwartz)

Bach on steel drums? The purists will call it sacrilegious but the beautiful sounds emanating from those metal instruments would probably have charmed the wig off Johann Sebastian.

The Bender brothers Hilton, 16; Vernon 14; Oliver, 13, and Dennis, 11, have brought a new dimension to classical music with their acoustically fascinating renditions of masterworks on instruments traditionally associated with undulant Caribbean rhythms. The musical mentor of this unusual quartet is pianist Paul Danny Deaver, well known San Juan musical personality.

The Bender brothers were brought here from their home island of St. Kitts in the British Virgin Islands. Their parents asked Deaver if the boys could come to study music here. Deaver immediately made the necessary immigration arrangements and took the boys into his home as if they were his own children.

"We have a great relationship," says Deaver. "We're honest with each other, talk things out, learn together. I have tried to make the boys aware of the problems of today. They understand. They are very sensitive boys. I love them."

A drum maker from Trinidad was commissioned to construct eight drums and the boys wasted no time in preparing church hymns so that they would be used in religious services.

The Reverend Garth Thompson of Union Church heard the boys practicing one day and asked Deaver if they would perform the offertory in the following Sunday service.

The congregation's response was so overwhelming that the word about four talented young men began to circulate. They were offered scholarships from the St. Johns Episcopal School, where they now all study, plus practice facilities at Union Church.

"These boys love music. They want to help in some way to solve the problems they see around them," said their director. "It is our intention to bring peace and harmony to our audiences whether they be church groups, college students or concert fans."

The Bender Brothers are currently in the United States. Two weeks ago they performed in the Holy Trinity Lutheran Cathedral and Riverside Church in New York. Rep. J. J. Pickle (D-Tex.), of Austin, and Jorge Cordova, Resident Commissioner of Puerto Rico, arranged a concert in the Capitol building last week and the boys also performed at the National Episcopal Cathedral in Washington. After playing for top TV and music agents, including one from the Ed Sullivan show, in

New York's Carnegie recital hall two weeks ago, the offers have been pouring in for concert dates. If the Benders get clearance from U.S. Immigration authorities, they may have an exciting career ahead.

"A lot of people think the boys play by ear," says Deaver. "I have them working daily on piano, theory, ear training, and all the necessary musical rudiments. They also study guitar, accordion and vibraphone. I want them to have a complete education. In this way they will be able to interpret the compositions of the great composers."

The repertoire of the Bender brothers is impressive. Included in their programs are Bach works such as preludes, fugues, chorable preludes and suite movements. Palestrina, Mozart and Handel compositions have been arranged by Deaver for the drum ensemble with great success. The adaptations stay as close to the original as possible with slight changes only when the drums limitations prevent exact duplication.

When playing together, the steel drum band sounds like a great pipe organ. In fact, many strollers in the neighborhood have often looked inside Union Church in search of the organist only to discover these four youngsters swinging their sticks.

Apparently the boys do not limit their enthusiasm to music. They are outstanding athletes in their school and walked off with fistsful of ribbons in the field day competition. "The days are gone when young people are called sissies because they play music. These boys are the living proof," says their leader and second father, Deaver.

When asked about the validity of playing masterworks on steel drums, both the Bender brothers and Deaver feel that if the music is played well with feeling and serious commitment then the composer receives his due.

And after hearing Bach's "Jesus, Joy of Man's Desire," anyone with musical sensitivity will agree that there is beauty in this music-making. No doubt the old German master would be pleased.

LOS ANGELES OFFICIAL SAYS SMOG MAY BE WORST YET

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, two rather brief news articles from the Los Angeles Times indicate the mounting results stemming from failure by both public and private sectors to halt air pollution.

So, without further comment, I insert these important stories in the RECORD:

1970 MAY BE WORST SMOG YEAR OF ALL, POLLUTION CHIEF WARNS

(By George Getze)

Los Angeles may be heading into the worst smog season ever recorded here, Robert Chass, Los Angeles County air pollution control officer, said Friday.

He said the four alerts so far in 1970 were the direct result of the auto makers' inability to provide satisfactory controls of their products.

Chase said the fact that 1970 has had more alerts by July 3 than any other year made him fear that this year may be even worse than 1956, when there were 10 alerts, and than 1955, when the ozone count soared to .90 parts per million on Sept. 13.

John Mega, executive officer of the State Air Resources Board, said that while auto emissions are the major source of pollution, the 1970 alerts are a reflection of weather patterns and not of any increase in emissions.

"Of course, if the auto manufacturers had succeeded in controlling emissions five years ago, the 1970 pattern of foggy mornings followed by high temperatures would not have brought four alerts," Maga said.

Chass said the schedule for the control of motor vehicle emissions had fallen far short of need, and of the state requirements.

He said that emissions of one pollutant, the oxides of nitrogen, had actually increased since 1966.

Chass, an outspoken critic of the efforts of the automobile manufacturers to control emissions, said the people of Los Angeles can no longer tolerate smog.

"Regardless of what Detroit says, all is not well," he said. "That ought to be obvious from the smog we are having this year."

Chass said it must be recognized that Southern California is subject to a combination of meteorological factors that intensify the problems of air pollution.

These factors are many hours of bright sunshine, weak winds, and low and strong temperature inversions that combine to hold pollution close to the ground and keep it from dispersing.

"These natural meteorological conditions are things we can't change, and I doubt that we would if we could," Chass said. "The bright sunshine and gentle breezes are what have helped make Southern California climate famous.

"But it certainly is possible to control the sources of pollution that have spoiled our enjoyment of a climate that has been considered ideal," he said.

"Auto emissions are more or less constant. When the weather conditions are as they have been recently, we are going to have intolerable concentrations of eye-irritating pollution until auto makers are forced to meet California standards."

Maga said he is sure the smog problem will improve.

"The alerts are the result of emissions as they are now, and the state's program of control will reduce them," he said.

"The automobile manufacturers will meet state standards," Maga said.

"They will have to, if they are going to sell cars in California. That's why I know conditions will get better."

SMOG CAUSING POSTS TO CLOSE

RENO.—Lonely forest fire lookout stations in the Lake Tahoe basin and western Nevada are being phased out, not by economic necessity, but because of low visibility due to smog.

PANAMA CANAL ISSUES: PROCRASTINATION SHOULD CEASE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of pending House resolutions that aim to clarify and reaffirm U.S. sovereignty over the Canal Zone and of measures to provide for the major increase of capacity and operational improvements of the Panama Canal, I have read a recent letter to the editor of the New York Times by Capt. Franz O. Willenbucher, U.S. Navy, retired, with much interest.

Captain Willenbucher became seriously interested in the Isthmian Canal question while he was on active duty in the Navy Department, where he actively participated in the drafting of certain national defense provisions of the 1936–39 Hull-Alfaro Treaty.

My State of Louisiana, as one of the greatest shipping regions of the Nation, has much at stake in what transpires at Panama, for the State's ports will be inevitably affected. Clearly, the time has come for hearings on the previously indicated measures, without further delay; and they should start long before receipt of the forthcoming report on a sea level canal that is due before December 1, 1970.

As Captain Willenbucher's letter should be of interest to all Members of the House, especially those on the Committees on Foreign Affairs and on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, I include it as part of my remarks:

[From the New York Times, June 28, 1970]

CANAL ZONE ISSUES

To the EDITOR:

President Nixon's recent appointment of Daniel Hofgren "to take over direction of negotiations with Panama for a new Atlantic-Pacific canal" should be recognized as highly significant. A former Wall Street investment manager and now a Presidential assistant, Mr. Hofgren thus becomes a member of our Panama treaty negotiating team under Robert Anderson, a leading advocate of a so-called "sea-level" canal and strong proponent of the surrender of United States sovereignty over the Canal Zone, the indispensable protective frame of the Canal.

The policy questions involved, affecting as they do our own national security and the security of other free nations everywhere, must be understood in realistic perspective.

In June 1967 our President and the President of Panama announced completion of negotiations for three proposed treaties that would surrender our sovereignty over the Panama Canal to Panama; make that technologically primitive and politically unstable country a partner in the operations and defense of the Canal; grant the United States an option for the construction of a new canal of so-called "sea-level" design (not needed and discredited in recent scientific studies); and eventually give to Panama not only the existing Canal, but also the new canal to be constructed at high cost—a needless and wasteful expenditure which our taxpayers can ill-afford in these times of economic crisis.

Premature unofficial disclosure of these treaties, here and in Panama, and by Senator Thurmond, caused a national sensation, storms of protest in Panama, and strong opposition in Congress. The treaties were never signed and more than 100 members of Congress introduced or co-sponsored identical House resolutions opposing any surrender at Panama.

Clarification of the principal problems of increased transit facilities also has resulted in the introduction of identical measures in both Senate and House for the major increase of capacity and operational improvement of the existing Panama Canal, adaptation of the "third locks project" to provide a summit-level terminal lake anchorage at the Pacific end of the Canal to match the layout at the Atlantic end. This proposal is strongly supported by experienced independent engineers, geologists, navigators, defense experts, nuclear physicists, marine ecologists and others, who condemn the sea-level project in strongest terms.

The problem before Congress is two-fold: reaffirmation of United States sovereignty and ownership of the Canal Zone and full modernization of the present Canal. Procrastination should forthwith cease. Congress should act now.

FRANZ WILLENBUCHER,
Captain, U.S. Navy (retired)

BETHESDA, MD., *June 19, 1970.*

THE 101ST AIRBORNE DIVISION IN PHONG DIEM, VIETNAM

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker—

I think the nation has not been told of the fine efforts being made in Vietnam by our servicemen. If the news media do not tell the positive side of the war efforts, such as Vietnamization, what can be done? Surely there must be ways in which this message can be told . . . please speak out and let the world know they care about their country, their flag, what they have fought for, and their President.

These are the words of Mr. John Greensmith, of San Diego, Calif., whose son is serving with the 101st Airborne Division in Phong Diem, Vietnam.

Like the parents of many Vietnam veterans, Mr. Greensmith is concerned by the fact that this side of the Vietnam conflict is not being adequately told. As General Wright, the commender of the 101st Airborne has eloquently pointed out:

The destruction of war and the fury of battle seem to make more spectacular headlines than the resettlement of a village, the opening of a school, or the harvesting of a rice crop.

Speaking of the 101st Airborne's efforts in the Phong Diem area, General Wright went on to say that—

These are your victories, the positive and constructive results of your actions.

Mr. Speaker, because I concur with the statements made above, I would like to take this opportunity to acknowledge the fine work being done by S. Sgt. Robert Greensmith and his platoon of the 101st Airborne Division. I would also like to point out, as General Wright already has, that—

Phong Diem is not an isolated example, it is only one of 10 such districts in the 101st area of operations where similar efforts are underway.

In addition, I would like to include the text of an article from Rendezvous With Destiny which deals specifically with the enthusiasm, concern, and contribution of the 101st in the Phong Diem region. I fervently hope that the recognition we are giving them today, by placing news of their accomplishments in the RECORD, will assure them that their deeds will be remembered and appreciated by a grateful Nation.

AP UU THOUNG

(By Sp4c. James Greenfield)

An occasional visitor to Ap Uu Thoung hamlet in Phong Dien District, north of Hue, probably notices very little changes in this quiet little grouping of huts since October, 1969, when the 3rd Battalion (Airmobile), 187th Infantry, commanded by Lt. Col. William A. Steinberg began pacification operations in the district.

But then, life in tiny agricultural villages like Uu Thoung rarely does change. As conflict spread through Vietnam in the 1960's, the people who lived there noticed only one significant alteration in their way of life. Their home had become strategically important to the Viet Cong.

Uu Thoung sits on the bank of the O Lau River, just five miles from the district capital at Phong Dien. The hamlet was a logical place for VC rice-carrying groups to make portage around an impassible section of the river. It was also an excellent point from which the guerrillas could stage raids on the nearby district headquarters.

The first change had come. The ever-present VC dominated the area and used the people and resources of Uu Thoung in their war effort. However, as U.S. and Vietnamese forces pushed the enemy from the coastal plain farther back into the hills, Uu Thoung slowly emerged from the grip of communist forces.

In October, when the Rakkasans arrived, the immediate threat was gone, but an indirect one remained. The enemy was no longer in Phong Dien in strength. He was farther away, but still very hungry. Uu Thoung and scores of other hamlets like it were the targets of rice-gatherers from the enemy's retreats in the high country. Although the presence of Screaming Eagles from the 101st Airborne Division (Airmobile) and ARVN forces was cutting down on infiltration, the local villagers still had much to learn about their own self-defense. For the allied strategy of rice-denial to be effective, the last lines of defense had to be as strong as the front line. A second change was needed.

Uu Thoung fell under the area of responsibility of Company A, commanded by Capt. David Treadwell. Staff Sergeant Robert A. Greensmith, of San Diego, Calif., brought his platoon to the hamlet with a mission. They were to stop Viet Cong movement across the O Lau River and train a 20-man Popular Force (PF) platoon and the hamlet's own Peoples Self Defense Force (PSDF).

Pacification was in its early stages. Greensmith recalls that he and his men "really didn't know what to expect" in their new mission. They had only recently come back from face-to-face contact with highly-trained North Vietnamese regulars in the A Shau Valley.

Greensmith and his men soon found out the nature of their task after their first few combined patrols with the PFs. The PFs were doing quite a few things wrong. It was hard to know where to begin training, but there was no question that it had to be done if the overall goals of pacification in the district were going to be achieved.

Noise and light discipline were stressed. The PFs were taught not to move their position during the night, and not to build shelters and light fires on ambush when the weather was wet. Despite the initial language barrier, progress was made. Soon, PF platoon leaders were given the responsibility of leading patrols and selecting ambush sites. The Americans left the role of leaders to the Vietnamese and became advisors.

Instruction in light weapons was part of the training. Rifle marksmanship classes were conducted, and the Vietnamese became acquainted with the use of the M–79 grenade launcher and the M–60 machinegun. The language barrier had collapsed. The Vietnamese learned fast—by example. Watch the Americans, and then do the same yourself. It was as clear as any language.

As the winter months approached, the job of the Rakkasan soldiers in Phong Dien District, and Sgt. Greensmith's platoon in Uu Thoung, began to change. Civil Affairs projects were initiated, and coordinated with local Revolutionary Development Cadre, but only after the residents of the hamlet had asked for help.

For Greensmith and his men, there was a period of anxious waiting before the first project was begun. Then, a PF platoon leader came to the Americans with an idea—rebuild an old schoolhouse on the outskirts of the hamlet.

It was done, but it was only the beginning. Together, American soldiers and Vietnamese repaired the defensive perimeter around Uu Thoung. They fixed holes in the roads and helped in the construction of an irrigation dam nearby.

The joint projects nurtured a feeling of mutual respect between the co-workers. As the bonds of friendship grew stronger, Americans and Vietnamese found time, not only to work together, but to play together too. The 101st soldiers introduced baseball to the children of Uu Thoung. Specialist 4 Cecil Dutton, Rogers, Ark., recalls, "At first we had to coax them, but later on they were begging us to play ball."

The recreation program gradually expanded to include soccer, volleyball and hopscotch. There was an incident where the Rakkasans and PFs were returning from a joint patrol when they spotted drawings in the sand which they suspected were signs of enemy activity. After checking out the surrounding area, the patrol returned to find a group of children playing hopscotch on the proposed "enemy diagram".

Perhaps the best indication of the success of the Screaming Eagles' multi-faceted mission in Uu Thoung was shown by the people's response when it was decided to remove the platoon from the hamlet. For the first time in their history, the people organized a "pressure group" which went to the District Chief, requesting that the Americans be allowed to stay.

But, there were other missions ahead for the Rakkasan soldiers, and the hamlet was left to its own resources, to begin a new existence on a secure foundation, built with a little advice and a lot of self-help and determination.

DR. PAUL W. BRIGGS TESTIFIES BEFORE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND LABOR

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, it was today my honor to introduce my very good friend and one of America's most brilliant educators, Dr. Paul W. Briggs, superintendent of schools for Cleveland, Ohio, to those of my colleagues who serve on the House Committee on Education and Labor. Dr. Briggs' eminence in his field and the distinguished presentations he has made before congressional committees in the past actually require no introduction; his good works and his outstanding efforts to raise educational standards are nationally acknowledged and acclaimed. His remarks before the committee this morning are so timely that I would like to share them now with all of the Congress:

STATEMENT OF PAUL W. BRIGGS, TO THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE

MR. CHAIRMAN, MEMBERS OF THE COMMITTEE: Thank you for the courtesy you have extended me both on this occasion and in the past. I am grateful for the opportunity to present my views on various legislative matters under consideration by the Congress.

May I express to you a deep sense of appreciation, both personally and on behalf of the school children of Cleveland, for the keen interest this committee has shown in improving education for America's children. We are especially grateful for the leadership the committee has offered in addressing the problems of urban children.

Today my testimony relates to Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act and its benefits to Cleveland children—benefits that we proudly identify.

One of the reasons for the success of programs developed under provisions of Title I is that the Elementary and Secondary Education Act is a part of a constellation of landmark laws which complement each other in ways that have significant impact on major problems. I refer, of course, to the National Defense Education Act, the Manpower Development and Training Act, the Vocational Education Act, the Economic Opportunity Act, the Child Nutrition and School Lunch Acts, the Education Professions Development Act, as well as others.

The local school system often finds itself in a coordinating role in implementing programs administered by such departments of the federal government as Health, Education and Welfare; Labor; Agriculture; Housing and Urban Development. In the days ahead with the rising concern for ecology, I have no doubt that school relationships with the Department of the Interior will increase.

Not only is ESEA part of a larger family of legislative enactments, but the law itself with its various titles provides the basis for a coordinated attack on educational problems. In Cleveland, for example, Titles I, II, and III have enabled us simultaneously to deal with the interrelated problems of reading deficiencies among disadvantaged children, the lack of library resources and the isolation of children from various sections of the city.

With funds provided under Title I, we have significantly improved reading abilities among the disadvantaged. With Title II resources we have provided books and other library materials throughout the city. Title III enabled us to open the nation's first Supplementary Education Center in which we brought together children from throughout the city to experience together the excitement of discovering the wonders of space and science.

I should like now to deal specifically with Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

In Cleveland we have been careful to insure that support provided under Title I has in every instance been a supplement to and not a substitute for local resources.

The additional revenue has enabled us to mount a variety of programs. Our efforts have been concentrated on improving and reinforcing basic learning skills for the children most in need of such assistance.

During the school year just ended we had in operation twelve Title I projects serving 11,000 pupils. The projects are described in the folders attached to my statement.

PROGRAM RESULTS

After four years experience with programs financed through Title I we have convincing evidence of the value of these programs for disadvantaged children. In the critical areas of reading and arithmetic we find the data particularly encouraging.

10,000 pre-kindergarten children have been served since 1965. Their average reading readiness scores upon entering first grade was in the high average category—eight points higher than children of similar backgrounds who did not participate in the program.

In our special reading improvement program last school year for second and third grade children, the average gain was a full year's growth in reading achievement meaning that these children are reaching normal functioning in reading.

Library circulation in our elementary schools increased by more than 1,000,000 over the preceding year, showing that children are reading more.

Parents of these children, in response to a survey, indicated that in their opinion the program had helped their children to a very great extent.

Our mathematics skill improvement program produced equally significant results. Two thousand children participated last year. Their average achievement was twice as great as during the year prior to their participation in the program. We realize, of course, that test scores can be misleading and are subject to misinterpretation. However, our results have been consistent and they do provide one important index.

Data from other Title I programs are being analyzed by our evaluators. Tentative results, however, are heartening.

Summers for children in Cleveland's inner city are no longer periods of idleness or of aimless activity. These are learning times in our city. As a matter of fact, at this moment while I am here testifying more than 25,000 children are attending classes supported by Title I in 78 schools. They are part of the total of more than 80,000 enrolled in programs other than recreation activities this summer. The children in Title I programs are aided by 300 local college students employed as tutors. The first thing this morning all those children received a nutritious breakfast as they began the school day.

This afternoon almost 3,000 will receive instruction in water safety in the 20 portable swimming pools located on playgrounds at inner city schools.

These children are catching up academically with their more privileged contemporaries—so that when regular classes resume in September the gap will be narrowed.

As state revenues have become available for special educational services to disadvantaged children, we have been able to finance from that source several programs that had been started with Title I money. This has made it possible to provide a greater depth of service as well as to include more of the children needing help.

Among the projects in this category are the following:

Kindergarten enrichment which continues the special support initiated during the pre-kindergarten child development program supported by Title I.

School camping through which 2,000 sixth grade inner city children spend a week during the school year studying with their regular teachers in the physically and intellectually stimulating environment of a well-equipped camp 14 miles from the city.

Job development which assists graduates of inner city high schools in obtaining employment if they wish to enter the labor market instead of going to college or some other training program. This has been one of our real success stories. Of last year's graduates of the five inner city high schools, 99.5% were placed in jobs with Cleveland area businesses and industries. The annual earnings of that group total more than $5,000,000, which will bolster significantly the economic level of their families.

Teacher in-service training through which we are able to help Cleveland teachers acquire new understandings and special skills in dealing with the needs of disadvantaged children.

SIGNS OF HOPE AND PROGRESS

Today there are signs of hope and progress in the education of disadvantaged urban children.

In one of Cleveland's large high schools serving a seriously depressed area of the city, a survey of this year's graduating class indicates that of the members of that class, fewer than half their parents had graduated from high school. In one generation, therefore, we have seen a doubling of the high school graduation rate among the families residing in that area.

In our inner city high schools the college admission and entrance rate for our graduates has increased by 100% in five years.

The number and value of scholarships and financial assistance to graduates of those high schools is up by 100% during the same period.

From no libraries in Cleveland elementary schools in 1965, we now have libraries in all 135 of our elementary schools with circulation last year of 3,500,000.

Just a few years ago hundreds of Cleveland children found themselves on waiting lists for kindergarten. Today not only is every child able to enter kindergarten as soon as he is old enough, but for 2,000 four-year-olds in our high poverty areas we offer a year of pre-kindergarten school experience.

In the past five years we have provided new classrooms for more than 25,000 children with several hundred more now under construction.

The Cleveland schools have attacked major pressing problems confronting the people of the city—

40,000 children received breakfast every day last school year

vocational education courses in our high schools increased by more than 300% in five years

in our various special programs we have offered employment to more than 250 previously unemployed residents of the inner city who serve as aides and technicians.

We have provided job training and retraining for several thousand formerly hard-core unemployed citizens.

There is a new involvement of parents and other adults in the education of children. We have more than 4,000 volunteers serving regularly in the classrooms, libraries, and laboratories of Cleveland schools, offering encouragement, advice, guidance, and special technical service to children.

After a quarter century of neglect, we have begun to move forward in the revitalization of urban education. The results of the concentrated extra services are emerging. For example, on scholastic aptitude tests, the scores of Cleveland children are consistent with national norms.

THE TASK AHEAD

Yet, such evidences of progress, encouraging as they are, must not be taken as indications of a completed task but rather as promising trends showing that we can indeed revitalize education for America's neglected urban children.

I feel I must also express a note of caution about premature expectation of results. It should be remembered that the neglect of America's poor children has gone on for much of this century. The abandonment of our cities and their schools is a phenomenon of the past quarter century. To expect these ills to be corrected in the span of three or four years is most unrealistic. To suggest instantaneous solutions is charlatanism.

Recently the schools of this nation have been besieged by people with answers looking for questions. Some of these are well intentioned though uninformed persons, while others—too many—are simply mercenaries. The schools in many places have also been the targets of groups seeking a power base or a platform.

Our attention must not be diverted from the central task of facilitating and reinforcing children's learning. Our resources must not be dissipated on schemes that simply shuffle school arrangements or apply glamorous labels to costly gimmicks.

The key to school success is the learning-teaching interaction that occurs in the classrooms, libraries, laboratories, gymnasiums, and other settings within the individual school.

Our task in the years ahead is to make that interaction a more meaningful one for each child.

We must provide for every American child—from the one most intellectually gifted to the one least intellectually endowed, from the most robust to the one most physically limited, and from the one most socially and economically affluent to the one most seriously disadvantaged.

For all of them, each of them, we must provide the kind of school experience that capitalizes upon his interests and his background.

We must do more than teach the literature, history, and culture of yesterday or the mathematics, science, and economics of tomorrow. School must make emotional as well as intellectual contact with the underprivileged, the undereducated and the undermotivated. Each child must be helped to see that school can be a door to opportunity both for his personal benefit and for his development as a fuller participant and contributor to the general welfare.

THE URBAN CRISIS

This nation is rapidly becoming a collection of cities—massive urban complexes with the potential for liberating or encapsulating the human spirit. America will live or die in her cities.

A highly significant part of what occurs in America's cities will take place in the schools—schools like Cleveland's nearly 200 which enroll almost 150,000 children and youth.

The schools of my city today are making progress, but it is still an uphill climb. The people of Cleveland want good schools. They have demonstrated their desire for good schools as they have voted to double school taxes in recent years.

Our city faces many serious problems. The schools reflect and share these problems. For example, since 1965 the percentage of children in Cleveland schools from poverty homes has doubled. In 23 elementary schools at least half the children come from families who are receiving public assistance. In each of the five inner city high schools at least 40% of the students are members of families receiving public assistance.

While all our costs have spiraled, our local tax base has remained virtually unchanged, as contrasted to the upward trend in suburban areas.

America's most serious domestic challenge is the urban crisis. While we certainly do not claim that schools can solve all the city's problems, we do state with assurance that the problems will worsen and cannot be solved without attention to the schools.

THE FUTURE OF ESEA

The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has given great hope. The help which it has provided has shown that additional resources can have significant impact on the problems schools face. At this crucial time in our history just as results are beginning to reveal progress, it is essential that we take a firm position for continued support of education.

It is important that we not be distracted by the misrepresentation, the misinterpretation, and the non-representation of the role and potential of the public school. The public school in America was counted on to Americanize those coming to this land to seek freedom and opportunity. It responded with success.

The school was called upon to provide the technical training needed by American agriculture in my own school days. The response was more than adequate.

In recent years, the schools have been responsible for the preparation of a generation of men who conquered space.

What we must have now is the kind of resources necessary to support the school program that will provide for today's child of the city the equalizing opportunity that went to the immigrant at the turn of the century.

The city child today deserves compensatory attention to his plight just as the farm youth for whose special educational needs we provided a generation ago.

Now and into the future we need moon shot level attention to the education of all children especially those who must cope with the distressing weight of poverty in our inner cities.

Title I particularly and the other titles of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act require full funding.

The guidelines that cover their implementation must be consistent with the intent of Congress.

Evaluations must be honest and must take into account actual program objectives, not objectives ascribed by the evaluator.

In Cleveland we have developed a comfortable relationship with officials of our state education department and with officials of the U.S. Office of Education.

I am convinced that with the proper coordinated approach, utilizing the resources and strength of the various levels of government, we can raise the educational sights of every American child and help each to become a full and equal partner in the American dream.

THE NATION'S MANPOWER CRISIS

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, recently I arranged a meeting between some of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle and representatives of various health organizations.

At that time we discussed the Nation's manpower crisis and the Federal role in encouraging and fostering the training of doctors, nurses, and other health personnel. These representatives have supplied me with some enlightening material illustrating the nature of the health manpower shortage. I would like to share this informative material with my colleagues and include it in the RECORD at this point:

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN MEDICAL COLLEGES,

Washington, D.C.

ANNOTATIONS ON THE AAMC BUDGET FOR THE NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH (FY 1971)

The NIH fiscal year 1971 Appropriations measure as part of the general Labor-HEW Appropriation, breaks down into three categories: a) *Research Institutes*, which provides operating funds for the Research Institutes and programs of NIH. It is these programs that support the nation's medical research; b) *Health Manpower*, which covers the programs providing funds for the institutional support of the health professions schools and the financial assistance programs for students in those schools; and c) *Construction Assistance*, which is the money for the construction of teaching facilities, research facilities, and libraries for the health professions.

The Administration total FY 1971 budget request for NIH *Research Institutes* is $1,035,548,000. Allowing for the cost of inflation at an annual rate of 6 percent over the 1969 levels of obligation and adding on the additional monies called for by the President for Special Emphasis Programs, the AAMC recommends a figure of $1,190,351,000 for biomedical research programs carried on by the research institutes for fiscal 1971. It is our conclusion that this figure is a bare minimum to pay for the same level of research activity as prevailed in 1969 plus the special programs proposed by the President; in other words, the difference between the President's budget for the Research Institutes and our recommendation is $154,803,000.

For *Health Manpower*, the Administration has requested $242,234,000. This figure means a $3,000,000 cut in loans for medical and dental students and would provide less than 70 percent of the monies authorized for institutional support both in basic improvement and special project grants for our medical, dental, and other health professions schools. This comes at a time when 61 out of our 107 medical schools have had to file applications on the basis of financial distress for special projects grants. The AAMC recommendation for health manpower, which calls for the full statutory authorization in all categories in order to close the health manpower gap and alleviate the acute financial crisis now being faced by the health professions schools, is $402,188,000 or an increase of $159,954,000 over the Administration's budget. In some cases, such as student assistance, our recommendation of the full $35,000,000 authorization for loans will still leave us $8,300,000 shy of the total in pending loan applications. Of the $159,954,000 difference cited above, $79,150,000 represents programs directly supportive of medical and dental education.

Construction Assistance which provides the money essential for the expansion of our education plants in the health professions, is once again an area where the Administration budget is totally inadequate to meet the needs. The Administration's budget of $126,100,000 in construction omits to budget a single penny for health research facilities or medical libraries construction. The AAMC recommendation of $321,000,000 for construction assistance representing an increase of $194,900,000 over the Administration figure, is the minimum amount required to meet immediate needs for construction assistance in this area. There is at present $600,000,000 worth of approved but unfunded applications for the construction of medical and dental teaching facilities. Out of the $194,900,000 increase over the President's construction budget, $147,900,000 repsents programs directly supportive of construction for medical and dental education and research.

In summary, the total AAMC recommendation for NIH programs in fiscal 1971 is $2,071,707,000 or $529,668,000 over the Administration's figure of $1,542,039,000. These increases are distributed as follows:

Program—Increase over the President's budget	
I. Research	$154,803,000
II. Health Manpower	159,954,000
A. Institutional Support	107,034,000
B. Student Assistance	52,920,000
III. Construction Assistance	194,900,000
IV. Others	20,011,000
Total	529,668,000
Subtotal (Medical and Dental only)	381,853,000

The respective totals are:	
AAMC Recommendation	2,071,707,000
Administration Request	1,542,039,000
The respective subtotals (medical and dental only) are:	
AAMC Recommendation	1,676,151,000
Administration Request	1,294,298,000

COMPARISON OF PRESIDENT'S NIH BUDGET AND AAMC RECOMMENDATIONS, FISCAL 1971

[In thousands of dollars]

NIH programs	Final fiscal year 1970 appropriations	President's proposed fiscal year 1971 budget	Difference between columns 1 and 2	AAMC fiscal year 1971 recommendations	Increase (column 4 minus column 2)	Actual fiscal year 1969 spending
	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)
Research institutes:						
Biologics standards	8,441	8,640	+199	9,052	412	8,057
National Cancer Institute	181,332	202,383	+21,051	226,514	24,131	181,660
National Heart and Lung Institute	161,049	171,747	+10,698	193,718	21,971	161,373
National Institute of Dental Research	28,860	34,563	+5,703	39,026	4,463	29,571
National Institute of Arthritis and Metabolic Diseases	132,091	132,152	+61	157,888	25,736	140,520
National Institute of Neurological Diseases and Stroke	96,320	96,972	+652	117,197	20,225	104,305
National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases	98,231	99,219	+988	114,918	15,699	102,276
National Institute of General Medical Sciences	148,309	148,376	+67	179,588	31,212	159,833
National Institute of Child Health and Human Development	74,543	93,303	+18,760	99,173	5,870	71,087
National Eye Institute	23,892	25,686	+1,794	26,306	620	21,632
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences	17,730	19,843	+2,113	22,048	2,205	17,842
General Health Services				931	931	828
John E. Fogarty International Center for Advanced Study in the Health Sciences	2,951	2,664	−287	3,992	1,328	3,553
Total, research	973,749	1,035,548	+61,799	[1] 1,190,351	154,803	1,002,537
Health manpower:						
1. Institutional support:						
(a) Medical, dental, and related	101,400	113,650	+12,250	168,000	54,350	66,000
(b) Nursing	7,000	11,000	+4,000	40,000	29,000	7,000
(c) Public health	9,471	9,071	−400	12,000	2,929	9,471
(d) Allied health professions	10,988	14,245	+3,257	35,000	20,755	10,975
Subtotal	128,859	147,966	+19,107	255,000	107,034	93,446
2. Student assistance:						
(a) Traineeships	20,670	22,270	+1,600	39,000	16,730	20,523
(b) Direct loans:						
(1) Medical, dental, etc	15,000	12,000	−3,000	35,000	23,000	15,000
(2) Nursing	9,610	9,610		21,000	11,390	9,610
Subtotal	24,610	21,610	−3,000	56,000	34,390	24,610
(c) Scholarships:						
(1) Medical, dental, etc	15,541	15,000	−541	16,800	1,800	11,218
(2) Nursing	7,178	17,000	+9,822	17,000		4,783
Subtotal	22,719	32,000	+9,281	33,800	1,800	16,001
Subtotal, student assistance	67,999	75,880	+7,881	128,800	52,920	61,134
3. Manpower requirements, utilization and program management	16,746	18,388	+1,642	18,388		15,470
Total, health manpower	213,604	242,234	+28,630	402,188	159,954	170,050
Health Education Loan Funds: Sales insufficiencies and interest losses	957	3,083	+2,126	3,083		[2] 168
Dental health	10,824	10,954	+130	10,994		8,750
Research resources	62,678	63,701	+1,023	73,044	9,343	65,009
Construction of health, educational, research, and library facilities:						
1. (a) Medical and related	94,500	94,500		180,000	85,500	106,915
(b) Dental	23,600	23,600		45,000	21,400	23,158
2. Nursing and allied health	8,000	8,000		55,000	47,000	21,652
3. Health research facilities				30,000	30,000	20,618
4. Library				11,000	11,000	1,250
Total, construction	126,100	126,100		321,000	194,900	173,593
National Library of Medicine	19,263	19,769	+506	23,764	3,995	20,337
Buildings and facilities	1,615		−1,615	[3] 6,656	[3] 6,656	4,864
Office of the Director	7,930	8,206	+276	8,223	17	7,318
Scientific activities overseas (special foreign currency program)	3,455	32,444	+28,989	32,444		30,000
Grand total, National Institutes of Health	1,420,175	1,542,039	121,864	2,071,707	529,668	1,482,626

[1] For NIH Institutes and Research Divisions, these data are the fiscal year 1969 actual spending increased at an annual rate of 6 percent for fiscal year 1971; in those cases where there are special emphasis programs, the President's increase for fiscal year 1971 over fiscal year 1970 was added to the rate of 6 percent and is reflected in AAMC recommendations for the 6 affected institutes.

[2] $11,429,000 in revolving funds for health professions loans and $7,300,000 in revolving funds for nursing loans also were available.

[3] Already obligated.

Background on Selected Dental Items in Fiscal 1971 HEW Budget

1. Dental school construction

a. *Authorization:* The Health Manpower Act authorizes $225 million for construction of teaching facilities for medical, dental and other related schools of the health professions.

b. *Administration Request:* The Administration is requesting $118.1 million of which $23.6 million (20 per cent) would be allocated to dental schools. This amount, plus a carry-over of $2.5 million would make a total of $26.1 million available for dental schools' construction in 1971.

c. *Need:* As indicated in the attached appendix, $130.3 million will be needed to fund the federal share of dental school applications for construction grants in fiscal 1971 including: $47.1 million for applications that currently are approved but unfunded; $66.2 million expected this month; and $17 million expected by November 1. Thus, there will be a shortage of $104.2 million under the Administration's proposed budget.

The current fiscal year was the first time during the history of this legislation that federal matching money was not available for dental school construction projects that were, in all other aspects, ready to proceed. That is to say, the surveys were done, the plans drawn, the construction bids let, the non-federal money available, the project approved on all levels, but the federal money not forthcoming. On the basis of the Administration request, this situation will become markedly worse in fiscal 1971. It will almost certainly start a chain-reaction whereby construction bids will expire and be revised upwards for resubmission, meaning changes in plans and the necessity of returning to the non-federal source in order to request an increase in its share. This is happening at a time when the pressure for dental care is heavier than any time in history, when the ratio of dentist to population has worsened in the past two decades from 1:1,677 to some 1:2,100 and when the current dentist shortage in the United States stands at about 20,000.

2. Institutional and special project grants to dental schools

a. *Authorization:* $168 million is authorized for fiscal 1971 for medical, dental and other health profession schools.

b. *Administration Request:* The Administration is requesting $113.6 million.

c. *Need:* Two dental schools have been forced to close their doors, permanently, one in Missouri and one in Louisiana, and at least six others may well do so in the near future. The cumulative operating deficit of the nation's 53 existing dental schools is estimated at some $45 million. The basic and special institutional grants are essential for the continuation of many dental schools. Additionally, several dental schools have expanded their facilities and increased their enrollments partially on the basis of the increased institutional support promised in the Health Manpower Act. Under the President's budget, this promise cannot be kept.

3. Loans for dental students

a. *Authorization:* $35 million is authorized for fiscal 1971 for loans to medical, dental and other health professions students.

b. *Administration Request:* The Administration has requested $12 million.

c. *Need:* The dental schools of the nation have requested about $10.6 million in student loan funds for fiscal 1971. Under the Administration's proposed budget only $2.6 million or 25.4 per cent can be allocated. In fiscal 1969, 6,375 dental students received student loans. Under the proposed budget for fiscal 1971 only 2,163 students will be able to receive such assistance.

Dental education is lengthy and expensive. The average yearly cost to each student is estimated at $5,500. This sum is in addition to the costs of the four years of undergraduate education that most dental students have had. Of all health school students receiving loans in fiscal 1969, 68 per cent came from families with an annual income of $9,999 or less including 34 per cent who came from families with incomes of less than $5,000. In the case of scholarships, the comparable figures were 80 per cent and 38 per cent. Without continued loan and scholarship assistance, the doors of the health professions schools will be closed to many of those students. Ongoing efforts of health professions schools to recruit and support students from especially disadvantaged families similarly will be stymied.

The guaranteed loan program of the Office of Education, even if amended as proposed by the Administration, is not designed to meet the needs of health professions students. Its ceiling is unrealistically low and the fluctuations of the money market together with prevailing high interest rates combine to make it an undependable source of support in many areas of the country.

4. DENTAL RESEARCH (NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF DENTAL RESEARCH)

a. *Authorization*: Open (FY 1970 appropriation $28.6 million.)

b. *Administration Request*: $34.56 million.

c. *Need*: On the face of it, the fiscal 1971 request is a substantial increase, some 22 per cent, over the final fiscal 1970 figure of $28 million. Three pieces of background information, however, put this in truer perspective. First, through NIDR's fiscal 1970 budget was $28 million, so too was its fiscal 1967 budget. Since fiscal 1967, the Institute has suffered a number of unfavorable actions, including two successive years of significant reductions. The present Presidential request, then, can be said to average out to an annual increase of barely 5 per cent since fiscal 1967. Second, the non-fatal character of dental disease and its consequent lack of drama restricts the attractiveness to private sources of dental research support; consequently, as much as $8 out of every $10 available for dental research in the United States is said to come from NIDR. Third, most of the increase suggested for fiscal 1971 is earmarked for one aspect of the Institute's program, dental caries research. Nearly all other aspects of the overall program once again suffer reductions. Compared with fiscal 1969, for example, funds available in fiscal 1971 will support 14 per cent fewer research grants, 32 per cent fewer fellowships and 13 per cent fewer training grants. This will invariably mean a slighting of such research as that on periodontal disease, oral cancer and cleft lip and palate. It will mean as well, a reduced flow of qualified teacher-researchers to fill vacancies in existing dental schools or staff new and expanded schools. At least $2.7 million should be added to the Administration request.

5. DIVISION OF DENTAL HEALTH (NIH)

a. *Authorization:* Open.

b. *Administration Request:* $10.9 million.

c. *Need:* There are few HEW agencies, if any, charged with so wide a range of duties as is the Division. Because it is the sole federal dental agency specifically concerned with dental public health, it has current responsibilities ranging from applied research, expanded use of dental auxiliary personnel and liaison with OEO to exploration of continuing education mechanisms, experimental programs on rural dental care and methods of dental prepayment.

From a fiscal point of view, the Division has been on dead center for years. In fiscal 1967, its budget was $9.2 million. The budget being asked for fiscal 1971 will give it barely ten per cent more money than it had four years ago. It is not possible for the Division to adequately discharge its wide range of duties under such unreasonably stringent restraint. A budget of $13 million for fiscal 1971 is suggested.

6. PILOT DENTAL CARE PROJECTS FOR NEEDY CHILDREN (SECTION 510, TITLE V, SOCIAL SECURITY ACT)

a. *Authorization:* Open.

b. *Administration Request:* None.

c. *Need:* Dental disease being endemic, the dental profession has long urged a preventive program for children as being the soundest and most economical approach to ultimate control of dental disease. Section 510 of Title V was enacted into law in late 1967 as a first step toward shifting emphasis of governmental programs in this direction. In the process of giving badly needed care to poor children, the Section authorizes pilot projects that would experiment with various ways of doing this, in differing urban and rural settings, in order to identify those delivery and administrative methods that hold most promise. The projects have never begun. While they have been ignored, dental care spending under Medicaid has mounted to an annual level above $200 million. Much of this money goes to repair damage that would have never occurred had there been a sound children's program established.

When the Section was first being considered, it was estimated that $5 million would be needed in the first year. Today, more than three years later, that figure is too low and $7 million would be more realistic. The authority for the program will expire in 1972.

Dental school construction applications
(fiscal year 1971)
[Approved but unfunded]

Institution	
University of Minnesota (Minneapolis) (Donald Fraser)	$16,900,000
New York University (All NYC Congressmen)	16,200,000
State U. of N.Y. (Stony Brook) (Otis Pike)	4,200,000
Meharry, Phase I, (Nashville) (Richard Fulton)	900,000
Creighton (Omaha) (Glenn Cunningham)	6,500,000
Iowa (Iowa City) (Fred Schwengel)	400,000
New Jersey (Jersey City) (Cornelius Gallagher)	2,000,000
Total	47,100,000
To be submitted in July	
Colorado (Denver) (Byron Rogers)	10,200,000
Oklahoma (Oklahoma City) (John Jarman)	12,000,000
Texas (San Antonio) (Clark Fisher) (Henry Gonzalez)	16,000,000
Texas (Houston) (Robert Casey)	1,000,000
Illinois (Edwardsville) (Melvin Price)	7,000,000
California (San Francisco) (Phillip Burton)	20,000,000
Total	66,200,000
To Be Submitted in November	
Meharry, Phase II, (Nashville) Richard Fulton)	2,000,000
New York (Buffalo) (Richard McCarthy)	15,000,000
Total	17,000,000
Grand total	13,300,000

HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENT LOAN PROGRAM

Type of school	Participating schools			Enrollment of participating schools			Number of students assisted			Percent of students assisted		
	1969	1970	1971	1969	1970	[1] 1971	1969	[1] 1970	[1] 1971	1969	[1] 1970	[1] 1971
Medical	98	100	102	35,117	36,814	38,240	12,808	6,980	5,191	36	19	14
Dental	50	52	52	14,833	15,708	15,980	6,375	2,910	2,163	43	19	14
Osteopathy	5	6	6	1,876	1,959	2,025	1,050	425	287	56	22	14
Optometry	10	11	11	2,243	2,536	2,600	853	480	359	38	19	14
Pharmacy	51	53	60	10,907	13,021	14,700	2,541	2,325	1,789	23	18	12
Podiatry	3	3	4	643	722	960	303	150	113	47	21	12
Veterinarian medicine	14	18	18	3,774	4,895	5,015	1,075	785	600	28	16	12
Total	231	243	253	69,393	75,655	79,520	25,005	14,055	10,502	36	19	13

Type of school	Amount needed (actually requested)			Amounts allocated		
	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971 [1]	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970	Fiscal year 1971 [2]
Medicine	$19,030,340	$22,113,875	$23,448,899	$14,240,726	$8,442,212	$6,339,000
Dental	9,985,220	10,850,955	10,604,750	6,777,734	3,584,393	2,689,000
Osteopathy	2,111,095	2,260,479	1,823,954	892,880	452,650	339,000
Optometry	1,364,675	1,573,110	1,827,756	883,332	551,392	416,000
Pharmacy	2,054,645	2,356,458	3,221,560	2,019,517	1,781,149	1,380,000
Podiatry	461,711	480,274	659,774	306,034	166,824	126,000
Veterinarian medicine	1,581,655	1,703,333	1,795,110	1,308,777	921,380	711,000
Total	36,589,341	41,338,486	43,381,803	26,429,000	15,900,000	12,000,000
Appropriation				(15,000,000)	(15,000,000)	(12,000,000)
Revolving fund				(11,429,000)	(900,000)	0
Fiscal 1971 authorization						35,000,000

[1] Estimated.
[2] President's budget.

Source: American Dental Association, Washington office.

FACT SHEET

(By Association of Schools of Allied Health Professions)

Three years ago there were thirteen colleges and universities which had made a commitment to allied health education by establishing schools, colleges and divisions. As a result of the Allied Health Professions Personnel Training Act of 1966, there are now 70 such administrative structures, many of which have not been able to develop anticipated programs because the Act has not provided adequate funding. Under the present program, only 21 (9 baccalaureate and 12 associate degree programs) out of approximately one hundred current personnel) are funded at the present time. Out of the 302 institutions which are receiving training grants funds, only six have received any construction funds, of which only two of these grants are of a significant amount to make an impact on the increase of student enrollment in the program. Only one is under construction.

Although the authorizations increased slightly each year since the beginning of the Act, the gap between the authorizations and appropriations has also increased. On a percentage basis the basic improvement funding has decreased from 96% of the statutory formulas in fiscal year 1968, to 65% in the fiscal year 1970. For example, at the State University of New York at Buffalo, the decrease from 1967–68 to 1970–71 was from $92,965 to $81,066. This percentage decrease existed in all of the 302 programs funded. Commitments to staff and programming is impossible with this procedure of funding.

The present appropriation for Educational Improvement Grants is $9,750,000 against an authorization of $20,000,000. This supports 23,000 students. If the full amount of the authorizations were available, the Department would have two options: (a) follow present law and regulation of granting the money by present formula which would spread the support very thin, and result in very few additional students; or (b) use the increase over the present level of support to increase substantially the number of students enrolled by making grants to programs that have *demonstrated* a capacity to increase student enrollment, and are willing to make a commitment to increase present enrollment at least 10%. The impact of the Act, with all its limitations is very impressive—students enrolled increased from 12,000 in 1967 to 23,000 last year.

Four hundred eight students are in leadership training for allied health personnel. These are for teachers, chairman of departments, deans, and directors of programs in junior colleges, colleges, and universities. The authorization was for five million dollars but the appropriation was for only one and one half million. The strength of training programs will depend upon such leadership personnel. With the full appropriation of five million dollars we could have 1,300 students preparing for such key positions.

Developmental grants are for the purpose of developing curricula for training new types of allied health personnel. Twenty-six programs were funded this past year and fifteen were approved but not funded. Many did not submit requests because of the limited funds available. New allied health personnel are essential to the delivery of health care.

The Public Health Service projects the following deficits in allied health manpower personnel: from 227,000 in 1967 to 343,000 in 1975. The work force in allied health has almost tripled since 1950. Though manpower has been attracted to these fields, there has been lacking a firm funding base for quality training programs.

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR NURSING EDUCATION, JULY 8, 1970

I am Evelyn Cohelan, R.N., Ed.D., first vice-president of the American Nurses' Association which is the organization of 200,000 registered nurses in 50 states, the District of Columbia, Guam, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

Our organization is concerned with and committed to efforts to improve the health, education and welfare of all our citizens. The gains made in the programs which deal intimately with human welfare must be safeguarded with adequate appropriations.

The Association is in complete support of available. New allied health personnel are full-funding for all of the schools preparing health manpower. Our special concern is with appropriations for Title II, Nurse Training, Health Manpower Act of 1968. Those of us preparing nurse practitioners, teachers, and other leadership personnel for the field are especially concerned about the budget funding requests for FY '71. We believe there are sufficient grounds to support full-funding of the programs for nursing education. When Nurse Training became Title II of the Health Manpower Act, P.L. 90–490, two significant changes in the provisions have created unusual problems in addition to the inadequate appropriations for all sections.

1. Formula grants for hospital schools of nursing were deleted and institutional grants for all schools was written into Section 805. Special project grants became Section 806.

2. Authorization for appropriations for these two sections is provided in Section 808, with the provision that $15 million of the ceiling must be spent for special projects grants. This language not only cuts out the funds that hospital schools could apply for, but because of the amount of the funds required for FY '70–'71, no institutional grants are available to any school.

The other problems are similar to those experienced by each of the schools of the health professions, namely inadequate financial support to meet needs. These are:

CONSTRUCTION GRANTS

The Administration request for FY '71 is $8 million. At present there are 31 approved applications for a total of $24,712,677. In addition, there are many letters of intent. These are usually based on state or regional studies of nursing needs and resources.

INSTITUTIONAL GRANTS

Tuition and fees do not cover the costs of educating a student. According to a sampling of schools of all three types, costs over tuition, average $1,000 to $3,000. No money has been available because of the language of the law and the inadequate appropriations. We recommend the full $40 million so that both Sections 805 and 806 can be funded.

SCHOLARSHIPS AND LOANS

At least 40% of the total student enrollment requires financial help in order to attend school. Approximately 15% of the total nursing enrollments (over 163,000 students) will receive student assistance through Federally supported scholarships and/or loans in FY 1971.

A precise dollar amount is not specifically authorized in the legislation for the *nursing scholarship* program. The legislation does contain a formula for the allocation of funds based on enrollments. The application of this legislative formula results in a quasi-authorization of $32 million in 1970 and $33 million in 1971. The amount requested by the schools for scholarship assistance in FY '71 was approximately $27,000,000. The President's budget for 1971 requested $17,000,000. Initial awards from fiscal 1971 funds were limited to the 1970 appropriation level of $7,178,000. Any amounts appropriated by the Congress above the $7.2 million will be allotted to the schools at the earliest possible time.

The FY '71 authorization for *nursing student loans* is $21,000,000. The President's budget requested $9,610,000. The amount requested by schools was approximately $21,110,000. Consequently, the schools' requests had to be reduced to fit within the available funds.

TRAINEESHIPS

In order to increase the supply of nurse power it is essential that the supply of faculty, supervisors, administrators and clinical specialists be increased. In 1968 there were 16,422 faculty positions filled. With the increase in baccalaureate and community college programs, and the enrollment potential for these schools, it is estimated that by 1975 there will be a need for 45,000 faculty positions.

We recommend that the Traineeship Program be funded to the full amount of $19 million.

RESEARCH GRANTS AND RESEARCH TRAINING

Appropriations for training grants for nurses in research has remained at the same level, $700,000, for several years. This results in a decrease in the number of grants each year, since a grant must be extended to a grantee until their research is completed, which may be several years. Students must be supported for the entire educational program. If the funds are all committed, no new grants can be made for training in research.

Funds for nursing research grants have been reduced by $170,000, a seemingly small sum in relation to the large sums expended by our federal government, but it could mean for this program, a lack of funding for one or more critically needed research projects. Nursing is desperately in need of trained researchers and for funds for research to pursue the quest for knowledge in the science of nursing.

We recommend funding for research grants at the FY '70 level, which is $2,625,000; and an increase of $500,000 for Special Fellowships in Nurse Research.

To sum up, the authorized ceilings for each of the Sections of Title II would provide some guarantee that the need for increasing the nurse supply would be stimulated.

FEDERAL FUNDS FOR NURSING EDUCATION—TITLE II, PUBLIC LAW 90-490, FISCAL YEAR 1971

	Authorization	Administration request	Need
(1) Construction grants to schools of nursing	$35,000,000	$8,000,000	$27,712,677
(2) Scholarships	(1)	17,000,000	27,000,000
(3) Loans	21,000,000	9,610,000	21,110,000
(4) Special project grants for improvement in nurse training	40,000,000	11,000,000	40,000,000
(5) Institutional grants		(2)	
(6) Traineeships for professional nurses	$19,000,000	$10,470,000	$19,000,000
(7) Special fellowships in nurse research	(1)	650,000	
(8) Research training	(1)	700,000	1,200,000
(9) Research grants	(1)	2,455,000	

[1] Not available. [2] None.

COUNCIL OF URBAN HEALTH PROVIDERS

The large public hospitals of the country are in trouble. And a large part of this trouble is health manpower. One only has to look at such centers as Boston City Hospital, D.C. General, Cook County General or Los Angeles County to realize the critical importance of health manpower required to provide high quality medical care in sufficient quantity to meet the needs of our largest cities. There is not a major municipal hospital system in the county which can meet the service demands presently placed upon it. Part of the problem is the obsolete, inefficient facility; part is the financial limitations under which tax-supported institutions have to operate; and part—resulting from inadequate facilities and financial limitations—is the lack of sufficient manpower to operate good medical care programs.

Yet these large municipal hospitals are a major part of the system by which we produce additional health manpower—they provide residencies, internships, nurse training and allied professional training. If they fail, then a basic health manpower resource fails. The Los Angeles County system alone has within it 4200 people in training over any given year—1200 residents, internes and medical students, 2400 nursing trainees including 600 in the hospital school of nursing, 300 physical and occupational therapy students, 125 radiology and medical technician trainees, and 200 other trainees in allied areas such as speech pathology, psychiatric social work, etc.

Clearly, the training responsibilities of a large municipal hospital system are crucial to the expansion of the health manpower supply, and clearly also, the additional costs of operating extensive training programs cannot be borne by the patient population of these hospitals, most of whom are unable to pay even that part of the hospital bill directly chargeable to services.

Adequate fundings of health manpower programs are essential to the survival of urban public hospitals which today provide about 20 percent of all medical care and are the principal health care providers in the inner cities.

FACT SHEET: DIRECT LOANS FOR HEALTH PROFESSIONS STUDENTS

Background: The U.S. is faced with a critical shortage of professional health manpower. More than 50,000 additional physicians are needed now, and comparable shortages exist in the other health professions. The demand for health professionals is increasing faster than the supply, a situation contributed to by the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

To meet this need, a program of direct loans to students of the health professions was established by Congress, taking effect in 1965. Grants are made to the schools of the health professions who then loan the money to the students most in need. Students of the following professions are eligible: medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, optometry, podiatry, pharmacy, and veterinary medicine. A similar program exists for nursing students.

Problem: Despite the students' demonstrated need for and dependence on these loan funds, the Administration is requesting only $12,000,000 in FY 1971 for students of medicine, dentistry, etc., and only $9,610,000 for nursing students. These figures are far below the amounts authorized by Congress under the Health Manpower Act of 1968, as can be seen by the following table:

	Fiscal year 1971 authorization	Fiscal year 1971 administration budget
Loan funds for students of medicine, dentistry, etc.	$35,000,000	$12,000,000
Loan funds for students of nursing	21,000,000	9,610,000

There is absolutely no question as to the need for these loan funds. The table below compares the amount of funds requested by the health professions schools with the amount proposed to be spent by the Administration:

	Fiscal year 1971 funds requested by schools	Fiscal year 1971 administration budget
Loan funds for students of medicine, dentistry, etc.	$43,381,803	$12,000,000
Loan funds for students of nursing	27,900,929	9,610,000

Proposed Amendment: It is that these two programs be funded to the full authorization amounts: $35,000,000 and $21,000,000. This amendment would result in an increase of $23,000,000 for students of medicine, dentistry, etc., and an increase of $11,390,000 for students of nursing, for a total increase of $34,390,000.

NUMBER OF STUDENTS ASSISTED

	Fiscal year—						
	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Medical	7,186	9,475	11,303	12,484	12,808	6,980	5,191
Dental	3,367	4,472	5,530	5,944	6,375	2,910	2,163
Osteopathy	614	726	937	977	1,050	425	287
Optometry	387	564	656	745	853	480	359
Pharmacy			1,584	2,105	2,541	2,325	1,789
Podiatry			158	211	303	150	113
Veterinary medicine				797	1,075	785	600
Total	11,554	15,237	20,168	23,263	25,005	14,055	10,502

PERCENT OF STUDENTS ASSISTED

	Fiscal year—						
	1965	1966	1967	1968	1969	1970	1971
Medical	23	30	34	37	36	19	14
Dental	26	33	40	42	43	19	14
Osteopathy	37	42	53	54	56	22	14
Optometry	27	38	33	37	38	19	14
Pharmacy			19	21	23	18	12
Podiatry			47	50	47	21	12
Veterinary medicine				31	28	16	12
Total	24	31	34	36	36	19	13

DHEW HEALTH MANPOWER PROGRAM FUNDING, FISCAL YEARS 1969–71, INCLUSIVE

	Fiscal year 1969		Fiscal year 1970		Fiscal year 1971		
	Authorized	Appropriated	Authorized	Appropriated	Authorized	Budget request	Difference
Institutional support:							
Medical, dental, related	$80,000,000	$66,000,000	$117,000,000	$105,000,000	$168,000,000	$113,650,000	$54,350,000
Nursing	14,000,000	7,000,000	35,000,000	8,400,000	40,000,000	11,000,000	29,000,000
Public Health	15,000,000	9,471,000	15,500,000	10,071,000	23,000,000	9,071,000	13,929,000
Allied health	20,000,000	10,975,000	24,500,000	11,587,000	(1)	14,245,000	(1)
Student assistance:							
Traineeships	25,500,000	20,670,000	30,000,000	20,670,000	(1)	22,270,000	(1)
Direct loans:							
Medical, dental, related	26,500,000	15,000,000	35,000,000	23,781,000	35,000,000	12,000,000	23,000,000
Nursing	30,900,000	9,610,000	20,000,000	16,360,000	21,000,000	9,610,000	11,390,000
Scholarships:							
Medical, dental, related	(2)	11,219,000	(2)	15,541,000	(2)	15,000,000	
Nursing	(2)	6,500,000	(2)	7,178,000	(2)	17,000,000	
Manpower requirements, utilization, and program management	(2)	15,641,000	(2)	16,771,000	(2)	18,388,000	
Health education loan fund (interest)	(2)	200,000	(2)	957,000	(2)	3,083,000	
Dental health	(2)	10,185,000	(2)	11,722,000	(2)	10,954,000	
Construction:							
Medical, dental, related	160,000,000	75,000,000	170,000,000	118,100,000	225,000,000	118,100,000	106,900,000
Nursing	25,000,000	8,000,000	25,000,000	8,000,000	35,000,000	8,000,000	27,000,000
Allied health	13,500,000	1,800,000	10,000,000		(1)		
Medical libraries	10,000,000		10,000,000		11,000,000		11,000,000
Health research facilities	93,300,000	8,400,000	20,000,000		30,000,000		30,000,000
Total							206,569,000

[1] Legislation pending.
[2] Open.

OUR ELECTRIC POWER CRISIS

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply concerned about the electric power crisis our country faces. Our Nation is thereatened by the increasing possibility of brownouts and blackouts, by soaring electrical rates—especially in the New England region—and by the pollution caused by present power facilities. It is imperative that Congress respond to this potentially catastrophic dilemma.

In my opinion the Dickey-Lincoln project and other hydroelectric projects are a viable solution to the power problem. The recent defeat in the House of appropriations for further preconstruction planning of this project was indeed disheartening. In the course of the debate opponents suggested nuclear power as a more economical and quicker solution to the power shortage. Although I share the hope that nuclear power may some day help alleviate the shortage, at the present time such a source of power is fraught with difficulties. For example, I have noticed a number of serious questions raised concerning the safety of the nuclear power industry; the problems associated with guidelines limiting the radiation exposure to man and regulating the radioactive release from nuclear power installations seem to be numerous.

Generally speaking, the problem relates to the release of radionuclides by power reactors and their eventual accumulation in biological organisms that form man's food base. A study conducted by Dr. Arthur R. Tamplin of the University of California, demonstrates the absolute and essential need for the nuclear power industry to be designed and operated so as to approach the absolute containment of the radioactivity within the reactors and fuel reprocessing facilities.

A section of Dr. Tamplin's study, which I am submitting for the RECORD, relates some startling aspects about primary radiation exposure guidelines. I hope my colleagues will find this inclusion resourceful and will induce them to vote for the Dickey-Lincoln project in the near future when it comes back to the House after conference with the other body. Also, I urge support of all other approved hydroelectric projects. They provide a nonpolluting source of needed power.

The study follows:

THE "PRIMARY" RADIATION EXPOSURE GUIDELINES

I would now like to discuss the most critical factor related to the day to day operations of the nuclear power industry. This is the primary standard that should be applied to all aspects of the atomic energy industry. This primary standard is the dosage which should be allowed to be given to the average individual in the population as a result of the operation of this industry. Once we have arrived at an acceptable dosage to the population-at-large, or to the most critical individual within the population, we can then proceed from this number and calculate backwards to determine the amount of radioactivity that can be released by the reactors into the environment without exceeding this primary dosage limitation. The present guidelines which are set forth by the Federal Radiation Council and adopted by the Atomic Energy Commission in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations are that the average dosage deliverable to the population-at-large is 170 millirem per year. The other standard is that the limiting dosage deliverable to an individual is 500 millirem per year. It is also stated in the Federal Radiation Council Guidelines that the dosage should be kept as far below this limit as is practicable. It is important to recognize that the nuclear power industry acting in what I would say is a responsible manner, built extra safety into the reactors. Their design objectives have been to limit the exposure of the public to something less than 10 millirem per year. That is, less than 0.1 of the allowable guideline.

But the point is that there is no solid basis for believing that the 170 millirem per year guideline is safe. In fact, the scientific evidence, devoid of opinion, suggests that, if the United States population were exposed to this dose rate, the result could be some 17,000 additional cancer deaths each year. This is more deaths each year than resulted from the worst year of the Vietnam war. The 17,000 deaths are estimated even without any consideration of genetic effects. Genetic effects would be expected to be even worse than this. The power industry must realize that their design objectives do not necessarily contain a margin of safety. In fact, it is essential that the dosage to the public-at-large be kept at or below their design objectives.

COMPUTERIZED BILLING: A THREAT TO THE DOMESTIC TRANQUILLITY

HON. CORNELIUS E. GALLAGHER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to comment upon recent developments related to my two bills H.R. 16266 and 16267. When I introduced those bills on March 3, 1970, I said:

To put it bluntly, private industry now seems to treat many of its customers the way militants claim the Establishment treats our citizens . . . It seems from the thousands of complaints that have reached public attention, that some completely automated firms are deliberately trying to destroy the future of the computer.

On May 31, the Parade supplement to Sunday newspapers around the country, published an article entitled, "The Revolt Against Computerized Billing," which commented favorably on my two bills. Since that article, my office has been literally deluged with letters pointing out how fundamentally correct were my statements of March 3. Just this morning, a Navy commander stationed at the Pentagon called to say that he had been involved in a running battle with a credit card firm and that in 6 months he had yet to be able to reach a responsible human being in the organization.

The worst example is a letter from an automated bill collecting service. I reproduce part of it below:

DEAR SIR/MADAM: Since our first reminder has not produced a response from you, we must conclude that you are not concerned with the importance of computerized credit information.

The information we have gathered will now be available on a nationwide basis to all banks, retail and commercial establishments and credit card organizations. This [sic] data may also include other debts uncovered by our computers.

Mr. Speaker, "other debts uncovered by our computers" may mean either debts which are not on file with this firm or, worse yet, may mean that its computer may unearth new debts for this hapless consumer. The man who sent me this firm's incredibly arrogant demand states that he tried for months to convince someone that he had paid the debt, and he sent them canceled checks to prove it. This man now knows all too well the importance of computerized credit information.

My two bills, which I will reproduce at the end of my remarks today, are an attempt to transfer the responsibility from the consumer to the firm which runs the computers. But perhaps most important to America's future, they will relieve the computer itself of the dread responsibility for indifference which has been placed upon it by these large firms. America desperately needs the computer to grapple with our complexities, and certainly one of the basic reasons behind my bills is to see that it is not fatally tarnished by current practices.

Of more immediate importance, however, is to protect the credit ratings of people whose letters are ignored and to lessen some of the real human misery these billing practices are causing. In order to demonstrate the depth of that outrage I will now quote from several of the letters I have received.

A major in the U.S. Air Force writes:

I wonder if these people really exist. Or are they just names placed in a computer to create an impression.

Incidentally, Mr. Speaker, this Air Force major is perfectly correct. Many such large firms sign letters with phony names, which are merely computer codes. Should my investigation of this matter reach the stage of holding public hearings with my House Government Operations Committee Privacy Subcommittee, I intend to subpena these fictitious individuals. The involved firms will probably have to deliver their computers to the subcommittee hearing room.

A field representative for a union writes:

I have sent three (3) letters to Diner's Club asking that this matter be corrected. As yet I've received no satisfaction, in fact they have now added late charges, to this improper charge.

A housewife from Wichita, Kans., writes:

The present intolerable situation either will alienate customers completely or unfairly destroy many innocent people's credit. Thank you for your efforts toward trying to convert this Frankenstein into the useful and convenient aid it should be.

A professor from New Jersey writes:

It finally dawned on me that there must be a perpetual office party going on at Diners Club, and that the machine is allowed to grind away to pay these people's salaries.

A Michigan machinist sent me a copy of a letter he had written to a credit card firm's collection manager:

It pleases me to see that you are concerned at my bill. It would please me even further if someone in your Collection Department would be concerned about my three previous letters.

A registered nurse from Texas writes:

If enough Americans get mad enough to go "on the warpath" it might not be good for business, credit industry or whatever. Personally we have had several experiences in recent years with the computer (rather, the dumbbells who run the dumb adding machines.)

An AID employee now in Vietnam writes:

There is no excuse for such negligence, especially when that negligence can so easily result in permanent harm to one's all-important credit rating. At this point, I certainly do not regard my American Express account as a convenience; rather, it is a menace as long as it is so sloppily administered.

A career Government employee who is concerned about the continuation of his top-secret security clearance, writes:

This irresponsible action has caused me and my family intense mental anguish and resulted in physical effects on my wife who is very sensitive to this kind of accusation.

Finally, a retired Army major in Arkansas writes:

Over the years I have maintained an excellent credit rating, and it isn't always easy nor without sacrifice, but this type of thing can undo everything I have managed to attain.

Mr. Speaker, I could continue at a length only slightly less than that of the collected works of Dickens. I would hope that the fact of my two bills, and those that will be introduced by others, would compel these firms to speed internal reforms. I would hope that these human cries of rage would convince the House Banking and Currency Committee to include these two bills as amendments to the credit bureau bill now under consideration, as I recommended when I testified on March 17, 1970. I would hope that letters on White House stationery from Mrs. Knauer, the President's Special Adviser on Consumer Affairs, could solve individual problems.

Frankly, however, I suspect that the only thing that will work to alleviate this source of intense aggravation for our citizens and preserve the future of the computer, will be for more Members to voice their concern and that of their constituents. I appeal today to my colleagues to join me.

Mr. Speaker, I insert at this point in the RECORD, the article in Parade and the text of H.R. 16266 and H.R. 16267. I would only add that every individual who has felt the full fury of indifferent computerized billing now has a personal answer to that often asked question: "If I have nothing to hide, why should I be concerned about privacy?"

The articles and bills follow:

[From Parade magazine, May 31, 1970]

THE REVOLT AGAINST COMPUTERIZED BILLING

(By James D. Snyder & Robert F. Hickox)

A Chicago public relations man swears it actually happened. A major credit card company sent him a computerized bill stating: Monthly charges . . . $0.00.

Naturally, he tossed it in the wastebasket. A month later another bill arrived, stating: Balance from previous month . . . $0.00. Please pay immediately to avoid penalty charges. Again, he discarded the notice as some weird mistake.

The third month rolled around and—you guessed it. Account in arrears. Your credit card revoked. Return full payment and credit card immediately or we will be forced to initiate legal action.

The man was so angry he ripped up *all* of his credit cards on the spot. But his problems probably aren't finished. If he has a phone, home mortgage, insurance policy, department store account, or similar necessities of "modern living," chances are he'll be subject to the impersonal, erratic whims of busy computers cranking out billions of billing statements.

Supposedly, creditors turned to computerized billing to speed efficiency and rescue clerks from tedium. But perhaps top management has handed too much responsibility to computer technicians. Says Robert Townsend in his best seller, *Up the Organization:* "They're building a mystique, a priesthood, their own mumbo-jumbo ritual to keep you from knowing what they—and you—are doing."

Nothing more eloquently illustrates Townsend's point than a statement received by Cleveland residents from a large department store. "If your bill is in error," it said tersely, "blame the computer."

Blame the computer? This company's management has apparently forgotten that computers are just big, dumb adding machines programmed by *people*. And in such companies, it invariably follows that neither people nor computers are prepared to cope with the slightest deviation from a programmed routine transaction. A Montgomery County, Md., career woman learned this when she tried to cancel her American Express credit card account. Her monthly statement had listed regular charges plus $15 as an annual membership renewal fee. Since she already had enough free bank and oil company credit cards, she deducted the $15, sent a check for the remainder, and enclosed a letter requesting that her account be dropped.

BILL UPON BILL

But the computer knew only that $15 had gone unpaid. Bill upon bill followed, until compounded penalty charges brought it to more than $25. The woman had to spend time and money on letters and long-distance phone calls until the charges were finally dropped.

More often, however, computers go awry for the following reasons:

Mail lag.—The average credit statement allows you a month to pay before you get socked with penalty charges. This usually means a month from the computer's processing time—not when the bill is mailed or received by the customer. With the worsening crisis in mail delivery, many computers are churning out new bills with late charges before the customer has a chance to pay his old one.

William Hendrickson, for example, lives in Yellowstone National Park. Last Dec. 23 the postman delivered a bill from a store listing $474 in previous purchases and stating that he had 25 days to pay before penalty fees began. The outer envelope, sent by bulk mail, bore no postmark. The computer statement inside was dated Dec. 12, meaning a return check was expected by Jan. 6.

Mr. Hendrickson had one complication. The purchases were described in abbreviated computer symbols. One $10 charge made no sense at all. So he sent a check for $464, enclosing a letter asking for an explanation of the remaining $10 charge.

The check was canceled Jan. 5—a day before the deadline. But no one told the computer. The next month's bill included "finance charges" of $7.10—not on the questioned $10, but on the entire $474.

Changes of address.—If you're moving and send a change of address postcard to your friendly credit card company, it should be expected to notify its computer. Right? Don't bet on it. Army Lt. Col. W. C. Bouzard found otherwise after writing the company (twice, just to make sure) that he was being transferred to the Canal Zone.

That was last May. "On Aug. 15," he says, "I received a bill which had apparently been sent to my old address in the States and forwarded by steamship to Panama. I paid the bill the same day, then began to receive a strange series of communications. The first was a receipt for my payment. Then came a computer letter canceling my account for 'delinquency.' Next came a bill for a new credit card—and all still bearing my old address!"

Name mix-ups. If your name is John Smith, you're gambling with your sanity when you apply for credit. Even "James Davenport" is too common a name for an aerospace executive in McLean, Va. He's dunned repeatedly by a department store for $100 owed by some phantom namesake.

Retail mistakes. Once the computer gobbles up data, it's locked there forever—right or wrong. Last May, Richard Boeth, a *Newsweek* writer, used his Diners' Club card for a plane ticket to London, stipulating that charges be spread over monthly installments. Without fail his next Diners' bill demanded the entire $300 fare all at once.

KEPT ON PAYING

"I began writing letters to find out why," says Boeth. "No answers came. But every time a dunning notice arrived, I wrote to the name signed at the bottom. Finally I got a form letter signed "M. Sandone" explaining that my inquiry was being investigated. All this time I was paying my regular Diners' charges on schedule, plus $25 a month on the plane ticket.

"I never heard from M. Sandone again. Instead, in late January I got a letter from a lawyer. It threatened that 'legal proceedings will be instituted immediately' unless I paid the full balance by return mail.

"I called the lawyer and asked if he knew of my correspondence with M. Sandone. No, he said. The threatening letters go out automatically when he gets a case, and he never investigates reasons for late payment. But he did promise to look into my situation.

"In late February a telegram arrived from the lawyer threatening legal action. All that mattered, he said, was that Diners' had *recorded* the ticket as calling for immediate payment. Its only concern now was getting its money. Since I had hit an obvious dead end, I sent a check the same day for the full balance.

"At this point I had only one request," Mr. Boeth says. "I called the lawyer and asked if Diners' would notify the local credit bureau that the late payment was not my fault. This time the lawyer got nasty. There would be no such explanation at all, he said. The credit bureau would be told that the bill had been 'cleared up' eight months late and could draw its own conclusions."

For argument's sake, suppose that just *maybe* Mr. Boeth didn't make it clear he wanted monthly installments. Customers, after all, make mistakes, too. But right or wrong, they all find it outrageously inexcusable when their letters of inquiry go unanswered. Nor are they pacified by replies like the one a Parade writer got from American Express after he'd written about a billing error. Your communication acknowledged, said the computer message. Please pay disputed amount.

Once a customer is lucky enough to contact a real human, the experience can be as frustrating as arguing with a computer. Nobody seems to be in charge. In July, 1968, a public official in Jersey City, N.J., had his pocket picked—including his Diners' card. He notified Diners' at once, and it promised

retailers had received notice to stop honoring the stolen card.

CREDIT IN DANGER

But soon Diners' began sending the official bills—obviously run up on a forged signature. "Diners' told me to disregard the charges," he recalls. "Despite this, the bills continued. Finally, I was notified that my card would be discontinued and my credit impaired."

Due to his "public visibility" and fears that credit troubles could be "devastating" to his career, the official sent Diners' a check for $500 with instructions that it be placed on deposit as good faith until the snafu is settled. In his words: "They credited this $500 to the original account and opened another account in my name." Meanwhile, the unauthorized charges kept rolling in against the original account—and eroding his $500.

"Each time a Diners' representative answers one of my protests, it's a different person," he adds ruefully. "Despite their solemn promises that I'll be sent an itemized statement and that the account will be adjusted with no liability on my part, they continue to send me bills and threatening letters."

Is there a sure way to get action from the companies? Unfortunately, there are no laws which compel a company to answer its mail, nor any legal time limit by which a complaint must be resolved. As a result, some irate consumers have resorted to "guerrilla warfare." "When I can't get action through a letter, I mutilate the computer billing card and send it back," says a Washington, D.C., man who, ironically, sells computers. "When the computer kicks it out as a reject, some human has to write to me and ask why I committed such a dastardly deed. Then I pounce on him with my problem."

The range of more conventional weapons is rather limited. Here, however, are at least three steps everyone should take:

1. Use Registered mail. The only way to be sure you've reached the "M. Jones" who signed that form letter is to send him back a registered letter. For $1.15 plus postage, the Post Office will send you a receipt showing who signed for your letter—and when.

2. Notify consumer agencies. If you've exhausted your patience trying to reach a computer biller, try sending copies of your correspondence (plus a one-page summary of what happened) to your local or state consumer protection agency—or to the President's Committee on Consumer Interests in Washington, D.C. The latter, for example, regularly forwards letters directly to the chief executives of the companies involved. Inquiries on White House stationery invariably trigger prompt responses to the aggrieved consumer—often from the company president.

3. Write your Congressman. Chances are he can't solve your immediate problem. Your letter, however, will add to the swell of mail from the grassroots demanding that something be done to make computerized billing more responsive and responsible.

Citizens' complaints are already having an effect. A few weeks ago the Senate passed a bill to ban the mailing of unsolicited credit cards and limit the owner's liability for unauthorized use to $50. In addition, both houses of Congress appear ready to enact long-pending legislation to protect the public against erroneous or malicious data reported by credit rating bureaus.

A HEART TRANSPLANT?

While both of the above measures will help, they admittedly don't strike the heart of computer billing problems—the failure of companies to communicate with customers. Congressman Cornelius Gallagher, however, thinks he has the solution. Throughout his six terms the New Jersey Democrat has waged a crusade to, in his words, "transplant a human heart and a human brain into computer applications."

His weapons are two bills. One states that any creditor who reports an account to a credit bureau as delinquent *when the amount due is under protest* can be fined $5,000 and jailed for a year. The second bill provides that once a creditor receives a written complaint, he has just 60 days to correct the error or furnish a detailed account of why the customer is wrong. If he fails to respond within that period, he forfeits "any right to collect" the amount in dispute.

But both Gallagher bills are a long way from passage. Pressures are great from the credit industry lobby to keep things the way they are. Until enough legislators are persuaded by enough constituent letters to change the law, computers will probably go on cranking out penalty charges and dunning letters with the same programmed precision that guides astronauts to the moon and back.

HUMAN TOUCH

Maybe the least customers might expect is a little more warmth in the computerized form letter. Recently, for example, the Clifton Springs (N.Y.) Hospital sent area residents a letter announcing a switch from manual to computerized billing. It read as follows:

"This statement was automatically produced by our new computer, untouched by human hands. . . .

"If it runs true to form, it undoubtedly will be wrong.

"If it is, please tell us.

"Please don't get mad, get mad, get mad, get mad. . . .

"In case of error, do not contact our computer! Instead, please write to our Mr. . . . .

"Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you."

H.R. 16266

A bill to prohibit creditors from reporting disputed accounts to credit bureaus as delinquent

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Any creditor who reports to any credit bureau or credit reporting agency as delinquent any consumer account the obligor of which has given written notice to the creditor that the amount of the account is in dispute, unless the dispute has been resolved by a final judgment of a court of competent jurisdiction, shall be fined not more than $5,000, or imprisoned not more than a year, or both.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act, the terms "creditor" and "consumer" have the meaning defined in section 101 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602).

H.R. 16267

A bill to provide that the willful and persistent refusal of a creditor to make corrections in the account of a consumer shall relieve the consumer of liability thereon

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. Any creditor who refuses for more than sixty days after receipt of written notice of an error in a consumer credit account either—

(1) to make correction of the error in accordance with the notice, or

(2) to furnish a detailed and specific explanation of why the notice of error is itself in error,

shall be deemed for all purposes to have waived any right to collect or enforce any liability purported to be stated in the account as of the date referred to in the notice of error or, if there is no such date, as of the date of receipt of the notice of error.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this Act, the terms "credit", "creditor", and "consumer" have the meanings defined in section 102 of the Truth in Lending Act (15 U.S.C. 1602).

ENGINEERING AND THE LIFE SCIENCE

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, a recent issue of Random Noise, published by the Engineering Science Association at Florida State University in Tallahassee, Fla., published a very excellent article by Mr. Rodney Givens, a sophomore in the department of engineering, whose home is in Tallahassee.

Entitled "Engineering and the Life Science," Mr. Givens makes some very telling points in using the language and profession of the engineer to point out that in many instances, those who get the most out of machines fail to get much out of life.

I felt that others would be interested in this very interesting presentation:

ENGINEERING AND THE LIFE SCIENCE

By any analysis, the engineering profession is of a highly pragmatic nature. The engineer must be able to design and perfect devices in order that maximum efficiency might be obtained from these mechanisms.

Yet one of the tragedies of modern times is that these pragmatists can get the most out of machines, but not out of life itself. Many an engineer has graduated from college only to find out that though he has learned how to make a living, he does not know how to live.

In order to understand why this emptiness inevitably plagues the modern engineer, it is necessary to examine an analog to the second law of thermodynamics. This law states that the entropy, or disorder, of an isolated system tends to increase. In an analogous manner, a life left to itself will tend toward discord and frustration. Just as periodic infusions of energy can "wind up" a physical system, so can life be made worth living for a while by various means, be they materialistic, egocentric, or hedonistic. But these effects are short-lived; disorder and aimlessness eventually return as the ever-present second law demands.

As a result, a device can function in the real world only if there is a continuous input of energy. When the source is cut off, it ceases to function properly. This is man's dilemma: created with three dimensions to life-physical (body), soul (mind, emotions, and will), and spiritual (life itself)—but only the first two functioning properly. Pascal, the French physicist described this state as "a God-shaped void in the heart of every man". This incompleteness results from being separated from the source of spiritual energy and direction. Jesus claimed to be this source when He said "I came that they might have life and have it more abundantly." (John 10:10.) When there is no connection with this source, the individual finds that life lacks real purpose and meaning. This situation is a direct consequence of an attitude of rebellion or, more often, simply apathy toward God. The common denominator in both cases is that the individual runs his own life—attempting by his own devices to create a reason for his existence, but to no avail.

Fortunately, this problem has a solution, and a unique solution at that: having a personal relationship with Jesus Christ. In Revelation 3:20, Christ explains how this relationship is possible, "Behold I stand at the door and knock; if any man hear my voice and opens the door, I will come in to him."

Obviously the engineer cannot base his designs on empirically fallible theories; the process, structure, or whatever, has to be ap-

plicable to the real world. Therefore, in order to be other than philosophical speculation, the preceding hypothesis has to work—which is precisely the point of this article. In every case, Christ has been given a chance, He has worked.

If this presentation has made sense to you, it is possible to appropriate this solution for yourself simply by asking Christ to come into your life and trust that He will keep His promise (see Revelation 3:20 above). For, after all, could He lie? When you do, you'll begin to discover that there can be life after birth.

GEN. WLADYSLAW SIKORSKI

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, 27 years ago, July 4, 1943, was a tragic moment in the history of the Polish nation and its people. It was also a tragic day for the United Nations and to the cause for which they both were fighting.

The untimely death of Gen. Wladyslaw Sikorski, Premier of the Polish Government-in-exile, and Commander in Chief of the Polish Armed Forces—who perished that day—was an irreparable loss to his own people, and to the United Nations as well.

General Sikorski, killed when the plane that was taking him from Gibraltar to London plunged into Gibraltar Harbor, died at a moment when his hopes for his native land may have been higher than at any time since 1939.

A liberal and a democrat who had devoted a lifetime to the cause of Polish independence, General Sikorski saw the essential problem of victory as one of unity among the freedom-loving nations. To this end he was exerting all his efforts at the time of his tragic death.

General Sikorski was a soldier and a statesman. Winston Churchill did not exaggerate when he described the tragic accident at Gibraltar as one of the heaviest strokes that the Allied cause has suffered. If any man can be called indispensable to his country at a given moment of history, it was Sikorski at the time of his death. He emerged from the defeat of Poland and the obscurity in which he had lived because of his opposition to the policies of its prewar Government as the natural leader and authentic spokesman of the crucified and indestructible nation.

At the time of Sikorski's death, Polish nationalism was fiercer than almost any other nationalism because it had been driven underground and had to feed upon itself. General Sikorski was a flaming patriot, a conspirator for Polish freedom in his student days at Lwow, and he was a man of the world in the same sense that Paderewski was.

One man was primarily a soldier, concerned with building up a new fighting force out of the remnants of the Polish Army, and the other an artist, but both played a similar role, Paderewski in World War I and Sikorski in World War II, for the liberation of their country. Both had faith in freedom as the prescription for the ills of Poland and Europe.

General Sikorski was no less important as a military leader than as Premier Sikorski, the statesman. He had personally supervised the organization and training of a new Polish Army that, at the time, was the fifth in size among the United Nations, and he had sworn to lead his troops back to Polish soil. In fact, his death came as a result of his dedication to these tasks. He was killed on his return from an inspection of Polish troops in the Middle East.

General Sikorski had one of those careers possible only in the dramatic transitional periods. Only 62 at the time of his death, he had fought in the First World War, served as chief of the general staff, Premier and Minister of Military Affairs in the early 1920's.

The plane in which he was traveling plummeted into the waters of Gibraltar Harbor immediately after takeoff. The tragedy also took the lives of his daughter, the chief of the Polish General Staff, and other important officers, including Col. Victor Cazalet, a popular and promising younger member of the British Parliament, who had been serving as political liaison officer to the Premier. He died with his daughter and 14 others in the crash in which only a badly injured Czech pilot survived. It was a loss that was deeply felt and will be long remembered, but the inspiration of Sikorski's life and heroic struggle for a free and democratic Poland will remain to encourage the Polish patriots who have been fighting for the same cause for so many years.

I wish to pay homage to this great statesman, patriot, and military genius. I also wish to pay homage to his daughter, Mrs. Sophia Lesniowska and to the others who were traveling with him and perished.

As I have stated before, the restoration of a free Poland was the lifeblood of General Sikorski. It is still the primary motivating factor of all those patriots who hope to live again under the white eagle of Poland. Since the origin of World War II was the preservation of the territorial rights of Poland, the complete restoration of these territorial rights should be one of the principal purposes of peace. Unless we are all dedicated to the restoration of these rights, unless we pledge ourselves completely to it, General Sikorski and all other Polish citizens who shed their blood for their country have shed it in vain.

The cause for which General Sikorski fought and died still lives on in the hearts of present-day Poland and its citizens. It is the hope of all peace-loving people that Poland will once again live free and independent and the flag of Poland will fly again on its own territory, smiling upon its own happy and industrious people, and proudly take its place among the councils of the nations who have won their peace.

AMERICA'S ASIAN TRAGEDY

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the fabric of our Nation is being torn over the long overdue national debate concerning our military involvement in Southeast Asia, there is still a great deal of misundertanding not only of the military and political realities and the unhappy alternatives we face but even the motives of those of us who are critical of our Government's Asian policies. I do not think it is because adequate information is not available—on the contrary, the public has access to most all the pertinent information available to the President. The problem is that most people are just too busy to devote the time required to sift through the available information sources to arrive at an informed judgment.

I ran across four good articles in the Washington Post. These articles admittedly fall short of providing a comprehensive background on the complexities on our tragic involvement in Southeast Asia. Nevertheless, they serve to provide the basis for a realistic perspective on the truly disastrous series of errors, disregard for facts, mistaken judgments, and fuzzy rationale which characterize four administrations, representing both Democratic and Republican Presidents, leading to our present dilemma.

I include these four articles in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point in the hope that it will help Members of Congress and the general public to gain a better understanding of our predicament:

[From the Washington Post, June 28, 1970]

A GRIM NOTEBOOK ON OUR ASIAN TRAGEDY

(By Stanley Karnow)

HONG KONG.—No exercise is more fascinating, illuminating and depressing for a reporter leaving Asia after a decade than to weed out his voluminous files on Vietnam. For the stacks of frayed notebooks, faded newspaper clippings and unpublished memorabilia provide a personal retrospective of an American tragedy in the making.

And the dominant sensation that emerges from this review of the past is disbelief—disbelief that the United States, purportedly a nation of hardheaded pragmatists, could have stumbled so blindly into a disaster that is now shaking the nation's stability and threatening to undermine its unity for a generation to come.

Equally striking, in retrospect, is how little has changed over the years. The war has grown to monstrous proportions, of course. But it is still, as it has been from the start, an assortment of wars being fought in different ways and for different motives in Washington, Saigon, Hanoi and on the battlefield. Thus nothing can be plausibly measured.

The search for the elusive truth about Vietnam will surely preoccupy historians and social scientists far into the future. Within the scope of my own narrow experience, however, I would suggest that our Vietnam commitment evolved gradually, perhaps in-

exorably, out of a frustrating conflict between our ideals and our capabilities.

On the other hand, it seems to me, an old-fashioned brand of idealism inspired the conviction among able, intelligent American policymakers that the United States could play a decisive role anywhere in the world. What we discovered, though, was that we could exert only minimal influence in a strange, faraway, alien society such as Vietnam.

Therefore, our enormous power was only marginally effective. We could inundate the South Vietnamese countryside with napalm and try to bomb North Vietnam back to the Stone Age. But we could not compel, or even persuade, our Saigon clients, much less the enemy, to accept an "honorable settlement"—if, indeed, we actually know what kind of settlement we wanted.

So our strategists and tacticians improvised and experimented and contrived dreamy new schemes, each in its turn proclaimed by official publicists to be the winning formula. Just as Lyndon Johnson praised Ngo Dinh Diem and Richard Nixon extolled Nguyen Van Thieu, we also sought to portray a succession of Saigon leaders as potential George Washingtons. I had nearly forgotten Nguyen Khanh until a sweat-stained notebook reminded me of Robert McNamara embracing him as the savior of Vietnam as they toured the Delta together in early 1964.

BELATED AWAKENING

Meanwhile, we sank deeper and deeper into the quagmire, with hardly anyone in or out of government perceptive or courageous enough to challenge the basic concept of our Vietnam commitment until we were so involved that the question of whether to quit or remain in that benighted land divided our own nation.

In part, I think, nobody quite saw where we were heading as our Vietnam engagement was taking shape eight or nine years ago. Reaching back to 1961, I recall Robert Kennedy's reaction to attempts by American correspondents in Hong Kong to discuss Vietnam. His attention waned after a couple of minutes and he cut us short with the remark: "We've got 20 Vietnams a day to handle at the White House."

For a long time, too many U.S. politicians preferred to skirt an issue that had not yet hit them directly. As late as 1966, a West Coast congressman explained to me: "Only a dozen boys from my constituency have been killed in Vietnam so far. When the number gets up to a hundred, I'll have to think about what to say."

Significantly, the earliest critics of our Vietnam policy, like John Paul Vann and David Halberstam, did not favor withdrawal but merely advocated different methods in opposition to the conventional Establishment approach. Several of today's prominent doves were also among the principal architects of our Vietnam commitment.

Back in 1962, for example, I recollect listening to Rogers Hilsman, then a senior activist on the Kennedy team, enthusiastically depicting "strategic hamlets" as a dynamic program that would revolutionize Vietnamese peasants and in the process both weaken the Vietcong and force the Diem oligarchy to reform. In short, as Hilsman told it, we were going to wage an American version of "people's war" that would beat the Communists at their own game.

The name of the game was "counter-insurgency," and it captured the imagination of the Kennedy administration. Suspicious of the Pentagon, which was still clinging to the "massive retaliation" doctrine of the Eisenhower era, the Kennedyites believed that they could spawn a new breed of American soldier capable of coping with "brush-fire wars." Hence the fanfare that heralded the "Green Berets," those romantic figures destined to use Communist tactics against the Communists in jungle conflicts from Laos to Venezuela. I remember one American general in Saigon switching to the fad: "Why, our forefathers were guerrillas against the British long before communism even existed."

A FADED ERA

Though the notion of Americans serving as revolutionaries in a foreign country is now discredited, the nonconformists were an attractive antidote to the Blimpish brass hats and bureaucrats who staffed our Saigon mission in the late 1950s, when I started reporting on Vietnam.

Saigon in those days was a pleasant, leafy city reminiscent of a provincial capital in southern France. Its easygoing ambience was matched by the complacent ignorance of our military and civilian officials, who seemed to believe their own propaganda that Diem had effectively consolidated his authority and was putting South Vietnam in the path to New England town hall democracy.

I recall one U.S. official showing me the crowd eagerly watching the results of the 1960 American presidential elections being tabulated in the display window of the U.S. Information Service library. This, he exclaimed happily, was heartening proof of real interest in democratic procedures.

A local acquaintance later informed me that the crowd was mostly composed of Saigon Chinese who could not tell Kennedy from Nixon or Maine from California and cared even less. Inveterate gamblers, they were simply betting on which numbers would come up next on the scoreboard.

The American ambassador at the time was Elbridge Durbrow, an able diplomat whose warnings about the increasing unpopularity of the Saigon regime were borne out in November, 1960, when South Vietnamese paratroopers staged an abortive coup against Diem. But Durbrow was overshadowed by the chief of the U.S. Military Advisory Group, Lt. Gen. Sam Williams, a leathery type known as "Hanging Sam" because he had presided over the execution of Nazi war criminals as commandant of the Nuremberg jail.

Personifying the adage that generals approach every new war with the strategies of the last one, Williams anticipated a Korean-style Communist invasion of Vietnam and helped Diem to build a roadbound army that the Saigon leader primarily wanted for protection against internal uprisings. Like his predecessors and several of his successors, Williams also operated independently from the ambassador, thereby giving Diem the opportunity to play off the Pentagon against the State Department.

DIEM POLICY HARDENS

The 1960 coup attempt, in which Diem outmaneuvered his adversaries by promising to reform and reneging afterward, was an important episode. It confirmed Diem's distrust of nearly everyone outside his immediate family and, as a consequence, strengthened the power of his brother, Ngo Dinh Nhu, and Nhu's wife—a couple that made the Borgias look like the Billy Grahams.

As the power of the Nhus grew, many of Diem's most intimate subordinates began to voice their grievances to foreigners. Among the disenchanted were Dr. Tran Kim Tuyen, director of Diem's secret police, and Col. Pham Ngoc Thao, a former Vietminh officer who had turned anticommunist in 1954. They and others like them repeatedly told any American who would listen that the Diem regime would collapse unless it was made to reform. Eventually, the Buddhist resistance of 1963 spiraled into an army-led revolt in which Diem and Nhu were murdered.

But even as this storm was brewing, there was an almost incredible refusal on the part of U.S. officialdom to concede that an eruption was possible. The CIA station chief in Saigon, for instance, offered a memorable reply to questions about rising disaffection in Diem's army. "Come now," he said. "Lincoln had trouble with his generals, too."

In a brilliant analysis of the American commitment to Vietnam published a couple of years ago, James C. Thomson Jr., a onetime White House aide, contended that the Bay of Pigs fiasco, Khrushchev's truculence at Vienna and the Berlin crisis all combined in 1961 to create an atmosphere in which President Kennedy felt compelled to demonstrate America's mettle. The arena for that demonstration was Vietnam. Accordingly, Diem was our man.

This was already apparent in early 1961 when Lyndon Johnson, then Vice President, flew to Saigon and referred to Diem as the "Winston Churchill of Asia." Later, riding in Mr. Johnson's airplane, I asked him why he had lavished such praise on the Saigon leader. "Now, you know he's the only boy we got out there," he responded casually.

That comment was, of course, a variant of the well-known rationale for backing unattractive characters the world over. "He's a sonuvabitch, but he's our sonuvabitch." In this case, though, Mr. Johnson's exuberance had the effect of convincing Diem that he was really Asia's Churchill and, after that, there was no shaking his belief in his own infallibility. Therefore, when Gen. Maxwell Taylor arrived in Saigon in late 1961 to work out the first in a series of massive aid programs to Vietnam, Diem stubbornly rebuffed recommendations that he liberalize his government. In essence, he acted as if he was doing us a favor by taking our help.

It soon became evident, as Robert Scigliano observed, that if Diem and his family were American puppets as the Communists alleged, they were puppets who pulled their own strings. And as the U.S. involvement expanded in later years, we began to perceive that the South Vietnamese pulled our strings as well—for the elementary reason, I believe, that our repeated assertions that the fate of our nation hangs in the balance in Vietnam have naturally convinced them that they hold the key to our destiny.

The pattern that has made us prisoners of our reputed puppets was therefore fixed in our 1961 decision to support Diem on his own terms. Moreover, the style of our approach to the Saigon leaders was set by Frederick Nolting, the U.S. ambassador of that period. He seemed to believe that, by appeasing Diem, he would somehow store up credit with the Saigon leader that could be redeemed when Washington sought South Vietnam's cooperation on major issues.

Accordingly, Nolting not only went along with Diem's whims but even, on one occasion in early 1962, delivered a speech to the local Rotary Club urging Saigon's middle-class burghers to cease their carping and get behind the regime. Nolting evidently did not know that one earnest Rotarian, Harvard-educated Dr. Pham Quang Dan, was then being held in an airless underground cell in the Saigon botanical gardens for having criticized Diem's family.

The flaw in the Nolting approach—and the flaw in subsequent attempts to appease Saigon leaders—lay in Diem's knowledge that we needed him more than he needed us. Nolting learned that his credit was worthless when, in 1962, he was instructed by Washington to dissuade Diem from breaking relations with the newly formed neutral government in Laos. Diem refused, saying in effect: "I don't owe you a thing."

POSITIVE THINKING

In the meantime, our immersion in a situation we could not quite understand, let alone control, was being accelerated by the insistence of our military establishment that we were making great strides in the crusade against the Communists.

To a large extent, I think, our capacity for self-delusion stemmed from what one U.S. diplomat has called "can-doism"—the certainty that Americans can do anything anywhere and that those who say otherwise are defeatists. In short, we became hypnotized by our own concept of ourselves as supermen to such a degree that American officials in Vietnam were instructed to turn in optimistic reports even if they bore no resemblance to reality. "Positive thinking" was the byword.

This urge to portray the U.S. effort in glowing Technicolor was reflected in Adm. Harry Felt's advice to correspondents to "get on the team." It was also dramatized in the graphs and flipcharts and statistics that led Robert McNamara to state that "by every quanitative measure, we are winning the war." Most of all, I believe, the generals wanted to believe they were making progress because they knew that there were no promotions for losers. In 1963, after McNamara predicted that Americans would be out of Vietnam by Christmas, 1965, the U.S. commander in Saigon, Gen. Paul Harkins, told me: "I think the Secretary is too pessimistic. We'll be home before the end of 1964."

The compulsion to register progress went to such lengths that a group of senior U.S. officials even announced a minor "victory" when a New Year's Eve party they threw was not attacked by Vietcong terrorists then active in Saigon. A similarly upbeat emphasis was constantly stressed by the ebullient Robert Komer, the former ambassador in charge of pacification. Flying with him around central Vietnam during the 1968 Lunar New Year offensive, we landed at one badly hit town. Komer scanned the scene and said in his staccato style: "They told me this place was 90 per cent destroyed. Why, it's not more than 70 per cent destroyed."

In 1964, when Maxwell Taylor became ambassador in Saigon, the mission machinery was reorganized in order to report progress even if none was actually taking place. Before this, U.S. and South Vietnamese officials had tried to plan together, and movement had been slow. To speed things up, Taylor created a "mission council" composed exclusively of Americans who conceived projects and passed them on in package form to the Vietnamese.

DISREGARD FOR FACTS

In some instances, careful studies of proposed programs were discarded because their recommendations were negative. This was the case in 1961, when two foremost American experts advised against moving peasants into "strategic hamlets" on the grounds that displacing people did more harm than good. Their advice was rejected, and the program went ahead anyway, with dubious results.

The demand from Washington for rapid action sometimes meant that decisions were made without advance study and were justified afterward. In late 1964, for example, a Rand Corporation team was set up to assess the possible political repercussions of employing tactical U.S. air power inside South Vietnam. The team expected to produce "preliminary" recommendations within a year. The bombings started long before that. The team thereupon endorsed the bombings with the somewhat contorted rationale that peasants blamed the Vietcong for turning their villages into targets for air strikes.

The tendency to shoot first and ask questions afterward often reflected a desperate desire to maintain a rapid momentum of innovations. The White House itself was frequently the source of the pressure for this momentum. A six-month course to train South Vietnamese pacification cadres was cut down to six weeks, for instance, because Washington was in a hurry. The upshot, explained one official connected with the course, was that "we turned out sausages instead of competent cadres."

The rush to do something was understandably prompted during times of extreme crisis, when almost any move was considered preferable to inaction. The decision to bomb North Vietnam, though planned in advance, was evidently taken in order to arrest the deteriorating situation in the South in early 1965, when Saigon governments were toppling and the Saigon strategic reserve battalions were being decimated.

Looking back, it seems to me that our conduct in Vietnam was generally less convoluted than many observers have suggested. Indeed, it could be argued that we were insufficiently Machiavellian, especially within the context of an arcane Oriental society. American military and civilian officials were not, like the Vietnamese, chronically involved in complicated plots and conspiracies. On the contrary, they behaved for the most part in straightforward fashion, and that was the rub. Vietnam is a corkscrew country, the "land of the doublecross," as Douglas Pike called it. Yet we persistently believed that we could shape the Vietnamese into facsimiles of ourselves.

To label the 1967 Vietnam elections fraud would be unfair. But they were a farce in the sense that, outside Saigon and other cities, the notion of free choice was alien. Still, Lyndon Johnson wanted a legitimate Saigon government and the Vietnamese leaders saw no inconvenience in obliging him.

At Bentre, the capital of Kienhoa Province, I asked the province chief about previous Vietnamese elections he had known. He candidly replied that the 1959 National Assembly elections had been crooked and the 1961 presidential election even worse.

"What will you have to say about the present elections if I come back here in five or six years?" I asked.

He laughed and answered: "Now these elections, I assure you, are truly honest."

If elections were calculated to Americanize the Vietnamese politically—or at least give that impression to the U.S. public—the decision in 1965 to send American combat troops into Vietnam was a move to Americanize the war. In retrospect, I think it represented a more honestly American approach than the romantic counterinsurgency efforts of the past. Now, for the first time, we would fight in American style with air and armor backed up by PXs and pinball machines.

By the end of 1965, moreover, the sheer weight of the U.S. military presence had stopped the Communists from dissecting the country. After that, however, we deluded ourselves into thinking that our ability to prevent a Communist victory meant that we could achieve a victory ourselves. In late 1967, Gen. Westmoreland announced that we had "turned the corner." A couple of months later, the Tet offensive exploded.

The Tet offensive was not the military success that Communists had anticipated. They took tremendous losses, and their political apparatus in the South was severely damaged. But, perhaps unintentionally, their drive dealt an irreparable blow to U.S. credibility. If nothing more, the Communists showed that they could mount a vast array of actions in the face of American claims that they were on the verge of collapse.

American credibility again suffered from President Nixon's thrust into Cambodia, for his decision seemed to contravene his repeated assertions that he was seeking to wind down the war. Like so many moves undertaken during the Vietnam conflict, the Cambodian invasion was apparently initiated for narrow military objectives without consideration for the wide range of political, diplomatic and psychological repercussions that were bound to occur at home and abroad.

In his April 30 speech, Mr. Nixon underlined an American problem when he depicted the United States becoming a "pitiful, helpless giant" unless we succeed in Vietnam. For the lesson we ought to have learned in Vietnam is that giants at this stage in history are not omnipotent. The Russians are as frustrated by their North Vietnamese allies as we are by our Saigon clients.

Until we adjust our aspirations to our capabilities, it seems to me, we are bound to be disappointed. In the meantime, I am changing the label on my files from "Vietnam" to "Indochina."

[From the Washington Post, June 28, 1970]

THE NIXON REPORT ON CAMBODIA

(By Ernest R. May and Thomas C. Schelling)

Just before Cambodia, President Nixon toted up prospective gains and losses on a yellow pad. Soon after June 30, he must add up results thus far and report to the public.

In earlier statements, he set forth at least four objectives: reducing American casualties, speeding troop withdrawals, influencing actions by North Vietnam, and protecting American prestige. When hearing his statement, we should bear in mind what he has said about these objectives.

First, the President said on April 30 and reiterated on May 8 that the operation "will reduce American casualties." Over 300 Americans have died in Cambodia. Undoubtedly, the President recognized that the offensive would entail higher casualties in the short run. But he has not explained how American lives have been saved over the long run. The Cambodian sanctuaries menaced the IV and III Corps Areas of South Vietnam. The former is already Vietnamized; the latter is to be Vietnamized by September. Did the President expect to save American lives because his Vietnamization plans call for sending U.S. troops back into combat whenever the South Vietnamese are hard pressed?

Second, the President pointed to a map on April 30 and said: "North Vietnam already occupies this part of Laos. If North Vietnam also occupied this whole band in Cambodia or the entire country, it would mean that South Vietnam was completely outflanked and the forces of Americans in this area as well as the South Vietnamese would be in an untenable military position." The President should explain how the Cambodian operation has reduced this danger. News reports tell of the Cambodians' inability to check the North Vietnamese. If U.S. troops, helicopters, and air support are withdrawn from Cambodia, what is to prevent the North Vietnamese from re-establishing the threat? Will the situation be more tenable in May, 1971, when the United States has 150,000 fewer troops in Vietnam? Are there grounds for confidence that the South Vietnamese can withstand next year a threat of "outflanking" that the President judged them unable to withstand this year?

Third, the President has predicted that the Cambodian operation will influence decisions by Hanoi. When announcing on April 20 his schedule for withdrawing 150,000 troops, he took occasion to "remind the leaders of North Vietnam that . . . they will be taking grave risks should they attempt to use the occasion to jeopardize the security of our remaining forces in Vietnam by increased military action in Vietnam, in Cambodia or in Laos." When ordering action in Cambodia, he cited this warning, and on May 8, he observed that President Johnson had erred in escalating the war "step by step." Referring to the move into Cambodia, Mr. Nixon said, "This action is a decisive move, and this action also puts the enemy on warning that if it escalates while we are trying to de-escalate, we will move decisively and not step by step."

There must have been earlier signals to Hanoi. The President surely did not believe that Hanoi could reach a decision and have that decision carried out by field commanders within 10 days. But by June 30, 61 days

will have passed since the President demonstrated that his words were not empty and that he was prepared to exercise his full powers as Commander-in-Chief even at the risk of a public storm at home. Is there evidence that the North Vietnamese have scaled down their operations in South Vietnam, Laos, or Cambodia? News reports suggest the contrary.

The President said earlier, "It is Hanoi, and Hanoi alone, that stands today blocking the path to a just peace for all the people of Southeast Asia." Has he had indication since April 30 that the North Vietnamese are more willing to bargain?

If the answers to both questions are negative—that is, if the North Vietnamese have not limited their operations or shown signs of negotiating—what is the next step? The President warned on June 3: "if their answers to our withdrawal program, and to our offer to negotiate, is to increase their attacks in a way that jeopardizes the safety of our remaining forces in Vietnam, I shall, as my action five weeks ago demonstrated, take strong and effective measures to deal with that situation." What "strong and effective measures" are available? Does the President contemplate renewed bombing of North Vietnam? Could a bombing campaign be more effective, militarily and politically, than that of 1965–68? Or does the President contemplate stepped-up ground force action? What happens then to casualty rates and to withdrawal?

Fourth, Mr. Nixon asserted that the action in Cambodia would work to restore American prestige and credibility elsewhere in the world. He asked on June 3: "If an American President had failed to meet this threat to 400,000 American men in Vietnam, would those nations and peoples who rely on America's power and treaty commitments for their security—in Latin America, Europe, the Middle East or other parts of Asia—retain any confidence in the United States?" The question was of course rhetorical, and White House officials conceded that many capitals reacted initially with alarm and misgiving. The President should indicate whether these attitudes have since changed and whether he sees in Europe, the Middle East, and Japan increased faith in the restraint, wisdom, and reliability of his administration.

There is a fifth criterion for judging the Cambodian operation. Admiral Smedberg quoted President Nixon as saying a few days before April 30, "I am not going to let Cambodia go down the drain." His remark on April 30 about the military untenability of South Vietnam should the Communists control "this whole band in Cambodia or the entire country" was consistent with such a position. On the other hand, he and Secretary Rogers have declared that the United States has no commitment to Cambodia. The President's forthcoming statement should clarify his stand.

If Cambodia now falls, will that event not arouse the same concern that the prospect of it apparently aroused in late April? Will not the President's credibility be at stake once again?

These are not all the questions that we hope to hear addressed. A crucial one is whether our allies, especially South Vietnam and Thailand, have incurred new commitments or adopted military goals that the United States is committed, directly or indirectly, to support. Is it American strategy that Allied troops—no Americans among them—remain deployed indefinitely in Cambodia, or is this an independent action of the South Vietnamese government? And how far does our commitment extend if South Vietnam elects to defend Phnom Penh or other parts of Cambodia while our forces are waiting in South Vietnam to be relieved so they can be withdrawn? The President cannot be expected to bare his differences with South Vietnam in a public address; but as he has repeatedly used his statements to the American public to communicate the gravest warnings to Hanoi, he may wisely go on record at home to clarify his policy for Allied countries.

The President could also shed light on "Vietnamization." Does it mean that South Vietnamese forces must be able in any circumstances to defeat the Vietcong and North Vietnamese? Or does it admit the possibility of defeat in a Vietnamized area or in a Vietnamized South Vietnam? The President might indicate what he expects of the 240,000 U.S. troops that stay in Vietnam after May, 1971. Will they provide helicopter lift and air and artillery support? Will they fight off attacks on their own installations? What rate of casualties are they likely to suffer? Are their functions eventually to be Vietnamized? Over what time? If the North Vietnamese do not negotiate and if the South Vietnamese prove no stronger in the future than in the past, does the President nevertheless foresee a time when the United States can disengage from the war? Does ultimate withdrawal depend on permanent North Vietnamese fear of the "strong and effective measures" he has threatened?

It may be too much to hope now for answers to these longer-term questions. There ought, however, to be one further element in the summing-up. According to Stewart Alsop, the President noted on his yellow pad that the Cambodian operation would cause "deep divisions" at home. No doubt, these divisions were reinforced by the tragedies at Kent and Jackson. But does President Nixon now estimate that the benefits of the operation justified the damage to domestic peace and to faith in America? And is this the last time we shall be asked in Indochina, to buy time with lives, to prove our nationhood by resort to sudden violence, to punish the enemy for warnings ignored, or to keep South Vietnam from being ounflanked by Communist forces in Cambodia or Laos?

[From the Washington Post, June 28, 1970]

"WINNING" IN ASIA—NIXON'S DILEMMA: HOW TO WITHDRAW TROOPS WITHOUT CONCEDING THE PRIZE TO HANOI

(By Chalmers M. Roberts)

President Nixon's Cambodian venture has raised to a new high the contention by his opponents that his real aim in Southeast Asia is to "win" the war in Vietnam. Now that the ground involvement in Cambodia is coming to an end, the point is worth examination.

Mr. Nixon has never said on the public record that he wants to "win." He has reduced the American goal to a single point: to allow the South Vietnamese "to determine their future without outside interference."

On June 20, in his much discussed speech assailing the President's critics, Vice President Agnew cut through the obfuscation. In criticizing Sen. J. William Fulbright, Agnew said the senator "has apparently abandoned *America's cause of a noncommunist future for Southeast Asia.*" (Italics added.)

Here, for the first time from a top administration official, is a clear-cut statement of what the government would like to see come out of the war. Agnew spoke of "Southeast Asia" and not specifically of Vietnam, but the context of his speech leaves no doubt of the meaning.

The United States' involvement in Vietnam from the time of the 1954 Geneva Conference has been founded on keeping that country out of Communist control. That was the Eisenhower-Dulles motivation, John F. Kennedy's and Lyndon B. Johnson's. There never has been any doubt that Richard M. Nixon, whose involvement in the issue goes back at least to 1954, always reasoned the same way.

The question, however, has been whether Mr. Nixon, since assuming the presidency 17 months ago, has based his policy on that premise or whether his public statements have been only a cover for what is often called "an elegant bugout" from the war.

The probability is that Mr. Nixon, like so many other Americans, suffers from a dichotomy: He wants to extricate the United States from the war but he does not want to "lose" it in the sense of having had more than 50,000 Americans die in vain.

Thus he has tried to pull out troops in a manner that would produce a reasonable chance that he could leave behind a government in Saigon that could survive the subsequent Communist challenge. In that sense he wants to "win" the war.

The President has never put it that way but the Agnew description of "America's cause" comes closer. Mr. Nixon's April 30 declaration that he would rather be a one-term President than "accept the first defeat" in the nation's "proud 190-year history" is buttressing evidence of his frame of mind.

The crux of the war is political control of South Vietnam. The resort to arms by all sides involved is, of course, an effort to force a political solution one way or the other. Thus far neither side has been sufficiently able, by force of arms, to impose its political will on the other.

Cambodia was an effort to employ arms for political aims. So is the war in Laos. The concentration on the battlefield has left the Paris peace talks in a state of doldrums. Yet the war cannot finally end, short of a military collapse by one side or the other, unless there is a political settlement.

In his June 3 report on Cambodia, the President said he would keep his "promise" to "end this war." He did not specify whether he meant to end American involvement alone or literally to end the war itself.

To do that, in either sense, Mr. Nixon will have to modify "America's goal" as stated by Agnew. He will have to take the risk of a Communist South Vietnam and its effect on the "noncommunist future" of the rest of Southeast Asia, including Laos and Cambodia in the first instance and, if he believes in the domino theory, of adjacent nations later on.

Politically, the key is an American commitment to total military withdrawal without a Communist commitment of total North Vietnamese withdrawal. Mr. Nixon has resisted that on the grounds that "ambiguity" is a key card in forcing Hanoi to bargain "ambiguity" meaning that the United States may keep a residual force in the South after the troops are out of combat to support the South Vietnamese forces with air artillery and logistics.

In short, Mr. Nixon still hopes to "win" and still sees "America's cause," in Agnew's words, as "a noncommunist future for Southeast Asia"—and for South Vietnam in particular.

(From the Washington Post, June 28, 1970]

CHANGING RATIONALES IN MID-CAMBODIA

In, zap the sanctuaries, and out—that was the way the administration's Cambodian venture was portrayed on April 30: "We shall avoid a wider war." That impression was strengthened by the President's announcement on June 3, after the public protests, that he had put reasonable time and space limits on American ground actions in Cambodia.

Tucked away in Mr. Nixon's June 3 address, however, was an announcement of, and a rationale for, post-June air actions—"to interdict the movement of enemy troops and materiel where I find this is necessary to protect the lives and security of our forces in South Vietnam." That the President has taken a broad view of the requirements of interdiction is suggested by news reports that air raids involving a hundred planes or more are taking place at points a hundred miles or more into Cambodia. Secretary Rogers kept insisting, however, that the protect-Ameri-

cans rationale would remain the guiding one and that the United States would not "become militarily involved in support of the Lon Nol government—or any other government" in Phnom Penh. "I'm talking about U.S. troops or air support or something," Mr. Rogers explained on May 13.

Now, of course, American fighter-bombers are flying close air support missions for Cambodian troops fighting North Vietnamese and Vietcong. Some of these planes take on fuel and Cambodian "spotters" at Phnom Penh airport. The other day Mr. Rogers made plain these missions would continue after July 1. He acknowledged that such a policy would have "a dual benefit—it may serve our purposes and at the same time serve the Cambodian government . . . I think that I can see very well why a Combodian might think it was helpful to the government when we fly (air support) missions."

So here the United States is, a long way down the road to propping up, not only by military aid but by direct combat support, a government which has shown neither the political appeal to win much support from its own citizens nor the military prowess to cope with its increasingly challenging foes. Laos, anyone? Vietnam? What will the administration do—this is far from inconceivable—if Phnom Penh falls? Once again a President, acting on his own, has moved the United States toward protracted involvement in a war in another country. The Cooper-Church proposal apparently will not become law; it is discouraging to think that, even if it had already been in effect, it probably would not have affected the President's Cambodian strategy since it (gratuitously) assigns him the troop-protection right that he is claiming now.

It is asserted, to be sure, that Mr. Nixon must deal with the situation as it is, and the situation is that Cambodia is under heavy Communist pressure. This ignores the administration's own contributions to escalation—obviously it was smart and characteristic of the enemy, once the American operation began, to slip out of the 21.7-mile border swath where American troops were confined and to head toward points deeper inside the country. This also ignores the military requirement imposed by needs in South Vietnam, and the political requirement imposed by public opinion at home, to get on with the administration's own policy of Vietnamizing the war in Vietnam.

FREE TRADE WITH JAPAN?

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the following letter was written to Asahi Evening News in Tokyo by a Japanese domestic buyer:

JUNE 26, 1970.

EDITOR,
Asahi Evening News,
Tokyo.

DEAR SIR: I would appreciate very much if someone can explain to me the term "Free Trade" as it is used in Japan.

In your paper of June 25 you carry a story on the current talks going on in Washington regarding the textile negotiations.

You quote Japanese International Trade Minister, Kiichi Miyazawa, as saying:

"GATT is based on the principle that where injury is proved or the threat of injury is proved a trading nation can seek compensation from the country causing the damage.

"But the U.S. appears to be establishing other trading principles in which imports must be restricted to a certain percentage of national consumption. A rapidly growing country like Japan which embraces free trade principles cannot agree to this concept."

"Free Trade" for whom I might ask? Although a Japanese auto can be purchased in the U.S. for less than it costs in Japan, a Ford Mustang in this country costs about US$14,000.00. It even costs more to park a foreign car, in spite of the fact it only takes up the same amount of space allowed to a Japanese car.

A package of 19 cents pipe tobacco costs 80 cents.

I just paid $5.00 duty for some shirts sent to me, as my size is not sold in Japan.

A trip through any department store or the American Pharmacy which sells foreign goods, will show you that items such as shaving lotion and toothpaste cost four times the price as in the country of origin. A pleasure boat of 25 feet which would cost $5,000.00 in the U.S. is $25,000.00 in Japan.

A water ski which is $60.00 in the U.S. is more than $225.00 in Japan.

The only way Japanese goods can compete in the U.S. is because they sell for a cheaper price than those manufactured in the U.S. The only way they can sell cheaper is to have the Japanese "Subsidize the Export", in other words, we must pay more in Japan for a Japanese car so that those going abroad can sell at a competitive price.

I had to pay $1,400.00 duty on a 1965 Volkswagen I brought to Japan in January 1970. And, I had to get a license from MITI to import it. Of course the duty was decided after arrival of the car. I would never have brought it in the first place had I known I would be charged more than the car is worth.

As far as I can determine, Japan imposes fantastic duties and restrictions on imports to Japan, while aggressively burying the rest of the world in Japanese products, made attractive price-wise at the expense of the domestic Japanese consumer.

A Japanese company can freely establish a Japanese subsidiary in the U.S., "Subaru of America," "Datsun of America," "American Honda," "JTB of America," "Takashimaya of America," "Seibu of America," etc. etc. etc. Yet we are subject to every kind of discrimination yet dreamed up, to keep us out of the Japanese market. Japan has the advantage of every unfair trade agreement yet thought up. These were of course made to help Japan after the war and when Japan was a "Poor Country," which is no longer the case. There is not one so called liberalized industry in Japan without strings. Hotels have been liberalized because the government here is fully aware that no foreign hotel company can pay the current market price of land and make a profit.

Japan spends less than 1% of her national budget on defense while much of what the U.S. spends for defense goes right into Japanese pockets. Not only what is spent here by U.S. servicemen and the fantastic sum it takes to maintain the U.S. facilities here but, what about all of the industrialists who can attribute so much of their earnings to direct income from the manufacture of items being produced to prolong the war in Viet Nam.

The Japanese put on a pious anti-war face but do not miss a trick when it comes to making a buck from this unfortunate war.

There is no danger of the U.S. military being pushed out of Japan by any amount of student demonstrations. The Japanese government would never allow it considering the revenue it brings in. The Japanese government does allow (and I firmly believe encourage) anti-American demonstrations to be sensationalized in the press so they can get trade concessions in return for what they have convinced Washington is a super effort on the part of the government to allow the U.S. military to stay in Japan.

All U.S. government leaders should spend one year in a commercial company in Japan. That would hip them in a hurry to the devious tactics applied here.

The one who really has to pay for all of this is the Japanese domestic buyer. He has to pay outrageous prices for any imported goods, and outrageous prices for Japanese produced products to allow the same item to compete overseas. One day the people will wise up that "Free Trade" means higher prices at home.

A JAPANESE DOMESTIC BUYER.

MISS SUSAN HUSKISSON

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, at the Honor America Day in Washington last Saturday, Knoxville's Susan Huskisson drew cheers with a recitation entitled, "I Am An American," which called the roll of battles in which American troops have died, reported the Knoxville, Tenn., News-Sentinel on July 5.

Tennesseans are proud of Susan, a very talented young lady whose father is Knoxville Police Chief Harry Huskisson. Once again we were able to see her marvelous rendition on nationwide television. I salute Susan, and all the patriotic young Americans, who are working for a better America and who helped to honor America this July 4.

Miss Huskisson's patriotic reading was truly inspirational and she received much acclaim.

Another item from the News-Sentinel said:

"WHAT ABOUT THAT GIRL"—BOB HOPE SAYS OUR SUSAN IS "TOO GOOD"

Knoxville's Susan Huskisson drew what was perhaps the ultimate compliment from a show business veteran for her reading of "What America Means To Me" at yesterday's Honor America Day observance in Washington.

Comedian Bob Hope, on nationwide television last night, quipped, "What about that girl! I'll tell you one thing, she'll never be on my program—she's too good."

Miss Huskisson's reading was also part of last night's CBS Evening News coverage of the day's ceremonies.

For those readers of the RECORD who have not read or did not hear Miss Huskisson's recitation of "I Speak for Democracy," I place it in the RECORD at this point:

I SPEAK FOR DEMOCRACY

I am an American. Listen to my words and listen well. For my country is a strong country, and my message is a strong message. I am an American, and I speak for Democracy.

My ancestors have left their blood on the green Lexington and the snow at Valley Forge, on the walls of Fort Sumter and the fields at Gettysburg, on the banks of the River Marne and in the shadows of the Argonne Forest, on the Beachheads of Salerno and Normandy, the sands of Okinawa, and in the bare, bleak hills called Pork Chop and Old Baldy and Heartbreak Ridge.

A million and more of my countrymen have died for freedom. My country is their eternal monument.

But they live on in the laughter of a small boy as he watches the antics of a

All U.S. government leaders should spend one year in a commercial company in Japan. That would hip them in a hurry to the devious tactics applied here.

The one who really has to pay for all of this is the Japanese domestic buyer. He has to pay outrageous prices for any imported goods, and outrageous prices for Japanese produced products to allow the same item to compete overseas. One day the people will wise up that "Free Trade" means higher prices at home.

A JAPANESE DOMESTIC BUYER.

circus clown, in the delicious coldness of the first bite of peppermint ice cream on the Fourth of July, in the little tenseness of a baseball crowd as the umpire calls, "Batter up!" And in the high school band's rendition of "Stars and Stripes Forever" in the Memorial Day parade.

America has offered freedom and opportunity such as no land before her has ever known. To a fish crier down on Maxwell Street with the face of a man terribly glad to be selling fish. She has given him the right to own his pushcart, to sell his herring on Maxwell Street; she has given him an education for his children and a tremendous faith in the nation that has made these things his.

Multiply that fish crier by 200 million, 200 million doctors and mechanics and coal miners and truck drivers and lawyers and plumbers and priests—all glad, terribly glad, to be what they are. Terribly glad to be free to work and eat and sleep and speak and love and live and pray as they desire, as they believe.

And those 200 million Americans, those 200 million free Americans, have more roast beef and mashed potatoes, the yield of American labor and land, more telephones and orlon sweaters, the fruits of American initiative and enterprise, more public schools and life insurance policies, symbols of American security and faith in the future, more laughter and song, than any other people on earth.

This is my answer. Show me a country greater than our country. Show me a people more energetic, creative, progressive, bigger-hearted and happier than our people. Not until then will I consider your way of life. For I am an American, and I speak for Democracy!

FUNNY MAN AGNEW

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, the Vice President of the United States is a very funny man, if one views him with a certain degree of detachment. In a way, it is funny to see a national officeholder get standing ovations by using alliterative phrases that are above the vocabulary level of his audience. In a way, it is funny to hear a national officeholder whose speeches contain more factual errors per square inch than a first-grader's explanation of the theory of relativity. In a way, it is funny to watch a Vice President of the United States so eager to win the hate vote that he will degrade himself and his administration to below the level of George Wallace.

But if one does not view SPIRO AGNEW with detachment, if one has to live with the division and antagonism he has created, the humor is black. Some officeholders—President Eisenhower was certainly one of these—have held that if one appeals to the best in people, they will frequently respond accordingly. Mr. AGNEW seems to base his hopes for 1972 on the principle that if one appeals to the worst in people, they will respond accordingly.

Perhaps he is right. Six months ago, the Gallup poll found him the second most admired man in America. But I suspect that in the next year or so he will find you cannot fool enough of the people enough of the time. I suspect he will find he has underestimated the innate decency and intelligence of the American people.

I include an editorial entitled "Funny Man AGNEW," from the Woodland, Calif., Daily Democrat of June 26, 1970, in the RECORD:

FUNNY MAN AGNEW

Spiro Agnew has outgrown his britches.

He hit a new low when he assailed Senators Wm. Fulbright and Edward Kennedy as "apologists" for the Communists. Neither is above criticism and both admit it. But certainly their Americanism is beyond challenge. Agnew should apologize.

The vice president's assault on Averell Harriman was even worse. It was bitter and inexcusable. He blamed the able former American Ambassador for all the diplomatic disasters that have befallen the West in the past three decades. Most everyone knows that Harriman has come out of retirement time and time again to serve his country. He has sacrificed his health and spent a great deal of his own money as an envoy of peace. He did not succeed, but neither did Senator Cabot Lodge, the Republican.

In contrast to Agnew's inflammatory attack, no intemperate criticism has ever come from Harriman's lips about the Nixon administration or Republican Ambassador Lodge. Harriman is one of the nation's most sincere patriots.

In his usual suave, dignified and quiet manner, Harriman said he was most grateful to Agnew for giving him a new image that will enable him to visit a college campus and be cheered instead of booed and heckled on account of the vice president indicting him.

Taken more or less in stride was Agnew's provoked blasts at Republican Clark Clifford, ex-secretary of defense. Clifford is popular with Republicans as well as Democrats. He is too seasoned in politics to get bruises.

Agnew's reference to present Democratic National Chairman Laurence O'Brien was as funny as a cripple's crutch. "He will not march behind a commander-in-chief riding an elephant," said Agnew, "but he will dash unhesitatingly into battle behind one perched on an ass."

As expected, O'Brien's comment was in good humor: "You'd think that of all people, Mr. Agnew would know the difference between a donkey and an ass."

Nixon's obliging stooge was addressing a "$250-a-plate" Republican fund raising dinner. He told them only what they wanted to hear and what Nixon wanted him to say.

Politics often gets so sticky it gets dirty. But Agnew's burps are unlikely to create a crescendo of fury. However, it strikes us that the president and vice president are resorting to a strange technique in attempting to unite the country when it is so badly split.

YM–YWHA DIRECTORS ESTEEMED

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, the directors of the YM–YWHA of Essex County of West Orange, N.J. are esteemed throughout the area for their dedication to improving the quality of the whole society. They are persons of unusual attainment who give generously of their time and talents in the public service. The views of this distinguished group on any issue command respect. Recently the directors, speaking as individuals of conscience, acted upon a resolution dealing with the war in Southeast Asia and its effect upon our Nation. I commend to the attention of the Congress the counsel of these highly responsible citizens as expressed in the resolution which follows in its entirety:

RESOLUTION

We, the undersigned directors of the YM–YWHA of Essex County, New Jersey, speaking as individuals of conscience, fear that the continued commitment of American military forces in southeast Asia will seriously endanger the integrity of our society. This long, drawn-out conflict is proving to be costly in human life and resources and is having a profoundly negative effect on the course of this nation's affairs.

We are greatly concerned about the increasing alienation of a great number of citizens, particularly our youth, and are deeply troubled that the Viet Nam war has bred disillusionment, anxiety and fear within our nation.

Our concern causes us to challenge the low priorities the government has given to the social problems that beset society, and the high priority it continues to give to this war.

We hold that the withdrawal of our troops from Cambodia and Viet Nam, and a reallocation of our resources and efforts to our critical social problems should be speedily accomplished for the good of this Nation.

Mrs. William Abrams, Herbert Altshuler, Jerome Ben-Asher, Robert L. Berg, D.D.S., Peter Berkley, Arthur Brody, Clive Cummis, Julius A. Feinberg, Edwin Fisher, and Mrs. Seymour Frieland.

Mrs. Morris Goodman, Mrs. Sol Goodman, Sol Goodman, Jacob Goodstein, Mrs. Martin Jelin, Martin Levin, Sanford Lewis, M.D., Mrs. Milton Lowenstein, Milton Lowenstein, and Meyer R. Lowy.

Robert B. Lubman, Leon A. Marantz, Eugene V. Parsonnet, M.D., Norman Pastor, Herman Raff, Clarence Reisen, Morris Reisen, Nathan A. Resnik, and Saul Robbins.

Alvin C. Schottenfeld, Joel J. Schwarz, Steven Schwarz, Mrs. Arlene R. Scott, Leonard Shiman, Gadiel Smith, Mrs. Stanley Strauss, Mrs. Sidney Weinstein, and Mrs. Fred Welan

PERSPECTIVE ON CAMPUS DISORDERS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in what I consider to be one of the most lucid and thought-provoking discussions about the role of young Americans in our society, Mr. William N. Plymat of West Des Moines, Iowa, recently addressed the Iowa State Board of Regents.

Mr. Plymat, chairman of the board of Preferred Risk Mutual Insurance Co., has long impressed me by his energetic and strong commitment to peace and nonviolence, and this statement fully reflects his deep-seated philosophy.

His counsel and analysis are impressive, and I hope that such advice can be followed throughout America.

I now place Mr. Plymat's statement in the RECORD:

STATEMENT OF WILLIAM N. PLYMAT

My views are personal and not to be considered the views of the insurance firm with which I am connected. To solve the problem

of student disorders we need cool not hot heads. Our major objective should be to inhibit violence—not to devise unusual or brutal methods of repression and punishment. We need to lead students in constructive response to what disturbs them and to change our own actions as we ask them to change theirs.

We should teach students that violence does not promote legitimate goals—that like war it usually escalates from destruction of property to life and limb—that it is self-defeating—that real political change requires hard work, plenty of patience, often the enduring of defeat before enjoying victory—and a willingness to trade the excitement of demonstrations for the hard work of politics. And that if we want freedom for ourselves, we must give it to others; and if they want to straighten out what they call the straight people, many will have to start with themselves. We must convince them to work to change the system in democratic ways and not be content to merely exhibit, by manner, dress and facial foliage, their defiance of it. Universities, without taking sides, could present courses on methods of effective politics which few students seem yet to know, understand or practice. They could offer courses on conflict resolution without violence and teach the principles of Gandhi and Dr. Martin Luther King that have been more successful in achieving proper goals than those of violent leaders.

But while we do this, we must recognize the great idealism of most young people—and understand their warranted disgust with the hypocrisy of adults. To more fully understand, read the famous talk of Dr. George Wald of Harvard titled "A Generation in Search of a Future." We should listen as well as speak to youth. Their complaints should be carefully considered with appropriate action taken. It would be healthy to poll students on campus issues to learn what the majority really wants not what a noisy minority demands. While we can't turn universities over to students to run as they please, we can give them a real hearing on desires in curriculum design and other issues, then really respond in a fair way. When pressures build up, we should ventilate them with full communication keeping cool heads. We must work with police where there is law violation, but we should be slow to call out large numbers of police and national guards because most student violence has been limited to property damage while student, police and guard confrontations have led to injury and death mostly inflicted by police and guards. Let's recognize that our university presidents, their staffs, and our Governor have in general acted wisely in handling campus discord, and we should seek to help rather than criticize.

A great cause of student unrest is the war, and we must end it. No military victory can be won so reasonable concessions and even a coalition government in South Vietnam is better than tens of thousands more lives lost in a scaled down war that can drag on for years. The appointment of a new fully competent and respected chief negotiator in Paris is long overdue.

We should admit we've loaded the major burden of war on the backs of youth. A young man may give up thousands of dollars of potential income to attend a university to learn an occupation valuable not only to himself but to society. But when he graduates we force him into the military requiring him not only to kill in a war, which in most cases he does not agree with, but to risk his own life in the jungles and do it at a pittance for a wage. The difference between what he can earn in civilian life and the military is in the essence a tax that often runs from 50% to 75%. The knowledge of this causes plenty unrest. Our government says it has brought home 115,000 from Vietnam, promises another 150,000 in a year, and a prompt end of the war. Then why the big current draft? Now is the time to end the draft and substitute an all-volunteer army with good wages. I believe that as adults and educators we should be active in advising the President and members of Congress that the immediate end of the draft will go a long way to reduce student unrest.

What are we entitled to ask of students in a tax-supported state university if we are fair with them? I believe it should be for a commitment of responsible conduct or adherence to a code of it. We should ask them to avoid violence in all personal and governmental relations except in self-defense—to be law abiding seeking to change laws they disagree with by legal means—to not interfere with the legal rights of others to do as they please—to avoid stirring up controversy in such a way as to incite violence—to avoid personal acts of retaliation to acts deemed improper or illegal leaving the administration of justice to those charged with it and to abstain from urging others to violate the law. If universities have the power to simply demand this, they should do so. If not, they should seek the authority to ask for a signed pledge of such a commitment as a condition of admission and continuance as a student. If a proper university tribunal is not available to consider charges of violations of such a code, one should be established with students, faculty and perhaps citizens from the general public as members. The penalty for violation should be termination as a student.

I have learned in other areas involving needed orientation that men will not easily orient to threats of severe punishment and huge fines that seem unlikely to be assessed. But they will usually respond to an effective legal system that convinces them that prompt effective action will be taken against them if they deserve it with a certain very unpleasant penalty. A simple example may suffice. I have had occasion many times to point out that a man will not stop drunk driving to save your life or his, but he will to save his license. Many students can be triggered into violent action by a display of violence, but I believe most will comply with regulations when they realize that they can't afford to pay the price of not complying. The license to continue as a student is perhaps the most valuable thing a student has, and I think the danger of its loss can be the best persuader for good conduct that we have.

YOUTH UNVEIL MONUMENT TO WAR DEAD

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, an increasing volume of evidence documents the fact that the unsung majority of today's youth does not favor the degradation of our Government's foundations but, rather, a reinforcement of them. The following article by Vi Murphy of the San Diego Union tells of a youth group in La Mesa, Calif., and their unselfish efforts to erect a monument to their city's men who have lost their lives in Vietnam. I know my colleagues will find the story both interesting and heart warming and it is my pleasure to share it with you. I ask to include it in the RECORD at this point:

YOUTH UNVEIL MONUMENT TO WAR DEAD

(By Vi Murphy)

"Greater love hath no man . . ."

The inscription stood out boldly on the bronze tablet attached to the soft pink face of the 12-foot mound of crystalline quartz while a brilliant Sunday sun struck sparks on tiny facets in the stone.

Members of the Heartland Youth for Decency (HYD) looked gratefully at the crowd of more than 2,000, then in strong, sure words, thanked all the people for coming.

"It is a very special occasion for us today," Denise Evers, a San Diego State sophomore and HYD chairman, told the crowd. "You see, we are dedicating a monument."

FLAGS FLUTTER

A gentle Flag Day breeze softly stirred the fold of the bright new banner on top of the new flag pole next to the monument, and more than three-dozen other large American flags lined along one side of the La Mesa city square fluttered in harmony.

It was a sparkling day yesterday—red, white and blue all over. And that was the way the young people had intended it to be.

The monument at Spring Street and University Avenue was dedicated to young servicemen from La Mesa and the surrounding area—Spring Valley, Santee, Lemon Grove, El Cajon and Lakeside—killed in the Vietnam war.

HEROES LISTED

Under the big, bronze tablet bearing the inscription, "Greater love hath no man . . ." were three smaller bronze plates engraved with the names and service designation of the young men to whom the monument was dedicated.

"We support our men in Vietnam, not because we are for war, but because these men include our friends, our brothers, our fathers and our husbands, and also because we support our country," Denise Evers explained.

As she spoke, eyes lifted to the stark, white cross topping the pink quartz monument. Denise continued:

"The past five years have seen race riots and campus violence taking place regularly.

"The flag is burned and desecrated daily by those who feel wronged by the establishment.

"At the same time, halfway across the world, in Vietnam, our young men fight and die in defense of this same flag."

An olive drab soldier's field helmet crowned the white cross atop the monument.

OFFICIALS ATTEND

Dignitaries at the ceremony included movie star Eric Estrado; Assemblymen E. Richard Barnes and Tom Hom, both Republicans from San Diego; Richard Cosgriff, vice mayor of La Mesa; the Rev. Henry Vetter of the Rancho Nazareth Orphanage in Tecate, Mexico; Undersheriff Warren Kanagy; La Mesa Police Chief Glen Adams, and police Sgt. Bill Cook, who helped organize HYD.

Harry Von Zell, radio and television announcer, was master of ceremonies.

Von Zell paid tribute to the members of the HYFD as part of the "decent, 90 per cent of American youth who do not get headlines but instead are quietly finishing their educations and going their ways becoming constructive, valuable citizens.

There is a silent majority in America, Von Zell contended, and "we have those people all around us, quietly, all through the year."

YOUTH HAILED

Hom presented the HYD group a resolution adopted by the Assembly, commending the organization.

"These young people are the real Americans, the 90 per cent of constructive youth in America, and I hope the time comes soon when they get the headlines instead of the destructive 10 per cent," Hom said.

Telegrams and messages were received by the group from John Wayne, Walter Brennan, Gov. Reagan, Ross Perot, Walter Knott of Knott's Berry Farm, and others.

The names of the young men from the Heartland area who have been killed in Vietnam were announced one by one, each by a different member of the HYD group who placed a carnation at the base of the newly-dedicated monument. When the roll call was finished, there was a solid chain of carnations around the memorial.

OTHER TRIBUTES

Wreaths were placed at the monument's base by representatives of the Gold Star Wives. Mrs. Virginia Ball of Encanto, a member of the U.S. Air Force Wives, presented a personal tribute in honor of her son, Gerald D. Pochel, a Navy man who died in Vietnam.

The flag was lowered to half staff, the crack Lincoln High School ROTC unit gave an 18-gun salute and the lovely, nostalgic notes of "Taps" sounded.

A member from each of the armed services—Marines, Army, Air Force, Navy and Coast Guard—formed an honor line before the monument.

MORE PARTICIPANTS

Robyn Tucker, HYD executive secretary, thanked the participants in the ceremony. They also included units from the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the American Legion, Disabled American Veterans, Boy Scouts, Fleet Reserve Association, the Junior Women's Club, the Marine Corps Band and the La Mesa Fire Department, which constructed the speaker's platform.

"To all the patriotic people in the Heartland area, we salute you, thank you and God bless you," she said.

A reception at the La Mesa Police Station followed the dedication.

DSG STUDY ON SECRECY IN THE HOUSE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the Democratic Study Group has issued a special report on secrecy in the House of Representatives. It documents the extent to which the House conducts its business beyond the purview of the American public. By spelling out many of the problems of House procedure, the DSG report indicates the basis for the bipartisan antisecrecy amendments which will be offered when H.R. 17654, the legislative reorganization bill, reaches the House floor next week. For this reason, I insert at this point in the RECORD the DSG study and I commend it to Members and others interested in making the House a more responsive institution:

SECRECY IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

(Democratic Study Group special report)

Secrecy pervades the legislative process in the House of Representatives. Arbitrary and undemocratic procedures are so much the rule that they are hardly noticed let alone seriously challenged. Yet secrecy has a more debilitating impact on the House than its well-publicized companion, the seniority system.

Secrecy in the House is corrosive. It undermines the Democratic process by denying Members information they need to make intelligent legislative decisions and by denying voters information they need to make informed electoral decisions.

It destroys public confidence in the House as a responsible legislative body. It makes the House incomprehensible to the average citizen and contributes to the growing distrust the following sections:

Since House consideration of H.R. 17654, the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, will provide the first opportunity in more than two decades to make major changes in House rules and procedures, DSG has prepared this special report to focus attention on secrecy and its impact. The report contains the following sections:

SECTION I. MAJOR FORMS OF SECRECY IN THE HOUSE

Secrecy in the House takes many forms. It is closed committee meetings; it is refusal to disclose record votes taken in committee; it is the unavailability of reports and other information about the contents and effect of legislation; it is non-record votes on major amendments during floor consideration of bills; it is closed House-Senate conferences and more off-the-record votes; it is calling up conference reports and other measures for a vote before Members have had adequate opportunity to study them.

Whatever the form, however, the effect of such procedures is to deny the public and Members themselves basic information they need to participate effectively in the democratic process.

Secrecy follows legislation through every step of the legislative process from initial committee deliberations through the closed House-Senate conferences. Perhaps the most notorious example of secrecy is the House appropriations process which is almost totally closed not only to the public but also to most of the membership of the House.

Following is a discussion of the major forms of secrecy involved in the legislative process in the House:

Closed committee sessions

Nearly half of the hearings and meetings of House committees are closed to the press and public. Most of the closed sessions are held by major committees such as Ways and Means, Armed Services, Foreign Affairs, and Appropriations. Indeed the powerful Appropriations Committee holds *all* of its more than 300 annual meetings and hearings behind closed doors, out of sight of the taxpayers who foot the bill for its actions. The House Appropriations Committee is the *only* Congressional committee which always meets in secret session. While the House permits its Appropriations Committee to blatantly disregard the public right to know, the Senate Appropriations Committee manages to hold 75% of its meetings *open* to the public and the press.

With the exception of Appropriations, most committees open the majority of their hearings to the public, while closing their doors for mark-up sessions in which members vote on various provisions of the bill under consideration.

One exception to the "closed door" syndrome in the House is the Education & Labor Committee which holds all sessions—including mark-up meetings—open to the public without impairing the committee's effectiveness.

Secret committee votes

Except for the Education & Labor Committee, each Member's vote on key provisions of legislation considered in House committees is withheld from their constituents and the public generally. The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 requires committees to maintain a record of the votes on any question on which a record is demanded. However, this information is not released by the committees.

Unavailability of committee reports and hearings

Committee reports and hearings are frequently filed too late to permit Members adequate time to review them before they must vote on the legislation. Appropriations Committee reports are generally unavailable until a few days before the multibillion-dollar measures are approved by the House. In most instances, transcripts of the closed-door appropriation hearings—which average over 4,000 pages per bill—are published so late that even the Members of the Appropriations Committee not on the subcommittee involved do not see them until the day the full committee meets to report the legislation. Similarly, the several thousand pages of Armed Services Committee hearings are usually not made available until the day before floor consideration of the measure begins. In the case of the District Committee, reports are frequently unavailable until the day of the vote itself and many of the hearings are not even published at all.

Nonrecord votes on amendments

The House considers most amendments to legislation while it is meeting as a Committee of the Whole, a procedure under which no record votes are taken. Thus, constituents have no way of knowing how their Representative votes on most major amendments. These votes—regardless of how important—are either by voice or division (in which Members stand in place to be counted) or teller (in which Members file up an aisle between tellers who count them as they pass). No record is made, however, of how—or even whether—Members voted. Thus only those on the House floor and in the galleries have any chance of ascertaining how individual Members vote on a particular amendment. And those in the gallery who might wish to record how Members vote on an important teller vote are thwarted by the fact that only the press is permitted to take notes in the House galleries, and they cannot see Members' faces during teller votes because the teller lines go in the opposite direction.

Closed House-Senate conferences

All House-Senate Conferences (to work out differences between House and Senate versions of a bill) are closed to the public, the press, and other Members of Congress. Although Conferences often significantly alter legislation passed by the two houses, no record of what occurs during a conference or how the conferees vote on the key issues involved is made available.

When the conferees reach agreement, they report back to their respective houses. In the House, a conference report may be taken up almost immediately, the only requirement being that it be printed in the *Record*. Thus a report filed for the *Record* at the close of business one day may be called up for debate and a vote at the opening of business the next day. Since conference reports are often obscure and complex and since debate is limited to one hour, such a procedure does not give members adequate time to gain an understanding of the conference agreements before voting to approve or disapprove the measure. Further, even when conference reports are not called up immediately after being reported, they are called up without notice.

SECTION II. IMPACT OF SECRECY

Secrecy is detrimental to all concerned—except possibly special interests whose purposes cannot stand public scrutiny.

Secrecy prevents Members of the House from doing their jobs effectively. It inhibits the press in meeting its responsibilities. It denies the public information to which it is entitled in a democratic society.

Thus, secrecy undermines the democratic process and impairs the ability of the House to function effectively. It saps public confidence in the House as an institution and weakens confidence in all democratic institutions and elected officials.

Impact on Members

Non-record votes and closed committee sessions saddle all Members of the House with the poor image that secrecy engenders. Non-record votes reduce participation and make it almost impossible for Members to get support for amendments regardless of non-record votes on amendments and the vast majority of them fail. The absence of recorded votes also results in procedural votes being transformed into tests of sentiment on key issues—a practice which may subject a Member's record to misinterpretation.

Closed committee sessions pose additional problems for Members by making it more difficult to reject the entreaties of interests seeking legislation not in the public interest. The lack of early availability of committee reports works to the disadvantage of Members by denying them adequate opportunity to make an intelligent evaluation of pending legislation or to draft amendments and seek support for them. This often places Members in a position in which there is little choice but to accept the recommendations of the committee which reported the bill.

Impact on the press

Closed committee meetings, secret or non-record votes, and lack of information prevent the press from meeting its obligation to fully and accurately inform the public about the conduct of public business in the House. Closed committee sessions make reporters dependent on "leaks"—thereby increasing the possibility of misleading reports or outright manipulation of the press through "leaks," designed to favor a particular point of view.

The unavailability of committee reports and hearings prevents reporters from familiarizing themselves with legislation before it reaches the floor, thus limiting background analysis and in-depth reportage. Further, the consideration of conference reports without prior notice curtails the ability of the press to cover these important votes adequately.

Impact on the public

Closed committee sessions and off-the-record votes in committee and on the House floor deny the public information essential to effective functioning of the democratic system. Procedures which foster secrecy make the institution of government which is supposed to be closest to the people remote and unresponsive. In addition, secrecy gives special interest an advantage over the public interest by permitting professional lobbyists to exert an influence out of proportion to the righteousness of their cause. Finally, the public interest is not served when such major issues as the ABM, the SST, the invasion of Cambodia, school desegregation, civil liberties and air and water pollution are decided anonymously. The poor attendance on many of these votes effectively disenfranchised many constituents and in some cases permitted the continuation of programs and policies opposed by the public.

SECTION III. SOLUTIONS TO THE PROBLEM OF SECRECY

The Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970, scheduled for House consideration in mid-July, provides the first major opportunity in a quarter of a century to attack the problem of secrecy in the House.

The bill, H.R. 17654, will come to the House floor under a rule permitting amendments dealing with any aspect of House operations except committee jurisdiction.

Thus, numerous amendments are anticipated—including several designed to open House proceedings to more public scrutiny. The most important of the secrecy-related amendments deal with record votes, access to committee meetings, and availability of information.

Following is a discussion of reforms needed to eliminate secrecy in the House.

Record votes on amendments

The public has a right to know how Members of Congress vote on the major issues of the day. However, many of the most important House votes occur in conjunction with amendments in Committee of the Whole where record votes are not permitted under present rules. Thus, several amendments are being considered to provide for record votes. One of the major proposals would simply authorize clerks to record the names of Members as they pass through teller lines. This would avoid the necessity of a time-consuming roll call while at the same time providing a public record of how Members voted on a particular matter. This is perhaps the most important reform amendment which will be offered. It would not only permit constituents to better evaluate the performance of their representative, it would also significantly improve Member participation in voting on amendments to legislation. Ironically, however, whether such record votes will be permitted will be decided by *non-record vote* under present procedures.

Disclosure of votes in committee

The public has a right to know how their elected representatives vote on matters which come before them in committee as well as in the House. Present rules require committees to maintain a record of how Members vote on any committee roll call, but this information is not made public by the Committees. The only change in this situation provided by the Legislative Reorganization bill is a meaningless requirement that committees announce the vote total on motions to report legislation—but without indicating how each Member voted.

To provide substantive reform in this area, an amendment to the Legislative Reorganization bill is being considered which would require that each Member's vote on committee and subcommittee roll calls be made public.

Open committee sessions

The Legislative Reorganization bill contains provisions stating that committee hearings and business meetings "shall be open to the public except when the committee, by majority vote, determines otherwise."

This language is only slightly different from the present rule and would therefore have little, if any, effect in opening more committee hearings and meetings. Committees would still be permitted to close any or all hearings or meetings by majority vote without explanation. Thus, the House Appropriations Committee could continue holding all of its hearings and meetings behind closed doors.

An amendment is therefore being considered to require a two-thirds roll call vote to close a meeting or hearings, plus disclosure of the reason for doing so. This would promote more open sessions while still providing committees with flexibility to close hearings and meetings involving national security matters or other sensitive issues.

Availability of information

Members must be provided with reports, hearings and other information sufficiently in advance of floor consideration of legislation so that they may know what they are voting on. At present, a Member who wishes to inform himself about a bill or measure on which he must vote, must make a special request to obtain the committee report on the measure. And all too often committee reports are not available in time to review them prior to voting on the bill. Thus, the following three amendments are being considered in this area:

1. An amendment requiring that the committee report on any appropriation bill be *delivered* to each Member's office at least seven days before House action on the measure. Such a requirement is not unreasonable in view of the fact that appropriations bills involve the expenditure of billions of tax dollars.

2. An amendment requiring that the committee report on any non-appropriations measure be *delivered* to each Member's office at least three days, excluding weekends and holidays, before House action.

3. An amendment requiring that House-Senate conference reports be available to Members for at least three days before House action and that advance notice be given when such reports are to be called up. Conference reports presently may be called up without notice providing they have been printed in the *Record*.

These amendments would end the practice of developing legislation behind closed doors and then rushing it through the House before Members have had an opportunity to analyse the measure. As the Joint Committee on the Operation of Congress noted in its 1966 report, bills which cannot survive scrutiny are bills that should not be enacted. "The world's most powerful legislature cannot in good conscience deprive its membership of a brief study of a committee report prior to final action," the bipartisan committee noted.

WALTER C. BORNEMEIER, M.D., AND A REVOLUTION IN AMERICAN MEDICAL CARE

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Walter C. Bornemeier was sworn in as president of the American Medical Association on June 24, 1970.

Dr. Bornemeier represents the finest product of our medical profession—he is wise, compassionate, and highly articulate. I am fortunate indeed to represent him and his family in the Congress of the United States and I count him among my most concerned and involved constituents.

Dr. Bornemeier's inaugural address to the AMA delegates, who met in convention in Chicago last week, was a graphic illustration of the kind of man he is and what he has brought to his noble profession. In his speech he said:

> The number one priority should be to increase output and production of physicians. Enrollment in our medical schools should be markedly increased and the curriculum shortened.

Then, with a series of specific suggestions, Dr. Bornemeier outlined several goals which he believes should guide the medical profession in the years ahead.

I bring his excellent speech to the attention of my colleagues today that they may obtain firsthand knowledge of the man who will head the AMA and who will have a significant influence on its course in the future.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. Bornemeier's thoughtful speech follows:

A REVOLUTION IN MEDICAL CARE

(By Walter C. Bornemeier, M.D., president, American Medical Association)

Dr. Dorman, Dr. Montgomery, Officers and members of the Board of Trustees, Dr. Howard, honored Presidents of the State,

Territorial and Commonwealth Associations, Members of the House of Delegates, Ladies and Gentlemen:

I am deeply grateful for the honor that has been bestowed upon me. I am not unmindful of the responsibility. I hope and I pray that I may carry out the responsibilities of this high office so the people of this country may have continuing improvement of adequate high quality care and in a manner that makes the practice of medicine a satisfying profession for the physician. I do want to talk a bit about these matters this afternoon. Before I do so, I want to introduce my family. My wife Mabel, who has been my companion, helpmate and favorite consultant for over forty years. My daughter Lois and her husband, Dr. Louis John Kettel who is an Associate Professor of Medicine at Arizona, their children, Linda, Chip, and Laura. Our daughter Beatrice and her husband, Ralph Fiedler who is a teacher in the schools of South San Francisco, Michael, Tommy, and Randy. Our son Walter C. Bornemeier, II, his wife Mary Lou. Walter is an attorney in San Jose, California. Their children, Walter C. Bornemeier, III, age 2½, and Maren, 6 months, are with grandparents in Scottsdale.

A REVOLUTION IN MEDICAL CARE

I am sure that all of us were fascinated in our youth by Washington Irving's story of Rip Van Winkle. When I first read it, I thought the amazing part was that Rip could sleep for 20 years. Now I know the really amazing part was that he slept through a revolution. When Rip went to sleep, we were a British colony. When he awakened, the nation was a republic. We are living through a revolution in health care, and I am sure that physicians, the press and the community are well aware of it. In this address I shall consider some of its causes and effects, and propose some fundamental possible solutions to the problems this revolution has created.

Medical care changed from an Art to a Science during the transition from the pre-antibiotic days before World War II, to the gradual emergence of antibiotics in abundance. The famous painting, "The Doctor," by Sir Luke Fildes typified the ancient Art of Medicine at its best. For many years, the painting was found in almost every pharmacy, in mamy homes and in many physicians' offices. Most of today's young people have never even seen the painting because it no longer represents the present day practice of medicine. In this painting a physician, with no tools specific for an illness, sits helplessly at the bedside of a very sick child. In the background, the father comforts the grief-stricken mother who knows that only a miracle can save her young one. That physician was loved forever by the bereaved family . . . not for what he did scientifically, but for his kindness during those trying hours and days. The physician in those days had relatively little to offer other than kindness. How different from the treatment of illness today! The physician cares for people today by prescribing specific or near specific remedies . . . then moves on to the next problem.

In this century, we have lived through two eras of medical care. Before World War I, it is generally agreed that medical care often did more harm than good. Between World Wars I and II medical care—other than surgery—did very little harm, but often very little good. But during that time an overlay of scientific knowledge was gradually emerging. A few specifics became available for the prevention and cure of disease. At the start of World War II, the big news in medicine was improved treatment first with sulfa drugs and then, in the early 40's with antibiotics. Those two wonder drugs ushered in the second era—the era of Scientific Medicine. The antibiotics have given the non-surgical practitioner a genuine capability to cure or control the illness of his patient. For the surgical practitioner, the sulfas and the antibiotics have greatly increased the application of his skill. The dramatic development of laboratory and other diagnostic methods has resulted in much improved service.

Additional evidence of the present health care revolution is the *discovery since World War II that the hospital is a place to go for health instead of a place to die.* In fact, going to a hospital has become such a status symbol that even with an illness that can be managed well in the doctor's office, people often insist on being hospitalized. This revolutionary change in the science of medicine is continuing, but concurrently the delivery and financing of medical care are also undergoing rapid change. The extraordinary demand for medical and related services created by the infusion of billions of dollars into an already overheated system, increasing affluence, public appreciation of modern medicine has placed a heavy obligation on physicians and other health professionals to increase productivity and availability while at the same time preserving quality. We have an abundance of consumers, but too few providers.

The obvious urgent need today is a sharp expansion of the totality of medical and related services provided by physicians and other health professionals, in an efficient and productive team effort. The supply shortage is especially acute in the ghettos and in rural America. In Chicago in the past decade, 1,700 physicians—through retirement, death or relocation—have been lost to the inner city. In numerous rural areas the only available service is too remote to be accessible, especially in emergencies. A cooperative effort between physicians and government is beginning to solve some of the problems of the inner city, with government supplying the facility such as a neighborhood health center and physicians supplying the medical service.

The use of paramedical personnel to extend the hands of the physician is just beginning to receive adequate emphasis. The amelioration of these difficult medical care problems will require the cooperation of the total physician population, including those in administration, full-time teaching and research, and those already active in patient care. The answer to strangling government regulation will be a visible and effective response by the medical profession.

The number one priority should be to increase the output and production of physicians. Enrollment in our medical schools should be markedly increased and the curriculum shortened. The cost of educating a doctor must be reduced. The place to start is to increase the efficiency of the education system. We can do this, first, by reducing the length of time spent in the premedical and medical curriculum; and second, by deemphasizing those studies that do not contribute materially to the preparation of the student for clinical patient care.

We might have as our goal, a maximum of six years from high school to the M.D. degree. We are on the way! The majority of the medical schools are presently shortening the curriculum and increasing their enrollment. The course of study of the conventional freshman year in medicine is being given as the final year of the premedical curriculum in some areas. The medical student can then go directly into a medical curriculum that is patient-oriented from the first day. As an added benefit, much of the restlessness of present-day medical students can be avoided by prompt involvement in patient care.

By giving the freshman year curriculum in the premedical course and eliminating the summer vacation, medical school itself may be reduced to 24 months. One quarter should be spent in a clerkship in internal medicine so every graduate would have had contact with that most important specialty before he goes into any other choice available to him upon graduation. Medical schools might admit a class every six months in order to get maximum use out of their laboratories and specialized teaching. In addition to efforts to shorten the medical school curriculum and increase the enrollment, a critical review of residency training programs should be completed as soon as possible.

For the past 25 years, more and more of our medical school graduates have been withheld from the productive practice of medicine for two to five or more years in order to pursue their education in a specialty. Today there are about 35,000 of these licensed doctors of medicine, graduates of schools in the United States in residency training programs. A high percentage of these are over 30 years of age. These young men and women would have been in the active practice of medicine under our system of training 25 or 30 years ago. In addition to these 35,000 residents, there are an estimated 5,000 of our best physicians who have quit practice to take positions as medical educators in the full-time employment of the hospital for the purpose of teaching the resident. No wonder we have a doctor shortage.

We should take a good look at these training programs to determine whether or not this is the most efficient and effective way to produce a high quality physician. When the residency programs were first developed about 40 years ago as a method of training specialists, the length of the program was two years. Gradually this has been expanded to four or even five or more years in some of the specialties. More important, when the residency programs were initiated, most large hospitals had sizable charity services where the intern and resident were able to develop responsibility in the care of patients under the close supervision of an attending physician. Such programs are today almost nonexistent.

Thirty years ago, physicians had more time to teach residents than they do today and there were less than half as many residents. Today many hospitals have residency programs designed principally to provide service rather than education. In addition to the 40,000 residents and full-time hospital-based medical educators, medical schools now employ 10 to 12,000 full-time instructors to teach the junior and senior students. Twenty-five years ago this teaching was done by those of us in practice. That makes over 50,000 licensed physicians in training and teaching. This diversion of so large a number of M.D.'s from direct patient care has aggravated the current shortage of medical services for the public.

Perhaps we are training too many specialists? In some fields we definitely are. General surgery is oversupplied yet there seems to be no reduction in the number of general surgery residencies that are created. Are some of these residencies established only so that the surgeon can have an assistant at the operation, and someone to look after the patient when the surgeon is not present? Why should the hospital need to employ an assistant for the surgeon? A residency training program in a 600 bed hospital costs over a million dollars a year—about $5.00 per day per patient. For 54% of the hospital beds in the United States, there is no house staff. The surgeons and other staff doctors in those hospitals hire assistants where needed and they look after the patients themselves, usually aided by a capable head nurse.

I have asked the Board of Trustees of our Association to make a renewed in-depth residency program. The Board has referred this matter to a review committee to determine whether such a study should be made and implemented. I believe that any new program that might be developed should

be under the direction of an appropriate national body composed of representatives of the American Medical Association's Council on Medical Education, the Association of American Medical Colleges, the American Hospital Association and other organizations concerned with the training and certification of specialists. At the end of this training period, this national supervising organization could issue a certificate of specialty.

In any new graduate education program we might be well advised to emphasize again a preceptorship method of training, being sure to have the program well directed and supervised. If M.D. graduates could be trained in the active practice of medicine outside of the hospital with a physician or group, approved for teaching, the doctor shortage would, in large measure, be solved. The trainee would certainly develop an expertise for care of the patient outside of the hospital rather than be trained almost exclusively to become experts in the care of hospitalized patients. He would be learning what it is that makes people sick, not just how to make them well.

With today's emphasis on continuing education for the doctor, over 2,000 courses have been developed for constant refresher education for physicians in practice. About half of these are in hospitals, the others in universities. Our recent graduates would have access to these programs in addition to the education at the elbow of a practicing physcian; the same physician who now teaches him in the present program. The preceptor would as rapidly as possible permit the new physician to develop responsibility commensurate with his skills and knowledge.

It is possible that we might, almost overnight, add 50,000 doctors to the care of patients in our communities. At the same time we would introduce our young physicians into a continuing education program that would continue throughout the physician's lifetime. Along with an increase in the supply of physicians, there is an urgent need for increased numbers of those who assist the doctor in the care of the patient.

At the present time there are about 14 allied health people for each physician. Junior colleges across the nation are to be congratulated for including in their curricula many opportunities for medical technologists. The AMA Council on Education is active in establishing standards so these graduates can have a certificate that is recognized nationally. Schools for practical nurses are increasing rapidly. On-the-job training in hospitals and physicians' offices is an important source of technicians and aides. We need more nurses, but especially, we need a redefinition of their role on the health care team. As I said in a Readers Digest article in the July 1970 issue, nurses will no doubt merge as the chief source of supply of the physician's assistant. Already many practitioners rely heavily on a nurse assistant. In the future, the graduate nurse must be given more responsibility. She can liberate a great deal of the physician's time by taking over many of his duties. I commend to you the forward looking report on the nurse presented at this meeting by the Board of Trustees and its Committee on Nursing.

The role of research in influencing the supply-demand equation is also profoundly important. Consider how many physicians and other professionals would be released for other duties if a cure were found for tuberculosis.

However, it is possible that the chief cause of the shortage of funds for teaching in medical schools is that many schools are overspending their financial resources in a maladjusted effort which emphasizes research at the expense of teaching. It might be better if those schools would re-emphasize teaching.

A little over 10 years ago, our Congress, in its wisdom, appropriated substantially more than was requested for research. In order to use this money, it was necessary to train a great many research people. Once more hundreds of our best young men, just finished their specialty training and ready to go into practice were persuaded to accept a research traineeship which was a training program of several years duration. In order to accommodate this influx of research money, it became necessary for medical schools to provide housing for this activity so great research laboratories were built. The school hoped to benefit from the teaching that would be provided by the research physicians. But as it developed the research grants that became available carried with them rigid restrictions on time spent on unrelated activities. So—instead of a plum, the medical school may have picked a fruit of a different color.

Today, the scarcity of research funds might persuade many of these physicians to return to patient care where they are desperately needed. The medical school might convert the research laboratories into teaching facilities and greatly increase their enrollment. Research could be left principally to those medical schools with large endowments, the many foundations whose principal interest is investigative, and other selected centers of research excellence.

Certainly this has been one of the most significant meetings in the long history of our Association. Health has become one of the major objectives of the nation and all those measures that promote its realization have become a matter of intense public interest. The first public forum sponsored by the AMA at its Annual Meeting, and the wide interest shown in our deliberations, reflect the fact that the American Medical Association—the organization that is most representative of all of our physicians regardless of specialty or location—remains a focal point of important decision-making that will continue to have a significant influence on the nation's future health care system.

It is our obligation as a profession and an Association to accept the obligation of leadership and to identify ourselves clearly with the legitimate concerns of the nation. It is our obligation to formulate and implement constructive solutions to those problems. It is our obligation to help realize those expectations which should and can be met.

I am proud to have delivered this inaugural address at a meeting when so many issues of overriding importance to the nation have been considered in a statesmanlike and constructive manner. I am sure that my specific recommendations to improve the relationship between demand for services and the supply of those services will be received in the same forward looking and innovative spirit. We must continue to be innovative. We must adjust our education and our delivery system to the needs of the times. What is needed is money to increase supply . . . not demand. Dollars should be poured into scholarships for students, salaries for teachers, and schools for nurses and paramedical personnel. Then let us graduate enough boys and girls, men and women, to bring the supply up to the level of demand. We must revise the method of training our specialists so that the system is in keeping with the needs of our people. In this way, and only in this way, will we have high quality health care for all of the people—one level of care for all—at a cost that this nation can afford.

DR. NOVICH

HON. JOSEPH G. MINISH

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. MINISH. Mr. Speaker, it was my honor recently to present to Dr. and Mrs. Max M. Novich a trophy bearing the inscription "for dedicated effort in the promotion and development of emotional, mental, and physical fitness of our youth," the gift of Dr. and Mrs. Ben Cannapa, the trophy attests to the respect and affection in which the Novichs are held by the students—and their parents—of the doctor's boxing clinic for overprivileged youngsters. Dr. Novich, an orthopedic surgeon, has run the clinic in the basement of his home in South Orange, N.J., for the last 6 years. It has been so successful that larger quarters must be obtained and the clinic expanded to include wrestling, judo, and weight control.

The indefatigable Dr. Novich has traveled all over the world to promote the sport of boxing. A highly interesting article on Dr. Novich's observations on the state of boxing in the Soviet Union appeared in the News Tribune of Wednesday, May 6, 1970. I should like to insert the article by Mr. Charles J. Read, Jr., News Tribune sports writer, at this point in the RECORD:

You've heard, or said it for more than a decade.

"Boxing is dead."

"The sport is finished. Most of the fights are fixed, anyway."

What should be made clear, is that no matter how much truth is contained in such statements, they refer primarily to professional boxing in the United States. In some countries, boxing is very much alive—although the sport flourishes in a form quite different from what we are associated with.

Dr. Max M. Novich, who runs his orthopaedic practice in Perth Amboy and travels all over the world to help promote his favorite sport, boxing, has again come up with some refreshing and stimulating ideas on the subject.

Dr. Novich knows the sport from all angles, having battled his way from the streets of Newark through the University of North Carolina on a boxing scholarship. He was a speaker a few weeks ago at a Dinner of Boxing Champions in Los Angeles. Before past greats of the ring as Jimmie McLarnin, Freddie Steele, Maxie Rosenbloom, Fidel L. Barba and others, Dr. Novich shook up the gathering with a graphic report on amateur boxing.

His speech was drawn from a February trip to the Soviet Union. He was team physician for an AAU boxing team which competed against the Soviets in Moscow and Minsk. Last October, the USSR team had visited Las Vegas and topped the U.S. boxers, 6–5. Before 14,000 in the Moscow Sports Palace the Russians won, 9–2, and before 12,000 in Minsk, the U.S. took another loss, 8–3.

"Our 12-man squad was selected from 22 AAU boxers who trained one month at Fort Dix," Dr. Novich said. "These 12 men were used for both matches in Moscow and Minsk, whereas the Russians were able to field fresh teams in both cities. The Russians are blessed with a large number of boxers. They have 333,000 registered boxers in the USSR. We have only 8–9,000 registered AAU boxers in the USA.

"In the United States when an amateur boxer wins a national or Olympic boxing title, he usually turns professional. In Russia, when a boxer wins a national, European or Olympic title, he continues to box. These awards entitle him to be a Master of Sports with additional financial, athletic and social rewards.

"Their definition of an amateur athlete," Dr. Novich continued, "is in marked contradiction to our interpretation of the words. Their boxing team had an average age of 25 with an experience of 153 bouts per man. In contrast, our boys had an average age of 21.5 with an average of 57 bouts per man."

The 46-year-old Dr. Novich told of certain Soviet boxers, their records and how their experience overshadowed our boxers in the matches. He then explained the Russian methods of preparing their boxers for national and international competition which, "pays off in spades."

"Unlike the USA, which permits their boxers to enter national boxing competition at 16 years of age, in Russia a boxer is not permitted to try out for a national team until after he has reached 19 years of age. By virtue of this system, a boxer gains considerable experience. Instruction in boxing drills start in school at age seven, but he is not permitted medically to participate in actual boxing competition until he has reached 14. Then he competes on a junior national level through 19. In the United States, there is no matching by age. A 16-year-old, if he is in the open class by virtue of a number of bouts and-or wins, may have to compete against a boxer who is much older and stronger."

Dr. Novich spoke on the superb condition of the Russian boxers. He told of the 10,000 Sports Complexes (Schools) throughout the Soviet Union where a boy—or girl—gets lessons on any sport of their choice under qualified coaches. Boys in vocational schools must go to these complexes in the afternoon, and students in primary and secondary schools usually attend after regular classes. Working people can also use these gyms in the evening, but in the USSR, the accent is on youth, "be it for educational, vocational training, physical education or sports.

"Here are the lessons we learned," says Dr. Novich of his trip to Russia.

"1. We should not participate in international competition unless we can field our very best teams. Although it is a sporting event, our national prestige is on the line. The lop-sided scores we suffered does not help our image. Europeans are very nationalistic and serious about wins and losses.

"2. Intercontinental travel with time changes can cause havoc with an athlete. A period of a week for training and body adjustment should be mandatory before an event. In Las Vegas, William Hawthorne beat Kukamov, but was no match for the same Russian in Minsk," and the doctor cited other examples.

"3. Some means must be found so that the U.S. athletes who are not in the Armed Services can take time off and train for such important international sporting matches without being saddled with the financial woes that occur if you are working, married and support a family. An athlete can not put forth his best efforts when he is beset with social and financial problems. Athletes going to school find it almost impossible to leave their studies. Russian athletes are free of these worries because their salaries continue if they take time off to train for an event such as our recent matches.

"4. Boxing on the intercollegiate level in the United States, after enjoying great success for many years, is now only seen on three west coast campuses. It has been abandoned by most schools because of hue and cry made by physical educators and some physicians that boxing for collegiates is not desirable."

Dr. Novich said only one of our boxers was a college man, a UCLA graduate. The Soviets had eight collegiates or former collegiates on their squads in Moscow and Minsk.

"There certainly must be something wrong with our physical education system," says the rugged surgeon, "which denies our youth a chance to participate in intercollegiate boxing, yet it is encouraged in other great nations of the world."

Just how important the experience of qualified instructors is to an amateur boxer can be seen by Ray Lunney of California, a 125-pound featherweight. His father was a former pro and is now a boxing instructor at Sanford University. Ray, with a dazzling display of counterpunching and moves, outclassed both his Soviet foes in Moscow and Minsk. Ray has had only 26 bouts yet defeated a 23-year-old Russian with a record of 137–3, and another with a mark of 108–15.

Boxing dead? Not while Dr. Max Novich has life.

THREADGILL

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the term "Threadgill" sparks little response in Washington—but someday, it might bring about the pleasant reaction that this thing called Threadgill does in Austin and central Texas, and Nashville and Newport.

Threadgill is a name that belongs to a man—but that man is a legend. He is Kenneth Threadgill who has accomplished what Presidents cannot. Threadgill is a genuine product of today that has the power to make us recall the good of yesterday. Threadgill has brought widely divergent sections of our society together.

Threadgill, you see, is a yodeller, a singer, a humanitarian and nothing short of being a tremendous human being. Austin city officials, our State senator, civic groups, myself and many music lovers have declared Friday as "Threadgill Day."

I meant what I said about the fact that this man can "bring us together." His authentic call to the basic philosophy of America cuts across all cultural and social and philosophical lines. His admirers run the gamut from the longest of long-haired hippies to the cowboys in their summer strawhats and the straight up businessmen in ties and short hair. I have even known Republicans to be his fans.

I cannot explain his magic; neither can his followers. All we know is that listening to this man is a pleasure that blots out the wrongs of our time and emphasizes the good.

His group—called the Hootenanny Hoots—has been together for a good spell now. But barely 2 years after they were formed, the Hoots were invited to the Newport Folk Festival in 1968.

From singing as a kid at revival meetings in Texas lead by his evangelist father, Threadgill next began memorizing Al Jolson songs. That changed however when he met the Singing Brakeman, Jimmy Rodgers.

Threadgill says:

I fell in love with his sincerety and the story he told and I've been trying to sing his songs ever since.

He does that job better than any man living. Threadgill is backed up by a great team: Chuck and Julie Joyce, singers and rythm guitarists, and Bert McGuire, lead guitarist.

The reason I call this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is to enviously point the affection the people of central Texas hold for this man Threadgill. I say enviously because I wish I could be in Austin, Tex., this Friday night when the good folks down there turn out to honor this man with an appreciation night. A party barn has been rented and I suspect the people will come from miles around and years ago just to pay their respects to this guy of ours, this Threadgill. It is an amazing tribute: usually these things are done to honor a man of power who can return the favor in some fashion. Not here. Not with Threadgill. Just the opposite is true. We are returning the favor to him. It is our thanks for all the years, all the songs, and all the smiles.

CHARLOTTE T. REID REPORTS ON 1970 PUBLIC OPINION POLL

HON. CHARLOTTE T. REID

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mrs. REID of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, it has been my policy since coming to Congress to send an annual legislative questionnaire to my constituents concerning problems of vital interest to us as legislators. Once again this year, the enthusiastic response has been most gratifying and indicates an unusually keen awareness of national issues among the people of the five counties of the 15th District of Illinois whom I am privileged to represent in Washington.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the results of my 1970 public opinion poll reflecting approximately 32,000 opinions of those responding to this questionnaire. I thought my colleagues might find this information useful also:

RESULTS OF REPRESENTATIVE CHARLOTTE T. REID'S 1970 PUBLIC OPINION POLL

[Percentage]

1. Do you approve of the efforts President Nixon is making to end the war in Vietnam?

Yes	75
No	22
No answer	3

2. As one of the means of curbing inflation, do you think that a balanced Federal budget should have top priority for the next fiscal year?

Yes	86
No	10
No answer	4

3. Do you approve of the President using his veto power if he believes a bill is inflationary?

Yes	90
No	7
No answer	3

4. To reduce crime, would you:

(a) Favor increased Federal grants to cities and States for law enforcement assistance?

Yes	54
No	29
No answer	17

(b) Deny bail before trial to a person previously convicted of a felony or presently on bail who is again arrested for a felony?

Yes	86
No	9
No answer	5

5. What actions would you favor to curb the increasing use of dangerous drugs?

(a) Increase penalties for illegal sale of drugs?

Yes	92
No	4
No answer	4

(b) Reduce penalties for possession and first-time users of marijuana?

Yes	25
No	53
No answer	22

(c) Provide more funds for drug abuse education?

Yes	62
No	20
No answer	18

6. Do you believe the Supreme Court has been too lenient in its decisions on pornography and obscenity?

Yes	76
No	20
No answer	4

7. Do you favor:

(a) Increasing Federal aid to education?

Yes	39

(b) Reducing allocations?

Yes	18
No answer	1

(c) Maintaining aid at present levels?

Yes	42

8. Do you favor busing school children to achieve a greater racial balance?

Yes	7
No	91
No answer	2

9. Should the Federal Government have greater authority to combat environmental pollution and enforce penalties for violations?

Yes	84
No	12
No answer	4

10. Do you favor the bills I have introduced to:

(a) Provide automatic cost-of-living increases for Social Security annuitants?

Yes	82
No	10
No answer	8

(b) Permit annuitants to earn more money without losing their Social Security benefits?

Yes	91
No	4
No answer	5

11. Do you believe that Federal farm controls and subsidy payments should be:

(a) Phased out over a five-year period?

Yes	64

(b) Continued substantially as is?

Yes	17
No answer	12

(c) Made permanent with increased subsidies?

Yes	7

12. Do you favor the President's new plan to make basic changes in the present welfare system with emphasis on work incentives?

Yes	92
No	4
No answer	4

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

WE CANNOT AFFORD A NON-PRESIDENT

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, it appears that President Nixon's approach to tough national problems consists of taking a deep breath, looking the American people straight in the eye, and ducking the issue.

Mr. Nixon urges the South Vietnamese to do their own fighting, but refuses to say we are going to leave them on their own even if they continue their ineffectiveness. He deplores the wage-price spiral that is playing havoc with our economy, but refuses to institute the controls needed to stop it.

Mr. Speaker, this will not do. The times will not tolerate equivocation and business as usual. If Mr. Nixon is unwilling or unable to face the issues alone, let him come to us, the Congress. Let him ask us to share the responsibility of getting out of Vietnam and of establishing wage and price controls. But let us not wait until the horse is three States away before we close the barn door.

Under unanimous consent agreement, I insert the editorial by Ed Davis entitled, "It is Time for Nixon to Act," from the Willows, Calif., Daily Journal of July 2, 1970, in the RECORD at this point:

IT IS TIME FOR NIXON TO ACT

Senator Mike Mansfield says it's a "recession," Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans, perhaps taking his cue from the late President Herbert Hoover, says "we are at a bottoming-out position. I do not expect any significant change, except upward, from here on out."

Whatever it's called, it represents an abject failure of economic policy by the present Administration—a failure which is hurting millions of Americans—from the farmer who must borrow money for economic survival to the Penn Central stockholder whose investment has gone belly-up.

So far as the farmer is concerned in the past year new loans have dropped some 18 percent, foreclosures have climbed, and interest rates have soared to record levels.

Not only rising interest rates but rising costs of everything else have caught the farmer, as most other Americans, in a tightening price-cost squeeze.

In spite of President Nixon's promise to end inflation, here is the record: Three years ago prices rose 3 percent, two years ago 4.6 percent and last year a whopping 6.1 percent. Yet Mr. Nixon's vapid reaction has been to establish a "productivity commission" to get wage and price "guidelines." As if either labor or manufacturer is likely to respond to "guidelines" carrying all the force of a 20-ounce boxing glove wrapped in a feather pillow.

The fact of the matter is that inflation has been caused by complex factors and to expect to control it by the simple upward manipulation of interest rates is like trying to cure pneumonia with cough syrup.

Meanwhile, the skyrocketing interest rates have converted the prosperity of millions of Americans into a financial nightmare. Yet President Nixon proposes to control the inflation with a "productivity commission" endowed with everything except authority.

What's wrong with the President himself intervening to slam the lid on rising prices and wages, which must be stopped if inflation is to be stopped?—E.F.D.

SUMMER JOBS FOR YOUTH

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an editorial of WJBK channel 2, Detroit, Mich., discussing the problem of employment of youth in the Detroit, Mich. area.

Of equally serious concern to anyone troubled with the problems of youth is the fact that this editorial points out that unemployment among inner-city boys and girls in the Detroit area is something like 35 percent. The hardship, degradation, suffering and incentive to hopelessness, bitterness and criminal activity, resulting from that circumstance should be clear to all.

WJBK is to be commended for this fine editorial and its concern for our young people.

SUMMER JOBS FOR YOUTH

(By Robert J. McBride)

MONDAY, JUNE 29, 1970.

With Detroit's overall unemployment rate currently at 6.7 percent, it naturally follows that the summer job outlook for youth is even more desperate.

Among Motor City youngsters aged 15 through 22 who are actively seeking work, unemployment stands at 17 percent. Among inner-city boys and girls, the figure is more like 35 percent.

William Trolley, manager of the MESC's Youth Opportunities Center estimates that of 205,000 young Detroiters hoping to land summer jobs only 130,000 will find them. The result will be that at least 75,000 teenagers who would prefer to be working will instead be roaming the streets—with many of them unlikely to return to school in the fall.

The MESC's major concern, of course, must be to direct unemployed adults—especially heads of households—into the better jobs available. This means that most unemployed young people, if they find work at all, will have to settle for such odd jobs as mowing grass, caring for gardens, or washing windows. But, for boys and girls who really want to help themselves, such prospects are better than no job at all.

If you—as a small businessman or manufacturer, or just as a homeowner—can offer any sort of temporary job opportunity for one or more young people, the MESC would like to hear from you. TV2 urges viewers who can provide youth employment—for the summer or just a day or two—to call the Youth Opportunities Center at 873–6284. That number again is 873–6284.

THREAT OF DEPRESSION HAS LITTLE FOUNDATION IN FACT

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, Democrat Party propagandists are trying to frighten the public with charges of a depression as part of their 1970 campaign.

A very objective and effective article discussing the remoteness of a depression as carried in the La Grange, Ill., Citizen, July 2, written by Mr. Murray Lummer is worthy of review. The article follows:

THREAT OF DEPRESSION HAS LITTLE FOUNDATION IN FACT

(By Murray Lummer)

"With the way things are going, what prospects are there in store for us? Is it possible that we may be facing a depression? My husband and I are extremely worried about this."

Why is it that any time our economy runs into some difficulty, people immediately begin to imagine the worst possible consequences? Can it be that they actually believe that a business cycle continues on upward without any interruption for adjustment or correction? Since the beginning of civilization, the history of economics has proven this time and time again. Business cycles, market cycles and other such cycles are subject to fluctuation. Its mostly a matter of degree.

To prevent what was one of the longest boom periods in this nation's history, from becoming a bust, the Johnson, and later the Nixon administration found it necessary to impose a number of restrictions in order to curb our spiraling inflation.

The effects of these restraints are presently being widely felt.

What were these restrictions? They included tightening of the money supply, increasing the interest rates, higher taxes (the surtax, for example) and proposed elimination of certain tax allowances and curtailment of government spending.

Through the efforts of our federal reserve board, money did become, and still is, very tight. Interest rates were raised, and the surtax was extended.

However, curtailment of government spending, if at all, has been negligible and the present tax program under consideration by congress seems destined to fall far short of its mark.

Another factor to be reckoned with is the stubborn resistance from both business and labor: business in its resistance to reduce its expansion programs and succumbing too easily to the demands of labor unions; labor unions total disregard to inflation and its ramifications in its persistent demand for higher wage scales.

Despite these efforts undertaken by the present administration, prices have continued to soar. More recently, however, the tide shows some indication of subsiding but not nearly enough to warrant any change of action.

The present consensus of opinion varies greatly. Some economists warn us of the possibility of a sharp recession. Others predict a mild recession while still others that the worst that will happen might be a business slowdown or a mini recession. At any rate, there can be some unemployment and reduction of profits.

Many people become confused in trying to understand the difference between a depression and recession.

I'm sure that those who have lived through the depression of the 30's and later on witnessed some recession periods, need no further explanation.

Actually, the difference between the two is that a recession is a short-term period of slow business activity accompanied by lower profits, unemployment and lower commodity and stock prices.

A depression is in effect when we have a prolonged period (lasting for several years) of a sharp business decline accompanied by mass unemployment, exhaustion of many peoples' savings, lower business profits and depressed stock prices.

In the past 17 years, we have had three recessions. In 1953–54, 1957–58 and 1960–61. In each of these periods, the downturn was so minimal that the total personal income continued to climb. While there was some drop in production and business profits sagged somewhat, most people who weren't advised that we were in a recession never knew it happened.

IS IT ALWAYS RIGHT—TO BE RIGHT?

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, it has been observed by many eminent historians that nations experiencing rapid social and political change often experience serious and bitter differences among its people. These differences that America is feeling today ultimately pit one man against another and sadly stem not from personal assessment of individuals, but rather from impersonal assessments of individual ideologies. Often times, our self-righteousness replaces our humility.

Warren H. Schmidt, assistant dean at the University of California, Los Angeles, graduate school of business, articulates these feelings in his short but meaningful parable made at an address in California last year. Mr. Schmidt points out the necessity to guard against these seemingly natural propensities and tells us that, "There once was a land where men were always right."

His poem follows:

IS IT ALWAYS RIGHT TO BE RIGHT?

SOME REFLECTIONS ON TENSIONS AND HOPES

(By Warren H. Schmidt)

There once was a land where men were always right
They knew it . . . and they were proud of it.
It was a land where a man was proud to say, "I am right" and "You are wrong"
For these were words of conviction, of strength and of courage.
No one was ever heard to say, "I may be wrong" or "You may be right"
For these were words of weakness, uncertainty and cowardice.
When differences arose among the people of this land they sought not to re-examine and explore
But only to justify and persuade.
When differences arose between the old and the young, the *older* would say,
"We have worked hard to build this great and prosperous land.
We have produced cars and highways that permit us to move quickly from place to place.
We have built planes that surpass the speed of sound
We have produced computers which solve complex problems in milliseconds.
We have even touched the moon.
We expect those who inherit this good land to appreciate what we have accomplished and to build on the heritage we have given to them."
These older people were right, of course . . . and they knew it and were proud of it.
But the *younger* people of that land would respond,
"We see around us a land that has been befouled and exploited.
People starve where food is plentiful.
Laws and practices prevent some from having an equal chance to develop and to influence.
Noble and moral words are matched by selfish and sordid deeds
Leaders urge us to fight wars to preserve peace—and the fighting does not end.
The whole scene is phony and polluted and inhuman and out of control.
We want no part of this money-mad Establishment."
These younger people were right, of course . . . and they knew it and were proud of it.
. . . *and the gap between the generations grew wider*
When differences arose between men of different races, those from the *majority* race would say,
"We are working steadily to build a land of justice and equality for all our citizens.
We have made considerable progress—but social progress does not come swiftly.
Those whom we seek to help and lift can only hurt their own cause when they push and intrude and pressure us.
Let them show some patience—and let them use more fully the opportunities we have already supplied.
Then we will feel like doing even more for them."
These people of the majority were right, of course . . . and they knew it and they were proud of it.
But those from the *minority* group would reply,
"We have been pushed around too long and we are angry.
We have been confined to a ghetto.
Our children's education has been stunted in second-rate schools.
We have seen jobs go to less qualified while our people are rejected or shunted into menial tasks.
We see a thousand subtle signs that brand us and our children as second-class citizens in this land.
We will tolerate lofty promises and meagre deeds no longer."
These people from the minority were right, of course . . . and they knew it and were proud of it.
. . . *and the gap between the races grew wider.*
And so it went in this land . . .
Group after group defined the right
And took their stand
And upheld their position against those who opposed them.
It happened between those who taught in the school and those who provided the funds.
It happened between those who gave priority to a strong defense and those who gave priority to better cities.
It happened between those who pleaded for peace at almost any price and those who argued for national honor at almost any cost.
Everyone was right, of course . . . and they knew it and were proud of it.
. . . *and the gaps between groups grew wider*

Until the day came when the rigidity of rightness caused all activity to come to a halt.
Each group stood in its solitary rightness
Glaring with proud eyes at those too blind to see their truth
Determined to maintain their position at all costs
(For this is the responsibility of being right).

But the quality of life in the land declined
And grew more grim
And the people became more angry
And violence increased.
People had more things, but their sense of well-being and personal fulfillment diminished.
Some measured the cost in tasks undone and energy wasted
Others in loneliness and fear
Most felt powerless and without hope.
But through the tense days of confusion and gaps of all kinds
Some maintained their vision of a time when men would again value their differences . . .
As a source of richness
As a stimulant to learning
As a base for creativity.

Then . . .
One day a strange new sound was heard in the land.
Someone said, "*I* may be wrong . . . *You* may be right."
The people were shocked that anyone could be so weak and so confused.
But the voice persisted
And when the people looked, they saw that it came from one who was known for his strength and wisdom.
And some people began to listen in a different way.
It now seemed safe to listen to opposing—and even "wrong"—views.
As they listened, they discovered common beliefs they had not known before.
They even began to see signs of humanity and noble purpose in those whom they once only knew as adversaries.
Here and there men expressed their common desires in deeds—and bright examples of joint action were seen in the land.

With each new effort, men's faith in one another grew . . .
and their faith in the future . . .
and in their ability to shape their own destiny

They stated these beliefs in a *Declaration of Independence* which read in part.
"All men are created equal—but each develops in a unique way.

"All men are endowed with certain inalienable rights—but each must assume certain inevitable responsibilities.

For the happiness and fulfillment of all depends on the commitment of each to accept and support equality *and* uniqueness
rights *and* responsibilities."

In this land men had learned how two rights could make a costly wrong.

That it may take less courage to point a finger than to extend a hand and less wisdom to defend a narrow right than to search for truth.

Most important of all, the people of this land had learned that the quest for truth is never over; that the challenge is always the same . . .

To stop fighting long enough to listen
To learn from those who differ
To try new approaches
To seek and test new relationships
And to keep at a task that never ends.

MORMON CHURCH PROGRAMS AID AMERICAN INDIANS

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, July 8, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues three special releases made recently by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints—Mormon. The church issues many releases, but the thing that makes these worthy of general note is that they describe programs and activities of the church among the American Indians, with outstanding results. The releases follow:

MORMONS HELP EDUCATE INDIANS

SALT LAKE CITY.—The American Indian is very much in the public eye these days. He's speaking out in relation to his rights, and there'll likely be a good deal more attention given him as he continues to speak out.

But while the American Indians may have just cause for complaining about their overall situation, there are things being done for them—positive things, which all too easily get lost in the maze of the more newsworthy negatives.

A case in point is the program sponsored by The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. The Church has long taken a special interest in the Indian, or the "Lamanite," a name derived from the Book of Mormon, which the church considers ancient American scripture.

There are about 34,000 American and Canadian Indians on the rolls of the "Mormon" Church. The church sponsors an Indian "student placement" program, wherein children from eight to 18 are given the opportunity of living with a non-Indian Mormon family during the school year. They go to modern schools and share all other advantages of their "brothers and sisters." More than 4,500 young Indians are participating in the program this year. They come from a score of different tribes in a dozen states and Canada. This is the 16th year of the program.

Often, the Indian youngsters, after "graduating" from the placement program, continue their education at Mormon-operated Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah, whose president, Dr. Ernest L. Wilkinson, once spent 16 years as an attorney for the Ute Indians and handled for them the largest single claim ever won in a lawsuit against the Federal government.

BYU has a rather cosmopolitan enrollment, with students from some 55 foreign countries, as well as every state of the Union. More than 300 American Indians are enrolled at the university. They represent 58 tribes and come from 26 states. There are many other students from Mexico, Central and South America and Polynesia.

The Indian student is given special consideration for admission, says Dr. Lester Whetten, dean of the General College. "If he has had reasonable academic success in high school," Dean Whetten says, "and he is strongly motivated to attend the university, his admission is given careful consideration on the basis of a total human evaluation."

Once Indians become students at BYU while they are not pampered, they are given encouragement and assistance through an understanding faculty, specially selected and devoted to "going the extra mile" to help them overcome linguistic, cultural and economic hardships, Dean Whetten said. There is even a special tutoring service available for those who may require additional assistance and more personal instruction, he added.

The BYU Indian Education Department outlines its objectives this way: "To assist Indian students to recognize and appreciate their full potential; to promote better relationships and greater understanding between Indians and other students, both on and off campus; to provide a comprehensive educational program which is flexible enough to meet individual needs and abilities; and to provide a program of personal assistance so that the Indian student may achieve and gain satisfaction in his university pursuits."

A remarkable example of the fruits of the overall Mormon program for Indians is Kenneth Nabahe, 27, a Navajo who went up through the ranks of the student placement program, earned a master's degree at BYU and is now working on his doctorate. Nabahe's wife, Rachel, 24, is also a BYU graduate. She's a Shoshone Indian.

Early this year, Nabahe was ordained a bishop in the Mormon Church. He presides over a congregation on the BYU campus.

Nabahe spent six years as a "foster child" in the Don W. Pace home in Torrey, Utah. From there, he went on to BYU where he met his future wife. The Nabahes are devoted to the church and they enthusiastically endorse the many programs designed to help the Indian.

Once a year on the BYU campus, the Indian students sponsor "Indian Week." They organize seminars and workshops, stage a colorful dramatic pageant, display their handiwork and, in general, educate their non-Indian fellow students as to their history, culture, special skills and talents, and their hopes and desires for the future. These activities and displays have dramatized the fact that the white people have much to learn from the way of life of the American Indian. Indian Week activities feature the selection of a Miss Indian BYU.

Not just during their "week," but throughout the school year, the Indian students on the BYU campus are organized into their own fraternity, or club, the "Tribe of Many Feathers." University officials are delighted with the results of their Indian education program and plan to greatly expand the number of students in future years.

MORMONS TAKE INDIAN STUDENTS INTO THEIR HOMES

The tousle-haired boy might think of Indians as painted, shrieking savages bearing down on the wagon train. So oldtimers equate the "redskins" with the traditional cigar store figure. Others think of smoke signals and tomahawks, moccasins and teepees, or war drums, buffalo hunts and rain dances.

But today's Indian is a far cry from this romantic, make-believe image which the movies and television have made so familiar.

Today, for example, thousands of young Mormon boys and girls think of the Indian as a "brother" or "sister," one who dresses as they do, eats what they eat, sits next to them in church or school, plays with them and works side by side with them.

Indeed, this fall, thousands of Indians between the ages of eight and eighteen have left their reservation homes to spend the school year in white homes. It's all part of the Indian Student Placement Program of the Mormon Church, or, officially, The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Each year since 1954 numerous white members of the Church have opened their homes to deserving young Indians and have helped them gain an education and experience in dealing with the "outside world" that would be virtually impossible on most Indian reservations.

Since its humble debut, when less than a hundred students were placed, the program

has flourished. This year, some 4,500 Indians from ten states and Canada have been enrolled. They have been placed in homes in Utah, Idaho, California, Arizona, Washington, Colorado, Georgia and Canada.

MANY TRIBES REPRESENTED

Tribes represented in this year's program include the Hopi, Navajo, Apache, Mescalero, Hualapai, Pima, Papago, Kowa, Cherokee, Cheyenne, Ponca and Sioux. Then there are the Chippewa, Assinibone, Crow, Squamish, Lumbee, Stony, Opetchesat, Blackfoot, Frog, Thlingit, Haida, and many more.

A. Theodore Tuttle, a leading Mormon official, calls the program "unique and distinctive." It is based, he says, "on love—the love of natural parents for their children that is sufficient to motivate them to send them elsewhere to obtain better opportunities." And, Tuttle continues, "it is based on the love of foster parents that is sufficient for them to open their homes and hearts to accept another's child as their own."

The program, says Clare Bishop, executive director, is "designed to make possible educational, spiritual, social and cultural opportunities for the young Indian children in our church, and to provide them opportunities to participate in non-Indian community life so they can use their own experience both now and later in life for the benefit of themselves and their people."

YOUNG APACHE IS TYPICAL

A typical Indian enjoying the opportunities of the program is Derl Tortice, a 13-year-old Apache from Arizona. This fall he is spending his fourth year in the program and his second with the David C. Evans family in Salt Lake City, Utah. Evans, a computer scientist at the University of Utah, has three sons and four daughters of his own. Both parents and children have literally taken young Derl into the fold as "one of us." He works with them, plays with them, studies with them, worships with them, and yes, "on rare occasions," says Mrs. Evans, he disagrees with them, especially when it is time to take his piano lessons. In short, there is no coddling, no preferential treatment. He is one of the family. As such, he enjoys all the responsibilities as well as the advantages such a relationship provides.

A healthy percentage of the placement program "graduates" go on to college, usually to the Mormon-operated Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah, which has some 800 Indians enrolled this year.

Laura Like Him, a 20-year-old BYU sophomore from Winnebago, Neb., is a graduate of the program. She says her experience "helped me to realize that we can improve ourselves and our people." She speaks highly of the "lifelong friendships created and religious principles taught which become priceless guides for living."

RETURN TO RESERVATION

After completing their college educations, many of the young Indians return to their reservations to help their people. Others make meaningful contributions to society as a whole.

A statement by its Council of Twelve Apostles handsomely sums up the Church's attitude toward the Indian:

". . . the children of the forest must be educated and instructed in all of the arts of civil life, as well as in the gospel. They must be clothed, fed, and instructed in the principles and practice of virtue, modesty, temperance, cleanliness, industry, mechanical arts, manners, customs, dress, music, and all other things which are calculated in their nature to refine, purify, exalt and glorify them . . ."

INDIAN NAMED BISHOP IN MORMON CHURCH

An articulate young Navajo Indian from Arizona has been ordained a bishop in The Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints.

Kenneth Nabahe, 27, who has his sights set on a doctorate in psychology at Brigham Young University in Provo, Utah, was chosen by Church officials to preside over a congregation on the BYU campus

Nabahe did his undergraduate work at BYU, taking a degree in Zoology. He was ordained a bishop by Elder LeGrand Richards, a member of the Church's Council of Twelve Apostles, and chairman of the Indian Committee of the Church.

Bishop Nabahe is a remarkable example of the fruits of the Mormon program for Indians. He has advanced through the ranks of the Church's Indian Student Placement Program, wherein youngsters from eight to 18 are given an opportunity to spend the school year in the home of white Mormon families. Nabahe spent six years as a foster member of the Don W. Pace family of Torrey, Utah. He then "graduated" into the Indian Education Program at BYU.

There currently are more than 300 American Indians participating in a special education program at the university, whose cosmopolitan campus includes students from every state and some 55 foreign countries.

The new bishop met his wife, Rachel, 24, a Shoshone Indian, at BYU, where she was earned a degree in social work. They were married in a Mormon temple and have two small children. He has held other positions of Church leadership and has spent two years as a Mormon missionary to his fellow Indians.

Bishop Nabahe says his ultimate goal in life is "to help my people obtain the opportunities that I have had." He enthusiastically endorses the Church's varied program for the Indians. Speaking of his experience at BYU, he says "Here we have really understood the destiny of our people and feel blessed to be a part of the university." He says "BYU is unique in providing both an education and a spiritual background—opportunities we could not have obtained anywhere else in such combination."

THE FLAG

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, a poem concerning the American flag appeared in the Sevier County News-Record and the Gatlinburg Press on July 2 which I found deeply interesting and touching.

The poem was written by Mr. James E. Carr, Route 3, Sevierville, and to me it is a poignant expression of his love for the American flag and the principles for which it stands.

I would like to submit the poem for readers of the RECORD:

THE FLAG

(By James E. Carr)

Old Glory to me is a pretty Flag;
For to me each color has a meaning
not just some colors splattered on a rag.

As you read this you will see;
Just what the American Flag means to me.

When I see the stripes of red;
I think of all our ancestor's blood
that was shed.

Their lives for freedom they were willing to give;
So that their families and others in a free country
could go on and live.

And when I see the white it reminds me of the dawn;
So proud to see Old Glory still waving high
Francis Scott Key wrote for Her a pretty song.

Then when I see blue I think of the Heavenly space;
and it reminds me of the One who is up there to watch
no matter what type or race.

Old Glory has seen her share of troubles;
And with each passing day them seem only to double.

So if by chance you ever see Old Glory on the ground;
Don't pass her by; feel proud to give Her a helping hand,
for She's too precious to be kicked around.

She has flown high and proud for so long;
So it is up to us now the young generation, not our ancestors,
to keep Her waving and strong.

Because to see the Flag waving in the soft breeze;
Reminds me that I am an American and I am free.

MSGR. LAURENCE F. HENNESSEY—A TRIBUTE

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, great men are recognized not by what they are—but by what they have done. Because a man is king or president does not make him great. Because a man is less than a king or a president does not make him insignificant.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to give praise to a man whose deeds have made him a great man and whose love has made him a good man.

Msgr. Laurence F. Hennessey came to the then little town of Concord, Calif., in 1940. Concord at that time was hardly more than a crossroads community. Since then, Concord has become a bustling, vigorous suburban commercial and residential center nearing 100,000 persons.

And importantly, Mr. Speaker, it bears evidence of the dynamic and positive influence of Monsignor Hennessey.

Monsignor Hennessey foresaw the tremendous growth that would and did come to Concord. He planned and built the first Catholic school in the county and he oversaw the planning of an integral parish complex that began with 100 families and now has thousands.

Now he retires, Mr. Speaker, and his parishioners and those residents of Concord who know him well are honoring this great and good man on August 2.

He is a humble man, Mr. Speaker, a man who announced his retirement from the pastorate at an early morning Mass and then left the parish so as not to arouse the emotions of his friends.

His people would not allow this man to go without some tribute. So on August 2 they will gather to pay him the honor he is due.

I join them in honoring Monsignor Hennessey. He is a great man—and his deeds demonstrate that greatness.

BLACK SILENT MAJORITY ORGANIZATION

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the July 7, 1970 issue of the Washington Post contains a United Press International article entitled "Black Silent Majority Formed by Ex-GOP Aide."

It was surprising to me that the Washington Post would give any attention to a fledging organization that did not have some militant voice at its head and some revolutionary demands as its goals.

This organization, in announcing its formation, did announce some beliefs which I feel that most of us in Congress can subscribe to. For instance, this new group stated that black revolutionaries and militants do not speak for the vast majority of black people. Further, they said the vast majority of blacks disapprove of current disorders and are working for a living, trying to keep their children in school, and are law abiding.

Mr. President, it is encouraging to hear such words spoken about blacks by blacks. It has always been my feeling that black progress will depend upon black leadership. We all should work together, but a race naturally looks toward its own people for guidance and direction. Frankly, whites might well follow this good example, for there are plenty of white radicals on both sides of the political spectrum who try to speak for groups which they do not actually represent.

I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

"BLACK SILENT MAJORITY" FORMED BY EX-GOP AIDE

A group of Negro leaders announced yesterday formation of national Black Silent Majority Committee aimed at showing that the majority of American Negroes are not represented by violent militants.

Clay J. Claiborne, national director of the new group with representatives from 22 states, said: "We believe that black revolutionaries and militants, upon whom some segments of the news media seem to dote, are not dedicated to progress for our people.

"Blacks don't want to burn America down. We want to build America—and like all patriotic Americans, earn enough money to own part of this great nation."

Cailborne, an Atlantic City, N.J., publisher and a former special consultant to the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee said the organization will encourage blacks to participate in the electoral process and to develop a strong two-party system within predominantly Negro areas.

In a statement of beliefs, the committee summarized: "There are millions of black Americans who work every day, keep their kids in schools, have never been to jail, pay their taxes, shop for bargains, have never participated in a riot—but are being shouted down by a handful of black militants. We have organized to raise the voice of patriotism and responsibility for the black silent majority and to demand for rightful share of national attention due us as the majority within the black minority."

A STUDY OF THE NEGRO ATTORNEY—ACCESS AND ENTRY INTO THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on June 17, 1970, the Philadelphia Bar Association passed a resolution in support of a proposal by the American Foundation for Negro Affairs. The AFNA proposal was entitled "A Study of the Negro Attorney—Access and Entry Into the Criminal Justice System."

Because I feel that this issue is one which concerns all of us, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution and statement of goals and list of consultants be reprinted in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF AMERICAN FOUNDATION FOR NEGRO AFFAIRS

(Request for bar association approval of proposal submitted to National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice for grant of $123,438 for a study of the Negro attorney—access and entry into the legal system.)

The American Foundation for Negro Affairs is headed by Samuel L. Evans, National Board Chairman. The National Executive Secretary is Barbara L. Weems who was the Executive Director of PAAC and who was instrumental in helping to secure funding for the CLS programs in Philadelphia.

The Bar Association has been asked to give its endorsement to their proposal submitted to the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice regarding the survey of the Negro attorney and access in the criminal justice system.

The specific goals of the present study are outlined on enclosure 1. The consultants for this program are itemized on enclosure 2.

This proposal has been reviewed by the Chancellor and the Chairman of the Board of Governors and they both recommended that we support it.

Resolved, That the Board of Governors of the Philadelphia Bar Association approve in principle the proposal submitted by the American Foundation of Negro Affairs to the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice third draft and expresses the hope that this project will be approved and funded by the National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice.

THE GENERAL GOALS OF THE PRESENT STUDY

The study will therefore attempt:

1. To determine whether the 1954 school desegregation decision significantly influenced trends toward increasing the supply of Black lawyers due to improved opportunities for enrollment in law schools in both the North and South.

2. To determine whether broadening of employment opportunities for the Black attorney significantly influences his career choice, i.e., did openings of opportunities in northern White law firms detract from interest in the criminal justice field; to determine to what extent, if any, the presence of Black lawyers in White law firms has added new dimensions to the criminal justice activities. There is some indication that these lawyers, particularly since 1964 with their increasing attention and interests in consumer protection and welfare fields have brought into focus increased emphasis on *preventative* rather than *punitive* aspects of the criminal justice fields.

3. To determine whether there was significant change in the attitude of Black lawyers as to their occupational choices after the 1963 march on Washington, the turning point in the civil rights movement.

4. To determine whether educational training and background significantly influence career choices, i.e., do Black lawyers graduating from Ivy League colleges choose the criminal justice fields as readily as their contemporaries from other schools?

5. To determine to what extent the ability or inability of the Black attorney to pass the state licensure examinations influenced his career choice. As indicated previously, if he does not pass his licensing examination for all practical purposes, there would be little that his answers would contribute to this study. It could be possibly assumed that most of the respondents who do not reply to the preliminary survey in this study will not have passed their licensing examinations. However, if the respondent had to take the licensing examination several times, this factor would be of considerable significance in his career choice.

6. To determine the number of Black law students currently enrolled in law school, their career choices, i.e., criminal justice fields and other law interest areas as well as other pertinent information necesary to build a student profile. It will also be interesting to look at career choice as it relates to the kind of school attended.

7. To determine whether the law schools, both Black and White, have placed particular emphasis on course offerings that might conceivably influence career choice, i.e., the criminal justice field.

8. Since students must graduate from law schools before they can enter the criminal justice field, to determine from the law schools and students what factors may prove to be inhibiting their chances for graduation.

LIST OF CONSULTANTS

1. Bullock, Matthew, Esquire, Deputy City Solicitor, City of Philadelphia.

2. Bruton, Paul, Esquire, Professor, Law School, University of Pennsylvania.

3. Diggs, Paul, Esquire, Professor of Law, Howard University.

4. Fordham, Jefferson, Esquire, Dean, Law School, University of Pennsylvania.

5. Giles, James, Esquire, Associate, Pepper, Scheetz Hamilton Law Firm, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

6. Johnson, E. E., Ph. D., Associate Dean of the College, Southern University, AFNA National Research Committee.

7. Klaus, William, Esquire, Partner, Pepper, Scheetz Hamilton Law Firm, Chairman, Public Service Committee, Philadelphia Bar Association.

8. Miller, Paul E., Esquire, Acting Dean, Howard Law School.

9. Simpson, Stephen, Esquire, Law Clerk, for Judge Spaulding, Common Pleas Court, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

A BILL TO STRENGTHEN FEDERAL CRIMINAL LAWS CONCERNING ILLEGAL USE, TRANSPORTATION, AND POSSESSION OF EXPLOSIVES

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting today a bill that would strengthen Federal criminal laws con-

cerning illegal use, transportation and possession of explosives.

Although there are no accurate statistics on the nationwide incidence of bombings, the following examples are illustrative of the disturbing trend.

Thirty-two bombs destroyed over $600,000 of property in Seattle last year.

Sixty-two bombs rocked the San Francisco Bay area in 1969. Bombs have been found in the Oakland Army Base barracks which house Vietnam-bound GI's, and a freight train destined for an oil refinery.

In 1969, New York recorded 93 explosions, 19 dud bombs and 2,587 threats compared with 1968 figures of 81 explosions, 10 duds, and 1,094 threats. Between March 12 and 28, 1970, police found 14 bombs, not including Molotov cocktails, and recorded 2,264 threats.

Most disturbing has been the wave of bombings and threats on schools and college campuses. Through March of 1970 there had been over 30 bombs which have done $500,000 damage to college campuses. Tennessee papers have carried particularly disquieting accounts of bomb threats lodged at our primary and secondary schools.

President Nixon on March 25 of this year proposed strong sanctions against bombers. By introducing my bill today I hope to spur Congress into taking prompt action to strengthen the Federal laws to deal with the demented terrorist who resorts to the bomb and the anonymous threat. It is particularly urgent that something be done to protect our children before the opening of schools next fall.

A STUDENT'S VIEWS

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, last month there appeared an exchange of letters in "The Bulletin Board" student newspaper for Embry-Riddle Aeronautical Institute in Daytona Beach, Fla.

The first letter was from a young sailor in Vietnam, addressed to the student body president of Embry-Riddle; the second letter is the reply by Terry Miner, president of the Student Government Association. Both letters are thoughtful and illustrate the earnest desire of many of our young people to get real education. These are the young people who are honestly concerned about the problems that face America, and who are willing to study and learn in order to do something about these problems.

Below are the letters:

DEAR STUDENT GOVERNMENT PRESIDENT: I am writing this letter to you because I am interested in the feelings of the Student Body of Embry-Riddle on the issues of today.

I am 20 years old, a sailor stationed on the rivers of Vietnam and as a result, the news I hear from the states is sometimes not the whole truth or even the whole news.

I am planning to attend ERAI in September of 1972 and must say am looking forward to it. But first things first.

As you no doubt know, this past month has been a restless month on many of the nation's campuses. Demonstrations against the war have done everything from talk to the President to precipitate killing of students in their cause to bring a halt to this war. Many of these colleges were closed as a result of a widespread student strike. Many buildings have sustained minor damage, while others have been left completely destroyed in the wake of the violence.

What I would like to know is: What part did ERAI take part in the demonstrations? Did the school close? Were there any active demonstrations on the campus? Did the students occupy any buildings? Or were the students passive and just concerned with good weather for flying?

As you may have guessed by now, I am interested in the stand that the school has on national issues as well as the school's academic standing. After all, what good is an excellent curriculum if the school is closed?

I'm looking forward to hearing from you soon on these as well as any other questions that you can think of that may be of interest to a not-so-well informed G.I. in Vietnam that wants only to get out and fly airplanes.

Sincerely,

JAMES WILKINSON.

DEAR JIM: Thank you for your letter of May 27. I'll answer your questions one at a time, but first I'd like you to understand a few things. First, these answers are my own and the opinions are my own. While I may represent the entire Student Body as SGA President, I'm sure you'll understand that I can't speak for everyone here.

Embry-Riddle didn't take part in any of the demonstrations. The school did not close, and there were no active or inactive demonstrations. The students occupied every building on this campus, as they do every day. They occupied the flight line, its flying classrooms and its "Oral" rooms, planned cross-countries filed flight plans, and went through all the other procedures that keep us swamped every day. They occupied the academic classes, sweating exams, cursing instructors—some were even studying. The A & P Hangars were occupied by guys safety-wiring recips, welding, running up jets, and a bunch of other things. Yes, the students occupied the buildings here—the way they were intended to be occupied.

No, Jim, I wouldn't say our students were passive; in fact, if anything, they're hyperactive. It's the only way to stay on top of this rat race. Of course we're concerned with good flying weather. When you break ground and climb to altitude, it's beautiful until your flight instructor starts in with his "Fun and Games." It's rough enough when they start giving emergencies, unusual attitudes and flight maneuvers, without having choppy air or having to duck clouds. But we are also concerned with the things that go on in our country. However, I don't feel, and I'm sure most of the students here will agree with me, that we can change the national picture as radical rebels. The way we can change it is by finishing school and broadening our knowledge. Then later, as responsible members of society, we can effect our changes knowing what we are doing.

After the last five years of turmoil, what has been accomplished? The ghettoes are still with us. The war still goes on. Our environment is still polluted. To me it seems as if a lot of energy has been expended by people running around in circles. I'm hoping that in the next five years, maybe we can start taking a realistic look at these and the other problems that face us today and solve them. I've always believed there were two sides to every coin, story, problem, etc. We know the idealistic side hasn't worked; maybe the realistic side will. This is the battle you and I will have to face.

Jim, I'm sorry it has taken me so long to answer your letter. I know how important mail is in 'Nam. Take care of yourself, and when you get back, stop in and see us.

Sincerely,

TERRY MINER,
President.

Mr. Speaker, these young men are pointing the way for all our youth to follow. Let us all encourage this kind of attitude—hearing our thoughtful students and helping them in every way possible to achieve their goals for America.

MOM AND DAD MADE PROGRESS

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, someone said very few people read the editorial page of the newspaper. But those that do, actively spread the word. On my wife's desk was this editorial that Dee had cut out for our children to read. It was last week's editorial by Felix McKnight, editor of the Dallas Times Herald.

Sunday night the church house was packed over at Park Cities Baptist. The main speaker was Murphy Martin who had read McKnight's editorial on "Mothers and Fathers Didn't Do Too Badly." So half of Martin's speech was reading McKnight's comments in the Dallas Times Herald. For those of you who are not daily readers the editorial follows:

It isn't an impossible hangup—this talk-and-understand void between the young persons and the adults, notably their parents.

No one can sell me on the myth that in these past three or four years the link between a parent and a son, or daughter, has been washed out by "experimenting" with grass or the sick trip trash of the Jerry Rubins.

Jerry Rubin of the Chicago Seven (available to the suckers at $2,000 per "lecture") stood—or lay—before a group of Kent State students shortly before their campus tragedy and advised them to "kill your parents." It would give them a feeling of security to start at home with homicide.

"Until you are prepared to kill your parents," Rubin advised the Kent State students, "you're not really prepared to change the country, because your parents are our first oppressors . . ."

It will not get through to a drug-saturated anarchist, but it will help most sons and daughters to know a little more about their parents. Even their grandparents.

A man named Bergen Evans, of Northwestern University, researched his memory a bit and came out with some interesting data on these square discards that Rubin would have murdered by their children.

Give me just a moment—young sons and daughters.

Your parents and grandparents are the people who within just five decades—1919 to 1960—have by their research and work increased your life expectancy by 50 per cent. They, while cutting the work day by a third, have more than doubled the per capita output.

These are the people who have given you a healthier world than they found. Today, none of you have to fear epidemics of flu, typhus, measles, diphtheria, smallpox, scarlet fever or mumps that they knew in their youth. Dreaded polio is no longer a crippling threat and tuberculosis is almost unheard of.

Its up to you to come on and conquer other great killers such as cancer and heart disease.

These remarkable people—old Dad and Mom—lived through history's greatest depression. Many of your parents and grandparents know what it is to be poor; what it is to be hungry and cold. They determined it would not happen to you—that you would have the better life, that 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 the best-looking generation we have ever known.

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 life's ambition.

They are also the people who fought man's worst war. They are the people who defeated the tyranny of Hitler under which you would have been living today had he succeeded; and, when it was all over, had the compassion to spend billions to help their former enemies to rebuild their homelands.

These are the people who dreamed the dream of a United Nations. It is a weak instrument, but they tried. These are the people who want Vietnam's war, and all wars, to end so that you will be spared its miseries.

These are the people who have recognized racial discrimination and have worked to erase the evils of injustice and intolerance.

They have built thousands of high schools, trained and hired 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 have made a start—a late one—in healing the scars of the earth and in fighting pollution that you might breathe good air and live the longer life.

They also have the dubious record of paying record taxes—but you will probably exceed them in this.

They have done these things. But they have had failures. They have not yet found the alternative for war, nor for hatred and distrust. Maybe it will be you—sons and daughters—who 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 man from trespassing against man.

Your Mothers and Dads, and their Mothers and Dads before them, made more progress by the sweat of their brows than in any previous era. Don't you forget it. They did it for others—for you.

If you can make as much progress you should be able to solve most of the world's remaining ills . . . But don't be sidetracked by miserable bums who would misuse and mislead you.

STOP THE FLOW OF NARCOTICS

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to be a sponsor of legislation being introduced today which has immense possibilities, if enacted, of cutting down on the deadly flow of narcotic drugs such as heroin, morphine, and cocaine into this country.

Under the bill being introduced today, the President will be authorized to suspend economic or military assistance under foreign aid programs to any country which fails to take appropriate and necessary steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed in that country from entering the United States unlawfully.

Narcotic addiction, and the crime caused by addicts in their never-ending search for funds to supply the habit, is one of the most serious social problems in America. According to the FBI, annual arrests for heroin violations have risen 120 percent in the last 4 years. The addict is directly related to the increasing crime problem since he or she must obtain funds to support as much as a $50 a day habit. The average heroin addict steals some $50,000 worth of property a year to feed his habit.

The narcotic addiction problem has reached epidemic proportions. Officially, the U.S. Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs says that there are 68,000 known addicts in America. Unofficial estimates claim that there are 100,000 heroin addicts in New York City alone. The Director of the Department of Justice's Bureau of Narcotics has stated that last year in New York City alone, there were 900 deaths due to narcotics—224 of them infants. Each year more than 1,000 babies are born in that city addicted to narcotics because of the addiction of the mother during pregnancy.

In an effort to control the narcotics traffic, Federal, State, and local enforcement agencies spend more than $24 million per year. The addicts themselves spend hundreds of millions of dollars per year on these deadly, poisonous drugs.

Despite the deadly nature of this problem, and despite the fact that the United States has had treaty obligations dating back to 1909 to monitor and control the international flow of narcotics, the situation continues to get worse—and certain Middle East countries have failed to cooperate in controlling the growth of the deadly opium poppy.

Turkey, in particular, produces about 80 percent of the heroin smuggled into the United States. The illegal supply of opium is so plentiful in Turkey that the amount necessary to produce a kilo of heroin can be purchased for about $350—by the time that kilo is sold in the United States it is worth $225,000.

Because of a request of the United Nations, Iran placed a strict ban on the growing of the opium poppy for 14 years. But because neighboring countries failed to control such growth, Iran, to prevent smuggling and gain foreign currency, has relaxed its ban and is now back in the opium business.

These countries have received U.S. foreign aid for years, yet some of them are taking little action to stop this drug traffic which saps the life spirit of tens of thousands of Americans.

The bill being introduced today would add a new arm to the international drug control effort. The threat of economic sanctions could put force into America's efforts to dry up the source of narcotics at the place where it is grown.

Legislation aimed at the addiction problem will not only reduce or stabilize increasing crime rates, but it will also save tens of thousands of citizens who can make important and worthwhile contributions to society.

It is my hope, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation can receive favorable attention in the near future.

A copy of the bill is as follows:

BILL SPONSORED BY REPRESENTATIVE C. A. VANIK

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 620 of the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 (22 U.S.C. 2370) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsection:

"(v) The President shall suspend (in whole or in part) economic and military assistance provided under this or any other Act, and shall suspend (in whole or in part) sales under the Foreign Military Sales Act and sales under title I of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, with respect to any country when the President determines that the government of such country has failed to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs (as defined by section 4731 of the Internal Revenue Code) produced or processed, in whole or in part, in such country from entering the United States unlawfully. Such suspension shall continue until the President determines that the government of such country has taken appropriate steps to carry out the purpose of this subsection. In implementing the provisions of this subsection, the President is authorized to utilize such agencies and facilities of the Federal Government as he may deem appropriate to assist foreign countries in their efforts to prevent the unlawful entry of narcotic drugs into the United States. The President shall keep the Congress fully and currently informed with respect to any action taken by him under this subsection. Nothing contained in this or any other Act shall be construed to authorize the President to waive the provisions of this subsection."

THE FUTURE OF COAL

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker—

We are deluding ourselves if we think either imported residual fuel oil or natural gas will be available in anything like the amount needed to replace coal as an electric utility fuel in the decades ahead.

Those, Mr. Speaker, are the words of W. W. McClanahan, Jr., executive vice president, National Coal Policy Conference, Inc., about the alternative fuel sources to generate the electric power of the coming decades.

Along with Mr. McClanahan, I would not underrate the importance of other energy sources. Yet we must be realistic about their limitation. Indeed, we are witnessing firsthand that even nuclear power has its limitations and drawbacks.

My district, the great State of Wyoming, and other Western States are blessed with immense reserves of coal—coal of low sulfur, and hence, low pollution content. The future holds great promise for the development of this resource—as an electric generating fuel and as a basic raw material for synthetic fuel production.

A recent speech by Mr. C. G. Herrington, vice president and director of Humble Oil Co., outlined in significant detail the promise and problems of western coal development. Unfortunately, little attention except for local press coverage was given the speech.

I include the June 30, 1970, story by Morton L. Margolin, business editor of the Rocky Mountain News, and a related editorial of July 2, 1970, by Editor James M. Flinchum, of the Wyoming State Tribune, in the RECORD:

[From the Rocky Mountain News, June 30, 1970]

WESTERN COAL HOLDS GREAT PROMISE FOR FUTURE APPLICATION

(By Morton L. Margolin)

Coal, particularly Western coal, is on the threshold of once again finding a place in the economic sun, the Rocky Mountain Coal Mining Institute was told Monday in Aspen.

But there are still some roadblocks to overcome according to C. G. Herrington, vice president and director of Humble Oil Co., who made the predictions in a talk at the conference.

The problems involve:

The long distances from Western coal beds to the markets where the energy can be used.

The attempt to eliminate oil import restrictions, which Herrington said, can only delay synthetic fuel development from coal.

Technological problems involved in protecting the environment from damage from strip mining and coal burning.

But the Humble Oil vice president did not think any of the problems insurmountable.

He said the vast Western reserves and the low price of that coal will go a long way to offset some of the disadvantages he mentioned.

Herrington noted the U.S. population shift is continuously westward, and added that where population goes, energy will be needed. He also noted the center of coal mining is moving westward, just as the population is moving.

AN INCREASING IMPACT

"There seems to be a great magnet which steadily pulls out people towards the western horizon," he commented, "and this will have an increasing impact on the commercialization of our western coals."

Herrington said western coal operators are continually seeking ways by which coal's westward trend can be accelerated, and added, there are more reasons for optimism on that score today than ever before.

On the synthetic fuel issue, he noted that the most conservative forecasters have been predicting a great boom in the manufacture of oil from shale deposits about the time the known petroleum reserves are depleted.

He termed the future for synthetic fuels a "mirage" that could easily slip away if oil imports are allowed to depress the price of domestic oils.

"Then," he said, "the incentive for building a costly synthetic fuel plant for a coal feed will not develop, and our mirage will simply move further away from us in time."

Herrington forecast a gradual increase in coal consumption from the 475 million to 525 million tons per year now, to about 590 million tons in 1975. By 1985, he estimated, coal consumption will total 1,140 million tons, roughly double the present rate.

The big problem of moving the energy from the Western mines to the places where the coal can be profitably used is being solved in many ways, Herrington said.

COAL SLURRY PIPELINES

He cited unit trains and coal slurry pipelines, and the increasing construction of minemouth electric plants to manufacture the energy and transport it by wire for long distances.

Herrington said the proposed Extra High Voltage Power Grid, supported by the Federal Power Commission and the Department of Interior would provide a market for the coal of Wyoming, Montana and North Dakota, where he said mine mouths could be built meeting all ecological specifications.

"On average, Herrington summed up, "Western coals have several advantages over Eastern coal.

"For example, Western coal is generally strip-mineable and the beds are well placed for efficient recovery. The terrain and climate are favorable in most instances. The costs of conservation and safety tend to be lower. And for the fast growing electric utility market, the low sulphur content of much of our Western coal is desirable. The large lignite deposits may prove desirable for synthetic gas production."

[From the Wyoming State Tribune, July 2, 1970]

THE WEST'S COAL FUTURE

A ranking official of Humble Oil & Refining Co. which has substantial investments in our state including a stake in the coal future, made some significant comments at a meeting of the Rocky Mountain Coal Mining Institute as Aspen, Colo., Monday that were generally overlooked in the news media.

C. G. Herrington, a Humble vice president and director, predicts that the production of liquid hydrocarbon fuels—synthetic petroleum—from coal will begin on a commercial scale about 10 years from now, in 1980. Herrington sees a developing future for coal as a result.

He offers one warning, however. "If large oil imports are permitted to force down the price of domestic oil, then the incentive for building a costly synthetic (coal) fuel plant . . . will not develop . . ." he says. Because of the vast lags involved, says Mr. Herrington, domestic energy concerns cannot turn on and off their production like a kitchen sink faucet.

By 1975—five years from now—domestic coal consumption in the U.S. will move upward from the average of 475 to 525 million tons a year to about 590 million tons although by 1980, as nuclear power enters the picture more strongly, demand for coal by electric utilities will slacken off.

"And at about that time," Mr. Herrington said in his speech to the Rocky Mountain Coal Institute, "we foresee synthetic hydrocarbons entering the picture and giving coal a further rising demand trend." By 1985, he predicts that coal consumption will zoom up to more than one billion tons, double today's rate.

The western states of Wyoming, Montana, Colorado, Utah and the Dakotas will play a significant role in this rising trend of coal usage, Mr. Herrington believes. While they contain one-half of the nation's coal reserves, only 5 per cent of all the coal mined in the United States has come from these states. The main problem has been distance from coal deposits to consumers. But, adds Mr. Herrington, "our increasing sophisticated technology . . . is beginning to solve the disadvantage of distance." Coal from the Rockies is moving east by unit trainloads for burning in midwestern coal-fired steam generated power plants.

Herrington noted that Secretary of Interior Walter J. Hickel recently expressed support for a national extra high voltage power grid. "The possibilities for strategically located mine-mouth power plants in Wyoming, Montana and North Dakota for feeding power into this major cross-country line are obviously tremendous," says Herrington.

Herrington also sees in the future the construction of "major industrial complexes based on western coals and producing near the mine-mouth a great mix of products: electric power for a national high voltage grid, synthetic liquid fuels and synthetic gas, petrochemicals, sulphur, fertilizers, cements, and so on."

TOP LEVEL ACTION ON DRUG ABUSE

HON. DONALD D. CLANCY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. CLANCY. Mr. Speaker, since President Nixon has called for top level action on drug abuse, I thought it appropriate to present the following article by Gene Lees. The author is a regular columnist for High Fidelity magazine which is published by Billboard Publications, a Cincinnati firm.

If Mr. Lees is correct in saying that some people have been making money through the sale of rock music recordings that promote drug use, it would be quite interesting to hear their testimony before a congressional investigating committee.

I am sure that all of the Members of the House of Representatives will be most interested in Mr. Lees words. His article reads as follows:

TOP LEVEL ACTION ON DRUG ABUSE

Jonathan Swift once made what he called a Modest Proposal: since the Irish could not grow enough food to feed themselves but had no trouble producing babies, he suggested that babies should be made the prime Irish export (perhaps served as a table delicacy in England). There were those who thought he meant it. Perhaps, in a bitter and angry way, he did.

I wish to make a Modest Proposal myself. It relates to two serious contemporary problems: narcotics addiction and overpopulation. I feel that it is incumbent upon me as a man who makes his living from the record industry to offer this proposal. For the record industry is as responsible as any sector of our society for the growing number of deaths from the use of heroin and other drugs.

Now don't be hasty in condemning them. They've done no more than other industries have. Detroit finds 40,000 deaths a year in crashworthy cars an acceptable price for profits. Why shouldn't the record industry too be allowed to kill its quota of people for profit?

Ten years ago I devoted an issue of *Down Beat* to the drug problem. At the time only a few music-business people thought addiction was an important issue. A Negro singer I know said to me recently, "Nobody gave a damn about it when only black kids were dying in the doorways of Harlem. Nobody gave a damn until the well-to-do middle-class white kids started dying." *Touché.*

There is a great deal of criminal money invested in the music business, both in groups and in some record labels. Rock groups began pushing drug use. The kids bought it. The kids are dying. The underworld is making money on it. This is all coincidence, right? Oh sure.

Drug education in the schools is only going to make the problem worse, I am convinced. It will increase fascination, or even cause it, among youngsters who had never even thought much about using drugs. Watch it happen in the next two years.

And so I have come around to another view of the matter. I modestly propose that to all our other welfare programs we add free narcotics for the kids, including heroin. If you're a parent, this may shock you. But

it shouldn't. You have been permitting your kids to take dope intellectually for years—from Bob Dylan, the Jefferson Airplane, the Lovin' Spoonful, the Beatles. When your five-year-old was wandering around the house singing, "I get by with a little help from my friends, I get high with a little help from my friends," didn't you say, "Isn't that cute? He's singing a Beatles song." All right, so now he's a few years older, and you're startled at the circulation of drugs in his school, and fearful that he'll start using them. (Maybe he's already started.) Why? You permitted it.

Now the main thing wrong with junkies is that they steal. Sometimes they go farther than that: in desperation for money, they kill and steal. This is a great social inconvenience, tying up the time of all kinds of policemen whom we need for such things as messing up traffic.

If I get my way, and the government subsidizes addiction the way it now subsidizes lethargy, all this will stop. It is useless to tell young people that the Beatles and heroin are bad for them. It simpy is not so: the kids have told us this. And they are the wisest and most honest and idealistic and decent and loving and unprejudiced and well-informed generation of Americans in history. We know it because they have told us this too. And the advertising industry and Marshall McLuhan have confirmed it. Who in his right mind would doubt the combined wisdom of Marshall McLuhan, the advertising industry, and our wonderful young people?

Now, if we supply them with all the heroin they can use—and I am talking about the pure, uncut stuff, not the powdered sugar that's floating around in many places these days—it will have immediate and far-reaching social benefits.

First, they'll stop rioting. Heroin makes you terribly passive. They'll start nodding out all over the place, and this will permit the police to catch up on *their* sleep in parked cruisers.

Then a lot of them will start dropping out of school. This will reduce the overload on our schools and universities. It will stop the building program, thus braking the felling of trees which give us our oxygen. Our air will improve.

Third, it will increase the food supply, since junkies don't eat much even when they can get it.

Fourth (and here is the real genius of my plan), ultimately the program will end the population explosion. One junkie I know told me that he and his strung-out wife hadn't had sexual relations in two years. Heroin produces profound sexual indifference, and impotence. But that isn't the end of it. Junkies die. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, a great many jazz musicians were on heroin. None of them are now. They are either in their graves or they are off drugs. There is no middle road, apparently.

Kids constitute nearly fifty per cent of the population. The population explosion, then, *is them*. Now since anyone forty years old is going to be around only for another thirty years or so tops, *they're* not going to be much of a problem. They're starting to die off now, from working too hard to make enough money for their kids to buy the Doors' records and acid and junk. But that eighteen-year-old over there—man, he's going to be around breathing air, using up food, making garbage for another forty or fifty years. Even a kid can grasp that he himself is the real enemy.

Now when we begin the widespread free distribution of drugs, this group will start dying like flies. And still more benefits will accrue to society as a whole.

Junk music will fade from the radio. There won't be so many cars on the highway, and those that are there won't be in such steady use. Air pollution will be further reduced. Since we won't need so many highways, the grass and trees will grow again, making more oxygen. Drug use, incidentally, including acid, is becoming as common a cause of traffic deaths as alcohol. So we get a bonus here too.

I know there are those out there in Readerland who will write me letters telling me I've got it all wrong—like the people who wrote me letters telling me New York is not dying. They'll say my proposal is heartless and cruel. But it isn't, I assure you. We have given the young what they want until now. Why should we draw the line at death?

To young people I would say this: don't believe old squares when they tell you that drugs, even grass, are damn dangerous. Don't believe the growing reports that the grass available now is often spiked with heroin to hook you on hard narcotics. Don't believe those who tell you that heroin is evil stuff. You know all those people are just trying to keep you from having a hip kind of good time.

And don't think about death. Think instead how you will be reducing the pressures of population on the rest of us. Think what a noble deed you'll be doing. Think Zen thoughts about eternity and the continuum of consciousness and about astrology and how mortal existence is a mere passing cloud. Think not of going into a valley of blackness. Think instead how you are going to join the great All-Consciousness and rest forever in nirvana. As you sit there, listening to John and Yoko with a needle in your arm, reflect not on the dying you're about to do. Just think how high you're going to be as you go.

And to the record industry I would say: keep up the good work, gentlemen. You've done a hell of a job thus far.

DEFECTS IN H.R. 16542

HON. W. S. (BILL) STUCKEY

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. STUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the Post Office Civil Service Committee will be offering committee amendments to remove two defects in H.R. 16542 as it was reported from the committee.

One defect is the mandatory requirement that unsolicited credit cards be mailed in a marked envelope or cover indicating that a credit card is enclosed. While the value of such a marking is doubtful to me, it is clear that the marked envelopes would present an open invitation to theft from the mails. I understand that the committee now proposes to give the Postmaster General discretion to prescribe what information shall be contained on the envelope. Certainly the Postmaster General is in the best position to determine what form of markings are consistent with the security of the mails.

The second defect involves the exemption of replacement cards from the requirement of registered mail. In its present form, the language of the bill is ambiguous as to whether the exemption includes renewal and substitute cards. I understand the committee now proposes an amendment expressly including renewal and substitute cards within the exemption.

This amendment will avoid unnecessary confusion for both the issuers and users of credit cards. The amendment would clearly permit individuals holding credit cards to have their expired credit cards renewed without making a reapplication and without the requirement of registered mail.

SUPPORT FOR CLAY'S POSITION ON CUBAN AIRLIFT

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, since I initiated efforts to terminate what I believe an unnecessary subsidy to the Cuban Government inherent in our "airlift" program bringing 1,000 Cubans to the United States every week, I have been overwhelmed by letters from American citizens who support the termination of the airlift.

The House Foreign Affairs Committee is presently holding hearings relative to this issue. My amendment to the foreign assistance appropriation bill seeking to eliminate funds for the Cuban airlift program was not successful. It is my understanding, however, that sufficient interest and support for my efforts has been generated to substantiate similar efforts in the Senate where I anticipate such an amendment will be offered when they consider the appropriation bill.

For the attention of my colleagues who have registered interest in this issue, I submit the following letter as one which is representative of the feelings voiced by Americans who are concerned that the American policy is not one of benevolency, but of misplaced priorities, a mistake in fiscal policy as well as in foreign relations:

JULY 2, 1970.

Hon. WILLIAM CLAY,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: It has been a month now since the enclosed editorial first appeared in a local paper. My hesitation in writing to compliment you on your stand has been due to fear that I could not write objectively because of my own very tragic situation as a direct result of the airlift. Since that time Federal narcotics agents have arrested a number of refugees in connection with smuggling activities and peddling of narcotics. You may not be aware that one of those arrested, according to local media, was present in the Bay of Pigs fiasco, and was ransomed out of Castro's jail.

It has been known here and much aired that with every inflight of the airlift Castro agents enter this country, and who could deny that this does in fact happen. With only a cursory check at the airport (and free passage) Castro would indeed be an imbecile not to seize the opportunity.

Without going into detail let me say that it has been more than a year since I left the employ of a small Miami manufacturing firm. The first Cubans hired there were very kind individuals, and appeared most deserving and hard working. To the credit of the ethnic group they are loyal to their kind, but unfortunately this has caused an employment squeeze out of American citizens. We hear much about the black citizen being pushed out by this influx, but believe me it applies to both black and white. In contrast to the first immigrants the later freedom flight em-

ployees appear contemptuous and derisive of the American citizen.

Following are some personal observations as to the effect on the area and the nation by this airlift:

1. Overload of welfare clinic and bed space in county hospital.

2. Additional classroom space for large families in schools—religiously opposed to birth control.

3. Government relief checks—in multiple to households.

4. Cultural legality of family surnames carried forward to current generations allows:

Multiple driving licenses allowing substitution on suspension.

Additional social security cards where one is so industrious as to moonlight, or after working minimum quarters to qualify for benefits, change names and cards.

The minimum quarter provision holds an umbrella over every Cuban refugee, as well as American citizens, and discriminates against the worker who has labored for many years and finally winds up being doled out the same amount as one who has worked the minimum quarters. When one is faced with the total loss of savings and job as a direct result of the Cuban influx and has yet to work years before benefits are available meanwhile facing age discrimination it is difficult to remain free from bitterness at our government.

5. Some Cuban business men pay cash over the counter on accounts receivable. The tax dodge could never be unraveled even with computer cross reference of suppliers, due to surname multiplicity.

With payroll, insurance, and receivable experience in the position mentioned in my third paragraph, the above words are not without substance.

Much of the blame for the entire mess lies with the government. It is a truism that few appreciate what is given, and many otherwise honest individuals perhaps find it hard to refuse that which waits for the taking.

There is a gentleman, Paul Bethel, formerly with the State Department, who has voiced the opinion on the radio here many times that the Freedom Flights are a sad mistake. He has testified in Washington, and is intimate with, and has the support of, many of the Cuban community here.

Before closing I should like to quote from Alice-leone Moats book No Passport for Paris in which she quotes an underground leader just before victory in Europe in 1945. "Americans are a wonderful people—kind, generous, and impulsive—but they aren't realists. Nor do they seem to be able to understand foreign mentalities. It would probably be much better if they didn't try. Their childlike desire to please and be liked is paradoxically enough what so often brings about their unpopularity. They never seem to be able to realize that nobody ever really loves the strong, the powerful, and the rich. Their efforts to please are merely taken as evidence that they are suckers." ". . . if only they were as hardheaded and realistic in politics as they are in business."

You will understand why I have given the above quotes, for are we not still being played for suckers, and are we not still engaged here and worldwide in a childish effort to please?

Thank you for your stand, and one would hope that the suicidal tax drain can be ended sooner rather than later.

Best regards,

Mrs. L. H. Dodgen.

[From the Miami Herald, May 22, 1970]

Rep. Clay's Clear View: Stop the Cuban Airlift

From away out yonder in Missouri, U.S. Rep. William Clay has made a point to President Nixon that seems to us should receive solid support from officials here in Florida.

Mr. Clay, a Democrat, asks that the President stop the Cuban Airlift that brings nearly 1,000 new refugees into South Florida each week.

His proposal, one that we have urged in the past, has clarity and reason. The airlift no longer serves the best interests of the United States, and any objective study of it can hardly come to any other conclusion.

Mr. Clay says that the airlift "constitutes an outright subsidization of the Cuban government welfare program."

Since the country is in a conservative, cautious mood, and since Florida reflects that also, it would seem this state's own elected national representatives would be moved to stop any program that amounts to subsidizing Sr. Castro.

Mr. Clay continues: "This policy of accepting and bearing the expense of those who are either unwanted, unneeded, or uncomfortable within the confines of their country has no basis. We are trying to solve the social problems of an enemy nation."

Those are powerful words. Humanity, or welfare, must begin at home, and the country already has more welfare costs than it can handle.

For taxpayers to shell out another $112 million this year for a special federal umbrella that not only gives better coordinated care to refugees than needy Americans, but with the airlift in effect recruits new ones, hardly makes sense. The costs have risen each year. In all, some $400 million has gone into the program.

United States policy supposedly is dedicated to the isolation of Cuba, to a quarantine policy that stresses economic hindrances. It is no wonder that Latin American nations have begun veering away from that quarantine when the United States itself so clearly punctures it.

Congressman Clay has assumed leadership from away out yonder in Missouri on a touchy political issue here in Florida. And those keeping hands off might one day find it difficult to explain to the folks here at home.

High prices, tight money, rising taxes and a new deficit in the federal budget are not comfortable bedfellows with a program that has clearly outlived its time.

JIMMY ARMSTRONG—QUITE A MAN

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, recently residents of a community within my 20th Congressional District of Pennsylvania paid tribute to a man who, in the course of his life, has served them as a protector as well as a civic and political leader.

The man is James E. Armstrong, who began his career as a "beat cop," serving in that capacity as a protector, an attorney, a father-confessor, and as a friend to everyone in his block. Mr. Armstrong, now the mayor of the borough of Homestead, was honored late last month at a testimonial dinner. He was recognized not just by his local comrades and friends but by law enforcement leaders from throughout the State.

They came by the hundreds to attend his affair at the Elks Lodge 650 and to pay tribute to his long and dedicated work as a police officer and a community leader. The guest list included Ian McLennan, Pittsburgh regional director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation; Otto Platts, president of Lodge 91, Fraternal Order of Police; Earle V. Wittpenn, editor of the New Daily Messenger in Homestead; John Wittmore, president of the Western Pennsylvania Police Chiefs Association; and a host of dignitaries from surrounding communities.

Mayor Armstrong's police career began in 1936 when he joined the force as a patrolman. He worked his way through the ranks and was named chief of police in 1952. At that time he was 40 years old; the youngest man to hold the chief's office in Homestead and one of the youngest to serve in that capacity in the State. While chief, he was elected to two terms as president of Lodge 91, Fraternal Order of Police, and another as president of the Western Pennsylvania Chiefs of Police Association. The State association's magazine featured him in a cover article in 1968, citing his superior performance as a police administrator.

In the meantime, Mr. Armstrong was active in other fields, principally education. He served 16 years on the local school board, including six as vice president of the board and one as president. In 1963 the community hailed him as "Man of the Year."

Despite his many interests and activities, Mr. Armstrong still found time to: attend courses on criminology, civic and welfare problems; become active in St. Mary Magdalene's Church; and serve as chairman for various community drives on behalf of crippled children, the Heart Fund, the Red Cross, and the Salvation Army. Last year he culminated his long career in serving the public by running for the office of mayor and winning.

Mr. Speaker, the police in Pennsylvania are proud of Jimmy Armstrong. The people of Homestead are proud of Jimmy Armstrong. And why not? He is quite a man.

THE BEAUTIFUL PEOPLE: COSA NOSTRA SEEKS CAMOUFLAGE

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, as a former special agent with the Federal Bureau of Investigation, I am well aware of the difficulties of investigating cases where the Federal law has been violated. In these trying days of racial and ethnic sensitivities some citizens overlook the fact that what is illegal is illegal regardless of who commits the act. Pride in the nationality of one's ancestors is a commendable and typically American custom. However, when one's pride in national heritage blinds to truth it is unfortunate. The recent protests by Italian Americans is such a case. To excuse illegal activities because they are committed by individuals who share a particular heritage is absurd. Italian

Americans have so many things of which they can be justifiably proud, it does them no credit in defending the Mafia.

A recent column by Victor Riesel points to this problem and makes some very cogent observations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of my colleagues to this column discussing the Italian-American problem in connection with Mafia investigations. I include it at this point in the RECORD:

THE BEAUTIFUL PEOPLE: COSA NOSTRA SEEKS CAMOUFLAGE

(By Victor Riesel)

NEW YORK.—To me the beautiful people are the Italians and the tens of millions of Americans of Italian extraction—and distraction when it comes to the ladies.

Once, oh, so long ago, when I went to Venice to nurse an old wound, my room was filled with flowers, the piazza below was thronged with sympathizers, and men came from as far off as Genoa to offer an eye for a transplant. In Rome the police, swords clanging, halted traffic so we could cross the Via Veneto or the Corso. In Naples, no fleet waterfront denizen tried to sell me a wrist watch or fountain pen. Only laughter to ease the pain.

And it was there that I learned more of the Mafia than I have in America.

So, of course there is a Mafia, or in the dese-dems-doze argot of the ailing Joe Valachi, there truly is a Cosa Nostra. I tell you plain, it's so. I can recall the legless French Mafioso who asked me to come to his barricaded high hilltop hideout so we could talk about a mutual assistance pact against "the Southern crowd from the other island."

No thanks, said I, there's enough in America. Indeed there are and they are a banditti no more reflective of the vast community of Americans of Italian descent—regardless of what some speakers said at the big demonstration here the other day—than the old Murder, Inc., was of the Jewish communities, or the Hell's Kitchen killers were symbolic of the IRA fighters during the big trouble.

So let's say it like it is, right on. There is something called La Cosa Nostra. J. Edgar Hoover has testified during closed hearings there are some 26 families—meaning corporate-type units—numbering some 3,000 men. Each combine in this $50 billion a year racket has its bosses and underbosses, its hoodlums, its respectables, its "corrupter" and its chief "enforcer."

It does have a national commission. This acts less like a board of directors than a jurisdictional mediating force. On it are or have been, according to FBI Director Hoover, such men as the self-exiled Chicago boss Sam Giancana, and the late Vito Genovese.

To picket the FBI with a "grand march" behind a municipal workers band and denounce the Bureau for hitting this tough integrated combine as anti-Italian is as ludicrous as denouncing Tom Dewey as anti-Semitic for going after Murder, Inc.'s Lepke Buchalter, Jacob (Gurrah) Shapiro, Abe Reles and Pittsburgh Phil Strauss.

La Cosa Nostra is but an infinitesimal group among the Italian-Americans who started emigrating to the U.S. in 1820. From then, during a decade when Thomas Jefferson and John Adams still lived, to 1968, some 5,122,086 Italians have immigrated into the U.S. Thus there are millions who are of the seventh and eighth generation. As of the 1960 census there were 4,543,935 persons in the U.S. who were either born in Italy or were second-generation Italian-Americans.

Thus the Mafia, or Cosa Nostra, or combine, or combination, or mob, call it what you will, is but 3,000 men out of a population of Italian extraction running into the tens of millions. In J. Edgar Hoover's words these 3,000, mostly Sicilians, "control and direct the criminal activities of many times that number." Incidentally, the population of poverty-stricken Sicily is 4 million and they work mighty hard to scratch a living from the hard rock soil and tiny shops.

No sophisticate will tell you that the 26 families control all crime in America. It cuts across all racial, religious, political and national lines.

Let's tell it like it is. There is the suspected power of the alleged combine man, Mayer Lansky. There is a small, but tough black mafia. There is the new cocaine and narcotics-running Hispano crowd, now the biggest in drugs. There is the endemic gentry of rock-ribbed America which has billions of dollars in Swiss banks—simply by manipulating bookkeeping figures.

It is ludicrous to charge the FBI therefore with being anti-Italian because it hits this small but tough combine, as it would be to smear it as anti-white because it infiltrated and smashed the Ku Klux Klan. There are hundreds of Italo-American special agents in the Bureau. They are in the most sensitive of spots and probes. Some of them are Special Agents-in-Charge (S.A.C.s) of big cities.

And it was the FBI, wasn't it, which rushed to the rescue of young Sinatra, arrested his abductors, and saw them convicted even though Frank Sinatra himself has admitted being quite social with some of the alleged Mafia—including Sam Giancana?

It is just not true, as the leaflets at the big demonstration shouted, Americans of Italian extraction are not being "defamed, degraded, discriminated against." Worshipped yes. Discriminated, no. What of Gian-Carlo Menotti, Joe DiMaggio, Fiorello LaGuardia? The Ladies' Garment Workers first vice president Howard Molisani; Secretary of Transportation John Volpe, Dean Martin, or the motion picture producers' Jack Valenti, who was virtually assistant president of the U.S. during the Johnson years?

What of the American outpouring for Sophia Loren, for whom hooray? What of Ben Gazzara, and Liza Minnelli? And to swing from the glamor set, what of Peter Fosco, president of the Laborers' International Union (AFL–CIO) and my own beloved Jimmy Petrillo who, though only president emeritus of the Musicians, just never will fade away?

So, come off it, my good friends. There is no degradation, only inspiration from the great scientists, ophthalmologists, composers, poets, writers, executives, bankers, labor leaders, musicians.

And, of course, there is the perspiration of those few who need protective coloration.

THE JAPANESE AMERICAN CITIZENS LEAGUE: A FORWARD-LOOKING ORGANIZATION

HON. SIDNEY R. YATES

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, on July 14–18, 1970, the Japanese American Citizens League will hold its 21st biennial national convention at the Palmer House Hotel in Chicago, Ill. With the theme, "Understanding—The Basis for the Changing JACL," the delegates at the convention representing 92 chapters and more than 25,000 members throughout the United States, will be making crucial decisions for the future of the Japanese American Citizens League, popularly known by its initials, JACL.

Born 40 years ago out of the then deep-seated anti-oriental attitudes prevalent on the west coast of the United States where most Japanese Americans lived, JACL is the only national organization representing this group. JACL received its baptism of fire during World War II when more than 100,000 persons of Japanese ancestry were evacuated from their homes along the west coast. In spite of severe anti-Japanese feelings both during and after World War II, JACL stood firm in its untiring efforts to gain full citizenship in spirit and in fact for Japanese Americans. It was instrumental in the successful fight for the right to naturalization for those of Japanese origin the previous denial of which formed the basis for many other discriminatory Federal, State, and local laws.

Today, JACL still continues its work of correcting remaining injustices in spite of the fact that Japanese Americans have achieved a status of acceptance almost undreamed of by those dedicated organizers in 1930. At this crucial juncture in American history, JACL is turning its attention to the wider society, expanding its work in order to help other minorities, as well as all Americans, attain the fullest possible life of dignity and respect. JACL has come a long way from the dedicated but inexperienced group which first brought forth the idea of joining together all segments of the Japanese American community to carry forth its basic philosophy embodied in the twin national slogans, "Security through Unity" and "For Better Americans in a Greater America."

The 21st biennial JACL national convention affords an opportunity for focusing attention on the future work of JACL, particularly among the younger generation whose hunger for justice and earnest desires for a peaceful and harmonious society are being dramatically revealed daily. Older delegates will be joined this year by the younger group which will be holding its third biennial junior JACL convention at the same time in Chicago.

The convention will open on Tuesday, July 14, with registration at the Palmer House Hotel. Notable events during the week will be the reception-fashion show at the Furniture Club, the president's recognition luncheon where the "JACLer of the Biennium" award will be given, and the convention banquet where the "Nisei of the Biennium" award will be presented to an outstanding Japanese American who has made an unusually significant contribution to American life. A particularly memorable special event this year will be the Mike Masaoka testimonial dinner to be held on Thursday, July 16, where tribute will be paid to Mike Masaoka, Washington, D.C., representative for JACL, who has given almost all of his life for the cause of justice and dignity for Japanese Americans as well as all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I will be one of the speakers at the event. Eminent speakers for the evening include the Honorable Alexis Johnson, Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs; Edward Ennis, national board chairman of the American Civil

Liberties Union; Roy Wilkins, executive director of NAACP; and Shig Wakamatsu, past national president of JACL and close friend of Mike Masaoka. The Honorable Spark Matsunaga of Hawaii will be the toastmaster.

A most important part of the convention will be the report of the National Planning Commission which will set the direction of JACL in the 1970's. Business sessions are scheduled throughout the week to provide for full discussion of the many proposals coming out of this report. The final session on Saturday, July 18, will include the election of new national officers for the next biennium. Current national officers include the following: President, Jerry Enomoto, of Sacramento, Calif.; first vice president. Henry Kanegae, of Newport Beach, Calif.; second vice president, Kaz Horita, of Norristown, Pa.; third vice president, Dr. John Kanda, of Sumner, Wash.; secretary, Kay Nakagiri, of Burbank, Calif.; treasurer, Yone Satoda, of San Francisco, Calif.; 1,000 Club chairman Dr. Frank Sakamoto, of Chicago, Ill. Appointed officers include: Masao Satow, of San Francisco, Calif., national director; Mike Masaoka, Washington, D.C., JACL representative; William Marutani, of Philadelphia, Pa., national legal counsel; and Harry K. Honda, of Los Angeles, Calif., editor of the JACL publication Pacific Citizen.

PRAISE ACTION OF FIVE MEN

HON. BARRY M. GOLDWATER, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. GOLDWATER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to take a moment of my colleague's time to pay tribute to five men, who in the true American spirit, risked, and for four of these men, gave their lives, during an incident little more than 3 months ago that shocked this Nation.

It was late on Sunday evening, April 5, when 31-year-old Gary D. Kness of Saugus, Calif., drove by a local coffee shop on his way to work at Hydraulic Research, when he witnessed the unbelievable, horrifying gun battle between what seemed to be two highway patrolmen and two heavily armed men. For a few minutes he watched the patrolmen exchange fire with the two gunmen. Suddenly, one of the officers fell to the ground. Kness jumped out of his car and ran to the aid of the mortally wounded officer, while the officer's partner continued to fire at the gunmen. As he ran out to help, he saw that two other officers had already fallen. Kness grabbed one of the wounded officers by the belt and pulled him toward the car. Suddenly one of the gunmen started to move toward him; Kness reached for the blood shotgun that had been dropped by a fallen patrolman and pointed it around the side of the car and pulled the trigger. Nothing happened. The gun was empty. However, this action prompted the armed killer to retreat to the rear of his own car. The killer then started moving toward Kness again. Kness found one of the officer's handguns on the blood-covered ground and picked it up. He fired off a shot and, apparently, hit the oncoming killer. After he fired the gun, he realized that the last officer had also been slain. There was nothing more that he could do, so he headed for a drainage ditch. Within minutes, more officers arrived on the scene as the gunmen drove off. For this heroic action, Gary Kness has been commended by the California State Legislature, the California Highway Patrol, the Los Angeles Board of Supervisors and numerous private organizations.

We pay great tribute to the four heroic highway patrolmen who sacrificed their lives in the line of duty, without regard to their own personal safety: Walter Frago, Roger Gore, James Pence, and George Alleyn. Their deaths are one of the greatest tragedies in California's history of law enforcement.

I am sure that I speak for all my colleagues in praising the actions taken by these five men. I now ask that each of us pause for a moment to pay tribute to each of those four gallant patrolmen and to the heroic efforts of Gary Kness.

KIDNAPINGS AND HIJACKINGS ON COMMERCIAL FLIGHTS

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn the recent kidnapings of international diplomats and the continued hijackings and sabotage of commercial air flights. There is no excuse for allowing innocent passengers to become victims because of the lack of sufficient protection. At the same time, individuals must not be permitted to pose such dangerous threats to achieve personal political ends. This is a serious problem and it deserves our critical attention.

I urge the House of Representatives at this time to give its full support to House Resolution 1076, proposed by Congressman SYMINGTON, regarding the safety of persons entitled to diplomatic immunity. The resolution asks an international compact through the United Nations be secured, by which any foreign national would be held in confinement for extradiction if his release from deportation and custody was achieved by a threat or act endangering the well-being of any diplomatic representative. The compact would extradite as soon as practicable, that national to the appropriate national authority of the country from which his release was effected. It would also deny formal recognition to any government formed by any persons who have been found to have participated in any threat or act against a member of the diplomatic corps or the family thereof; and finally, to take measures within its jurisdiction to bring anyone accused of an act or threat before the tribunal appropriate under the circumstances. This measure will inform the President of the seriousness of the situation as viewed by the members of this body and further encourage him to seek the agreements called for in this measure.

I would also like to urge a continued effort on the part of the Federal Aviation Administration to combat the threat of aircraft hijacking. Like the kidnapping incidents, the most recent events of the attempted and successful hijacking command that no time be lost in insuring that some substantial steps be taken in this direction. The problem is no longer merely an occasional incident within our country, but is now one of an international nature.

The efforts by the Federal Aviation Administration to this date appear to approach the steps required to combat the hijacking and air sabotage problem. Specifically, I refer to the establishment of a full time office at the FAA which will be staffed with specialists and will utilize the best available expertise to deal not only with the aircraft hijacking, but with the total air transportation security problem. This is a good beginning but I urge the recognition and implementation of more measures in the immediate future to provide security to the traveler.

Also, the special tariffs granted to an increasing number of airlines by the Civil Aeronautics Board permitting the search of passengers and baggage by scientific devices are another indication of preventive action to assure safety of other passengers.

The integrity of the United States can not be allowed to diminish in the eyes of the world. We must do everything possible to protect both diplomats and citizens from hijacking and kidnaping.

VICE ADM. PAUL E. TRIMBLE'S RETIREMENT—A TRIBUTE

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, 1970, after 34 years of service to his country, Vice Adm. Paul E. Trimble retired from the U.S. Coast Guard. The Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee handles Coast Guard affairs. As chairman of that committee it has been my privilege to work closely with the Coast Guard and particularly with Admiral Trimble for the past 15 years.

Our committee will miss Admiral Trimble. He has been an outstanding administrator and an excellent representative of his service. He possessed a unique combination of practical experience, broad education and personal characteristics that well fitted him for the heavy responsibilities he so capably shouldered. We could always depend on him for a keenly perceptive, practical and straightforward approach to the problems we have handled together.

Upon Admiral Trimble's retirement,

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe awarded him a Gold Star in lieu of a Second Distinguished Service Medal. As an indication of the high esteem in which Admiral Trimble was held, I would like to quote from Mr. Volpe's remarks on that occasion:

Paul, I feel truly privileged to represent the President—and the American people—at this particular ceremony. It gives me a chance to tell others of the high personal regard I have for you.

Our purpose here is to thank you for dedicated service to the Nation.

You have had a productive and distinguished career, and the United States Coast Guard is a far better organization for the contributions you have made. But your public service has been far wider than through the Coast Guard alone. It is the mark of your ability that you have served, not only as Vice Admiral—as Assistant Commandant—but also as a top executive in the Department of Transportation. I place a high value on your competence and your intelligence. And I respect your proven ability to get a job done. Your service has been, truly, distinguished.

Our ceremony here today, must also be somewhat of a farewell for you will be soon leaving the service. Your many friends will miss you and so shall I. However, I do want to wish you good luck in your new career. And I hope, somehow, we shall continue to be doing business together.

Paul, on behalf of the President, I am honored to present you this Gold Star representing a second medal for truly distinguished service. You well deserve it.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to call such a man as Paul Trimble my friend.

"HEART-SAVER SQUADS" BILL

HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, it is within the power of this distinguished body to make a major contribution toward lowering the casualty toll of one of the Nation's greatest killers—heart attacks—by passing H.R. 6956, my proposed bill to amend title IX of the Public Health Service Act to provide Federal assistance and encourage local initiative to demonstrate the effectiveness of emergency care for heart attack victims by dispatching to the patient specially trained persons in specially equipped ambulances.

Since I introduced this bill last year, I have brought to my colleagues' attention the success of the "heartmobile" unit recently established in nearby Montgomery County, Md., which speeds immediate care to hundreds of heart attack victims. We urgently need Federal action to create similar heartmobiles around the country.

I was pleased to note in this regard in the Washington Post of July 5, 1970, that the American Medical Association has a similar proposal before it, and that one of its leading exponents is Dr. Eliot Corday, clinical professor of medicine at the University of California at Los Angeles.

Dr. Corday was a pioneer in the effort to install hospital coronary care units several years ago. It has been estimated that heart attack deaths have been cut in half since hospitals opened special cardiac care units.

However, 65 percent of all heart attack deaths occur outside hospitals. H.R. 6956 is designed to help these people who die before ever reaching hospital facilities by providing funds to enable local units to demonstrate the effectiveness of emergency "heart-saver" squads to provide immediate care for heart attack victims.

I am including the article with Dr. Corday's pertinent observations so that my colleagues can read of the tremendous potential of these heart-saver squads and specially equipped ambulances which could save up to 50,000 lives a year. For our delay in establishing a federally assisted program for these squads under the Public Health Service Act literally dooms up to half of all heart attack victims.

The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 5, 1970]

MAKING HEART CENTERS OF AMBULANCES URGED

(By Victor Cohn)

A second fundamental change in the treatment of heart attacks is being pushed by leading cardiologist: turning every ambulance into a rolling heart center at a "modest" cost of $1,000 to $1,500 apiece.

Behind the new movement are the same doctors who wrought the first cardiac-care revolution of recent times, the creation of hospital coronary-care units.

Turning all U.S. ambulances into mobile heart units could save 50,000 lives a year, Dr. Eliot Corday of Los Angeles said in an interview yesterday, enlarging on a proposal before the American Medical Association late in June.

Corday, a clinical professor of medicine at the University of California at Los Angeles, was one of the men most responsible for starting the mid-1960s' trend toward hospital coronary units. Equipped with electronic monitors and equipment to restart faltering hearts, they have cut heart disease deaths in hospitals by a third nationally and by close to 50 per cent in some centers, Corday said.

Now, he maintained, "we have to start improving medical emergency care in this country—it is probably the worst of any developed-country," mostly unplanned and "absolutely primitive."

As one part of the job, he said, every ambulance driver should be trained as a heart technician and every ambulance equipped with:

A radio-equipped EKG (electrocardiogram) machine.

An electric heart regulator called a defibrillator.

A two-way radio link.

Then, he said: "You could bring the patient to the hospital under radio control." At the hospital, a heart specialist could direct the driver—to save "about" one in five of the 250,000 heart attack victims who now die each year outside hospitals.

This could be achieved in just two years' effort, he maintained, as "something every municipality can afford."

CITIES PILOT PROGRAM

For example, he said, a pilot program is under way at Mount Zion Hospital, San Francisco, with two ambulances. "Each charges a patient $15 to ride on the radio signal, a hospital or ambulance firm could get its $1,000 or $1,500 back in a hurry."

This recommendation was first presented at a meeting sponsored by the National Heart Institute in 1969 and endorsed by 80 other cardiologists. But it has had almost no public attention, he said, with pilot programs only in San Francisco and Miami.

In the Washington area, the Montgomery County Heart Association is now operating a new but more complicated "Heartmobile," manned by a nurse and two technicians to bring heart attack victims to Holy Cross Hospital. It is costing $145,000 to build and run for a year.

What is needed to show that hospitals can bring the cost down, Corday said, is perhaps $6 million a year for three years in federally-financed pilot projects, much like the three-year hospital coronary unit pilot program financed in the late 1960s.

Heart victims usually die not because some heart muscle is destroyed but because the heart goes into a wild and ineffective kind of beat. It is this beat which is now regulated in hospital coronary units—a tremendous medical accomplishment which Corday and others now want to put on the road.

A TALE OF TWO SYSTEMS

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker. I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to some very interesting figures sent to me by one of my alert constituents, Mr. Charles S. McGill of Valparaiso, Ind.

These figures comparing the rates of the postal service with the telephone system were taken from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce's "Action Report for Business Leaders" and are an interesting commentary on the present plight of our post office.

A TALE OF TWO SYSTEMS

The postal service and the telephone system are two of the most widely used means of communication today.

The cost of communicating between two cities such as Chicago and Los Angeles by first class mail has risen 300% since 1932, and the possibility exists rates may be raised again to 8c an ounce.

Telephone costs, in contrast, have dropped dramatically over the same period, and today the cost of a three-minute daytime call between these cities is about one-fourth the cost in 1932.

The postal service was one of first and most important functions of the Federal Government when the republic was founded.

Telephone service, on the other hand, has been left in the hands of private enterprise.

One can only wonder what would have happened if our founding fathers had telephones and had decided that only the government could make them work.

Year	Telephone rates [1]	Postal rates [2]
1970	$1.55	$0.6
1968	1.80	.6
1963	1.95	.5
1959	2.20	.4
1952	2.25	.3
1933	6.25	.3
1932	6.25	.2

[1] 3-minute daytime rate between Chicago and Los Angeles.
[2] 1st class surface mail.

AMBASSADOR HOWARD L. CHERNOFF, THE COMMISSIONER GENERAL OF THE U.S. PAVILION AT THE JAPAN WORLD EXPOSITION, EXPO '70, OSAKA, JAPAN

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I have long since known of the great ability of my friend Ambassador Howard L. Chernoff, the Commissioner General of the U.S. pavilion at the Japan World Exposition, Expo '70, Osaka, Japan. He has put together and is presently in charge of the No. 1 attraction at that World Fair.

I have had many complimentary letters with regard to our exhibit as well as a few containing criticism. Under the permission heretofore granted me, I am including with these remarks the editor's report: "The Strongest Tie," by William Randolph Hearst, Jr., editor in chief, the Hearst newspapers, which I think accurately describes the success of our American pavilion:

THE STRONGEST TIE

(By William Randolph Hearst, Jr.)

TOKYO.—After quite a few years of globe trotting, I am convinced that speaking or even understanding a common language is the strongest tie that binds peoples of different nationalities, yes, even races.

In a tie for second, I would put an active sense of humor and the ability and even eagerness to convey one's thoughts or wishes in what is descriptively known as sign language.

What brings these perhaps trite thoughts to mind today is our presence this past week in Japan.

(My son Will, who was 21 last week, joined Joe Kingsbury Smith, Bob Considine and me here Tuesday, having flown from Malaga, Spain, via Paris and Moscow to enlist in our Task Force, and am I pleased and proud to have him.)

Now all of us know enough French—Italian—German—or Spanish to eat, shop, drive in the country and find the men's room from one corner of Europe to the other.

But what to say and more importantly what they are saying in Japanese, Chinese or Vietnamese is, to coin an Oriental cliche, "another cup of tea."

Throughout Europe, the languages are derived from the same root words as our own. Namely, Greek, Latin, Germanic and Anglo-Saxon. Besides we have the same alphabet.

But over here, absolutely nothing. Rien—niente—nada—nicht is familiar or offers a clue in sound or script.

As a consequence it is sign language or nothing—more often nothing. It calls for a bit of imagination and skill in portraying a thought pictorially, which the other guy must understand. Too often you find yourself repeating over and over with increasing impatience and mounting irritation, a charade which obviously is not getting through to your audience.

This language barrier, though insurmountable in the streets of Tokyo, is minimized at Expo '70, the great international Oriental fair in Osaka.

Fairs represent more than mere fun and frolic. They express the will, determination and pride (often false) of the exhibiting nation, and they are more revealing in many cases than an exclusive interview with the prime minister of the country involved, or a six-week visit.

Only about half a million Americans will make it to Expo '70, the way being long and costly. They will probably agree with what I now say: This is the best display America ever presented before the eyes of fair-going multitudes—at least, it's the best in my somewhat considerable experience.

We could have built the biggest pavilion on the Expo grounds and loaded it to the rafters with everything in our arsenal of technological, scientific and artistic products (the Russians have done just that, predictably).

Instead, we show a bit of this, a bit of that: Frederick Remington's magnificently vital "Cavalry Charge on the Southern Plains," and a hunk of the moon; John Trumbull's virile "Washington Before the Battle of Trenton," and a snazzy yellow Stutz Bearcat; Apollo 8's scarred command module, and Babe Ruth's bat, Indian and Eskimo folk art; helium neon laser beams and great photographic murals—both still and moving.

But we must be saying something that has appeal to the people, in our modest way. Ten million of them have browsed through our unique inflated-ceiling building—some of them after waiting in an inching along queue for two and a half hours. They've literally worn out the pavilion's rugs already.

However, our prize exhibit is the staff that runs our show, headed by Howard Chernoff, ex-San Diego newsman and acquaintance from London in WW II. Chernoff has ambassadorial rank during the run of Expo, but he hardly fits the pattern of the bow-and-scrape school of diplomacy.

He has been known to "tell off" an occasional foreign official who abused our hospitality. But I saw him impulsively pick up a beautiful little Japanese child and pose for parental pictures with it on his lap, while he sat in John Glenn's capsule seat.

As for Chernoff's staff, all of whom speak Japanese, they are the kind of American kids you want your sons and daughters to grow up to be.

The Russians, as earlier noted, are showing everything but the kitchen sink, and perhaps the only reason it isn't in their cluttered pavilion is that they haven't invented it yet.

One thing you absolutely can't miss in the U.S.S.R.'s show is Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. This is the centennial of his birth. He's all over their lot, in heroic size statutes, 1917 newsreels, paintings, whatnot—as compared to our lone portrait of the Father of Our Country.

Moscow artisans turned out so many images of Lenin that they spill over into the pavilions of neighboring Iron Curtain countries, including, alas, the always beautiful Czechoslovakian exhibition. Lenin sticks out like a sore thumb in what the Czechs hoped would be (as it has been in previous fairs), the "sleeper" of the whole show.

My personal "sleeper" is the tiny Irish pavilion. It features Irish hamburgers, Guinness, Irish coffee, and red hair.

Oh yes, one item more. We're leading the other 76 nations in pickpocketing. More than 500 such heists have been committed on our reservation. Confirming an old saying—"Ply your trade where the money is."

On returning to Tokyo Friday night, we learned that our request for an interview with Japanese Prime Minister Eisaku Sato was set for Saturday morning. In my book, he is an ideal world leader in this day and age. Patriotism and his nation's interest come first, as they should, but he feels a strong bond of friendship for the United States.

To top it off, he is philosophically attuned to the times of today and the facts of life. War to him is not the answer for the settlement of international problems. In fact, he seems to exclude even the possibility of there ever being a nuclear holocaust.

Purely and simply, he feels that, as everyone knows, it would lead to total destruction and possibly the annihilation of mankind and civilization as we know it today. However, he recognizes, as he said, that there may someday be "crazy people around," and we should take whatever measures we can to protect ourselves.

Before you conclude that there is an element of contradiction, if not fence-straddling, in the prime minister's line of reasoning, let me assure you he is a pragmatic realist.

Furthermore, he recognizes what America has been trying to do in Vietnam and Cambodia. In fact, he showed a much greater understanding of the President's move into Cambodia than many of our senators and congressmen. He said he felt there has been a lot of inaccurate reporting about the American move into Cambodia, especially by the Japanese press.

It was not, in his opinion, President Nixon who escalated the war in Cambodia, but the Communists, who went in there first and built up their forces.

Since Japan's constitution forbids the country from participating in any wars except in defense of its own territory, Japan's contribution to resisting the spread of Communism in Free Asia has been to extend economic aid to the under-developed nations.

Sato seemed to subscribe to my suggestion that Japan might increase its contribution of yen instead of men and help promote an Asiatic Marshall Plan to strengthen the stability of the non-Communist nations in this part of the world.

As long as he remains prime minister, we won't have to worry about Japan as an ally and reliable friend.

PROPOSED NEW FIREARM CONTROLS

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, I am submitting today a bill that would amend the U.S. Criminal Code to provide mandatory sentencing upon the conviction of certain felonies during which the defendant was armed with a firearm and to make it a Federal offense to use a firearm which has been transported in interstate commerce, in the commission of robbery, assault, rape, burglary, kidnaping or homicide other than involuntary manslaughter.

In 1968 when Congress was considering crime legislation, I worked for a law that would impose mandatory prison sentences on anyone who committed a Federal crime with a gun and I opposed registration or licensing of all guns and gun owners. The object was to place the penalty for crimes with guns upon the criminal rather than the decent citizen. The Senate altered the provisions of our bill, thus weakening the mandatory sentencing section.

The object of the legislation I am today introducing has the same purpose of our 1968 mandatory sentencing provision, but it goes further by extending the reach of the Federal law. In addition it will provide a model for States where the approach has not been uniform, but differs greatly from State to State.

Since under the terms of my bill, whenever firearms are used in the commission of a crime, the local State law enforcement officer upon certification of the Department of Justice, could immediately have the assistance of his Federal counterpart in the apprehension and conviction of the apprehension and conviction of the dangerous offender. The law would give the Federal Government jurisdiction to assist in the fight against crime at the State and local area where most of the crime occurs.

Making the use or carrying of weapons in the commission of a felony a Federal offense would act as a deterrent to violent crime because the would-be criminal could face stiff penalties not only for violation of the State statute, but also for violation of the Federal law.

The bill constitutes a valid exercise of congressional power to regulate commerce even though it punishes the act of using the gun rather than the shipping of the gun. By making use of a gun in a felony a Federal offense only when the gun is shipped in interstate commerce, the proposal makes the necessary connection between the crime and commerce. The commerce becomes illegal only when the end result of the commerce is illegal under State law. The Federal law is violated only when interstate commerce is involved.

The rising crime rate demonstrates that Federal action is needed to more effectively prosecute the minority who would harm others with their firearms and protect the law-abiding majority.

In 1968, according to Federal Bureau of Investigation figures, there were 8,900 gun murders committed in the United States. In addition, 65,000 Americans were victims of gun assaults and 73,000 citizens were robbed by gunmen that year. These figures reflect substantial increases over 1967, and since 1964, gun murders have jumped 117 percent and assaults have increased 117 percent and gun robberies have risen 113 percent. This must not continue.

CURRENT NATIONAL ISSUES QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. DELBERT L. LATTA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. LATTA. Mr. Speaker, every year I send a questionnaire to my constituents wherein I solicit their views on current national issues. I have found that most of the people in the district like this method of expressing themselves and not only do they complete the questionnaire but they use the back side to comment on other matters not specifically listed. I have just finished tabulating this year's returns and I would like to call them to the attention of the Members of the House. They are as follows:

[In percent

	Yes	No
1. Do you favor President Nixon's plan of gradual withdrawal and Vietnamization of the war?	60	40
2. The Senate has passed a bill reducing the penalty for the use of marihuana for first offenders from a felony to probation with the right of the court to eventually expunge the arrest from the defendant's record. Do you favor this bill?	39	61
3. Do you favor the administration's plan guaranteeing a Government-financed income to poor families, providing the head of the household registers for work or training once every 3 months? (The program initially would pay $1,600 plus $800 in food stamps to a family of 4. $300 would be paid for each additional child.)	37	63
4. The law presently makes it illegal for Government workers to strike. Do you agree with this law?	68	32
5. Should unions representing Government employees be permitted to force employees to become dues-paying members?	28	72
6. Do you favor the transfer of our postal service to a wholly owned Government corporation?	51	49
7. To make our selective service lottery system work effectively, it has been proposed that all deferments be abolished. Would you favor such a system?	52	48
8. Do you believe it is time for the Federal Reserve Board to relax its "tight money" policy?	51	49
9. Would you favor controls on wages and prices if both continue to increase?	74	26
10. Do you favor busing of schoolchildren from one school district to another in order to bring about a racial balance?	23	77
11. Do you agree with President Nixon's position that more strict constructionists are needed on the Supreme Court?	51	49
12. For farmers: Do you favor the "consensus" farm bill now being considered by the House Agriculture Committee, which would give farmers greater freedom to plant as they wish, permit more land retirement, provide cash payments at about current levels (approximately $3,000,000,000 per year) but would lower price support loans on wheat (10 cents) and corn (5 cents)?	64	36

PRESIDENT AGAIN BECOMES LEADER OF FREE WORLD

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I insert an article in the RECORD written by Mr. Ray McHugh, the distinguished Washington bureau chief of Copley News. Mr. McHugh reports that President Nixon, by taking the initiative and acting decisively in Cambodia, has reaffirmed for the Presidency of the United States the acknowledged leadership of the free world.

The article follows:

IMPORTANT CHANGE—PRESIDENT AGAIN BECOMES LEADER OF FREE WORLD

(By Ray McHugh)

WASHINGTON.—The emotional, partisan debate in the Senate over the presidency and its powers has blinded Washington to an important change in the status of the chief executive.

The President of the United States is once again the unchallenged leader of the free world.

The Senate undoubtedly could stage another debate on whether this change resulted from President Nixon's conduct in office, or from the shifting tides of international politics, but the fact is evident to any newsman who travels widely in Europe, the Middle East and the Mediterranean.

Europeans do not underestimate the dangers of the Middle East and a goodly number will quarrel with the American involvement in Southeast Asia, but there is a willingness to follow the lead of the man in the White House.

"President Nixon understands us."

That phrase is heard in country after country from men in responsible positions.

ASSET OVERLOOKED IN WASHINGTON

It is an asset that has eluded many in Washington.

It is evident that Mr. Nixon soon must make decisions concerning the Middle East than can be fateful to all the nations in this region.

While a majority in Congress already has endorsed the popular proposition that Israel be supplied with all the jet warplanes she needs, or says she needs, the President in his role of a world leader must weigh the views and concerns in a much wider context.

In Greece, which lives on the edge of the Middle East fire zone, the foreign minister told this reporter candidly that the smaller nations of Europe cannot influence Israel or the Arabs. Athens, he said, would use its good offices to transmit or promote any American initiatives for peace in the region "but there is no reason to hope that Greece could act alone."

Mr. Nixon reportedly is preparing a peace proposal that will be announced at the same time he makes known his decision on jets for Israel.

The proposal is described as "a major American undertaking," although its provisions are secret. The President reportedly will send special emissaries to each Arab capital to explain his plan in detail. Special briefings also are planned for concerned European leaders.

Among European statesmen and political leaders there was no denunciation of Mr. Nixon's decision to send Americans into Cambodia. Instead there was an almost audible sigh of relief, accompanied by the question:

SENATE HUE AND CRY IGNORED

"Why wasn't this done two or three years ago?"

The hue and cry in the Senate against the President has not had the disruptive impact in European capitals that one might expect.

Mr. Nixon is a known quantity to most western leaders. He has been a personal friend or acquaintance for 10 years or more. Rather than join the chorus against his policies, most of these leaders—even in such countries as Egypt—are inclined to sympathize with the President.

The spectacle of 46 senators who have demanded immediate withdrawal from Vietnam and who have denounced the Cambodia operation joining 27 colleagues in the call for Israeli jets, regardless of consequences, has not inspired confidence in their wisdom.

The resignation of Gen. Charles de Gaulle more than a year ago removed the last of the wartime leaders from the summit. De Gaulle's successor, President Georges Pompidou, has shown none of the old general's flair for independent leadership.

BRANDT FACES EAST, BOGS DOWN

Chancellor Willy Brandt of West Germany is bogged down in diplomatic overtures toward Moscow, Warsaw and East Berlin that have provoked serious divisions in his own country and already have begun to erode his thin margin in the bundestag.

Harold Wilson of Britain, who preached insular policies and a retreat from empire, has been upset by Edward Heath and the Conservative party—a party whose leaders promise to work much closer with the American White House.

Italy wallows in a political quagmire and while the Christian Democrat party remains the largest and most influential bloc, its top three figures have shown little leadership. Mariano Rumor, Aldo Moro and Amintore Fanfani all have taken turns trying to form

workable cabinets and trying to cope with social and economic problems and each has met the same disappointment.

Spain is conscious of impending change as Gen. Francisco Franco marks his 78th year and grooms Prince Juan Carlos for a vacant throne. Portugal is adjusting to Premier Marcello Caetano and finding to its pleasant surprise that Premier Antonio Salazar's successor is a man of moderation who is bent on economic growth and development.

To such a continent, President Nixon is becoming a familiar and reassuring figure.

CONGRESSMAN SCHMITZ' INITIAL REPORT TO HIS CONSTITUENTS

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, July 1, 1970, I had the honor and great pleasure of being sworn in as a Member of the House of Representatives by the Speaker of the House, the Honorable JOHN W. MCCORMACK. This followed my predicted election the day before, in which I am most grateful for the almost 3-to-1 victory given to me by the voters of the 35th Congressional District of California. As most of you know, this was the seat held for so many years by the late, very popular and most able Congressman James B. Utt.

I repeat that it was an honor and a pleasure to be sworn in by the venerable Speaker, for whom I hold great respect, notwithstanding that he is not a member of my political party. Due to his pending retirement, I will no doubt be one of the last to be given the oath by Speaker MCCORMACK, who has earned the respect of the entire country by his many years of public service. He has been Speaker for more years than any other man, with the exception of the man he succeeded, the Honorable Sam Rayburn of Texas.

My reception by my new colleagues on both sides of the partisan aisle was most cordial. One of those who crossed the aisle to greet me was the distinguished majority leader, the Honorable CARL ALBERT of Oklahoma, who has been mentioned as a candidate to succeed Congressman MCCORMACK as Speaker.

One of my first thoughts on taking office was the difference between being one of 40 members, as in the California State Senate, and being one of 435 Members, as in the U.S. House of Representatives. A principal area of attention is the seniority system, now under attack by some of the younger Members of Congress, and a system similar to that of the State senate, which has recently been in upheaval.

Unless someone can convince me, by more persuasive arguments than any I have yet heard, that the elimination of the seniority system would solve more problems than it would create, and that it would be more beneficial to the people as a whole, I will continue to support its retention. No system is perfect, and certainly there are shortcomings with the present plan under which committee members advance up the seniority ladder to chairman, only as ones above them either retire, die, or are defeated for reelection.

It is argued that by the time one accrues the seniority necessary to become a committee chairman, he has often aged to the point of inflexibility. My present age of 39 places me in the younger class, relative to the average age of the Members of Congress. I do not consider that the gage of a successfully effective Congress is the number of legislative matters passed, but, rather, in the quality of them, measured by their protection of the rights of the individual.

It is said that those who refuse to study past history are doomed to repeat the errors of those who preceded them. This is especially true of legislators. There really is little that has not been thought of before, but merely variations of past ideas, some of which may or may not be improvements. By the time a man gets to be a committee chairman, he has heard thousands of ideas debated, he has seen hundreds of measures enacted, and he has had the time to witness the results effected by them and is better equipped to know what will not work, and why.

There is less likelihood of repeating past errors under the present system and, in addition, the amount of intramembership campaigning for individual advancement is at a minimum. Under the "popularity" system of choosing chairmen, objectivity is lost in the political deals made between Members, not necessarily on a partisan basis, but strictly as a self-aggrandizing search for popular support of colleagues or leadership positions. It leads to bickering among groups of Congressmen, and votes cast not on constitutional and moral grounds, but to pay off obligations or to gain selfish advantage.

I will continue to study this matter in the light of experience I gain as a Member of Congress, but any alternative plan I might support will have to show definite improvement upon the present system, without incorporating either its shortcomings or ones that would be more seriously adverse to the welfare of our Nation.

I am presently located in the offices assigned to the staff of Congressman Jim Utt soon after his death. It is at 1208 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515. The telephone number remains the same as that given to Jim Utt, area code 202—225–5611.

NEW GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE PUBLICATION

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of the Members of the House a new Government Printing Office publication entitled "The Laws of the United States Relating to Water Pollution Control and Environmental Quality." This booklet, Committee on Public Works Print 91–33, is a committee compilation of those laws covering the subject, and I feel it will become an important reference work for all persons, public and private, who are concerned with our current environmental problems.

PRICE OPPOSES PAYMENT LIMITATIONS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Senate, in the absence of 25 percent of its membership, voted to tack an amendment limiting farm payments to $20,000 per farmer on the agriculture appropriations bill for fiscal 1971.

The Senate took this action over the strenuous objections of the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Appropriations Subcommittee, Mr. HOLLAND, a Senate leader who for decades has shown great wisdom and initiative in agricultural legislation. During the debate on the bill the distinguished Senator made it clear he thought the payment limitations issue should be considered in conjunction with farm program legislation rather than agricultural appropriations. As will be remembered, this was essentially the position the overwhelming number of House Members took when the same question was raised during last month's debate on the agriculture appropriations bill.

Mr. Speaker, I fervently urge my colleagues to defeat motions of any Member which would instruct the House conferees to agree to the Senate amendment limiting price support payments to $20,000. I submit the House must follow this course of action for several reasons. First, were the limitations to be applied to the wrong legislation; namely, the appropriations bill, it would set a dangerous precedence which could rightly disrupt the procedural machinery of the legislative process. Second, the question of the advisability and feasibility of payment limitations receiving concentrated attention in the House Agriculture Committee, and the membership will be advised of the committee's findings when the final bill is reported. At that time, and only at that time, will the Congress have a sufficient foundation on which to render a truly judicious decision on the question. Congress should not go off half-cocked on such a vital matter. Third, the abrupt establishment of a $20,000 payment limitation per farmer would disrupt and greatly dislocate the rural economy of the Nation, for large segments of it have grown and developed as a consequence of Federal farm policies over the last 35 years. Were this structure to dramatically change, as would be the inevitable consequence of Congress adopting strict payment limitations, not only would it sink the rural economy it would also drag down the general level of economic activity which

depends quite heavily on the agricultural sector for consumption and purchasing support.

In conclusion Mr. Speaker, I would like to stress again that this is not the proper time for Congress to act on the payment limitation question. For reasons of clarity, I state the case for defeating this amendment in terms of five basic points:

Unless the Food and Agriculture Act of 1965 is extended or replaced, most payments under the cotton, feed grains, and wheat programs will end in 1971, hence a limitation on these program payments in the current agricultural appropriations bill is unnecessary.

If the payment programs are continued, a simple $20,000 limitation on total payments to an individual would make it extremely difficult to administer the commodity programs to achieve their adjustment and price support objectives.

An extension of existing sugar legislation will come before the Congress next year and limitations on sugar payments can be taken up at that time—giving the Secretary of Agriculture discretionary authority to make appropriate changes on the program in the light of any payment limitations adopted.

Wool program payments are for the purpose of encouraging increased domestic production of wool. To limit the payments large farmers receive from the wool program will tend to discourage the production of wool on these farms.

The appropriate time for considering payment limitations is when a new legislative authorization bill comes before the Congress. At that time the Secretary should be given discretionary authority to adjust the programs as appropriate in the light of any payment limitations approved.

A LIVING EMBARRASSMENT TO THE COMMUNISTS

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTAIVETS

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, on June 20, the Organization for the Defense of Lemkivschchyna held its 10th annual convention up in Toronto, Canada. These valiant people, the Lemkos, who are now settled in North America, have known the whip of persecution and the yoke of slavery. They have been driven from their homeland in the Ukraine in the attempt to find freedom and a better life.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken on this floor many times over the years regarding the plight of those enslaved behind the Iron Curtain. I urge my colleagues here today to renew their dedication to the cause of justice and liberty, to the freedom of those under the heel of the Russian bear.

The Lemkos stand as a living embarrassment to the Communists. Let us keep the light of public opinion on them, for they serve as a constant reminder that freedom, while costly to purchase, is even more costly to preserve.

THOUGHTS OF A MAN IN UNIFORM

HON. F. EDWARD HÉBERT

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, two articles have come to my attention which I think are worthy of the attention of the House. They are written by Capt. Paul Gray, U.S. Navy, who 2 years ago received the Navy League's John Paul Jones Award for inspirational leadership.

In these articles, written for his base paper, Captain Gray expresses how the man in uniform feels about antiwar demonstrators and President Nixon's move into Cambodia.

Captain Gray is one of the most outstanding men to ever wear the uniform of our country. He has consistently done an excellent job and was decorated for his efforts in South Vietnam.

I am able to say these things about Captain Gray because I know the man and have been in a position to observe him through the years. I can sum up his naval career in one word—outstanding.

I insert his articles at this point in the RECORD:

THE NEW GENERATION GAP

As I watched the marine's magnificent sunset parade last Thursday I thought of the report I had received earlier in the day of the commencement speeches at Yokohama High School. The young speakers had eloquently vented their disgust with the establishment and the awful state of the world. Pollution, the war in Indo China, racial discrimination, poverty—all were attributed to the middle-aged and their callous failure to make things bright, clean, safe and untroubled. Nothing could be as bad as conditions in 1970.

I thought back to the days when the present establishment was entering the world of reality. Things were not very good then either. The smoke from the crematoriums of Dachau and Buchenwald was slowly extinguishing the lights in Europe. Poison gas was being used in Africa to control the Negros of Ethiopia. There was real poverty in the United States as a result of the economic collapse of the early 30's. Arrogant young intellectuals wanted a communist/socialist type political framework in America which was supposed to bring an era of peace, equality, and goodwill to the country and to the world. There was also a very marked generation gap.

Today there is another gap between many in the current generation and the old folks who are their parents. The young protesters demand peace now, racial equality now, and freedom now. The parents remember that the young have the freedom to protest and they have that freedom because the middle aged preserved it for them at places like Anzio and Guadalcanal.

As a demonstration-weary member of the establishment I welcome these brave young people into the struggle. I hope they have new solutions to the grim problems which beset mankind. I'm afraid though, that they will have to find a way to prevent human beings from behaving like human beings.

I don't know the ultimate answer to peace, security, and progress but as long as four fifths of the world adheres to the principle that power flows from the barrel of a gun I hope these fine young people keep their powder dry because if they destroy the shining sword of America as symbolized by our superb marines, a long darkness will soon settle over the free world.

CRISIS IN CAMBODIA

In view of the emotional, almost pathological response to the President's recent action in Cambodia, I would like to evaluate the consequences of his decision for you as I see it. I hope this brief analysis will give you a better understanding of the problem.

Putting all the glory aside, you must realize that in the end it is logistics that wins or loses wars. The South lost in the Civil War because of logistic failures. Germany lost World War I and World War II for the same reason. Any army or navy which is cut off from its supply base rapidly loses its ability to fight. A soldier on the front line is soon ineffective if he has no food or bullets. A warship without black oil and ammunition is no longer an aggressive fighting element.

Beans and bullets—you have to have them or you can't win. It's as simple as that. Ask any of our combat Marines or sailors who have been to Vietnam.

Now for Cambodia. Since about 1965 the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese have received their military supplies from two sources. Communist bloc ships were unloaded in Cambodia at Sihanoukville and the food and ammunition was trucked about 200 miles to storage points along the border of South Vietnam. Other bloc ships were unloaded in Haiphong and the supplies were trucked as far south as possible and then carried by men to other storage areas in Cambodia. The Viet Cong and NVA then used these supplies to arm themselves, infiltrate across the entire border, attack, and then quickly retreat back into Cambodia to rearm and regroup. They have done this for more than five years with complete immunity.

As a result of the President's action, these supply sanctuaries are either destroyed or being destroyed. Sihanoukville can no longer be used by the Communist bloc ships. To supply their troops the North Vietnamese now face the stupendous problem of transporting tons of supplies about 300 miles from Haiphong to South Vietnam over unpassable roads and trails. The instant the supply lines enter into Laos or Cambodia, they are vulnerable to attack from the air or ground.

How does this effect the war in South Vietnam? First, the deployed Viet Cong and North Vietnamese, deprived of food and essential military hardware will rapidly lose their ability to fight. No longer can they move at will across any point of a 700 mile border and mount surprise attacks on the cities and villages of South Vietnam. They will be forced to cross either through the DMZ or a very limited border area of Laos. The problem of defense by the ARVN (Army of the Republic of Vietnam) has been tremendously simplified and they should be able to cope with limited thrusts without difficulty. They should soon be able to stand alone now that the Communist maneuvering area has been severely limited.

Although they will never admit it, the North Vietnamese have suffered a catastrophic defeat. What looked like an easy triumph two months ago has become an almost impossible goal now. Their chances of victory over South Vietnam are now almost nil. The shift of Cambodia from the Communist side to our side was the break in the game we have been looking for. Any coach would have taken advantage of it.

Regardless of whether you agree with Mr. Nixon's decision, we all, as Americans, have a responsibility toward our president. A majority of our people elected Richard M. Nixon to lead us for four years. It was Richard M. Nixon who went before the people and was judged best fitted to make the hard decisions in the Cold War, the same as President Truman did during the Greek revolution and

President Kennedy did during the Cuban missile crisis. President Nixon's doing what he thinks is best for all Americans. As the elected President of the people of the United States he deserves and should have your prayers and understanding during his lonely time of crisis and trial.

NATIONAL HISTORIC PARK STATUS

HON. ORVAL HANSEN

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. HANSEN of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, on April 25 my family and I had the pleasure of joining several hundred persons on a hiking expedition along the Chesapeake & Ohio Canal on the occasion of the 16th annual reunion of the C. & O. Canal Association.

It was a rare treat for us to see first hand the beauty of the C. & O. which is one of the most fascinating and picturesque canals in the Nation. It is a place of scenic beauty and tells a story of one of the most exciting chapters in American history. After this experience I certainly agree with those who have endorsed the bill sponsored by my good friend, Congressman JOHN P. SAYLOR, which would designate the area as a national historical park.

I wish to commend this bill to the attention of my colleagues and suggest that they read the editorial in the Washington Evening Star of June 1, 1970, in support of the bill, which I include as a part of my remarks:

CANAL BREAKTHROUGH

For Washingtonians with a love of the outdoors, these are sparkling, golden days in which to savor the beauties of nature that abound along the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. And this element of timing no doubt has served to increase the response of widespread gratification to Secretary Hickel's formal endorsement of legislation which would incorporate the canal within a national historic park.

The bill would authorize, over a period of several years, the expenditure of $44.5 million—of which less than $20 million is the cost of acquiring about 15,000 additional acres of land, roughly quadrupling the present holdings. That expenditure is a modest sum for the result envisioned. The remainder of the money would pay for recreational facilities and reconstruction of portions of the thread-like canal park from Georgetown to Cumberland, Maryland.

The proposal is less ambitious in scope, and far less costly, than a venture favored by the previous Interior Secretary. In these days of desperate competition among domestic programs for dollars, however, it is a good beginning, which enjoys the merits of political realism without sacrificing the essential goals of reclamation which government agencies, conservationists and civic organizations have been pursuing now for decades.

Representative Gude of Maryland, one of the most persistent of the House and Senate co-sponsors of the measure, asserted the other day that Hickel's support means that "the cork has been pulled" from the legislative bottle in which the proposal has lain dormant. We hope that is an accurate prediction and that early hearings are forthcoming.

The canal, as nearly all those who flock to the area even in its present state are aware, has historic values which are in danger of being lost. Its reclamation offers Congress a rare opportunity to implement the sensible policy, gaining strength in recent years, which holds that the preservation of natural areas is fully compatible with the goal of making parks useful and accessible places of enjoyment for endless numbers of people who desperately need a touch of nature.

ECHO OF LINCOLN'S WORDS STILL HEARD

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, recently Mr. Bob Corbett, a distinguished science writer for the San Diego Evening Tribune, made a transcontinental flight from San Diego to Washington, D.C. Mr. Corbett's reflections on his trip, on the history of America, and the quotations he cites from the Lincoln Memorial concerning national unity, seem appropriate for this time in our Nation's history when thousands displayed their love of country this past weekend at Honor America Day gatherings.

ECHO OF LINCOLN'S WORDS STILL HEARD

(By Bob Corbett)

The real purpose of the flight to Washington was to talk to Mr. Lincoln.

The oceanographic convention in the nation's capital was only an excuse. Sorry boss.

The idea of talking to Mr. Lincoln must seem strange to anybody who wasn't born and reared in Illinois or its neighboring states, but in that area he is more than an historical figure or even a legend. He is family, someone you grow up with and who helps set the tone of your life.

The main reason I wanted to talk to Mr. Lincoln is that I, like many other people, am disturbed about what is going on in this nation he struggled to preserve, and I thought that he might set me straight.

The flight itself was instructive. Believe it or not, the land is still there despite our problems of smog and pollution and strife. The Rockies still stand, the farmlands of the Midwest are still a productive patchwork of green and yellow fields, the Mississippi (tainted as it is) still rolls on, and the forests still occupy vast expanses of the East. The nation is not just a wall-to-wall battleground that our troubles sometime do indicate.

It occurred to me that this geography is also associated with the long history of the nation, starting with San Diego Bay and Juan Cabrillo. The coastal mountains recall the Forty-Niners, the Rockies names like Zebulon Pike and the mountain men.

Even Lubbock, Tex., recently almost demolished by a tornado, has its bit of history. I have in-laws there who arrived in Texas in covered wagons and whose parents fought the Indians for the land. A little bit to the north is Palo Duro Canyon, where the once-proud Comanches, the lords of the plains, made their last tragic stand.

Then there is the Missouri River and Lewis and Clark; the Mississippi and Mark Twain and the Battle of New Orleans. We passed over Springfield and New Salem, Ill., where Lincoln grew to manhood and now rests.

The East Coast emerges and with it the entire scope of the developing nation from the settlements at Plymouth Rock and Jamestown to the Revolutionary War and Civil War.

Which brings us back to Mr. Lincoln.

If the nation is united in space through its geography and in time through its history, it seemed to me that our troubles must lie with the only other factor around—the people themselves.

There is the young against the old, white versus black, the hippie types and the hard hats, the rich and the poor, the weak and the strong. All people.

With this in mind, I rushed out to the Lincoln Memorial. Here on the marble steps of the monument, the people were united. There were blacks, whites, browns. A few hippies lounged on the steps. The middle-class American with his family and camera predominated.

They came in a steady stream and all approached with something akin to a reverence. I waited for a break in the crowds before stepping before the great seated figure of Mr. Lincoln to ask my questions.

Why, with so much to unite us, are we so divided? Where have we gone wrong?

Mr. Lincoln did not answer, of course.

But then I read the words of his two great speeches as they are inscribed on the side walls.

". . . that this nation under God shall have a new birth of freedom—and that government of the people, by the people and for the people shall not perish from the Earth."

". . . with malice toward none and charity for all . . ."

And it occurred to me, that perhaps Mr. Lincoln has been talking to us all along. Perhaps we have just not been listening.

VIEWS OF A GRADUATING HIGH SCHOOL SENIOR

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, unless you are a parent these days, it is no doubt the rare occasion that we have the opportunity to listen calmly to the individual voices of the younger generation. It seems regrettable that those who purport to speak on behalf of youth have unsuccessfully sought to interpret the impressions imparted by group action while successfully submerging the individual in the seamless melting pot of public opinion.

As I have regularly sent to all graduating high school seniors a copy of "The American Creed," it was indeed not only a surprise, but a pleasure, this year when one senior, Michael Herner, returned to me a copy of a speech he had prepared which reflects his views of the challenges his generation faces:

A TIME FOR US

A time for us, someday there'll be, and when it comes, we'll have to make the best of it. It will be up to us, the graduates of 1970, to convince the people that if they do not wise up, they will eventually destroy themselves.

America, the home of the free and the land of the brave, has many problems. The freedom which we proudly possess is being abused. We are free to hold peaceful demonstrations, but today they evolve into violent destruction, and the original cause becomes lost in the hassle between the doves and the hawks, and everyone becomes a vulture.

The students seem to be the most susceptible to demonstrations. They know they have the right to hold a demonstration, only most of the time, the privilege is abused. The rad-

ical students decide they have to resort to violence, yet nothing is done. Where is the silent majority? Why doesn't it speak up? Are the people afraid to voice their opinions; to back up what is right?

Our class of 1970 will have to show the people they are not afraid of anything or anyone. We will have to show the world that we can and will cope with all problems that arise. We will have to show the people that when a problem does arise, we will handle it maturely and intelligently, and not back away from it which seems to be the thing to do today. We will have to show the people that we will not lower our standards and stoop to violence and self-destruction just because we don't like what is going on. We will have to show the people that we will not put down our country or its leaders just because we do not agree with a decision they made.

The most important thing that we will show the people is that we love our country. We will not burn our flag or spit on it. The people today should be glad that when we salute our flag it is because we want to, not because "Big Brother" is watching or because there is a gun pointed at our heads.

Everything is taken for granted and it will be up to us to change that. Our time will be a difficult one, and our job will be almost impossible. It's hard enough to live in our country with all its internal problems, but it is even more difficult to try to solve the problems, to try to put our country together, and that is what our job will be—putting our country back together.

The entire blame should not be placed on the younger generation, as it is. The adults should accept some of the blame. They are allowing the younger generation to get away with their actions. They sit back, watch, and complain, but do nothing.

When the radical students act up, the adults sit home and say, "Damn kids, they're all alike. When are they going to learn?" On the other hand, the non-radical students sit home and say, "It's students like that that give me a bad name." These are the students that do not have to be labeled as bad. All they have to do is show the people they care, but they don't.

Our time will consist of showing the people we care, showing the people that most of our students are good students, not just telling them; showing the people that our greatest enemy is ourselves. That is why our job will be so difficult. No one is willing to admit that we are destroying ourselves, our country. No one is willing to admit that if the current trend continues, democracy as we know it will no longer exist.

A time for us, someday there'll be, but it might be too late!

INVESTIGATION OF THE FEDERAL MEAT INSPECTION ACT

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a concurrent resolution that proposes to establish a joint congressional committee to conduct a study and investigation of the Federal Meat Inspection Act.

The committee would be directed to make a firsthand evaluation of packing plants in which meat destined for consumption in this country is processed, with particular emphasis on the various imbalances and deficiencies in the level of inspection provided. Included in the study would be foreign plants which are approved for shipping meat to the United States. The committee would be composed of three Members of the House of Representatives and three Members of the Senate and would be required to submit its report by June 30, 1971.

The American public today has available the highest quality food supply in the world. However, it would be a grave misfortune if the purity of all the food products that Americans enjoy could not be insured. It is my hope that we can guarantee to the public that the food they purchase is safe, healthful, and pure. Enactment of this legislation would certainly be a step in the right direction.

DICKEY-LINCOLN PROJECT IN NORTHERN MAINE

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, the ever-increasing possibility of power brownouts and blackouts necessitates an immediate remedial action. I believe a large part of the answer lies in hydroelectric powerplants. The proposed Dickey-Lincoln project in northern Maine offers the Northeast a stable source of electric power at reasonable rates. More importantly, it is a nonpolluting source of electric power. Because of Dickey's advantageous character, I am confident that the Senate Appropriations Committee will reinsert the $807,000 in Federal funding requested by the administration for continued preconstruction planning and design of the project in the public works appropriation bill for fiscal 1971 and that this action will receive full Senate approval. I am hopeful that its reinclusion will then be accepted by a conference committee and subsequently endorsed by both Houses.

I realize, of course, that Dickey will continue to meet the same arguments the private power utilities have advanced now for 5 years. Primarily, the power companies maintain that they can produce more reliable and less costly power. And an essential part of their effort to bring this about is through the construction of nuclear powerplants. I disagree with the major premise and most other of the private power industry's individual arguments and have expressed my dissenting views on a number of occasions. For the present, I shall direct myself merely to the nuclear power answer to our growing power crisis.

According to Dr. Arthur R. Tamplin, a physicist at the University of California, nuclear power is a highly questionable solution to the power crisis. His extensive study points to radiation's adverse effect upon man and his environment. He studies the genetic consequences of radiation and describes the great possibility of lethal mutations, as well as severe life-shortening chromosomal changes resulting from even minimal radiation exposure. Lastly, he stresses the critical need for a reassessment of the proposed nuclear power solution.

In the hope that my colleagues find it both interesting and informative, I am submitting a section of Dr. Tamplin's study for the RECORD:

THE GENETIC CONSEQUENCES OF RADIATION

The more recent data on the biological effects of radiation are generally tending to demonstrate that the original optimistic opinions of the effects were wrong. In this respect, I cite the extreme radiosensitivity of the developing fetus in utero. To a considerable extent the existing guidelines were were based upon the effects of radiation on adults and the data are now demonstrating that the developing fetus is from 10 to 100 times more sensitive than the adult. In addition the data are suggesting that leukemia is not the most sensitive form of cancer with respect to radiation, but that indeed all cancers are equally likely to be induced. Further, the data show other cancers which occur in the population more frequently than leukemia are induced by radiation in proportion to their occurrence rate. Finally, the data which are now coming in from biological experimentation are suggesting that the most radiosensitive portion of the biological system was overlooked in setting the original standards. This part of the biological system is the chromosomes, that is the packages of genes. Radiation can affect genetic material in a couple of ways. One way, which is the one that has been given the most attention with respect to the genetic and somatic effects of radiation, is that of producing a point mutation. By this process irradiation changes the structure or the composition of a single gene, that is, a single hereditary unit. Through this process is determined the production of a point mutation. On the other hand, it is now abundantly clear that the radiation can also affect the chromosomes. By this process, the radiation is able to alter or remove from the genetic material not a single gene but a large number of genes. The developing evidence on chromosomes and the effects of radiation on chromosomes suggests that this process may represent the major mechanism through which radiation produces its damage both somatically and in a genetic way. In other words, a whole new mechanism for the potential biological effects of radiation is now evolving. A mechanism that may represent a far greater susceptibility of man than any previous mechanism proposed.

I think it is extremely important at this point to point out that scientists are not omniscient. That even though we have a considerable body of information at our disposal we can never be certain that we have made all the pertinent observations that are necessary to determine the outcome of a particular series of events. We must always keep in mind that we do not necessarily have all the significant facts before us when we are asked to make recommendations as to whether something which is planned will not adversely affect man or his environment. I think the recent developments that occurred with thalidomide represent a useful example in this respect. As a consequence of the rather tragic results of the use of thalidomide, the drug testing procedures have now been altered. Following the thalidomide disclosure we now find many drugs listed in the Physicians Desk Reference that have a pregnancy warning which was not recorded previously. In fact, as ridiculous as it may seem, drugs in the Physicians Desk Reference that were initially issued primarily for the treatment of nausea in early pregnancy have

a warning against their use in early pregnancy.

It would seem that we have a similar situation now with respect to the biological effects of radiation. Subsequent to the establishment of the exposure guidelines, a whole new body of experimental data concerning the radiosensitivity of chromosomes has evolved. I think recent results reported by a group from Johns Hopkins University demonstrate quite well the importance of the new body of data with respect to the biological effects of radiation. The Johns Hopkins data indicate that between 1 and 2 rads delivered in the first 30 weeks of in utero life will produce severe genetic damage, and in this case it appears to be chromosomal damage, to the fetal germ cells. As a result of this damage, 50 percent of the female conceptus of women who were themselves irradiated as fetuses will be killed. This is a very startling observation and other confirmations of this observation are highly desirable. It is an effect whose magnitude far exceeds anything that had previously been predicted concerning the genetic effects of radiation. Note also that this radiation was delivered some 20 years earlier. It seems that little repair if any has occurred.

One of the existing dogmas concerning the genetic effects of radiation is that only sex-linked mutations would be expected to contribute to deaths in the F–1 generation (the children born to irradiated parents). Now sex-linked lethal mutations would express themselves by the deaths of male fetuses. As a consequence of sex-linked lethal mutations, one would then expect to find the male to female ratio to be depressed in the live births. However, contrary to this existing dogma concerning the genetic effects of radiation, the Johns Hopkins study, rather than showing a depression in the male to female ratio, indicated that the male to female ratio increased. Not only did it increase, it doubled. In other words, twice as many boy babies were born as girl babies and this is from mothers who were irradiated as fetuses at dosages in the range of 1 to 2 rads. Now the Federal Radiation Council Guidelines for the population-at-large would allow some 0.1 of a rad to be delivered in the first 30 weeks of in utero life. Considering the Johns Hopkins data, this could result in the deaths of some 2½ percent of the female conceptus. Now it would appear only reasonable to assume that an equal fraction of the conceptus would be affected by the non-lethal but nevertheless severe life shortening chromosomal changes. All I am suggesting here is that this is most likely not an all or none phenomenon, that changes in the chrromosomes less than lethal could also be expected to occur. It would not seem to be unreasonable to assume that in addition to the 2½ percent of the female conceptus that are killed, something on the order of 1 percent of the surviving live born infants might have severe or significant chromosomal changes. Actually, their data suggests differences in the live born infants. Considering that each year in the United States we have some four million live births this would suggest that as many as 40,000 additionally severely affected children might be born as a result of this in utero irradiation.

Now I would agree the above is somewhat speculative. Nevertheless, I think the rather dramatic divergence from the accepted genetic dogma that is shown by these Johns Hopkins studies suggests that we should very critically examine this entire area as it relates to the allowable dosage to the population. If nothing else, it points out that when applying the existing 500 millirem per year dosage standard one should apply this to the most significant or the most critical of human beings, namely the developing fetus in utero. During the first 30 weeks of intrauterine life the 500 millirem guideline would suggest that the fetus could receive 0.3 rad. In considering the effects observed in the Johns Hopkins study, this would suggest that somewhere in the neighborhood of 7½ percent of the female conceptus would be killed and certainly then one would have to assume that a significant number of the live births, male and female, might carry with them severe chromosome changes that could result in significant life shortening and severe disease in future life. In other words, here is a potential genetic effect of radiation that doesn't require the multiplication by 200 million people in order to demonstrate its significance.

In summary then, when all of the data are considered and proper respect is given to the protection of the public health and safety, there would seem to be no other course than to reduce the existing radiation exposure guidelines. It would seem that these guidelines should be reduced by at least a factor of 10.

ESSAY WINNER MAKES STRONG ARGUMENT FOR CONTINUATION OF REC

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the June 23 issue of Current News, a publication of the Eastern Iowa Light & Power Co., recently carried an article written by Mr. Ronald Skubal. The article was identical to the essay written by Mr. Skubal in the REC's annual essay contest, which won him a trip to Washington. Mr. Skubal's essay is very well written, and sets forth many excellent arguments for continuation of the REC program.

The article follows:

ESSAY CONTEST WINNER SAYS THAT YOUTH MUST UNDERSTAND AND SUPPORT THE RURAL ELECTRICS

(By Ronald Skubal)

Can you imagine what a gruesome portrait it would make if an artist could depict on canvas the ever-increasing problems that beset our cities today? What artist could produce a pleasing picture with crime, overpopulation, and pollution for subject matter?

For years, these problems have been factors promoting suburban development. Now, as a new decade begins, the cities have engulfed the suburbs, and are now chewing their way into rural areas.

Shopping centers, drive-in movies, and motels now occupy land where farm buildings once stood. Fields where corn once grew are now the sites for industrial plants. These new enterprises hold a bright future for rural America.

NEED MORE JOBS

Today, farming alone can no longer support the rural economy. Small individual farms are being combined to form corporate operations. This leaves a need for more non-farm jobs in rural America. Without industrial development, rural areas would succumb from lack of non-farm jobs and taxpayers. However, due to the efforts of the Rural Electric Cooperatives, rural prosperity seems evident.

The REC had the foresight years ago to recognize the problem of the emigration of youth from rural areas. The Cooperative knew that lack of economic opportunity was to blame, and that action had to be taken to create new opportunities. The result has been considerable progress toward accommodation of new industries in rural America.

The REC can be proud of the progress and achievements made. But they have only begun the conquest of some problems that face them. There are still many steps to be taken to insure rural social and economic growth. Most of these problems can be surmounted if the youth of America also shows foresight and desire to cooperate in facing with the Cooperative the crucial problems yet to be solved.

One of these problems is the preservation of territory the Cooperative has pioneered. Many expanding urban areas have their own power system or else franchise a commercial utility. When the development annexes an area already served by the Rural Electric Cooperative, it also tries to annex the consumers.

PIONEER COURAGE

The situation is nothing new. When this nation was pioneered, there were only a handful of persons who were courageous enough to explore and develop the land. After the work was done, many others moved in. Now, commercial utilities are trying to annex the territory that was pioneered by the Rural Electric Cooperative. The youth of America must see to it that such annexations do not take place.

The importance of the Rural Electric Cooperatives is immeasurable. Aside from providing electricity for rural industries, the Cooperatives will also play a great part in the large farm operations of the future. Because of future lack of farm help and the increasing modernization of farm equipment, electricity will be needed more than ever before to insure efficient farm management at the lowest possible cost. Through the efforts of the Rural Electric Cooperatives to make electricity not only available, but also practical in terms of cost, chores that were once tedious and time-consuming have become simple and automatic.

The future once didn't look as bright as it does now. In 1935, less than 11 per cent of Iowa's rural farm families were enjoying electrical service. The companies that are now trying to annex Cooperative territory weren't interested in building lines specifically for farm use. The reason for this was that the utility couldn't get as much return per dollar invested in rural areas as they could in urban sections.

In an attempt to solve the problem, President Franklin Roosevelt established the Rural Electrification Administration (REA) in 1935. The chief purpose of the REA was to serve as a lending agency to assist privately-owned utilities in electrifying rural America. But despite the REA, these utilities still weren't interested.

MUTUAL COOPERATION

In a final effort toward rural electrification, farmers joined in mutual cooperation. Just as they had banded together in the past in time of need, the farmers were not afraid to move forward together to achieve their goal. They were scoffed at, but through mutual agreement and unquenchable effort they conceived a sound and financially feasible organization that qualified them for REA loans.

Despite propaganda to the contrary, these loans were not gifts; they had to be paid back with interest. By working together, farmers moved from a standstill to rural electrification.

Rural Electric Cooperatives came about because commercial utilities were worried about a profit. The situation hasn't changed. Today, these utilities have ten times more customers per mile and ten times more revenue per mile than the Rural Electric Cooperatives. Profit is the main reason these utilities are using the urban to rural movement as a reason to annex REC territory. (12–1221)

Thirty-five years ago, the commercial utilities thought it foolish to extend their lines to rural areas. But today, these skeptics are

trying to take over the territory the REC was not afraid to electrify.

As future lawmakers, the youth of America must realize the importance of Rural Electric Cooperatives and protect them. We should work toward laws that prohibit duplication of electric service facilities. In this way, we can prevent the REC from being pushed aside by other electrical suppliers.

Today's youth must work to see that our legislators are informed of the Cooperative's importance. Commercial companies have been trying to persuade committees of Congress that the generation and transmission loan authority of the REA should be eliminated. It is their claim that rural cooperatives are a threat to the commercial power market. But the truth is, without the right to generate power, a rural system would lose its bargaining power with its supplier. Thus, the importance of the REC can't be stressed too much.

BARGAINING POWER

Without Rural Electric Cooperatives, the future would be bleak for America's youth. Without REC bargaining power, a commercial electrical monopoly would develop, and America's rural economy would deteriorate. Deeply missed would be the continuing contributions of the Cooperative toward reasonable rates. The loss of bargaining power, such as we now have with the REC, would greatly raise rates, and place us at the mercy of the commercial systems.

Much work is yet to be done toward total rural electrification. Almost one hundred thousand farms still do not have electrical service. Unless the non-profit cooperative system is preserved, it is likely that these farms will never have the modern conveniences of electricity.

New homes and other loads are rapidly adding new electrical consumers each year. With power loads doubling every seven years, it will be a difficult task keeping ahead of the demand for electrical power. The Rural Electric Cooperatives will meet the demand, just as they have met those of the past, if America's youth will act. We need to understand and show others the importance of the rural electrification program.

REALIZE IMPORTANCE

Youth must realize that, whether they live on the farm or not, they live off the land of rural America. We, as the youth of America, must support the Rural Electric Cooperatives, because the REC supports us all.

As the administrators and legislators of tomorrow, we must recognize the problems facing our rural cooperatives. It will be our duty to stifle the selfish demands of those who would have the program abandoned and those who would try to annex REC territory.

We must realize that when it comes to rural electrification, there cannot be a "gap" between our generation and those of the past. It was the efforts of young people before us that helped create the Rural Electric Cooperatives. Our efforts of today must insure the preservation of REC, and the continuance of low-cost, dependable, electrical service to rural America.

NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL CENTER

HON. JOHN N. ERLENBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. ERLENBORN. Mr. Speaker, it is hard to overemphasize the importance of improving our environment, and it is hard to overstate the difficulty of the task which faces us in stopping pollution and then cleaning up our air and water.

As we turn to this task, it seems to me that we must have a National Environmental Center. We must recognize the need for thoroughgoing studies of our environment—studies leading us to action.

The place for this study center, I believe, is Argonne National Laboratory, a facility of the Atomic Energy Commission at Lemont, Ill. A distinguished body of scientific scholars has been assembled there. The initial purpose was investigation of the peaceful uses of the atom; and the record of accomplishment has been extraordinary.

Argonne already has done much environmental research for the AEC; and I urge that, as its studies of atomic energy make less demands on manpower, it be redirected into this new field.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS AND HUMANITIES—A TRIBUTE TO BARNABY KEENEY

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, the decisive vote of the House last week to extend the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities was in part a vote of confidence and thanks for the work of a distinguished scholar, Barnaby Keeney. Barnaby Keeney is leaving Washington after 4 years of service as Chairman of the Humanities Endowment. He leaves behind a record of great accomplishment. Under his leadership, the Humanities Endowment lives up to hopes of its original sponsors so well, that even the Nixon administration unscrambled its tangled sense of priorities long enough to recommend a 3-year extension of the program with a doubled authorization. It is impressive to listen to the bipartisan expressions of support for the work of the Humanities Endowment. It is apparent that Dr. Keeney has over the years won many converts to the cause of the humanities and changed many skeptics to enthusiastic believers. When he first came to the Hill seeking support and appropriations for the Endowment, he was somewhat of a "vox clamatis in deserto"; now he seems more a "vox populi." Unfortunately, he has suffered the fate of the earlier evangelist and has somehow incurred the enmity of the mighty, who have apparently decided that the cause of the humanities can be more humanely administered by a Republican than a Democrat. I am happy to say that this latter day evangelist is leaving Washington with his head firmly on his shoulders and with some characteristically pungent comments on his departure.

During one of the legislative battles over the future of the Humanities, Dr. Keeney won from the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. HALL) the cognomen of "Dr. Bikini" a nom de guerre which those who know him think applies more to his explosive personality than his figure. Well, "Dr. Bikini" is first and foremost an educator, and I think his tenure as Chairman of the Humanities Endowment has been an educational experience for all the Members of the House. Were Dr. Keeney to judge last week's legislative symposium on the humanities, I have no doubt that he would award high honors to the gentleman from Iowa for his learned dissertation on "Orthographic Trends in Modern American Poetry"; to the other gentleman from Iowa for his fine presentation of a "Philosophic Critique of Budgetary Considerations Determinative of Intra and Inter Cultural Transfer Payments." But, to speak seriously, I think last week's debate was in itself an essay on the importance of the humanities which, in its broadest sense, is rational debate among men using knowledge of the past to shape the future. It also demonstrated that the Humanities Endowment has not imposed the dead hand of conformist bureaucracy on the work of the scholars it helps. I think that when the time comes that some grant of the Endowment does not spark some controversy that is the time I will be worried. For the purpose of the humanities is to challenge us to think, and I like to believe that challenges to the Endowment and its work are the product of some careful thought.

Mr. Speaker, I think Dr. Keeney can look back on a job well done. Under his leadership the Humanities Endowment established itself and proved its worth. I regret that the administration did not have the good judgment to reappoint Dr. Keeney, who has won the confidence and admiration of members on both sides of the aisle. Dr. Keeney leaves Washington to return to little Crompton, R.I., which I am sure he will be the bigger for his presence. There he plans, he says, "to do some reflecting." I am certain that the rumbles of his reflections will continue to be heard in Washington. For one thing my friend, Dr. Keeney, has proved is that a humanist and a classics scholar is no slouch as politician and a legislative tactician. His is a remarkable career when you think about it—he survived the Second World War, the presidency of a major university, and 4 years in Washington, emerging from all unscathed with his sense of honor and more importantly, keen sense of humor intact. This is an impressive record and one to which I pay my respects today.

SENATOR EDGAR A. BROWN OF THE SOUTH CAROLINA SENATE

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the president pro tempore of the South Carolina Senate and chairman of the senate finance committee is Senator Edgar A. Brown of Barnwell County.

Senator Brown and I have not always agreed on political matters. However, his reputation for fiscal sanity is well known in South Carolina. Further, he has rendered a long and capable service to his State.

Senator Brown will be honored Saturday with a birthday celebration in Barnwell, where he will observe his 82d birthday. On this occasion, U.S. Representative L. MENDEL RIVERS of South Carolina will give the main address.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to insert the editorial entitled "A Civic Beacon," published in the July 6, 1970, Augusta, Ga., Chronicle, in the RECORD.

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

A CIVIC BEACON

The birthday cake has been ordered for the celebration Saturday in Barnwell which will honor State Sen. Edgar A. Brown. Were it possible however, to place on the cake all the 82 candles to which his age will entitle him, their radiance could only symbolically indicate the degree to which his record of public service constitutes a civic beacon.

Longevity of membership in the General Assembly of South Carolina, certainly, he possesses. It was back in 1921 that the people of his county elected him to the House of Representatives. In 1929 they elevated him to the Senate and have returned him at each election since. When redistricting brought it about, he became also the senator for Bamberg and Allendale Counties.

Recognition for leadership has been bestowed upon him. He has been president pro tempore of the Senate and chairman of the Senate Finance Committee since 1942.

It is not primarily for longevity or recognition, however, that Senator Brown's friends from all over South Carolina will gather in his home town to do him honor. It is, rather, because of his preeminence in insisting on responsible government in an era when the tax-spend-elect philosophy has permeated so much of government. Other states turned to deficit financing when their wants apparently outgrew their ability to pay. Senator Brown, however, challenged South Carolina to operate on a balanced budget, limiting its appropriations to what could be covered by current taxes or revenue-producing programs. He earned well the title of "Mr. Fiscal Responsibility."

And with it all he has sought the advancement of his state and senatorial district.

The celebration with parade, dedication of Lake Edgar Brown and a rally at which U.S. Rep. L. Mendel Rivers will speak, is only a part of a weeklong celebration in Barnwell County related to the state's Tricentennial. The week will include an agri-business tour, a religious emphasis day, an art show, an antique show, a library exhibit and other events.

It is, however, a well earned tribute that the entire celebration will be climaxed with Edgar A. Brown Day.

THE DOMESTIC DETERMINANTS OF FOREIGN POLICY

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Sunday Star, June 28, 1970, ran a version of the remarks of the distinguished Prof. W. W. Rostow on June 19 at the global strategy discussions of the Naval War College, Newport, R.I. Because I believe the Star in printing a shortened version of the speech, lessened the full import of some of his key points, I am pleased to reprint in full the text of Mr. Rostow's remarks.

In plain language, Mr. Rostow offers a challenge to democracy he sees inherent in our national responsibilities. The challenge is to move full steam ahead to solve the problems on our domestic agenda—but at the same time not to renege on our responsibilities as leaders in the free world. As he documents historically, this Nation has never accepted such a dual agenda, but has oscillated from one to the other. He asserts:

This oscillation has contributed substantially to the instability of the world arena over the past 54 years.

Perhaps his speech will be labeled as the hard-line approach which we have followed in our official policy. Those who are antiwar in philosophy will decry it as the same old hawkish rhetoric. But perhaps Mr. Rostow here offers more than that. He does not offer the psychological comfort inherent in the precipitious withdrawal or the "it was all a big mistake" approaches to our foreign problems. Nor does he call for a passionate commitment to war. He does offer the hope that, if we remain patient and careful, the growing capacity of other areas of the world to carry a more equitable share of responsibility for world peace will continue to progress. Then we can, indeed, come home.

I submit that in his proposal for a dual agenda Mr. Rostow forecefully reminds us of the responsibilities and challenges which face us as leaders in this world. Whether you agree with his conclusions or not, I commend his remarks to you as offering an important backdrop of history which every man who wants to build a more peaceful world—at home as well as abroad—would do well to consider.

What Mr. Rostow reminds us is there is no short cut to stability, no easy road to peace, and even withdrawal has its own pitfalls.

The remarks follow:

I. For almost two hundred years now the prevailing sentiment in our country has been a passionate desire that foreign policy go away and not bother us.

There were, it is true, some exceptional moments, when domestic imperatives led to military action and set purposeful objectives in foreign policy. These were times of controversy.

The Revolutionary War was stirred up by some rather awkward fiscal and tax problems within the English colonial system. Only a third or so of the American people actively supported the independence movement and there was a strong Tory minority as well as many who viewed the struggle with apathy.

The War of 1812 had its Western warhawks who saw economic advantage if we could steal Canada while the British were otherwise occupied; but it also had its vigorous opponents some of whom drafted the far-reaching resolutions of the Hartford Convention of January 5, 1815. Those resolutions would have drastically reduced the constitutional powers of the Commander-in-Chief.

In 1846 strong domestic interests pressed Polk to seek war with Mexico in order to assure the entrance of California into the Union; but, once again, there was a sturdy anti-war movement.

Finally a feverish public opinion pressed on McKinley to lift Spanish rule from Cuba after the sinking of the *Maine*; but the passion for empire waned quickly in the face of guerrilla war in the Philippines and a strong anti-imperialist movement in domestic politics.

But these, as I say, were exceptional times. The prevailing balance in American thought, in foreign policy, and in our security budgets was to avoid—not to seek—engagement in the world, especially outside this Hemisphere. On the eve of the First World War, in 1913, our national security budget was about one percent of our Gross National Product, about a third the relative level of security outlays in Britain and Germany.

Nevertheless, the fact is that in this century we have four times been involved in major military conflict. How did American participation in these wars come about? How did we become a major global power?

AMERICAN HABIT OF OSCILLATION

II. We came to where we are, I suggest, by living by Dr. Johnson's famous proposition: "When a man knows he is to be hanged in a fortnight, it concentrates his mind wonderfully."

In 1916 Wilson won re-election on the platform: "Too proud to fight"; "He kept us out of war." But five months later we went to war in the face of unrestricted German submarine warfare and the palpable threat it represented to our control over the Atlantic as well as to the survival of Britain and France.

For the next generation we remained essentially isolationist, acutely and purposefully so in the 1930's. In the spring of 1940 65% of the American people supported aid to the allies under the condition that it be short of involvement in war. Then Paris fell, Britain was beleaguered, the French coast became a base for German submarines. By January 1941 about 70% of the American people were for aiding Britain even at the risk of war.

In Asia, America passively observed the Japanese takeover of Manchuria in 1931 and then the major cities of China. In 1940–41 the Japanese moved into Indo-China and towards Indonesia. Franklin Roosevelt had every interest in concentrating American attention and resources on rearmament at home and aid to Britain—and then Russia. But he could not bring himself to accept passively the Japanese takeover of the balance of power in Asia, including control of the sea routes to the Indian Ocean and to Australia and New Zealand. He cut off shipments to Japan of scrap metal and oil; and he froze Japanese assets in the United States. Indo-China was the substance of the diplomatic dialogue with Japan down to the eve of Pearl Harbor.

At Yalta Roosevelt told Stalin that the American people would not support the presence of military forces in Europe for more than two years. And the postwar dismantling of our armed forces appeared to support Roosevelt's assessment. Only when the balance of power in southern and western Europe was clearly threatened by a mixture of economic weakness and Communist pressure did President Truman respond in 1947; and he did so only after surrendering hard-won wartime commitments to political freedom in Poland, in particular, Eastern Europe, in general.

In Korea, the JCS and the Secretary of State (in January 1950) drew the line of the American defense perimeter through the Tsushima Straits, after U.S. forces began to withdraw in 1949. Six months later, South Korea was invaded, and the United States

responded both to protect the balance of power in the Northwest Pacific and to give new-born NATO—now confronted with a nuclear Soviet Union—some credibility.

Out of the Korean experience other pacts were born, to make explicit the American commitment to hold the balance of power in the Middle East, South and Southeast Asia, and thus to deter further overt aggression across international frontiers. But after their failure in Korea the Communists turned to guerrilla warfare as a primary tool. Hanoi decided that it could proceed with success in Southeast Asia, despite the SEATO Treaty and, later, the Geneva Accords on Laos of 1962. The United States did not react promptly and decisively to the violation of the Laos Accords; and in 1965, in consequence, we confronted a choice of fighting or seeing an area, judged critical to the American interest, fall to aggression—a judgment incorporated in treaty and Congressional Resolution as well as the actions of three successive Presidents.

What are we to make of this story of erratic American behavior from 1916 to 1965?

I believe it comes to this: whatever the speeches made and postures struck during intervals of quiet, or relative quiet, the United States, as a nation, has behaved systematically as if it were endangered if a single potentially hostile power should seize control of the balance of power in Europe or Asia, or embrace itself to the south of us in this Hemisphere. But the United States has not acted regularly on this proposition in Europe or Asia. We acted only when the gallows hove into view. Between such crises we talked and behaved in ways which led a whole series of ambitious men in Europe and Asia to believe we would acquiesce in the fulfillment of their dreams for dominant power.

I know no story more worth contemplating than the statement of Vishinsky, made in the presence of Americans after the Korean War. Vinshinsky said that the Americans "deceived" Moscow about our interest in South Korea. In quite different ways, the Kaiser and Hitler and Mussolini, the Japanese militarists and Stalin and Ho Chi Minh could all claim to have been "deceived" by us. In a most dangerous century, we have time after time, permitted—even created—a gap between the image of American interests projected by the dynamics of American domestic life and our behavior as a nation when the balance of power in Europe or Asia was actually at stake.

I believe this oscillation has contributed substantially to the instability of the world arena over the past fifty-four years.

III. And I believe a consciousness of this oscillation has strongly shaped the policies of all our Presidents since 1945.

No man can confidently read the mind of a President of the United States. Only the President himself can know the balances struck among the immense array of factors that enter into his decisions.

But I do know this much.

In making his decisions on Southeast Asia in 1961, President Kennedy did not believe his option was war, if he stood firm on the treaty commitments, versus peace, if he let Laos and Vietnam slide away. He believed the United States, in the end, would not acquiesce in the region from Saigon and Vientiane to Singapore and Djakarta falling under the hegemony of a potential enemy. He was conscious, too, that Burma was the military gateway to the Indian subcontinent, and that the American performance in Southeast Asia would affect profoundly the stability of other regions of the world. He believed his realistic option was to stand on the treaty commitments—whatever the cost—or see the United States engaged in a wider war fairly soon.

I know, as you do, what President Johnson said at San Antonio on September 29, 1967:

"I cannot tell you tonight as your President—with certainty—that a Communist conquest of South Vietnam would be followed by a Communist conquest of Southeast Asia. But I do know there are North Vietnamese troops in Laos. I do know that there are North Vietnamese trained guerrillas tonight in northeast Thailand. I do know that there are Communist-supported guerrilla forces operating in Burma. And a Communist coup was barely averted in Indonesia, the fifth largest nation in the world.

"So your American President cannot tell you—with certainty—that a Southeast Asia dominated by Communist power would bring a third world war much closer to terrible reality. One could hope that this would not be so.

"But all that we have learned in this tragic century strongly suggests to me that it would be so. As President of the United States, I am not prepared to gamble on the chance that it is not so. I am not prepared to risk the security—indeed, the survival—of this American Nation on mere hope and wishful thinking. I am convinced that by seeing this struggle through now, we are greatly reducing the chances of a much larger war—perhaps a nuclear war. I would rather stand in Vietnam, in our time, and by meeting this danger now, and facing up to it, thereby reduce the danger for our children and for our grandchildren."

And President Nixon outlined a similar calculus when he said on November 3, 1969: "For the future of peace, precipitate withdrawal from [Vietnam] would thus be a disaster of immense magnitude. . . . It would not bring peace; it would bring more war."

The heart of the tension in contemporary America over Southeast Asia has been, then, between the choices as seen by the Presidents, on the one hand, those who came to oppose them, on the other. The Presidents have seen the real choice before us as pursuing the engagement there through to stable peace versus a larger war, and quite possibly a nuclear war. The opponents of their policy in Southeast Asia argue, in effect, that American disengagement from Southeast Asia would lead to peace or to a situation in which the United States would or could passively acquiesce in safety.

There has been—and there remains—a dangerous gap between the national interest as our Presidents see it—and as we have seen it as a nation at times of acute crises—and the way many Americans see it when the danger of a major shift in the balance of power in Europe and Asia is not palpable.

What is the basis for this gap?

It arises, I believe, from the nature of democracy—and, particularly, democracy in the United States. Alexis de Tocqueville stated the problem vividly a hundred and thirty-five years ago. In *Democracy in America*, he described the overwhelming attractions of civil life for Americans "placed . . . in the midst of a wilderness where they have, so to speak, no neighbors. . . ." He believed "the excessive love of the whole community for quiet" would lead Americans to ignore military problems until they became acute; and then they would turn to deal with them late but wholeheartedly.

It was an awareness of what we might call Tocqueville behavior by Americans between 1916 and 1947 which led President Truman to face up to Stalin's threat in Europe before it became a purely military threat. Our Presidents have understood how dangerous the Tocqueville oscillation might be in a nuclear, highly interdependent world.

And they have understod something else imposed on us by the coming of nuclear weapons. They have been conscious—in Korea and Southeast Asia, but also in the Middle East and in the Berlin and the Cuba missile crises—that danger lay not merely in a late reaction but in a wholehearted turning to war, engaging, in Tocqueville's phrase, the full "passions" of the people. There is no rational place for total war in a nuclear age.

Contrary to older American instinct, we have been trying to deter threats to the balance of power in Europe and Asia in a forehanded way and, when challenged, to use limited rather than total force.

This has been difficult for Americans, given our history and our national operating style.

It has been made more difficult by two other strands of thought and feeling at work in our domestic life:

First, a feeling that the United States is, in some sense, over-committed or disproportionately committed on the world scene;

Second, an opinion among some that the fate of Asia does not, in fact, matter all that much to the United States.

I shall say something about each of these factors in turn.

THE QUESTION OF OVERCOMMITMENT

IV. First, the question of American overcommitment.

After the Cuba missile crisis I took stock with some of my colleagues in the State Department of the forces which gathered strength after that historic event.

One fact was central: the fear of Moscow, rightly or wrongly, was considerably reduced, once the technique of nuclear blackmail was faced down by President Kennedy and, partially in consequence, the Sino-Soviet split became more overt and intense.

In every part of the world this reduction in tension led to an increased desire of nations to take a larger hand in shaping their own destinies. The image of a bipolar world was weakened both by Khrushchev's failure in the Caribbean and by the evident disarray of the Communist camp. There seemed to be more opportunity for old-fashioned nationalism and the nation state.

In the United States, there developed a feeling that the Communist threat had been reduced and, somehow, the world ought to be manageable with less American effort, cost, and commitment.

Analyzing these trends, I concluded that the problems actually confronted demanded stronger and more effective regional co-operation, if the nations of the world were to forge a destiny increasingly independent of the major powers. If rich European nations of 50 million could not handle their problems without effective regional co-operation, how could nations of the less developed regions do so on a nationalist basis?

As for the United States, I concluded that the heart of the problem was not excessive commitment, but a sense of excessive loneliness in bearing the burdens of the world. Our actual outlays for security purposes were declining slightly in the first half of the 1960's as a proportion of GNP; but the American image was one of our carrying an unfair share of the task of maintaining order and progress in the world arena.

I cite this exercise, which was set out formally in a paper dated April 1965, because it preceded our full engagement in Vietnam. It commended increased American support for regionalism in Latin America, Africa, and Asia—as well as continued support for regionalism in Western Europe. And it commended increased American efforts to move towards a more equal sharing of the security and economic burdens of the world community.

Quite independent of the State Department's policy planner, President Johnson had to come to similar conclusions.

In one of the least noted, but most important, foreign policy developments of recent years, President Johnson moved systematically to make the encouragement of regionalism (and sub-regionalism) central to American policy in Latin America, Africa, and Asia; and to base our global arrangements in monetary affairs, trade, and aid on what he called "partnership and fair shares".

President Johnson articulated this strat-

egy fully in a speech in New Orleans on September 10, 1968. Warning against isolationism, he stated this alternative doctrine:

"We have always hoped and believed that as our friends and allies grew in strength, our burden would grow less lonely. We have been moving over the last few years toward a long-term position in which the United States would be able to assume its responsibility in enterprises of common concern, but our partners would be able to assume theirs . . . I believe the day will soon come—which we have been building toward for 20 years—when some American President will be able to say to the American people that the United States is assuming its fair share of responsibility for promoting peace and progress in the world, but the United States is assuming no more or no less than its fair share."

President Nixon's foreign policy paper of February 18, 1970, was in much the same spirit.

What is it, then, that the United States is trying to accomplish?

First, our Presidents have recognized that the American interest in avoiding domination of Europe or Asia (and, indeed, Latin America or Africa) by a potentially hostile power is an abiding interest of the United States. It is heightened, not diminished, by the nature of modern weapons and means of communication.

Second, they recognized that this negative interest is fully shared by the smaller nations of these regions. In fact, this convergence between our interest and theirs has been the underlying strength of American postwar diplomacy. The nations of Europe do not wish to be dominated by Russia or Germany or the United States. The nations of Asia do not wish to be dominated by China or Japan or Russia or the United States. The nations of Africa south of the Sahara wish to forge their destiny without the military presence or political dominance of any major external power. The wisest leaders of Latin America wish not only to keep extracontinental powers out of security affairs in this Hemisphere, but they wish to build societies and a regional structure which would permit them to deal with the colossus of the North from a base of greater strength and dignity. That is the underlying political objective of the movement towards Latin American economic integration. The United States has been able to throw its weight behind regionalism in all these areas because our interest does not require that we dominate them; and because the stronger the regional organizations—so long as they are not dominated by a potentially hostile power—the more likely they are to resolve their own problems and reduce the level of American commitment and concern.

Third, the Presidents have recognized that the pace at which the United States could safely step back had to be delicately adjusted to the rise of strength and cohesiveness in the regions. They have recognized in Europe, for example, that a premature and excessive pull-out of American forces from NATO could lead not to a new and better-balanced Atlantic equilibrium but to a crisis as dangerous as—or more dangerous than—the Berlin crises of 1948–49 or 1961–62. The exercise called "Vietnamization"—if I understand it correctly—is an even more delicate exercise in shifting the balance of responsibilities in Southeast Asa in ways that would avoid collapse of the region, chaos, and a larger war.

The strategy of our moving back in degree as the strength and cohesiveness of others permit them to take a larger hand in shaping their destinies—while avoiding a collapse of the balance of power in regions of vital interest to the United States—is certainly the most subtle and difficult task of foreign policy ever undertaken by the United States.

Historically, America has performed best when it faced a palpable and acute problem—widely recognized and defined in common terms—to the solution of which it could address its full energies, talents, and resources. The First World War, once we were in it, was a problem of this kind; the Great Depression after 1933; the Second World War, after Pearl Harbor; Stalin's challenge in western and southern Europe, from 1947; the race to put a man on the moon, after the Soviet launching of the first Sputnik. These slam-bang affairs fitted well the national style.

Now we are trying to do something quite different. After the Second World War we moved into vacuums of power not to build an empire but because the cost of not moving in was judged, case by case, more dangerous than the reluctant acceptance of additional responsibility in a war-weakened world. Now—a quarter century later—we are trying to manage a redistribution of responsibility in which we will do less, others will do more, without inducing major crises or chaos on the world scene. We are trying safely to withdraw—in degree—from the preponderant positions we filled.

We are trying to exploit constructively:

The gathering strength of others on the world scene;

Their desire increasingly to shape their own destiny, without being dominated by any major power, including the United States;

And the fact that abiding American interests are satisfied by an essentially negative condition—that no potentially hostile power hold the balance of power in Europe or Asia.

This is the complex pattern of policy which our government has been trying to pursue in recent years in order to reconcile abiding American interests and the widespread sense in America that we were, somehow, overcommitted or disproportionately committed in the first postwar generation.

AND THE DOMESTIC SCENE

V. The pursuit of this policy is obviously complicated by many forces in our domestic life: an economy subject both to rising unemployment and rising prices which is not developing enough real resources for public purposes from the tax base; an infirm balance of payments position; acute racial tension; massive tasks of urban rehabilitation; an ardent margin of the affluent young, affronted by the ugliness of war, racial inequity, and other gaps between American aspiration and performance, who have been led to believe that a quick route to the humane and decent life they seek lies in confrontation, violence, and destruction.

I cannot, evidently, deal with all these features of the domestic scene here: the reactions they have set up in our political life; and their playback effects on our ability to conduct the mature and subtle foreign policy which our interests require and to which we have been committed.

But I will say a few words about one view to which some Americans have come, in part driven by these domestic pressures: the view that the United States can safely abandon its interest in and commitments to Asia and let the forces at work there find their way to chaos or equilibrium, war or peace—without American participation.

Let me quote the words of John Gardner, whom I regard as a good friend, as well as an old and respected colleague. Anguished by the intensity of our domestic debate and the urgency of our unsolved domestic problems, he counsels abandonment of our role in Vietnam and of our peacekeeping commitments in Asia. I quote him as an eloquent and sensitive representative of a good many Americans whose views on Vietnam and Asia have changed. Here is a passage from an interview with Gardner published in the *Christian Science Monitor* of June 8, 1970.

Q: "What should the President do about Vietnam?"

A: "I think that if the President would set a date, a terminal date . . ."

Q: "You're speaking about getting troops entirely out?"

A: "That is right. It would be extremely helpful, I think, if he would finally relinquish the notion that the words 'winning' or 'losing' have any relevance whatever any more with respect to Vietnam. The whole relevance of those two words is a thing of the past now.

"If he would relinquish what appears to have been his conception in his last press conference that we might conceivably be the peacekeeper in the Asian world, I think we could move expeditiously to get out of Vietnam and I think it would produce very considerable change in our national mood.

"Then I think moving vigorously on domestic priorities would be the next order of business. And the nation is ready for it. People are hungry for it. Americans are not people who want to turn their backs on their problems."

Elsewhere in this interview Gardner says: "Nothing that we could possibly be accomplishing in Southeast Asia could balance or compensate for what the war is doing to this country."

This is a solemn proposition. It ought to be discussed dispassionately, with care, since we all recognize the burdens thrown upon our national life by the war in Southeast Asia.

The proposition is that the United States should promptly withdraw its forces and commitment from Vietnam whatever the consequences may be in Asia and on the world scene.

Contrary to every conceivable political and personal interest, three American Presidents decided that the forces set in motion by such a decision risked a larger war in Asia and dangerous instability in other regions of the world. I believe no citizen taking a contrary view can, in good conscience, ignore the lines of argument that led our Presidents to this conclusion; for the risk of a larger war—quite possibly a nuclear war—should weigh heavily in the scales in assessing how much of a burden we can afford to bear at home.

RELATION OF ASIA TO U.S. AND WORLD STABILITY

I would not pretend to reconstruct fully the lines of argument which led the Presidents to this painful judgment; although in two cases I have some knowledge of their thoughts. But I would offer my own brief summary of at least some of the possible or probable costs of unconditional immediate withdrawal from commitment in Vietnam and Asia.

First, the withdrawal of American commitment from Southeast Asia would change the terms of the debate going forward within mainland China. Powerful forces are at work there to move post-Mao-China towards a long delayed concentration of its energies and talents on the modernization of its life. American withdrawal would, in my view, inevitably lead Peking to exploit its new opportunities to the south. No one can predict the precise form in which a nuclear China, with huge ground forces, would exercise its power in the vacuum we would create. But I can not believe that Peking would remain passive. Indeed, it is not passive now: in its influence on Hanoi; its road-building in Laos; and its actions elsewhere.

Second, the nations of Southeast Asia, certainly as far as Singapore—quite possibly as far as Indonesia—would lose their independence or be thrown into a protracted military or quasi-military struggle which would disorient for some of them exceedingly promising paths of economic, social, and political progress.

Third, Burma, in particular, would either fall under Communist domination or become the scene of an Indian-Chinese struggle; for Burma—not Tibet—is the point of critical strategic danger for the Indian sub-continent, a point consistently made to me in private, with equal lucidity, by high and responsible officials of India and Pakistan.

Fourth, almost certainly Japan and India would quickly acquire nuclear weapons; and, quite possibly, the non-proliferation treaty would die elsewhere in the world as well. It is, perhaps, not generally understood that the willingness of many nations to forego the production of nuclear weapons is based on a carefully balanced calculation that ties to the United States—explicit or implicit—provide marginally greater security and less risk than going it alone on the basis of national nuclear capabilities. The policy Gardner proposes would shift that marginal calculation. An America that walked away from a treaty commitment because it could not deal with its domestic problems—after bringing into the field a half-million of its armed forces and encouraging a small ally to fight desperately for its independence—might well not be regarded as a reliable ally on such a mortal issue in Asia—or elsewhere.

Paragraph 1 of Article X of the non-proliferation treaty states: "Each Party shall in exercising its national sovereignty have the right to withdraw from the Treaty if it decides that extradordinary events, related to the subject matter of this Treaty, have jeopardized the supreme interests of its country."

I believe an American withdrawal from a treaty commitment in a critical part of the world on the ground that its domestic problems did not permit it to continue to honor that treaty could well be judged an extraordinary event related to the subject matter of the non-proliferation treaty jeopardizing the supreme interests of nations which now depend upon us. We should be quite clear that, whatever public postures they may strike on one issue or another, India and Japan—as well as many others—count on our nuclear deterrent and the will—as well as the hardware—that give it meaning.

Fifth, I would put a question which every American must answer for himself, out of his knowledge of our country, its history, and its character: at home would the United States observe these consequences of its decision passively? Would it turn with energy and pride and unity to clean the air and the water, deal with ghettos and racial inequity as it read of Hue-like slaughter in Vietnam and elsewhere; of an Asia thrown into chaos or worse; of a world seized of a proliferating nuclear arms race?

And what of the effects of all this in Moscow and Cairo?

I, for one, do not believe we would remain unified and passive. I agree with Gardner that "Americans are not people who want to turn their backs on their problems".

We might repeat what I have called the Tocqueville oscillation, in a peculiarly dangerous way, but I do not believe we Americans, in the end, will turn our backs on Asia and on the world.

For what is Asia?

Asia is the place where about 60% of humanity now lives and will continue to live. In the year 2000, which is not so far away, Asia's population will be about ten times that of the United States—say, 3.7 billion souls.

There are some, I know, who regard Asia as primitive, in no way to be compared to Europe in potential importance to the United States. But as anyone who has recently been to Asia knows, it is a region on the march. We are all familiar with the extraordinary growth of Japan, now the third industrial power in the world and closing fast on a sluggish Soviet Union. But in South Korea and Taiwan, Thailand and Malaysia and Singapore, and in India, Pakistan, and Iran as well, the modernization of these old societies is moving forward swiftly. And Indonesia, too, is coming out of the chaos in which Sukarno left it.

Mainland China has been virtually stalled for a decade, set back first by the failure of the Great Leap Forward and then by the Cultural Revolution. But sometime in the years ahead the great natural gifts of the Chinese on the mainland will come to be focused on the modernization of that society in more or less rational ways.

Round about the year 2000, then, we shall face across the Pacific almost 4 billion people who, by that time, will have acquired the capacity to use most of then existing technology. They will have reached—or be close to reaching—the stage of growth I have described as technological maturity.

In income per capita they will not be rich: they will average, perhaps, only about $350 per capita, the average brought down by the low starting point and heavy weight of the Indian sub-continent and mainland China. But they will be a formidable center of power, a major factor in the kind of life Americans—that is to say, our children and grandchildren—will then lead.

Right now, I believe, the kind of Asia that will exist in the year 2000 is being determined.

It is being determined by the outcome of the debate on the mainland concerning post-Mao Chinese domestic and foreign policy.

It is being determined by the Japanese and Indian decisions on the non-proliferation treaty.

It is being determined, above all, by the growing sense of regional co-operation that has emerged since the United States honored its commitment to South Vietnam in 1965, at a time of mortal danger to Southeast Asia.

Each of these factors will be drastically affected by the way we conduct ourselves in Southeast Asia.

If we patiently, painfully see it through to an honorable and stable peace in Southeast Asia, there is a decent hope that the Asia that emerges will not be dominated by any single power. It could be an Asia in which the inherent weight of mainland China is balanced by the co-operative efforts of those living in the great and vital arc from Seoul and Tokyo to Karachi and Teheran—an Asia not hostile to China but offering to it no temptation to expand—an Asia to whose multilateral efforts Japan could make an enormous contribution—an Asia where nuclear proliferation did not happen, where the guarantee of the United States remained good, but whose inherent strength and co-operation permitted us to fall back to a role of even-handed partnership across the Pacific. That outcome is not assured; but it is a decent hope, because it is rooted in a political reality: the political reality that most Asians share with the United States an abiding interest that the region not be dominated by a single power.

If we do not see it through to an honorable and stable peace in Southeast Asia, we could confront a very different and dangerous constellation of power across the Pacific which would alter the whole setting of American society and its inner life and pose dangers greater than those that came upon us at Pearl Harbor.

I disagree, therefore, with John Gardner's dictum that: "Nothing that we could possibly be accomplishing in Southeast Asia could balance or compensate for what the war is doing to this country." The fate of Asia and America's long run relation to Asia is at stake; and this is a very great matter indeed.

A DUAL CRISIS: A NEW CHALLENGE TO DEMOCRACY

VI. Neither as a former public servant nor as a teacher nor as a social scientist nor as a man am I insensitive to the costs of our commitment in Southeast Asia and the war in which we are still engaged.

Clearly, the war in Vietnam has contributed substantially to student unrest in the United States; but I do not believe the war is primarily responsible for the restlessness and dissatisfaction of the young; for student unrest is a global phenomenon in the developed world.

Clearly, the war has diverted substantial resources from private and public purposes; but I do not believe it is primarily responsible for the slackening in allocations to the cities or education or for the present state of racial tension. The net cost of the war in Vietnam—what we would actually save by abandoning the effort—is less than 2% of GNP. The figure is declining, not rising. At a normal 4% growth rate it is less than half the annual increment in GNP we should have available to allocate to new private or public purposes. I regret every nickel of it, as I regret, even more, every casualty of the war. But with a GNP approaching a trillion dollars, we obviously command the resources in the United States to do far more in the public sector if we manage the economy well and generate the political will to allocate those resources wisely. And while the war in Vietnam is not irrelevant to the problem of bringing the Negro to full citizenship in our land, I do not believe for one moment that it is a critical variable.

The coming of stable peace in Southeast Asia would surely ease some of the strains in our domestic life; but our domestic problems have different and deeper roots and must be dealt with essentially in their own terms.

In considering our domestic life in relation to our foreign policy, I would make one further related point. Historically, in this century we have had domestic and foreign policy crises in sequence. Wilson had time to launch his New Freedom program before confronting the realities of the First World War. For good or ill—and probably for ill—Franklin Roosevelt could launch his New Deal program in an America locked into isolationism; and that program had run its course well before the outbreak of the Second World War. President Truman could face the Cold War crises of 1945–52 from a base which did not generate acute pressures for domestic innovation: he was, in fact, well out in front of his Congressional support in proposing domestic legislation.

But since 1963—say, from the Civil Rights march on Washington of August and the assassination of Diem in November—our political life has been strained by simultaneous crises of an acute kind, at home and abroad. I can easily understand the instinct of Gardner and others somehow to get "abroad" off our necks so we can turn wholeheartedly to affairs at home. I believe history will record that President Johnson faced and, now, President Nixon faces, challenges of unique severity because of this convergence of domestic and foreign crises.

But history is ruthless with those who build their policies on illusion. And I believe it is an illusion to hold that America, at this time in history, can safely walk away from its commitments and interests in Asia—or in Europe or the Middle East. I see no other viable course—in an age of nuclear weapons and modern communications, where the global community is being pulled closer together every day—than to play a responsible role on the world scene—to move patiently and cautiously towards a world of partnership and fair shares—while continuing to grapple at home with the long agenda

of unfinished business in this rich, but troubled, society of ours.

For I believe it equally an illusion to hold that we can be callous about the cities and the race problem of that we can for long safely live with a mixture of economic stagnation and inflation.

Yes, our problems are multiple and complex. Yes, they will not yield to a conventional American short-term burst of energy and enterprise: they require extraordinary perception, maturity, and balance. But this practiced democracy of ours—approaching its second century of continuous life under the Constitution—commanding a unique concentration of material and human resources, ought to be able to meet these challenges.

The outcome is not certain. It will require the best that is in us. We must set aside the notion that soft options are available either at home or abroad; reach out to understand each other; where we are; what makes up our common agenda; and, then, act on it together.

A decade ago, the challenge was put very well in these terms:

"Can Americans achieve enough agreement on their aims to act in concert? The answer is unequivocally yes. . . .

"We want peace with justice. We want a world that doesn't live under the fear of the bomb. A world that acknowledges the rule of law, a world in which no nation can play bully and no nation need live in fear. How many Americans would disagree with that purpose? Is it easy? Have we achieved it? Read your morning paper.

"We want freedom. We don't think man was born to have someone else's foot on his neck—or someone else's hand over his mouth. We want freedom at home and we want a world in which freedom is possible. Who would disagree with that as a national aim? Who would call it easy? Who would say we've achieved it?

"We believe in the dignity and worth of the individual and it is our unshakeable purpose to protect and preserve that dignity.

"We believe that every person should be enabled to achieve the best that is in him, and we are the declared enemies of all conditions, such as disease, ignorance or poverty, which stunt the individual and prevent such fulfillment.

"We believe in equality before the law, equal political suffrage and—dearest of all to Americans—equality of opportunity. . . .

"To the extent that we have made progress on these matters, we have done so through fierce and faithful effort. Courageous men and women have spent lifetimes of effort, endurance and frustration in pursuit of these aims. Others have fought and died for them. And the same measure of devotion is required today. The fact that millions of men and women have died violent deaths defending the ideal of individual freedom does not insure the survival of that ideal if we cease paying our tithes of devotion. Unlike the great pyramids, the monuments of the spirit will not stand untended. They must be nourished in each generation by the allegiance of believing men and women. Every free man, in his work and in his family life, in his public behavior and in the secret places of his heart, should see himself as a builder and maintainer of the values of his society. Individual Americans—bus drivers and editors, grocers and senators, beauty operators and ballplayers—can contribute to the greatness and strength of a free society, or they can help it to die."

These words were written by John Gardner in his essay called *Excellence,* published in 1961. I do not quote them now to score off an old and respected friend. Gardner and others have painfully come to the conclusion that we cannot both seek a society of quality and excellence at home and support our search for a decent and stable peace in Asia. In all conscience, the decade since his words were written has been a bruising, difficult, dangerous but, I would also say, a creative period in the life of America and the world community. Looking at what we have experienced, and having lived through it—knowing a little its lacerations—I can understand why some would draw back to a more limited vision of our agenda.

But I do not. I believe withdrawal to a search for the good life at home in a world of war and chaos and deepening danger is an illusion. And neither we—nor humanity at large—can afford another Tocqueville oscillation. There is no other rational way for America than to go forward on both fronts, increasingly sharing the burdens abroad with those capable and willing to play their part.

Despite the debate that swirls around us, I believe deep within our nation is the understanding, the strength and the will to do so.

IMPORT QUOTAS AND PRICES—A REVIEW

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a recent statement by Mr. O. R. Strackbein entitled "Import Quotas and Prices—A Review." Mr. Strackbein, president of the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, presents a revealing answer to the age-old myth that import quotas can always be related to a price increase to the consumer.

What Mr. Strackbein has to say has much relevance to all of us as we begin serious consideration of the establishment of new quota controls to protect our domestic producers.

The statement follows:

IMPORT QUOTAS AND PRICES—A REVIEW

(By O. R. Strackbein, president, the Nationwide Committee on Import-Export Policy, July 6, 1970)

A constant patter of comment tells us that import quotas will raise domestic prices of the products that are the subject of such quotas.

It should be possible to test the soundness of this unsubstantiated theory. To do so we should trace the wholesale price trends of products that are "protected" by import quotas compared with the price trend in general and the price on particular products that are not so "protected."

PETROLEUM

A favorite whipping boy is oil, or petroleum. An import quota was established in 1958, first on a voluntary basis, followed by a mandatory quota, effective March 1959.

The wholesale price of refined petroleum products expressed in an index form, where 1957–59 equals 100 had risen to only 100.3 in 1968 and 101.8 in 1969. A very recent rise carried the level to 104.2 in May 1970.

This compared with an index for all commodities, where 1957–59 again is 100, of 108.8 in 1968, 113.0 in 1969 and 116.8 for May 1970.

"All commodities," of course, include those on which we have import quotas. Therefore it will be desirable to compare the refined petroleum price level with that of other products that are not subject to an import quota. If we select another fuel, namely, coal, which has no import quota and should therefore not be free to move upward in price because it is not "protected," we find a sharp contrast. The wholesale price index had reached 107.1 in 1968, rose to 116.2 in 1969 and zoomed to 146.9 in May 1970.

Surely if there were an import quota on coal, the quota would be blamed for this runaway price. Obviously other factors were at work.

We find, in other words, that the wholesale price of refined petroleum increased distinctly less than wholesale prices of all commodities and very much less than the price of its competing energy fuel, namely, coal. (For confirmation, see Survey of Current Business, U.S. Department of Commerce, June 1970, p. S–8.)

COTTON TEXTILES

Another product that is the subject of an import quota or its equivalent is cotton textiles. An arrangement was made with Japan alone, effective January 1, 1957, whereby that country restricted its cotton textile exports to this country. This arrangement was superseded October 1, 1961 with the so-called Long-Term Arrangement negotiated under GATT. This arrangement covered some 30 countries and about 90% of our total cotton textile imports.

The wholesale price of cotton products (1957–59 equaling 100) was 105.2 in 1968. In 1969 it remained at 105.2 and in May 1970 stood at 105.8.

Once more we encounter a very moderate price rise compared with the general commodity wholesale price-level, which, as we saw, had risen to 116.8 in May 1970. (Reference: same, p. S–9.)

Wool products, which are *not* under quota restrictions, had an index level of 103.7 in 1968, compared with 105.2 for cotton products or only 1.5 below cotton products. The index rose to 104.6 in 1969 but fell to 103.8 by May 1970. It thus stood only 0.1 higher in May 1970 than in 1968. In the case of cotton products the increase from 1968 to May 1970 was only 0.6. Thus there was little to choose between the wholesale price movement in cotton and woolen products. Yet the one was under an import quota or its equivalent while the other was not.

In the case of man-made fiber textile products there was a decline in wholesale prices since 1957–59, accounted for by increased productivity. The index stood at 90.8 in 1968 and moved lower to 89.5 in May 1970.

The downward trend of man-made fiber textile products has been of longstanding. Measured on the 1947–59 base, as compared with the 1957–59 base as used here, the wholesale price in 1959 had already declined to 81.1. This was before imports reached a significant volume. Thus the further price decline on the 1957–59 base to 89.5 in 1970 merely represented a continuation of the cost reduction process that had already dropped prices in the decade of 1949–59 by nearly 20%. (Survey of Current Business, October 1961, p. S–8.)

There is nothing in this record to show that the price of cotton textile rose as a result of the import limitation. In any event the price increase through May 1970 was comparatively modest, lagging distinctly behind the general commodity wholesale price index.

In a pamphlet recently issued by the United States-Japan Trade Council it is asserted (p. 10) that "Textile Quotas Would Have Slight Benefit but Very High Cost."

"In sum," it says, "proposed textile quotas would be enormously costly to the United States.

"Quotas would accelerate inflation, raising clothing prices to consumers.

"They would boomerang against U.S. export

sales and harm the economies of port cities." etc.

Against this cry of alarm, the wholesale price trend of cotton textiles of the past ten years while these products have been under import limitation, stands as a complete rebuttal.

SUGAR

Yet another product that is under import quota control is sugar. This quota has been in effect antedating World War II.

In 1955 the retail price of sugar was 10.4c per lb. Ten years later (1965) the price was 11.8c. In 1968 the price was 12.5c. In 1969 it was 12.7c and in April 1970 it was 13.4c. In 15 years the retail price increased only 28.8%. (Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1969, Table 512, p. 350; and Survey of Current Business, June 1970, p. S–29.) Compare this increase in retail sugar prices since 1955 with the all-consumer price increase of 34.6% on the 1957–59 base, a period during which all food prices rose 32.4%—also a period during which public transportation cost rose 66.6%, medical care 63.6%. Keeping in mind that 1955, the base of our retail sugar price, antedated the index base of 1957–59 by several years, it is clear that the consumer paid distinctly less for sugar in terms of price increase than he paid for consumer goods in general, or for food in general, and much less than for transportation and medical care which were not pinched in point of supply by an import quota.

It follows that the sugar quota also cannot be used to demonstrate that import quotas raise prices unreasonably, or even as much as the rise in other prices.

WHEAT

Wheat is under a severe import restriction that permits less than 1% of domestic production to be imported, in pursuance of a limitation imposed under Sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act in 1941.

The price of wheat (hard winter, No. 2, Kansas City) has fallen quite sharply in recent years. The price per bushel was $2.22 in 1950. In 1955 the price was $2.25. By 1960 the price had dropped to $2.00. In 1968 it had sunk to $1.46 per bushel, and in May 1970 it was $1.53.

Corn is not the subject of an import quota. The 1950 price (yellow, No. 2, Chicago) was $1.50 per bushel. In 1955 the price was down to $1.41. The decline, as in the case of wheat, continued. In 1960 it stood at $1.15; in 1968 it was $1.14 and in May 1970 it was $1.30 (yellow, No. 3, Chicago. The difference from No. 2 is very slight, as note, that in 1968 the price of No. 2 in Chicago was $1.14 while that of No. 3 was $1.11). (See Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1969, Table 504, p. 343; and Survey of Current Business, June 1970, p. S–27.)

Comparing the price trend in wheat with that in corn we find that from 1950 to May 1970 the price of wheat dropped 31% while that of corn dropped only 13%. Yet it was wheat and not corn that was "protected" by an import quota. The wheat price dropped over twice as much in the 20 years as the price of corn.

Since 1960 the price of wheat dropped from $2.00 per bushel to $1.53 in May 1970, a decline of 23%. The price of corn, by contrast, rose from $1.15 per bushel in 1960 to $1.30 in May 1970. This was an increase of 13%. Thus while the price of the "protected" wheat dropped 23%, that of corn which was not under an import quota, rose 13%.

In comparison with other commodities the price of both wheat and corn has dropped while the other prices rose rather sharply, especially in recent years.

RAW COTTON

The price of raw cotton has also declined. The decline was greater than that of wheat and corn, dropping from some 36¢ per lb. to some 22¢ or by more than 38%. Yet raw cotton imports are limited under Sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act to a quantity less than 5% of domestic production. (Statistical Abstract of the U.S., 1969, Table 505, p. 344.) (There is some difficulty in reconciling the Statistical Abstract prices with those in the Survey of Current Business, but the discrepancy is not sufficient to destroy the value of the comparisons.)

DAIRY PRODUCTS

With a base of 1957–59 equaling 100, the wholesale price index of dairy products stood at 94.0 in 1955, at 105.0 in 1960. In recent years the price rose to 118.5 in 1966, to 127.7 in 1968 and on to 135.4 in May 1970. This was an increase of 29% since 1960, and compares with an increase since 1960 of 18.6% in wholesale price of "Farm Products, Foods and Feeds," which, of course, includes grains, on which the price, as we have seen, dropped considerably.

Dairy products enjoy an import limitation under Sec. 22 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and the price increase has outpaced that of other farm products, as mentioned, but did not outpace wholesale prices of many other products. Dairying has declined quite sharply per capita. Milk produced on farms was less than 1% higher in 1968 than in 1950, despite the considerable increase in population. The number of cows and heifers kept for milk declined by more than 40%. Unquestionably these factors have influenced the price of dairy products much more than the import quota.

The wholesale price of agricultural machinery and equipment on an index base of 100 for 1957–59 rose to 137.4 by May 1970. There is no import quota on this machinery and equipment. Moreover, agricultural implements are duty free! If imports exert such a salutary effect on prices the effect must have failed in this instance.

CONCLUSION

The foregoing recitation can leave little doubt that import quotas have not led to higher prices; indeed, quite the opposite. With the exception of dairy products, with respect to which other powerful factors, such as the public acceptance of oleomargarine, played a large part, the prices on products that are "protected" by import quotas have lagged distinctly behind average prices and far behind prices on some other products that were under no import quota limitation.

The cry that the imposition of import quotas would be costly to consumers is unfounded, and those who continue to raise the cry are guilty of misleading the public.

NEVER GIVE IN

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, on last Saturday morning the Reverend Billy Graham ended a stirring patriotic oration by quoting that great son of an American mother, Sir Winston Churchill. He quoted Churchill as saying:

Never give in. Never give in. Never! Never! Never! Never!

Mr. Graham then applied those words to Americans, exhorting them, in pursuing the American dream, never to give in. Never. Never. Never. Never.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help thinking that many great Americans have reached greatness by following that credo.

Certainly George Washington at Valley Forge knew the meaning of those words. The brave and valiant men at the Alamo also knew what they meant.

One of our greatest living Americans also knows those words well and he has proved their value.

Richard Nixon had a dream that he could serve his country best as its President. In 1960 he narrowly lost a presidential election. Two years later he was beaten by a larger margin when he sought the governorship of his home State and his political career seemed at an end.

But he never gave in. He never quit. And 6 years later he was elected President of the United States. His perseverance, his courage, his determination are an inspiration to all Americans. He is living proof of the worth of Sir Winston's advice: Never give in. Never. Never. Never. Never.

AN ACE FOR AMERICA

HON. PHILIP E. RUPPE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. RUPPE. Mr. Speaker, Britain's Economist magazine recently published an article dealing with our invasion of the North Vietnamese sanctuaries in Cambodia. In particular, two questions were discussed: Did Cambodia have to get involved and who is likely to profit from the opening of a new front in Cambodia?

In discussion of the first question, the Economist submits as the major consideration of the Americans and South Vietnamese the survival of a non-Communist government. Although the second topic is viewed as speculative at this point, they suggest the greatest immediate gain is the ease of pressure on South Vietnam.

I feel this view of the Cambodian operation is of special merit and insert "An Ace for America in Indochina Poker Game" in the RECORD:

THE BALANCE TIPS: AN ACE FOR AMERICA IN INDOCHINA POKER GAME

It is just possible that the events of the past few weeks have tipped the strategic balance in Indochina far enough in the Americans' favor to bring a satisfactory end to the war closer. No one can be sure about that until later in the year, when the monsoon is over and it becomes possible to take a long cold look at the altered lines of battle.

But the Americans and the South Vietnamese can already chalk up some useful tactical gains. They have pushed the Vietnamese Communists out of some of their border sanctuaries, easing the pressure on South Vietnam. They have broken up the other side's supply-lines, and seized large amounts of arms and ammunition even though the best modern weapons there were got away.

They have kept a friendly government in Phnom Penh in being for a little longer. And they have made it look safer to bring American soldiers home from the war according to President Nixon's schedule.

It is arguable that these are all transient gains, and that in six months the situation

in Cambodia could be the same as before or worse—with the Communists back along the border, a bustling traffic down the Ho Chi Minh trail, and the South Vietnamese army overextended on two fronts.

It would be folly to suppose that the gains in Cambodia are secure. Long-term success really depends on whether the South Vietnamese can consolidate their clearance of the frontier provinces near Saigon and put some backbone into Gen. Lon Nol's invertebrate army while taking over from American combat units in their own country. They are going to face that test in the next few months.

The Americans went into Indochina in the first place to look after someone else's security. What was at stake in Cambodia was not the immediate safety of American troops, but the long-range success of the Vietnamization program, and the survival of an anti-Communist government in Phnom Penh.

Twice as many South Vietnamese as Americans were involved in the Cambodian action and it is they and not the Americans who will be directly responsible for what finally happens in that country.

Two big questions still trouble many people. One relates to the past, the other to the future. The first is simply: Did Cambodia have to get involved?

Villages have been destroyed, rubber plantations burned, and even the archaeological treasures of Angkor Wat have now fallen within the fighting zone. Might it not have been better for Cambodia if its government had simply followed Prince Sihanouk's policy of appeasing the Vietnamese Communists?

A lot of people have said that it would. But it has to be pointed out that the belief that Cambodia could have stayed as it was is almost certainly illusory. Prince Sihanouk was quarrelling with the Vietnamese Communists long before his fall, and seemed to have realized that his uninvited guests were using their bases in his country for two reasons and not one: as a springboard for their assault on South Vietnam, but also as the headquarters for their subsequent intention to put a Communist government into power in Cambodia.

The North Vietnamese may not have been concerned about what kind of government was sitting in Phnom Penh so long as it played along with them. But they foresaw an eventual conflict of interests with Prince Sihanouk and his ministers and that is partly why they sponsored local Communist groups violently opposed to Sihanouk.

Any Cambodian government except a Communist one would have found it hard to coexist with the Vietnamese Communists. The real source of disagreement between Prince Sihanouk and Gen. Lon Nol concerned the management of the economy and the distribution of power. They both saw the danger from the Communists.

Unfortunately, there was only one way for the Cambodians to deal with the Vietnamese Communists. An appeal could not stir them. The Khmer army could not shift them. The Americans and South Vietnamese intervened only after the Communists, by moving towards Phnom Penh, had posed a direct threat to the survival of a non-Communist regime.

The second question is essentially speculative. The war has been widened. Who is likely to profit from the opening of a new front in Cambodia? If the South Vietnamese try to take on too much, they could find their resources stretched too far. They will need much stronger Cambodian backing, and they will have to work to create it.

The Communists have moved far back into the interior. They have the chance to regroup, to reconstruct supply lines farther inland, and to launch showpiece attacks on provincial centers.

On the other hand, they are now quite a long way away from the strategic delta region of South Vietnam, and if President Thieu's forces do their job they will be kept away. To get into South Vietnam from Cambodia now, the Communists have to filter through the difficult terrain of the Central Highlands. They have new supply problems in the interior, and their back is exposed to a possible attack from Thailand.

The greatest immediate gain is that the pressure on South Vietnam has been eased. For the rest of the year, at least, Mr. Nixon need not be overly worried about reducing troop levels in South Vietnam. This may be the chance to push ahead with the pacification program in the Mekong Delta while the enemy is short of men and arms.

Victory is bound to be cumulative in this kind of protracted war. It is not impossible that the Americans have just dealt themselves an ace. One ace does not make a hand in a poker game, but it does help.

CONGRESSMAN FRANK HORTON COMMENDS HONEOYE FALLS FOR FLAG CAMPAIGN TO PROMOTE AMERICAN SPIRIT AND PATRIOTISM

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, a campaign has started in the village of Honeoye Falls in my 36th Congressional District to promote patriotism by displaying and respecting the American flag.

This campaign may make Honeoye Falls one of the most flag-conscious communities in America. On July 4, the American flag was displayed up and down the main street.

More than 75 large American flags were displayed on the business street of the village, with another 125 flags flown throughout the rest of the community.

The Honeoye Falls American Legion Post No. 664 is sponsoring this project. The idea was initiated last year by Past Commander Joseph Mantegna. Newly elected Commander Charles Ferguson continues this project. Douglas Rath, chairman of the Americanism committee, spearheads the activity.

Working closely with the Honeoye Falls Post is the president of the Honeoye Falls Chamber of Commerce, Robert E. Burson. The flag campaign coincides with the recently announced objectives of the Monroe County American Legion announced by newly elected County Commander Henry Pape which is to promote respect for the flag.

The long list of businesses displaying the flag is testimony to the hard work of Douglas Rath, Robert Burson, and their committees.

Mr. Speaker, it is truly an inspiration to see a small village such as Honeoye Falls rally to the spirit of America and show respect and love for the flag.

I would like to share with my colleagues the list of businesses and members of Post 664 who participated in this campaign.

I would also like to commend Honeoye Falls Mayor Squire Kingston, Supervisor of Mendon Earl Broomfield, and County Legislator Henry Williams for their support of this campaign.

I know that the use of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to honor private citizens should be closely guarded, but because of the enthusiasm and spirit generated by this campaign, I feel that these people deserve special mention and national recognition.

The following businesses participated in the July 4th flag display:

The Family Diner, Oppedisano's Bootery, Walk In Tavern, Honeoye Falls Liquor Store, Emblidge Pharmacy, Village Hair Designs, Buckland's Pool and Garden Centre, Falls Grill, V M Tailors, Honeoye Falls 5 & 10, Barry's Furniture Shoppe, Pride Hardware.

Readex Electronics Inc., John J. Leonard, Attorney, L. B. Pierce Agency, Inc., Mantegna's Furniture Store, the Mill, Eddie's Jewelry, Speed-Wash Laundromat, Willie's Friendly Tavern, State Bank of Honeoye Falls, Julian Vogel, Optometrist, Town of Mendon Office, Falls Quality Cleaners.

Barker & Nilsson, Attorneys, Esley Kaper, Insurance Agency, the Nelsons' Country Store, Iroquois Gas Corp., Village of Honeoye Falls Office, Brooklyn Beauty & Barber Shoppe, Kling Sales and Service, Honeoye Falls Times, S. S. Caves Lumber, Inc., Kendall Distributors, Genesee Valley, Kingston Farm Machinery, Inc., Emporium, Mamoone's Barber Shop, Leone's Beauty Salon.

Jimmy's Citgo Garage, Driscoll Glass Service, Inc., Tichenor Furniture Services, Inc., Falls Dairy, Inc., Consler Manufacturing Co., Inc., Stever Locke, Inc., Rotuinda's Atlantic Service, Kaye's Funeral Home, Ann Wyld, Public Accountant, Proper & Smith, Animal Hospital, Emerson Electric Co., Inc.

Sumner Plating Co., Lion Division—Southco, Inc., Dutch Hollow Foods—Division of Crowley's Milk Co., Gleason Works, Inc., Cuningham Corp., Mendon Disposal Co., Magar Collection Service, Beam Milling Co., L. E. M. Plumbing & Heating, Inc., Raymond A. Lake Plumbing & Heating, Urban S. Drowne & Son, Inc.

Falls IGA, Amlyn Chrysler-Plymouth, Inc., Molye Chevorlet, Inc., Barrington Foods, Inc., Star Headlight & Lantern Co., Moore's Radio—TV Sales & Service, Sportacade, Inc., Everett M. Lewis, Inc., Elmer Schmidt Buick, Inc., Norwood Proprietry Home, Automated Business Machines, Clare J. Smith, D.D.S., R. Graham Hoffman, D.D.S., Jarle Holen, M.D.

The following members of the Falls Post No. 664 helped to sponsor and win public support for this project: Theodore L. Alfieri, Clarence W. Allen, Lawrence A. Allen, Lemuel G. Allen, Ronald B. Allison, Gerald C. Anderson, Glenn W. Anderson, Rev. Albert J. Anthony, George R. Appleton, William G. Ardella, Carl J. Arena, Curtis W. Barker, Jack R. Barker, Allen F. Barnes, Edwin O. Beard.

Thomas A. Benedict, William E. Benham, Harland E. Bortle, Jr., Arthur D. Breakingbury, George T. Brennan, Jr., Dewayne A. Brown, August C. Buckman, Lewis E. Buckman, Raymond W. Buckman, Glenn E. Burgess, Jr., Arthur W.

Burmeister, Robert E. Burson, Carlton G. Bushman, Charles E. Buys.

Robert E. Byrnes, Alex Cappi, Roger A. Cappi, Joseph J. Carrol, Lewis S. Cavalier, Stuart S. Caves, Joseph C. Chambers, Gordon C. Christensen, Phillip J. Cicchetti, Jr., William E. Clark, Robert J. Clements, Harvey F. Closs, Donald E. Collins, Josephine T. Collins, Hewitt C. Conant, Harold J. Conklin, James E. Connell, Charles Conrad.

George B. Corby, Carlton C. Crane, Carol Czajkowski, George H. Dawson Jr., James De Nardo, Albert Dechau, Raymond Dietz, Walter J. Dolan, James S. Doyle, Erwin F. Dresser, John Drojak Jr., Bernard S. Drowne, John E. Druschel, Edw D. Duffy, Preston W. Durkee, Earl Ellis, Vernon S. Ellzey, Richard J. Ertel, Charles E. Etheridge, William T. Farrell, Albert E. Ferguson.

Charles Ferguson, Daniel J. Fisher, James P. Fisher, Raymond E. Fiske, Merlin Foe Jr., Raymond C. Francis, Charles W. Freida, Edward H. Freida, William J. Friel, Terry A. Fuller, Charles Gardner, Clarence A. Gibbs Jr., Franklin Gilmore, J. Earl Gleisle, Gerald Grant, Charles R. Greathouse, John W. Grievson, Vincent J. Guerin, Calvin A. Gundlach, Raymond J. Hanna, Frank Harloff, Edwin B. Harnish, Donald Harrington, Robert S. Havens, Fredk Henning, Charles W. Herman.

George Herrick, Roy M. Hetzler, Roy E. Hickey, William L. Hirsch, Joseph W. Hoffman, George Hoh, Burns L. Hollister, Charles S. Hoover, Charles S. Hoover, Jr., Jack W. Horst, Sharon Horst, Lawrence B. Hovey, Frederic J. Howes, Robert L. Huff, Harold D. Hyland, George Jamieson, Robert J. Jamieson.

Myron E. Jennejohn, Frederick A. Jobe, Charles E. Kennedy, Ralph M. Kennedy, William L. Kishbaugh, George Kneibert, James E. Lagree, Leland Lake, Raymond A. Lake, Charles H. Lang, John F. Laraway, Edward R. Lautner, C. Kenneth Leonard, John J. Leonard, Everett M. Lewis.

Herman L. Lilley, Lois R. Lilley, Matthew S. Lo Biondo, Edward P. Longyear, A. Leslie Lord, Gerald A. Lord, Jr., Gerald Madigan, Jr., Dr. Eugene F. Madsen, Leo J. Maloney, Chester E. Manikowski, Joseph L. Mantegna, William Mantegna, Nicholas Marasco.

Robert Marin, George H. Martin, Richard A. Masterman, William T. Mateer, Ralph S. Matthews, Arthur R. Mauer, William F. McGary, Albert W. Meding, Gary W. Meister, John J. Meyers, Leon E. Michel, Raymond Michel, Harland D. Moffitt, Robert K. Moffitt, Archie L. Moore, Raymond J. Moore.

Keith W. Morehouse, Michael R. Morton, Richard M. Newman, Raymond A. Norris, McKendree O'Brien, George O. Neil, Joseph P. O'Neill, James T. Oblein, Vincent Oppedisano, Philip Osterling, Robert Palmer, Nelson C. Parker, Howard Parmelee, Richard B. Parmelee, Ronald Parmelee.

Stuart S. Peck, Ray B. Pierce, Richard Plain, George E. Plympton, Kenneth R. Potter, Howard M. Rapp, Douglas L. Rath, Norman H. Rath, Nelson W. Reichert, Edward J. Reilly, William P. Reilly, George F. Robison, Richard B. Ross, Samuel J. Rotunda, Thomas J. Rotunda.

Arthur H. Ruby, Duane N. Rumsey, Fredk F. Sabey, Gordon Sackett, John Sak, Joseph Samborski, Louis R. Samborski, Harry W. Schirm, Eldred Schrader, Carl H. Schultz, Raymond H. Schwink, Shaw Scott, Francis Seaver, Todd E. Seaver, Donald J. Seconi, Dante Seconi, Ralph M. Shaff.

Lincoln Shaw, Donald R. Shirley, Donald A. Short, Richard Shraeder, Wilfred A. Sigas, Robert L. Slough, J. Robt. Smalley, Ben Smith, Leet A. Smith, Fred Spittal, Harold L. Stanford, Donald J. Starr, Ronald C. Starr, Stanley S. Stever, Charles B. Swartz, Henry Templar, Roger W. Templar, Raymond H. Teuscher, Harry F. Thompson, Paul S. Tichenor, Douglas C. Travis.

Robert A. Treat, Leonard J. Tripp, Thomas E. Tullius, Henry Van de Wall, Percy S. Van Name, Harry Vellekoop, William E. Waringa, Robert B. Warren, Rufus Wesson, Rev. John K. Wheaton, Thomas Wheat, Gabriel E. Whitmore, Paul E. White, Robert G. Whitehead, Edgar H. Williams, Richard Y. Willis, Walter Wishnack, Wallace C. Wolff, Charles F. Wood, Edward C. Wood.

Mr. Speaker, I only wish it were possible to recognize each and every homeowner in Honeoye Falls who joined in this communitywide tribute to the flag on July Fourth. At a time when we hear more about defacing and disgracing the flag than about honoring it, I think the spontaneous cooperation between the American Legion, business, professional and government leaders, and the citizens of Honeoye Falls deserves our attention.

These men, women, and children were not displaying the flag to demonstrate that they were for or against any particular foreign or domestic policy. They were demonstrating their love and respect for our country and for the free system of government which our flag symbolizes.

Because of the lack of conflict or confrontation involved in an event of this nature, it receives little recognition, if any, in the national media. Because it is a positive sign that patriotism and love of country is still very much alive in America, I have seen fit to call attention to the fine people of Honeoye Falls in this way.

ROHR MOVES AHEAD

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, it is always gratifying when an old friend receives deserved recognition in the national news media.

The largest industrial employer in my district, the Rohr Corp. of Chula Vista, Calif., is the subject of a feature article this week in the Christian Science Monitor.

The respected Monitor notes the company's pioneering work in the development of new high-speed passenger train systems. As the article points out, Rohr is now preparing to embark on a Department of Transportation project to test air-cushion vehicles on a 16-mile run from the Los Angeles International Airport to the San Fernando. Although still relatively modest in scope, this demonstration project clearly has great portent and promise for transportation planning of the future.

Rohr is best known as a manufacturer of aircraft components. But Rohr also knows how to diversify, as witnessed not only by the work on new train systems but also by its promising new approaches to shipbuilding and the development of prefabricated housing systems.

Under unanimous consent, I now include the story about this enterprising firm as published July 7 in the Christian Science Monitor:

SPEED TRAIN COMES ROUND BEND

(By Richard Baskin)

CHULA VISTA, CALIF.—The timing of Rohr Corporation's investment late last year in a French high-speed air-cushion train system may prove to have been particularly fortunate.

Secretary of Transportation John A. Volpe recently announced federal backing for the nation's first air-cushion line to run at 150 m.p.h. on 16.3 miles of track from the San Fernando Valley to Los Angeles International Airport.

Rohr, headquartered in this suburb of San Diego, acquired a 60 percent interest in Aeroglide Systems, Inc., a U.S. subsidiary of Société de L'Aerotrain. The plan is for the French firm to market the high-speed system in this country and Mexico while Rohr builds the 80-passenger cars used in the system.

Mr. Volpe announced a $300,000 federal grant to the Los Angeles Department of Airports for preliminary marketing and engineering studies for the proposed system. Rohr's president, Burt Raynes, followed with a declaration that Aerotrain Systems is ready to lend a hand in making the proposed air-cushion system operational by late 1972, the target date set by the federal agency.

CAPABILITY DECLARED

"We are fully prepared to construct the guideway for the system and to share the cost of supplying an Aerotrain vehicle capable of carrying 60 or more passengers at speeds of 150 m.p.h. or greater," Mr. Raynes said.

Mr. Volpe said companies interested in high-speed ground transportation "will be invited to produce the vehicles for this project"—just the invitation Rohr has been waiting for.

"We assume they probably will put this on a competitive-bid basis," says Rembrandt Lane, Rohr's executive vice-president. The key, he says, is the 1972 deadline: "We think we can do it, and we don't know anyone else who can."

Aerotrain already has the technology, he says, having developed the world's only passenger-carrying, tracked air-cushion vehicle. Research and development began in France in 1958 and so far four models of the Aerotrain have been built and tested, the first two being experimental versions capable of speeds up to 250 m.p.h.

PROTOTYPES OPERATED

Two full-scale passenger-carrying prototype models now regularly carry passengers on a nonrevenue demonstration run, one a 44-passenger model outside Paris, the other an 80-passenger train operating on an elevated track near Orléans.

Rohr says the 44-passenger Aerotrain has made runs at 110 m.p.h., propelled by a linear-induction power system, an advanced electric motor.

Similar linear-induction systems will propel the air-cushion system that is to serve Los Angeles International Airport.

High-speed rail transportation systems aren't entirely new to Rohr, best known as a supplier to the aerospace industry. Last summer the company won a $66.7 million contract to build 250 rail cars for the San Francisco Bay Area Rapid Transit District.

Next year Rohr will begin delivery of the 72-passenger cars that will speed up to 80 m.p.h. over the San Francisco-Alameda-Contra Costa Counties system. Rohr is hoping for a follow-on contract that will help it reach its fiscal 1973–74 goal of $100 million in sales from other than aerospace business.

FINANCES ASSESSED

In its fiscal year ended July 31, 1969, the company's sales totaled $266 million. Profits were $10.1 million, equal to $2.45 a share. In the first nine months of the current fiscal year Rohr logged record sales of $206.1 million, up from $198.9 million in the comparable year earlier period. Nine-month net income increased to $7.6 million or $2.07 per share vs. year-ago net earnings for the same period of $7.3 million and $2.03 a share.

Several Wall Street analysts are predicting Rohr will finish the current fiscal year with fully diluted net profits of between $2.70 and $3 a share.

Mr. Lane says Rohr's goal is to be two-thirds involved in aerospace work and one-third in other transportation systems by 1975. That is also the year he projects company sales of around $500 million and profits of more than $22 million.

CURBING ILLICIT IMPORTATION OF HARD DRUGS INTO AMERICA

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. CELLER. The design of H.R. 18397, introduced today by my distinguished colleague Representative PETER W. RODINO, JR., of New Jersey, and corresponding H.R. 18400 introduced by myself and cosponsored by 127 Members, is to strengthen the President's hand in attempts to halt the traffic of hard narcotic drugs—for example, heroin, morphine, and cocaine—into this country. Simply put, the President would be authorized to suspend economic or military assistance under foreign aid programs to any country failing to take appropriate steps to prevent narcotic drugs produced or processed in that country from entering the United States unlawfully. The President would also be authorized to provide assistance to foreign countries in efforts to control entry into the United States of unlawful narcotic drugs.

There is no intention to threaten our allies and friends; rather, we most urgently wish to impress upon them the seriousness with which we view this scourge. We are conscious of the efforts our State Department, the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, the Bureau of Customs, and others are making in concert with foreign governments and international organizations; this measure, if enacted, will but be another device for their use in a needful heightened and sustained effort to obliterate the source and manufacture of hard drugs. Nor is this approach, hopefully to accomplish the ultimate end of destroying illicit traffic at its sources, meant to minimize, or detract in any fashion from, the continuing need for domestic programs to deal with this dreadful menace.

In my State alone over the past 4 years we have spent $90 million on treatment and research and an additional $160 million on treatment facilities. This year we are prepared to spend $145 million more on treatment programs and have authorized $200 million in loans for new youth facilities.

Gov. Nelson A. Rockefeller in a mid-May meeting with our delegation members on the subject of narcotic and drug abuse within the State said:

> This is not enough . . . a total war on drugs is required. It must draw on the resources of all levels of government . . . federal, state and local. It must involve parents, teachers, religious leaders and community groups. It must cover the whole range of programs from prevention and treatment to law enforcement.

While data on drug addiction—which cuts across the economic spectrum of our society—seem to concentrate on large urban areas, it is a plague that permeates throughout this land. It bears repetition to emphasize this is a matter of gravest national concern, wanting the active participation of all rungs of religious, social, educational, and political bodies to wipe out the hideous use of hard drugs.

Enactment of this measure will provide a means for stemming the flow of this diabolic merchandise and will allow us to strengthen our efforts domestically to curb its use.

MR. NIXON SEES GOOD IN OUR COUNTRY

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, too frequently in the recent past we have been reading and hearing only about the shortcomings of our country. Though we all know its good points far outweigh the bad, it is much easier and far more prevalent to dwell on those things considered wrong, oftentimes by only a few.

President Nixon in a recent speech in St. Louis concerned himself with the strong points in America and of Americans. He did not overlook our weaknesses but stressed that our strength "enables us to correct those things that are wrong."

This speech is properly noted in a Kansas City Star editorial. I include the speech and the editorial in the RECORD:

[From the Kansas City (Mo.) Star, June 27, 1970]

MR. NIXON LOOKS AT HIS COUNTRY AND SEES SOMETHING GOOD

President Nixon's St. Louis speech was in a real sense Richard M. Nixon at his best. Here was the thoroughly rational man, the Nixon who sought, in the last campaign, to unite, not divide. Here was the President, in obvious sincerity, discussing what is right about America, and drawing the logical conclusion that what is right "enables us to correct those things that are wrong."

To be sure, he had an audience obviously receptive to such a message. He was speaking before the Junior Chamber of Commerce, to men and women in their 20s and 30s who, in a sense, stand in the middle of the generation gap. His listeners, he suggested, are closer to the younger generation of college and pre-college age; and perhaps they are the ones who need most to listen, to explain and "not to set up a hostile confrontation."

But to any audience, be it predominantly one of hard hats, business suits or beards, Mr. Nixon on this occasion had some important things to say. And not, if you will, just about what is right with this country. Indeed, the point that should not be missed is that Mr. Nixon, on this occasion, took pains to point out that while, as a people, we have come a long way, we have a long way to go.

So very true, and yet there are those who scream that really, we have come nowhere and that we cannot, with our present equipment, possibly get where we want to go. Just as there are those who proclaim that America, thank you, has come quite far enough and should change no more. Mr. Nixon loves America, and yet would find areas in which it can and must be changed. This is not, clearly, the philosophy of those who insist, "America: Love it or leave it."

Indeed, he finds in the thinking of young Americans—in their "idealistic and spiritual terms"—what he regards as a great raw product, to be developed properly as a vehicle for taking us further toward the goal of the American dream. And in the alienation of those who have demonstrated on the campuses he finds something that requires the attention of all citizens, lest it become a division that can destroy a society.

In thus stating his case, Mr. Nixon proved that perspective is possible without invective, that a President can speak without politics in a political year, and that rational man can deal rationally with the problems of his nation. Mr. Nixon was addressing himself, with candor not always apparent in the pronouncements of some others in his administration, to both the greatness and the weakness of a nation. And is that not something that every American should do, now and then?

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE U.S. JAYCEES, 50TH ANNIVERSARY CONVENTION, KIEL AUDITORIUM, ST. LOUIS, MO.

Mr. President, all the candidates for president of this organization, all of the distinguished guests here on the platform, and the delegates to this 50th Anniversary Convention, your wives, your girl friends and your guests:

I know that you can understand how deeply moved I am, and my wife and daughter are, by this wonderful reception. You probably wonder what Tricia said to me while the very great applause was running up through the rafters. She said, "Why, Daddy, this is better than our convention in Miami."

And, of course, my answer was, "Why, there is a reason for it. They are young."

I am honored to address the 50th Anniversary Convention of the Jaycees. There are a number of reasons why this honor means a great deal to me: Because I was a member of the Jaycees, because I was honored to be made a JCI Senator. Incidentally, when they chose that number 72, I had no idea I would be in this office. There were no political connotations whatever.

When your president extended the invitation to me, I asked him, "When do you want me to speak, at noon or at night?" I chose noon. I want to tell you why. Twenty years ago when I was a Congressman and then a candidate for the Senate in California, I, for

the first time, had the honor of addressing a convention of the Jaycees of America.

It also happened to be in Miami, Florida. A friend of mine—I thought he was a friend—told me, "You know, Dick, we have a great spot for you, the night they elect officers. Everybody will be there. You will have a great enthusiastic crowd."

Of course, I could not choose my spot then, so I accepted the invitation. I arrived on time. I was scheduled to speak at 8:00. But that was quite a contest in Miami that year. I don't know whether there has been one since or whether this one will be like it. But there was ballot after ballot and I finally went on at 1:45 A.M. in the morning.

By that time, the delegates and their guests were so worn out by politicing and partying, that no one to this day who attended that convention to whom I talked can remember a thing I said. I don't remember what I said.

There is only one thing I remember about that convention. Does Indiana still have those whistles?

That just proves that the more things change, the more they remain the same.

Now it is customary on an occasion like this to look to the past, to talk about the grave and serious problems that we have at present, and perhaps to take a quick look into the future. It is particularly customary in these times to talk about America and its admittedly very serious problems.

Some believe the nation is coming apart at the seams; that we are gripped with fear and repression and even panic. I am not going to talk to you in that vein today.

I believe that at this time instead of talking only about and primarily about what is wrong about America, it is time to stand up and speak about what is right about America. Because, you see, what is right about America enables us to correct those things that are wrong about America. To do something, if I may borrow a phrase, about those things that are wrong.

What is right about America? Look back over the 50 years that this organization has been in being. Our population has almost doubled. But putting it in other terms, while the population has only doubled, the production of the United States, the income of the United States, has gone up ten-fold.

The number of Americans who are in high school has gone up ten times. The number of Americans in college has gone up twenty-fold. I could go on with the statistics with regard to the progress that this nation has made in the 50 years that this organization has been in being.

We can summarize it very simply by saying that never in human history have more people shared more wealth and had more opportunity with better jobs in the United States of America. We should be proud of that, and I believe that we are.

I realize that there is a fashion these days, and I understand this attitude and we must all try to understand it, that says we should not dwell on America's material accomplishments, that what really counts are problems of people. And they do. And what really counts is the spirit and the idealism and that certainly does count.

But let us look at it in another way, because America is the richest country in the world, because America has such enormous productive capacity, we can do things about our problems that no other country in the world can do.

Let me give you an example. You know about the problem of poverty in America. You also know about our welfare system. Let me give you my views on that system in just a word. I say that when any system makes it more profitable for a man not to work than to work, when any system has the effect of encouraging a man to desert a family rather than to stay with it, it is time to abolish that system and to get a better one.

Now what can we do about it? Because America is rich—and we could not do this unless we had the wealth that we have—I have been able to recommend to the Congress of the United States the most historic, and I think most objective observers would agree, the most revolutionary program in this field in a period of 50 years.

Let me summarize what that program is. It provides first a program of job incentives and job opportunities and job training so that we can move people off the welfare rolls and onto pay rolls in the United States of America.

But it goes beyond that. It provides for a family assistance program, and under that program we will place a floor—and we can do this—under the income of every family in America.

What does this mean? It means that a man and his wife and most important, his children, can stand on that floor with dignity. That is what we can do in America.

Consider the problem, the one so deeply dividing our country at the present time, the war in Vietnam. When we consider this war, it has gone on many years. It has cost lives. It has deeply troubled our people. So as we consider it, let us look at what we are doing about it.

Since coming into office, finally, after five years of more and more men going to Vietnam, we are bringing them home. 115,000 have returned home by April 20, and because of the success of our efforts to destroy enemy sanctuary areas in Cambodia and their supplies, we can continue with the program of withdrawal and replacement so that by the Spring of next year a total of 265,000 Americans who were there will be back home here in the United States of America.

I realize that is not the total answer. It is a plan, a plan that will end the war, and a plan that will replace Americans with the South Vietnamese as they are able to take over the defense of their own country.

But I have seen, as you have seen, those deeply troubled people, and I understand why they feel as they do, carrying their signs and shouting their slogans, "Peace Now." Why not? The day that I came into office, I could have had peace now.

Let me tell you what I vowed when I came into that office, when I came here 17 months ago. 40,000 Americans had lost their lives in Vietnam and I made two pledges: One, I pledged to end this war, and, two, I pledged to end it in a way that their younger brothers and their sons would not have to fight in another Vietnam sometime in the future.

So, I would say to all of you, let it be written that this generation had the courage and the character to end this war, and win a peace that the next generation will have a chance to keep. It is not just peace now, but peace in the years ahead and that is what we shall have as we bring our policy in Vietnam to its conclusion.

Let us turn to the problem of the economy. As we look at the economy of this country, we see troubles. And as we look at the cause of those troubles, one of them primarily is that we are having the difficult transition which must always take place when you move from a wartime to a peacetime economy. 700,000 men who were in the Armed Services or in defense plants have now had to find civilian employment. This has meant more unemployment than we would want. It has meant some dislocations in the economy.

But it is a cost that is worthwhile, because I say to you this economy is strong, this economy is sound, and it is time—and I believe this is the time—when America can demonstrate that we can have prosperity without war, prosperity with peace in the United States of America. That is our goal.

Here again, of course, there are those very well-intentioned who say, why not an instant solution, why don't we have Government wage and price controls to stop inflation of wages and prices?

That is an instant answer and an easy answer. But you know what it is? It is like a doctor telling you when you have a sore finger that the cure for it is to cut off your arm, because never forget how America got where it got today.

We became the envy of the whole world. We are an economic miracle for the whole world with the average American earning almost twice as much in real wages as that of the next highest nation in the world. How? Not by Government restricting free men, but by providing greater freedom and greater opportunity for America.

And in this period of transition, let's not make the mistake of replacing that system which got us where it has with one that will restrict that freedom, and also reduce the tremendous productive power, this engine of progress, that has made America what it is.

A word about the problem of inflation. It is a difficult one. One of the major causes, as you know, is the fact that our Government has been spending more than it has been taking in for too many years. So now the question comes in an election year: What do we do about it?

It is so tempting for a Congressman or Senator to vote for that spending bill or this spending bill that will help these people or those people in his constituency or a special group in the nation.

Let me say this: This is not a partisan subject. I would simply urge the young men and young women in this audience that when you go home, look at the records of the various candidates and give support to those candidates, be they Democratic or Republicans, who have the courage and the character to vote against a spending program by Government that would help some people but that would raise prices for all people.

Consider the problem that has been so much on the minds of many of our young people and older ones who have any sense of the perspective of history and what could happen in the years ahead, the problems of the environment.

As I flew by helicopter from Scott Field in here today, I looked down on the tremendous economy that surrounds this great city of St. Louis. I saw smoke coming from some of the factories, and I remembered, in my time, that when you had smoke coming from factories that was a good sign, it was a sign of progress, it was a sign of jobs, it was a sign of production.

But times have changed. If I can put it in symbolic terms, as far as the factory is concerned, what we need to do is to improve the jobs and increase them, increase the production and eliminate the smoke.

My friends, that is why, as we look ahead ten, 15, 20 years from now, unless we act now, we can have the most productive economy in the world, but we will have cities that are choked with traffic, suffocated by smog, poisoned by water and terrorized by crime.

It doesn't need to be that way. That is why we have presented to the Congress an historically new program to clean up our water and our air and to provide the open spaces which are the heritage and should be of every generation of Americans.

Consider another problem, one that deeply divides this nation, one that sometimes is not perhaps discussed as frankly and candidly as it should be, the problem of the relations between the races in America.

As we consider this problem, it is certainly not the answer simply to say that a majority of the people do not favor action which would attempt to solve the problem, because for Americans to be deeply divided is not in our tradition and certainly not in the best interest of America's future.

Now a great deal has happened insofar as

our race relations are concerned, looking at what is right about America. I was talking to a very distinguished Negro educator from the University of Columbia, Dr. Charles Hamilton recently. He pointed out that in the last ten years the number of Negroes who had moved above the poverty line was 35 percent, a greater percentage than whites who moved above the poverty line in that same period.

He pointed out another historic fact, the fact that in America today there are more Negro Americans in college than there are Englishmen in college in England or Frenchmen in college in France, and we have, of course, reduced the legal barriers for voting rights, for jobs and opportunities in housing.

What I am saying simply is this: We have come a long way, but we have a long way to go. I would urge this group of young Americans to recognize that you will be living in the future in which this problem will become more and more in the public mind, as it should be.

But it can be solved and it needs the devotion and the dedication of men and women of good will on both sides. I think you have the spirit to find solutions to it. I could go on. But I think these examples prove the point.

Because America is strong and rich, because it is so productive, we are able to do things about poverty. We have the strength to do things about our environment. We have the strength to do things about our economy that no other people in the history of the world have been able to do and that no other people in the world today can afford to do.

Now let me come to you. I have spoken of problems in which Government has a special interest. Government has the responsibility to end a war and win the peace. We shall meet that responsibility. Government has the responsibility for programs in the field of cleaning up the air and the water and providing for the open spaces. We will meet that responsibility. Government has the responsibility to break down the legal barriers which divide the races and we will meet and are meeting that responsibility. Government has the responsibility to provide the climate in which Americans, all Americans, have an opportunity for good jobs and not only for good jobs, but an opportunity, if they have the ability and the desire, to be owners and managers, to have a piece of the action, because if they have a piece of the action, then they believe in this system rather than fighting against it.

But there are some areas in which Government cannot do the job. Could I give you three examples? I turn first to the area of race relations. Here Government can pass laws. Government can enforce laws. But as Government passes the law and enforces the law, there needs to be added an extra element that can come only from the hearts and the minds of the people of the United States of America, because there is one thing that Government cannot provide, the healing power of mutual respect for the individual dignity of every person in this country.

Let me say to you, my friends, go back to your communities wherever they may be—because the problem is not sectional, it is national—go back to your communities and rather than having America torn apart, let's bring Americans together.

Remember this, speaking in personal terms: I believe in the American dream. I have seen it come true in my own life. But speaking also in broader terms, we can fulfill the American dream only when every American has an equal opportunity to fulfill his own dream. Let that be the goal of the Junior Chamber of Commerce.

A second area of concern in which you can help: The problem of crime, the problem of law enforcement and respect for law. Here Government can pass laws. Government can enforce the law. We will meet that responsibility. But the missing ingredient and what is needed all over this country is something that can only come from people, individuals who respect the law, and that respect for law does not exist in many areas. I want to tell you why. I believe we need a new approach. If we ask people to respect the laws we must have laws and those who enforce the laws who deserve respect. That means that in every community in this Nation—and it is primarily a local problem rather than a national problem—we need to provide those programs for laws and the enforcement of laws and the personnel that will deserve the respect.

Let me put it another way. I believe in obedience to the law and I know that you do. But let our proud claim be that we ask Americans to obey the law, not because they fear it, but because they respect it. That should be the goal of America.

Then finally, a problem that I should discuss with this great organization of young men and young women; the alienation between young Americans and older Americans, the generation gap. We must bridge that gap. You can do better than we can because the bridge you have to build is not as long as the bridge we have to build. You are closer to that younger generation.

I charge you, I urge you, to do everything that you can, not to make the gap bigger, not to set up a hostile confrontation, but to give to young people the understanding of our system that they need.

I would urge every club of the JayCees throughout America to invite Young Americans, high school age, college age, regularly to your meetings. Let them hear the speakers. Let them get the feel of your organization and perhaps they will have a different attitude than they would otherwise have.

But now, what do you tell them? This is the great question. It is not enough—and it is certainly no comfort to me, and I am sure no comfort to you—that a majority of Americans overwhelmingly disapprove of student demonstrations and student strikes. Because when any group of Americans, be they young Americans, particularly, feel so alienated from our system and society, have lost faith in it to the extent that they resort to other means than the orderly means, then we should do something about it and not allow that division to become something that eventually could erupt and destroy a society.

So what do you tell them? I will tell you what will not be enough. "We are going to win peace." They will want that, as they should, and that will come. "We are going to clean up the environment." They want that and they should because that environment is the one they will be living in. They will want an opportunity for at least a good job and an opportunity for advancement. They will want that. It will be provided. They will be concerned about the problems of poverty and they will support those programs that I have mentioned that will provide for a floor under the income of those unable to work and unable to provide for their families.

But let me leave you with one fundamental truth, and I believe this very deeply and unless we understand this we will fail to bridge this generation gap: Young America today, particularly those in college and high school years, are not going to be satisfied simply by an absence of war and by having good jobs. Young Americans think in idealistic and spiritual terms, and that is to their credit.

Could I put it in historical perspective? 190 years ago when this country was founded it was very poor and it was very weak. Yet, Thomas Jefferson was able to say, when this country was founded, when the Declaration of Independence was drafted and proclaimed—listen to his words:

"We act not just for ourselves alone, but for all mankind."

What a presumptuous thing to say about a weak and poor country. But it was true. America, when it was weak and poor, meant something more than military might and economic strength. It had the lift of a driving dream that caught the imagination of millions of people in this world.

As we think back to those days, let us remember that that driving dream, that idealism, is what is important today. Let us tell young Americans, all Americans, that we should love America. But let us love her not because she is rich and not because she is strong, but because America is a good country and we are going to make her better.

One hundred and ten years ago, in one of the bloodiest and most tragic instances in this world's, and this nation's history, John Brown, after the bloody raid on Harper's Ferry, was tried, convicted and sentenced to be hanged.

When he was on his way to the gallows he rode in a wagon with his own coffin right beside him. As he rode through the Virginia countryside that day, speaking to no one in particular, he said aloud these words: "This is a beautiful country."

Today, when America has all its blessings and admittedly has many problems, let us never forget that if John Brown could say that just before the tragic war between the States, with his own death imminent, then we, too, can say: This is a beautiful country and we are privileged to be the generation that has the responsibility to make it even more beautiful for the generations ahead.

POSTAL REFORM AND COMPULSORY UNIONISM

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 9, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, I include a brief item on postal reform and compulsory unionism, which I have written for my constituents:

POSTAL REFORM AND COMPULSORY UNIONISM

Coming from the upper house of the California State Legislature to the lower house of the United States Congress, I have been most interested, already, to see for myself that—as has been reported—the House of Representatives is more conservative than its counterpart, the United States Senate. In the California State Legislature the opposite was true; the Senate was the more conservative of the two houses.

The 435 Members of the United States House of Representatives, by virtue of their numbers and the fact that they have to go back to the people every two years for reelection, are close to the people. Because there are so many Congressional Districts, big-city bloc voting controls only a minority of them, while it has a disproportionate effect on state-wide elections for U.S. Senator. A Senator from Illinois, for example, must run reasonably well in Chicago, and a Senator from Michigan must do well in Detroit. But the Congressmen from the big cities make up considerably less than a majority of the whole House of Representatives, and of most individual state delegations. This may help account for the marked difference in orientation between the House and Senate.

Whatever its causes, the difference is real. It was manifested in the action taken on the postal reform bill, one of the most important bills of the year in Congress. The Senate approved this bill as originally introduced, including a provision which would allow postal workers' unions to bargain for and obtain—for the first time in our his-

tory—compulsory unionism for federal employees. The House removed this provision before passing the bill, which now goes to a conference committee, composed of members of both houses of Congress.

The need for postal reform is clear and increasingly urgent. The Post Office system has been growing steadily more costly and less efficient. It does not seem to have been operated according to sound business principles. The postal reform bill would transfer control of the system from the present Post Office Department to a special corporation created for the purpose. This offers hope for more businesslike and less bureaucratic and political management of the postal service, and this would seem to be a good change.

However, the postal reform bill, as passed by the Senate, would also open the door to compulsory unionism—once called the closed shop, then the union shop, and now the agency shop, on the familiar principle that if you change the name of an unpopular program, along with a few of its minor details, you can sidestep public hostility and rejection. But whatever the name and whatever the details, compulsory unionism is fundamentally contrary to the workingman's individual liberty.

Forcing a worker to join a labor union is most indefensible of all in government work. Since all citizens are paying for it through their taxes, certainly it should be open to all who are qualified, regardless of whether they want to join a union or not. President John F. Kennedy recognized this principle in his executive order of 1962 guaranteeing the right of all federal employees to join, or to refrain from joining, any labor union or other employee organization.

Experience with private industry clearly shows that compulsory unionism does much to lead to massive confrontations between employers and employees. Its introduction into government employment would almost certainly end in an acceptance of strikes by public employees. The postal strike last spring, which posed such a serious threat to the whole country despite its brief duration, shows the danger of any step in this direction.

Much as postal reform is needed, I shall not support any legislation for this purpose which would allow any group of federal employees to be forced to join or pay dues to any labor union.

SENATE—*Friday, July 10, 1970*

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH, a Senator from the State of Texas.

The Reverend Charles B. Nunn, Jr., pastor, First Baptist Church, Bluefield, W. Va., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our God, as we pray for the Members of this body, its officers, and all those who share in its labors, we remember that Thou art always One who is near, who is able and eternally adequate to satisfy the deep spiritual yearnings of men and nations.

Let us not forget that as wells run dry amidst a season of drought so do men's divine resources, when they are neglected or ignored.

Forgive us if we ever feel that prayer is a waste of time, and help us to see that without it we labor in vain.

Give to us Thy peace and refresh us in our weariness that this may be a good day with much done and done well.

We ask it in the blessed name of the One who has said:

As thy days, so shall thy strength be.

Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 10, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. RALPH YARBOROUGH, a Senator from the State of Texas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. YARBOROUGH thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 9, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA TODAY AND DELAY IN PROCEEDING TO THE TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, at the conclusion of the remarks today by the distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS), the distinguished Senator from West Virginia (Mr. BYRD) be recognized for not to exceed 10 minutes; that then there not be a period for the transaction of routine morning business until later in the day, but that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 874, Senate Concurrent Resolution 64, the termination of certain joint resolutions authorizing the use of the Armed Forces which was made the pending business last night.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Montana? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING THE SENATE SESSION TODAY

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the distinguished Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) is now recognized for 20 minutes.

WE WERE NOT INVITED

Mr. YOUNG of Ohio. Mr. President, it may come as a complete surprise to many Americans, but the fact is that no government of South Vietnam ever asked or suggested that the U.S. Government send combat troops into South Vietnam to maintain the Saigon regime in power.

A civil war has been raging in South Vietnam for more than 10 years now. During that time, there has never been any request for combat troops from any government of South Vietnam, neither the National Liberation Front, the political arm of the VC, nor from any of the Saigon regimes including the present one headed by General Thieu and Air Marshal Ky.

President Eisenhower and his advisers, principally Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, violently opposed the Vietnamese seeking national liberation. The Eisenhower administration provided immense aid to the French seeking to restore their lush and oppressive Indochinese colonial empire. Our militarists with the sanction of President Eisenhower had decided in 1954 to send in our airpower for the relief of Dienbienphu.

A few days before this outpost surrendered in May 1954 to the Vietnamese fighting for national liberation, Chairman RICHARD RUSSELL of the Senate Armed Services Committee and the then Senate majority leader, Lyndon B. Johnson, expressed their feelings of outrage to President Eisenhower who then changed his mind and rejected the militant advice of John Foster Dulles.

On the day President Eisenhower left the White House, there were 685 American military advisers in Vietnam. No combat troops. On the date that President John F. Kennedy was assassinated, there were in Vietnam approximately 16,180 American military advisers. No combat troops. Unfortunately, that situation was altered by President Lyndon Johnson. On the day that he left office, there were more than a half million GI's, marines, and airmen in South Vietnam.

Neither the militarist regime of Saigon nor any previous ruling group in Saigon ever requested or suggested that the United States send those combat troops and airmen into Vietnam. My statement may amaze many American citizens but it is factually correct. A few months back that flamboyant Air Marshal Ky who is Vice President of the Saigon militarist regime said that it would be fine with him if all American troops left Vietnam. He said, "We never asked them to come."

Among the first U.S. combat troops