

V. Harwood Blocker III, of Virginia.
 Oliver B. Bongard, of Minnesota.
 Robert E. Brown, of California.
 Paul M. Byerly, of Virginia.
 Paul J. Byrnes, of the District of Columbia.
 George W. Cave, of New Jersey.
 John E. Chere, of Virginia.
 Miss Margaret Clapp, of Massachusetts.
 Stephen L. Conn, of Maryland.
 Gustaf Coontz, of Massachusetts.
 Friedrich R. Crupe, of Maryland.
 George W. Ford II, of Maryland.
 Fritz H. Giesecke, of Virginia.
 Hugh G. Haight, of Maryland.
 John F. Hasey, of Virginia.
 George T. Kalaris, of Maryland.
 Donald K. Kanes, of Maryland.
 Walter J. Kaufman, of Virginia.
 Arthur W. Lewis, of Vermont.
 Robert W. Magee, of Maryland.
 Miss Mary E. Marchany, of the District of Columbia.
 Samuel L. Martin, of New Jersey.
 William E. McCarthy, of Virginia.
 John W. Mertz, of Virginia.
 George A. Naifeh, of Texas.
 Harry L. Orr, of Michigan.
 Peter D. Orr, of Washington.
 Robert E. Owen, of Wisconsin.
 Lawrence A. Penn, of New York.
 Richard K. Pyle, of Rhode Island.
 Howard E. Shetterly, of Ohio.
 Miss Joan V. Smith, of the District of Columbia.
 Gordon R. Sterner, of the District of Columbia.
 Robert F. Thompson, of Virginia.
 Robert E. Tierney, of Virginia.
 Norman H. Tolman, of Massachusetts.
 Kenneth F. Wesolik, of Maryland.
 Robert H. White, of Virginia.
 Foreign Service officer to be a secretary in the Diplomatic Service of the United States of America:
 Robert C. Ames, of Pennsylvania.
 Foreign Service staff officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:
 Miss Elizabeth Ann Bowen, of North Carolina.
 George D. Clee, Jr., of Connecticut.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Miss Margaret M. Cooney, of Rhode Island.
 Miss Marilyn Crocker, of California.
 William H. Deardorff, Jr., of Virginia.
 Condit N. Eddy, Jr., of New York.
 Joseph F. Fagan, of Pennsylvania.
 Peter D. Guadagno, of Virginia.
 Miss Ovsanna Harpoorian, of Rhode Island.
 Irvin Hicks, of Pennsylvania.
 James S. Huffman, of California.
 Richard B. Jackman, of Virginia.
 Joseph A. Malpeli, of Pennsylvania.
 Edsel B. McCowan, of Alaska.
 Miss Luby H. Miles, of Tennessee.
 James W. Mitchell, of Virginia.
 Miss H. Elizabeth Nussbaum, of Illinois.
 Walter John O'Grady, of New York.
 John D. Parker, of California.
 Duane A. Rames, of South Dakota.
 Miss Margaret E. Rea, of California.
 Miss Eleanor M. Ridge, of Massachusetts.
 Louis P. Russell, of the District of Columbia.
 Robert L. Scott, of Oklahoma.
 Paul Solomon, of California.
 John H. Stein, of Rhode Island.
 Dan J. Thal, of Virginia.
 Malcolm L. Trevor, of Florida.
 Elias K. Zugaib, of Maryland.

IN THE ARMY

To the Senate of the United States:
 The U.S. Army Reserve officers named herein for promotion as Reserve commissioned officers of the Army, under provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a) and 3384:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Herbert R. Hackbarth, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Brig. Gen. James M. Roberts, Jr., SSAN
 XXX-XX-XXXX.
 Brig. Gen. Leonard S. Woody, SSAN
 XXX-XX-X...

To be brigadier general

Col. Richard C. Allgood, Jr., SSAN
 XXX-XX-X... Quartermaster Corps.
 Col. James W. Dunham, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XXXX Field Artillery.
 Col. Charles L. Easterday, SSAN
 XXX-XX-X... Medical Corps.

Col. Rogers B. Finch, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XXXX
 Quartermaster Corps.

Col. Orville K. Fletcher, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XX...
 XXX... Infantry.
 Col. Naiff H. Kele, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XXXX
 Military Police Corps.

Col. Robert D. Upp, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XXXX
 Judge Advocate General Corps.

The Army National Guard of the U.S. officer named herein for promotion as a Reserve Commissioned officer of the Army, under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a) and 3385:

To be brigadier general

Col. Wilbert A. Allen, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XXXX
 Armor.

The Army National Guard of the U.S. officers named herein for appointment as Reserve Commissioned officers of the Army under the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 593(a) and 3392:

To be major general

Brig. Gen. Jack W. Blair, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XXXX
 Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. Larry C. Dawson, SSAN
 XXX-XX-X...

XXX... Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. John N. Owens, SSAN
 XXX-XX-X...

XXX... Adjutant General's Corps.

Brig. Gen. Alberto A. Pico, SSAN
 XXX-XX-X...

XXX... Adjutant General's Corps.

To be brigadier general

Col. Ferd L. Davis, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XXXX
 Infantry.

Col. Van Hixson, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XXXX
 Field Artillery.

Col. Rafael Rodriguez-Ema, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XX... Infantry.

Col. Theron F. Stimson, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XXXX
 Field Artillery.

Col. Ronald R. Woodin, SSAN
 XXX-XX-XXXX
 Signal Corps.

IN THE NAVY

Vice Adm. Ralph W. Cousins, U.S. Navy, for appointment as Vice Chief of Naval Operations in the Department of the Navy pursuant to Title 10, United States Code, section 5085.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

SENATOR HUGH SCOTT'S RECORD ON EDUCATION LEGISLATION

HON. WINSTON L. PROUTY

OF VERMONT

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, in the decade of the sixties, Federal aid to education expanded vastly. While most communities now spend up to 70 or 80 cents of each local tax dollar on education, the role of the U.S. Government in education is very significant. The U.S. Office of Education provides leadership by fostering innovation and giving added basic support in many areas.

The Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT) has consistently supported increased Federal aid to education. He recognized the need to supplement State and local funds in order to provide the best possible education for our Nation's citizens, young and old. He also works to insure that Federal programs are responsive to local needs.

As the Republican leader, Senator SCOTT continues to support increased Federal aid to education. Because of his

efforts in the past, Pennsylvania now receives greater educational assistance than ever before. In the future, Senator SCOTT will continue his efforts to insure a quality education for all children.

As the ranking minority member of the Education Subcommittee, I have always been gratified by the leadership Senator SCOTT has demonstrated in the field of education. His record is a most impressive one.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator SCOTT's record on education be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

SENATOR HUGH SCOTT'S RECORD ON EDUCATION LEGISLATION

86TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 924—To establish for educational purposes, priority in award of television channels.

S. 1016—To provide for a 5-year program of assistance to school districts in meeting debt service on loans for construction of urgently needed elementary or secondary public school facilities.

Votes

Voted to authorize funds to pay principal and interest annually coming due on school

construction obligations in the aggregate principal of \$4 billion and allocating for each of the next 4 years \$1 billion for school purposes.

Voted to increase authorized appropriations to \$15 per school-age child.

Voted to authorize allocation of up to \$600 million for school construction in each of the next 5 fiscal years.

87TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 3477—To provide program to assist States in general university extension education.

S. J. Res. 205—To propose amendment to U.S. Constitution permitting offering of prayer in public schools.

Voted to expand the utilization of television transmission facilities in our public schools and colleges, and in adult training programs.

Voted to withhold authorized funds from any State or school because of segregation.

Voted for the Mutual Education and Cultural Exchange Act of 1961.

88TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 259—To allow income tax deduction for certain amounts spent in providing a higher education for self, wife, dependents.

S. 1316—To establish a National Council on the Arts and a National Arts Foundation.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Votes

Voted *not* to reduce vocational education authorizations and *not* to eliminate programs for residential vocational schools and work-study grants.

Voted for the National Defense Education Act.

Voted to allow church-owned, operated or controlled colleges and universities to be eligible for Federal loans and grants.

Voted for the Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963.

89TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 2067—To increase educational assistance allowances to war orphans.

S. 2778—To provide financial assistance for the education of orphans and other children lacking parental support.

S. 2921—To provide a special school milk program for children.

S. 3405—To provide for sharing of Federal tax receipts with States for purposes of education.

Votes

Voted to liberalize the formula providing financial assistance to local school agencies for children of low-income families.

Voted for the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.

Voted for the Higher Education Act of 1965.

Voted to provide \$5.2 million for matching grants to the States for community development training programs.

Voted to propose a Constitutional amendment to allow voluntary prayer in public schools.

Voted for the Elementary and Secondary Education Amendments of 1966.

90TH CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 2871—To broaden and expand food service programs for children under the National School Lunch Act.

S. 1033—To provide assistance to States for development and construction of comprehensive community colleges.

Votes

Voted to extend for 2 years: (1) the school disaster program, (2) authorization for school construction in federally impacted areas, and (3) the coverage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 for children attending Department of Defense schools and Indian children.

Voted to increase by \$14.9 million funds for the Teacher Corps.

Voted for the Higher Education amendments of 1968.

Voted to authorize \$50 million for Fiscal Year 1969 and 1970 for school lunch programs.

Voted for the Vocational Educational Amendments of 1968.

Voted to increase by \$10 million funds for the school dropout prevention program under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

91ST CONGRESS

Legislation

S. 1788—To assist in removing financial barriers to the acquisition of a post-secondary education by all those capable of benefitting.

S. 2422—That the Secretary of HEW shall prescribe maximum rate of interest allowed for student loans.

S. 2579—To authorize Commissioner of Education to make Vocational Education Opportunity Grants.

S. 3850—To provide for emergency assistance to the Nation's medical and dental schools.

Votes

Voted for the Insured Student Loan Emergency Amendments of 1969.

Voted to increase school aid for federally impacted areas by \$60 million.

CHANCELLOR ALEXANDER HEARD OF VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY REPORTS TO PRESIDENT ON CAMPUS UNREST

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Miss Mary McGrory, the distinguished columnist of the Washington Star, recently assessed a report prepared by Chancellor Alexander Heard, of Vanderbilt University, for President Nixon concerning student unrest.

Miss McGrory's analysis is perceptive and penetrating and because of the great interest of my colleagues and the American people in this matter I place Miss McGrory's column in the RECORD.

The article follows:

YOUNG GRIPES IN NIXON'S LAP

(By Mary McGrory)

The 40 pages of the extraordinary document Chancellor Alexander Heard of Vanderbilt University left at the White House as he departed can be summarized in a sentence: The President is wrong, the students are right.

He has been obtuse and maladroit in dealing with them, says Heard. He has been willfully and woefully out of touch. He has failed to recognize a "national emergency" of his own making.

The students, on the other hand, have shown the qualities he should have—commitment and compassion. They may be egocentric and emotional, and sometimes intolerant, but they are, for the most part, idealists, and their opposition to the war is not based on their draft status.

No report in the annals of special adviser literature has been so unsparing. Heard and his colleague, Dr. James E. Cheek, president of Howard University, had the run of the administration and 11 hours with the President. They saw and heard little to make them hope that the President learned the lesson of Cambodia, although they list in a paragraph some positive actions, like the signing of the 18-year-old voting bill and the withdrawal of tax exemptions from "segregation academies," which may or may not have been of their prompting.

The trouble, as the pair from academe see it, begins and ends with the President. Only he can set it right.

DIFFERENT LANGUAGES

The President and the young are talking different languages. He addresses them in Cold War rhetoric which has no meaning for them.

Obviously, the President addressed to them a complaint familiar to White House staffers: Why did the youth not erupt in moral indignation over the Soviet invasion of Czechoslovakia as they did over the Cambodian invasion?

Heard explains: "They feel that by the wrongness of our own policies, such as the war in Vietnam, we have lost our moral standing to condemn other countries. Second, there is an obsession with our own problems, a feeling that our own crises should occupy all our attention. Third, the fear of communism is less than existed a decade ago."

They lay waste the President's contention that the war is not the overriding grievance of the students. In his famous morning-after-Cambodia outburst at the Pentagon, the President said that if it wasn't the war it would be something else, "you name it."

July 27, 1970

THE "SALIENT"

The war, says Heard firmly, may not be the only issue, but it is the "salient" issue. And if the President expands it, or takes action that looks that way, then forget any normal activity on the campuses next fall.

Nixon's dawn visit to the students who had come here to demonstrate against the Cambodia invasion is praised as "a splendid act." But the choice of his subject matter—surfing and football—was calamitous.

"That offended students who felt immersed in a national tragedy," says the inexorable Heard, "like telling a joke at a funeral."

At the White House, the fear of repression among students is put down as "paranoia." Not according to the visiting specialists. They tell the President that the arrests of students and faculty "after your speech in Knoxville for disrupting a religious service" is taken in evidence, as are the attacks by construction workers on students in New York and on the veteran and his family in St. Louis."

They tell him, in effect, to stop playing games. He has to do the right thing and admit it. This would seem to be a reproach for such things as presenting the Family Assistance Plan, which is aimed at helping poor blacks, as an exercise in welfare reform and managerial efficiency.

"Policies adopted and steps taken that respond to the concerns of the disillusioned must be recognized and understood by them as doing just that—if their confidence is to be restored."

REMARKABLE PASSAGE

And in one remarkable passage, Heard warns the President about the dangers of know-nothingism. "Intellectual power ought not to be forgotten," he writes, and the words are underlined.

The White House may be startled at the vehemence of the report. Heard's associates will not. They had promised that he would not tell the President what he wanted to hear, and recall he said he would be the White House emissary from the campuses, not to them.

The hawks and the hardhats will be enraged at this stiff lecture but students should hail it. They might have written it themselves.

There is no comfort for the President. Congress is not mentioned. Neither is the vice president. "Sledge-hammer statements by public official impugning the motives of dissent" are cited, but from the context, they could be the President's own.

Peace in the generational war is up to him, Heard says, and he better get right to the negotiating table.

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

HON. J. CALEB BOGGS

OF DELAWARE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. President, recently the Wilmington Lodge of Elks No. 307 of Wilmington, Del., held a Flag Day ceremony.

Mr. Thomas Schranck, president of the Building Trade Council of Delaware, was the principal speaker at the occasion; and I believe his address is a most appropriate one.

Also, the Wilmington Lodge of Elks conducts an annual essay contest. This year's winners were: Miss Evelyn Ewing of Claymont, Del., and Mr. James H. Trask, Jr., of Wilmington, Del. Their

short essays on "What America Means to Me" are good evidence of our young people's faith in this country and their determination to solve its problems.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Schranck's address and the two essays be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY J. THOMAS SCHRANCK

Exalted Ruler, Members and Guests of the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks.

Today all across this great land of ours, many high sounding words of praise will be heaped on our flag and on those who individually or collectively performed great acts of Bravery on and off the Battlefield acting under this Banner. It is meet and right that this should be done. Let us today reaffirm allegiance to our Flag and to what it represents, Justice, Freedom and Democracy.

Let there be no question of our support of our Servicemen no matter where they may be, in Viet Nam, Cambodia, the Far East, Europe, or right here in our land. Let there be no question of our prayers for their safe return to their Loved Ones. Let there be no question of our abiding sympathy to the families of those who will not return and our everlasting gratitude to those who have served us in all our worldly troubles. Those who have served in armed conflict remember well the surge of pride and the tingle of the spine when our National Banner was unfurled on the Battlefield and the High Seas. Today let us examine how we as Americans can help to serve our Flag better and bring to all in this Land, Justice—Freedom and Democracy.

Our Nation is troubled as never before. Crime runs rampant in the streets—murder, arson, rape, muggings and holdups are commonplace. Let us support meaningful action on the part of National, State and Local Governments to attack the root causes of this problem, unemployment, inadequate housing, poor education, and by active participation help to eradicate this problem, how better to serve our flag.

Some of our Youth, and we seem to have lost the ability to communicate with them, burn schools, smash and destroy and yes, riot in the streets. Let us seek to listen to their problems and offer solutions to them rather than dismiss them with a wave of the hand and an admonition to grow up, they cry out to us in their frustration and despair. Let us actively participate in solving this problem and by so doing eradicate it. How better to serve our Flag. A Vocal minority of the Black Community join together to smash, burn, loot and riot in their frustration and anger over real or imagined problems their communities face. Let us actively participate in finding solutions to these problems and by so doing eradicate them. How better to serve our Flag.

Our Nation agonizes over our involvement in Asia, the impending conflict in the Middle East and elsewhere. Let us actively participate by communicating with our elected leaders and letting them know our thoughts on these foreign matters that divide and dismay us and by active participation find a lasting solution towards peace on this Earth for us, our children, our children's children for all time to come. How better to serve our Flag.

As I sat contemplating what to say here today, an old Patriotic Song came to mind and I jotted some thoughts of mine between the lines and with your permission would like to read them to you.

My County 'Tis of Thee—'Tis of Thee I speak to friends and neighbors and all others who will listen, 'Tis to Thee I pledge my undying love and faith. 'Tis on Thee the hope of the World rests.

Sweet Land of Liberty—Liberty to go

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

where I please, when I please, to speak what I please without transgressing the Rights of others, to pursue any goal that you have made attainable, Liberty to walk with kings or paupers or to walk alone with you.

Of Thee I Sing—I sing to the high heavens my praise of You, I sing of the opportunities granted me and all Americans, I Sing of the never ending quest for equality that You have charged us to deliver.

Land Of The Pilgrims Pride—Pilgrims of yesteryear as well as today—down through the years seeking freedom from oppression and tyranny and finding that freedom in the Arms of that Great Lady in the Harbor of New York.

Land Where My Fathers Died—Some in Peace and Happiness, some in the bitter anger of war here and elsewhere, but wherever and however with a desire I am sure to serve You.

From Every Mountain Side—From the Mountains, The Hilltops, The Plains, The Prairies, the Cities, The Towns, the Hamlets.

Let Freedom Ring—Let Freedom Ring for all the World to hear and as hope springs eternal, we pray that around this planet we inhabit let Freedom Ring.

How Better To Serve Our Flag.

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

(By Evelyn Ewing, Claymont High School, Claymont, Del.)

"I was born an American, I will live an American, I shall die an American."¹ America is certainly the greatest nation on earth. I do not mean to say that it is perfect. It has its share of ignorance, cruelty, bigotry and hatred. At times these evils seem to be overwhelming. But in spite of everything wrong with America today, there remains a certain vitality in the spirit of the people which triumphs over contempt. Unkind words and heartless deeds seem only to renew and strengthen the ideal of Americanism. Generosity, love of justice and faith in mankind are fundamental in America. With these ideals as guidelines and universal peace and harmony as goals, the "American Dream" must surely be realized.

WHAT AMERICA MEANS TO ME

(By James H. Trask, Jr., Salesianum School, Wilmington, Del.)

America is a land of dreams. The United States is the embodiment of a dream of our founding fathers. Their dream, a dream of equality, of opportunity, of brotherhood, of freedom, is the guiding light of the people of this nation. In reality, however, a dream becomes complex. No government or society could ever be expected to be perfect because of the imperfection inherent in man. As flaws in the system appear, therefore, they must be remedied—no flaw is so large that the system itself cannot correct it. Through our errors, through our moments of trial and tragedy, we as a nation have learned and progressed. And we must proceed, for certainly we must strive for that unattainable perfection. We must be careful, however, not to let our interests in the progress of technology overstep those of the progress of humanity. This is the America I see.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—
HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks:

¹ Daniel Webster, Speech, July 17, 1850.

"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?

FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION
REPORTS FINDINGS OF SPECIAL
MISSION TO VIETNAM

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following: The report of a special factfinding mission composed of delegations from the United States, Australia, New Zealand, and the Netherlands, will be of particular interest to my colleagues who have been made aware during the past few weeks of the true situation in Vietnam.

The report follows:

STATEMENT OF FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION—VIETNAM FACTFINDING MISSION

We have just returned from Saigon where we completed an 8 day special factfinding mission inquiring into reports of growing expressions for peace in South Vietnam and intensified political repression.

We were joined in Saigon by delegations from Australia, New Zealand, and the Netherlands.

In Vietnam we met 18 hours a day with representatives of the religious communities, lawyers, labor leaders, writers, student groups, women's groups, intellectuals, and politicians. We talked with rice farmers in the field. We met with Vietnamese and American soldiers, and several members of the American press. We also met with U.S. Deputy Ambassador Samuel D. Berger.

The situation we discovered in Vietnam is both much worse and, at the same time, more hopeful than we had anticipated. Political repression is extreme. We discovered police and police agents are everywhere. We learned that when Vietnamese speak out for peace the government jails them on the pretext that anyone who opposes the government must be pro-Communist. It is common for Vietnamese who criticize the government to be arrested under the An Tri law, which allows people to be imprisoned on a renewable basis from 6 months to 2 years without trial. Many Vietnamese, especially students in the last 3 months, have been tortured at interrogation centers and prisons like Con Son and Thu Duc. We saw the bruises of the victims and we heard several of their direct accounts of the incredible torture by the U.S. supported Thieu/Ky regime from ex-prisoners and from mothers and wives of youths who are now in prison.

Newspapers which dare to carry news critical of the government frequently are confiscated by the police before they reach the stands. While we were in Vietnam, a daily issue of the English language newspaper, Saigon post, was confiscated because it carried excerpts from Secretary of State Rogers' speech in San Francisco in which he made reference to the possibility of coalition government in Saigon.

The hopeful side of our report is that we believe that a way to achieve peace exists short of military victory for either side. The strongest desires of the Vietnamese people are for peace and self-determination. Our meetings with many important groups in

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

South Vietnam have convinced us that they will continue to struggle for these twin goals in spite of the hardships of the war and the severe measures of repression by the Thieu/Ky regime. The military power of the United States cannot be underestimated, but neither can the determination and capacity of the "other side." Some form of interim government must be found which could be acceptable to both sides. Obviously, this cannot be the government of Thieu/Ky since it is so closely tied to the United States and continuation of the war. Again and again we were told by Vietnamese that the most important step the United States could take for peace is to withdraw support from the Thieu/Ky regime. This would allow for the formation of an interim government of reconciliation, acceptable to both sides which would be able to negotiate the withdrawal of U.S. forces, certainly an essential objective to Vietnamese, and at the same time develop the basis for a genuine and workable coalition government for South Vietnam.

We believe that is the only alternative to continuing the slaughter of the Vietnam war. The United States must withdraw its support from the present warlike and repressive regime or acknowledge its commitment to pursue the war, not merely against the "other side," but against the vast majority of Vietnamese, sometimes silenced, sometimes courageously speaking-out, who want their country free, free of war and free of foreign domination. There will not be peace in Vietnam until there is a government of peace in Saigon.

The special delegation from the United States included Dr. David Hunter, deputy general secretary, National Council of Churches; Charles Palmer, president, National Student Association; Sister Mary Luke Tobin, superior general, Sisters of Loretto, representing Catholic Peace Fellowship; Sam Brown, former coordinator, Vietnam Moratorium Committee; Dorothy Cotton, director, citizenship education program, Southern Christian Leadership Conference; Bishop Paul Moore, Jr., Episcopal Diocese of New York; Rabbi Balfour Brickner, director of Interfaith Activities, Union of American Hebrew Congregations; Bernard Lafayette, executive staff, SCLC; Timothy Butz, student at Kent State University and a Vietnam veteran; and Ron Young of the Fellowship of Reconciliation, coordinator of the U.S. delegation.

**PORTRAIT OF AN INDIAN CHIEF:
CHIEF FULTON BATTISE OF ALA-
BAMA-COUSHATTA TRIBE**

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH
OF TEXAS
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, the Alabama-Coushatta Indian Reservation is the only reservation in Texas. The reservation is located on U.S. Highway 190 between Livingston and Woodville. This is within the Big Thicket area of Texas. The reservation is on the northwestern corner of the proposed Big Thicket National Park. The reservation is home for a far-sighted group of Indians who are making a determined and successful effort to improve their economic situation through tourism.

The pleasure of visiting the reservation has been mine on several occasions. I am very proud to be an honorary member of the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe. My

most recent visit was with the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada (Mr. BIBLE) and Mr. George B. Hartzog, Jr., Director of the National Park Service, on June 12, 1970. The people of the reservation honored us with ceremonial dances, a scenic tour of the reservation, and a view of their arts and crafts center. The visit to the reservation was a highlight of a helicopter and automobile tour of the Big Thicket which we took in connection with the field hearings on S. 4, my bill to establish a Big Thicket National Park of not less than 100,000 acres.

A newspaper article about Chief Fulton Battise, the leader of the Alabama-Coushatta Tribe, appeared in the July 26, 1970, issue of the Houston Chronicle, in section 1, page 25. The article is by Margie Kirkland and is entitled "Portrait of an Indian Chief."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

**PORTRAIT OF AN INDIAN CHIEF, LEADER OF
ALABAMA-COUSHATTA TRIBE**

(By Margie Kirkland)

LIVINGSTON.—What's it like to be an Indian chief nowadays? Is a chief as important as his rank suggests? Does he portray the fierceness that little boys take on when they play cowboy and Indian games? Is there any power in the role of chief? Or does he carry the title like an honorary doctorate?

Getting to know a 20th century chief may be as difficult as it was in pioneer days—especially if it's to be a verbose acquaintance. "Chief Kina," who in the workaday world is Fulton Battise, is leader of the Alabama-Coushatta tribes, which live on Texas' only Indian reservation, 17 miles southeast of Livingston.

He is 61, stocky, dark and a bit sad-eyed. His expression at times changes into that of a shrewd warrior of an innocent brave. More often, he looks stern and unyielding.

Battise was elected chief by his people. The position is not handed down through inheritance. Sylestine Cooper was "first chief" until January of this year, when Battise received the war bonnet in ceremonies at the main ground of the reservation.

The "main ground," or Indian Village, is a complex of tourist attractions. There is a museum, snack bar, barbecue stand and a war dance area. It's a small part of the more than 4000 acres that make up the reservation. The tourist center is a busy place and a good source of income for the tribes.

There are around 400 inhabitants on these 4000 acres.

The chief is Alabama, not Coushatta, although the tribes are considered cousins and have a long history of cohabitation. They are peaceful, friendly and independent. The two tribes differ slightly. History records that in the past, Coushatta people have been by nature more war-like and impetuous than the Alabamas.

Battise said that formerly the chief was responsible for knowing the forests and location of springs. He had to be skilled in hunting. And, of course, he presided over council meetings.

Today the role is much the same, with emphasis on council meetings. They meet twice monthly to discuss problems and make decisions. The duties of the council are similar to those of any small city council.

Chief Kina has an assistant, or second chief—his cousin, Emmitt Battise. Also of the Alabama tribe, Emmitt teaches in the Rusk public school system, where he also is baseball coach.

July 27, 1970

The chief is a day laborer at Camden Plywood Co., a sawmill 15 miles from the reservation. He has been employed at Camden for 23 years, off and on, as a log cutter. Numerous other members of the tribes are employed there.

Chief and Mrs. Battise live in a small house two miles from Indian Village. The house is surrounded by a split rail fence erected by Battise himself.

They have a daughter, Zatha, who teaches music in elementary schools at Tucumcari, N.M. She is a graduate of Southeastern Colleges, Durant, Okla., and spends summers with her parents.

Chief Kina looks most comfortable when he wears his war bonnet. Although not an original one from a century ago, it is a good reproduction of the chief's headdress worn at early-day powwows. His wife made his ceremonial costume.

The tribes have special occasions when he dons this regalia. At these times, Battise is every inch a chief. It is there, showing plainly, mirrored in his eyes and somber countenance.

Asked about his philosophy of life, Chief Kina replied: "All I know is what I began to know in 1918 'till now. We living in a better way. And, we looking forward to having better place. White people been good to us and we are proud of it."

Battise is a peculiar blend of pride and humility. Concerning his own education, he said: "I never finished high school. That is why I am nothing."

Not everyone shares this view. Fulton Battise is in a position to prove himself wrong. He's making new friends for his tribes. He's trying to move with the times.

The Alabama-Coushatta people are receiving more recognition than ever before. Other Americans are beginning to let them mean something—not only for the heritage of their past, but for their unique place in present-day Texas.

CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK

HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, the people of the United States have lived in freedom for 194 years, and living in that freedom we often forget what a priceless possession freedom is, and while we enjoy it, much of the world only knows Communist domination and oppression.

The 86th Congress, in 1959, proclaimed Captive Nations Week to be observed during the third week of July of each year. This observance is used to show to our captive brethren in eastern and central Europe the American solidarity in expressing our concern for those who remain in subjugation throughout the world.

The initial reaction to this Captive Nations Resolution was an angry response from the Russian Government, denying that proven fact that there were enslaved countries dominated by Soviet Russia or Russian puppet governments.

For 11 years now, we have observed Captive Nations Week. We have been bringing the plight of these subjugated people to the attention of the world for too long a time. It is important that we continue to take such action which will bring an annual recollection of the realities of Russian denial of freedom and

liberty to over a billion individuals, whose God-given right is life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

The Captive Nations Weeks manifesto of 1970, points out that this year's observance falls just two months after the 25th anniversary of the victorious close of World War II, yet a generation of people in eastern and central Europe do not know the full meaning of liberty and freedom.

Captive Nations Weeks will always serve an important purpose. It will stand as a reminder that there must be created an atmosphere for peace in the world in which the people of both Communist and free nations will have the right of self-determination in establishing their government and in choosing their way of life.

As long as there is a solitary nation under the domination of an oppressor, we must continue to seek every possible solution to obtain justice and freedom for all.

It is my hope that in the very near future we will see the observance of Captive Nations Week fall into disuse, to see a brighter day for those presently denied the rights and responsibilities of free citizenship and freedom of their own choice.

This Nation has publicly stated and continues to reaffirm its position that freedom of choice regarding the form of government should be available to all peoples. Free choice is the essential part of this sentiment in which 17 other nations joined to show their abhorrence for the existence of captive nations. In 1967, the World Anti-Communist League, comprising membership from more than 80 countries, adopted a resolution advocating an expansion of efforts to show solidarity with the aspiration of the captive nations to be free.

Oppressed people have traditionally turned to us for hope and inspiration. During Captive Nations Weeks we must reaffirm our promise to remain firm against further Communist usurpation in the world, and to do all within our power to work for the ultimate liberation of every captive nation.

The National Captive Nations Committee, the Assembly of Captive European Nations, and the individual nationality organizations of the countries under the dictatorial regimes of the Communist bloc merit our speaking out on this subject more than just once a year. What has happened and is happening to the less fortunate peoples must remind us that we have no perpetual immunity from aggression.

Mr. Speaker, at this point of my remarks, I would like to include Captive Nations Manifesto for 1970 as proclaimed by the Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent.

The manifesto follows:

CONFERENCE OF AMERICANS OF CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPEAN DESCENT MANIFESTO FOR CAPTIVE NATIONS WEEK 1970

Captive Nations Week, established by the U.S. Congress on July 17, 1959 (Public Law 86-90), will be observed this year during the week of July 12 to 18, for the eleventh consecutive year. Each year, observances marking this signal event are held through-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

out the country, serving as a powerful reminder to the American people not to forget the captive nations or to approve their permanent captivity under Communist enslavement.

The Conference of Americans of Central and Eastern European Descent (CACEED) is an organization of American citizens of Central and Eastern European background whose countries of origin—Bulgaria, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania and Ukraine—are presently under Communist domination and are denied fundamental human rights and national liberties.

CACEED supports all the captive nations, and calls on all Americans to manifest their public support for the captive nations in their unequal struggle for national self-determination and the restoration of their national independence. Public Law 86-90 defined the plight of the captive nations in the following words:

"... The imperialistic policies of Communist Russia have led, through direct or indirect aggression, to the subjugation of the national independence of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, White Ruthenia, Romania, East Germany, Bulgaria, mainland China, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Georgia, North Korea, Albania, Idel-Ural, Tibet, Cossackia, Turkestan, North Vietnam, and others..."

Every year, since observances of Captive Nations Week have been held throughout the length and breadth of the United States, the official Soviet press and mass communication media in the Communist-controlled countries have untriringly attacked the Week as an instrument of the Cold War aimed at disturbing "peaceful coexistence" between the USSR and the United States.

This is a typical method of Communist propaganda by which Moscow and its satellites are trying to conceal their great concern over Western interest in the captive nations. Moreover, the captive nations movement has grown steadily, enlisting the staunch support of several countries of the free world, including the Republic of China, Korea, Turkey, West Germany, Argentina and Australia.

The worldwide captive nations movement received powerful and fresh impetus with the brutal and unprovoked invasion of Czechoslovakia by Soviet and satellite troops in August, 1968, and the subsequent enunciation of the "Brezhnev Doctrine," which claims that the Soviet Union has a "legitimate" right to intervene in the internal affairs of any "socialist" country.

There is no doubt that the "Brezhnev Doctrine" indicates Soviet determination to continue the oppression of the captive nations and to trample underfoot their fundamental human rights, although these rights to self-determination and national sovereignty are expressly set forth in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted unanimously by the U.N. General Assembly on December 10, 1948. The "Brezhnev Doctrine" further ascribes to the USSR a "mandate" to intervene at will in the internal affairs of neighboring states, in direct contravention to the principles enunciated in the Atlantic Charter and the Charter of the United Nations.

The contention of this spurious "doctrine" that Central and Eastern Europe is the exclusive domain of Moscow should be categorically rejected by the free world as immoral, imperialistic and dangerous to world peace.

Despite the Sino-Soviet conflict and the Russian fear of Red China, Moscow is doing everything to help Hanoi in its present war against South Vietnam and the United States. Only a few days ago the Kremlin announced that far-reaching agreements had been reached between Moscow and Hanoi, resulting in a large increase of material aid to North Vietnam by the USSR.

In the Middle East, the Soviet Union is continuing to push forward. The strategic

meaning of these actions is that expansion of Communist Russia's military presence and political influence would become an unchallengeable fact. The USSR is attempting to undermine U.S. power there and become a "champion" of the Arab and Moslem worlds with the ultimate objective of subverting the entire area and subjecting it to eventual Communist domination from Moscow.

There has hardly been any change in the status of the captive nations since the last observance of Captive Nations Week in 1969. This year's observances will be held a few months after the 25th anniversary of the termination of the war in Europe—at which time the Nazi totalitarian domination over vast areas of that continent was eliminated. But for millions in Central and Eastern Europe, as well as the peoples of the USSR, Nazi domination has been replaced with brutal and ruthless Communist rule and Soviet Russian colonial hegemony.

Soviet leaders, in attacking U.S. foreign policy would have us believe that all is well and orderly in the USSR and its far-extending Communist empire. Yet developments occurring daily behind the Iron Curtain speak of something else. In Poland, the Communist regime stifles intellectual and economic life, and continues its violation of human rights on a large scale. In Czechoslovakia, the Soviet-backed new regime has re-imposed censorship, curtails travel, and has made the country a faceless puppet of Moscow. In Romania, which is often described as following an "independent" course, there exists police repression, total control over intellectual and artistic life, and economic strangulation. Attempts by the people of Hungary and Bulgaria to secure more freedom and the enjoyment of human rights have been stubbornly opposed by the Communist regimes. In Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania, Moscow continues to exercise its oppressive policies, and the official course of Russification becomes an ever-increasing threat to the ethnic structure of those nations. In the Ukraine, the largest non-Russian captive nation in the USSR, arrests and trials of hundreds of intellectuals continue, while the Communist regime openly persecutes members of the Catholic, Protestant and Jewish faiths. Even in Russia proper, youth and writers demanding more freedom are being arrested and confined to mental institutions.

In observing Captive Nations Week this year, we:

(1) Express our full support for U.S. policy in Southeast Asia and elsewhere in resisting Communist aggression and attempts at world domination; at the same time we ask that the U.S. Government adopt a firm policy with respect to the USSR and its subservient Communist regimes of Central and Eastern Europe by challenging and denouncing their persecution and oppression of the captive nations.

(2) We accuse the USSR of crass violation of its solemn promises of freedom and independence for the nations made captive during and after World War II, such as Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland and Romania.

(3) We denounce the Soviet government for the destruction of the independence of the Ukraine and other non-Russian nations inside the USSR, and for depriving them of the right to national self-determination.

(4) We condemn the Communist celebration of the 100th anniversary of Lenin's birth and its sponsorship by UNESCO and the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, which bestowed international honor upon the originator of Communist terror and genocide.

(5) We denounce the Communist enslavement of Albania, China, North Korea, North Vietnam, Tibet and Cuba.

(6) We appeal to the U.S. Government and all other governments of the free world to

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 27, 1970

undertake measures in the United Nations to insure that the "Declaration on the Right of Peoples and Nations to Self-Determination," adopted in 1952, the "Declaration on Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries," adopted by the U.N. on October 14, 1960, and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, adopted on December 10, 1948, are applied to all the captive nations as enumerated in the U.S. Captive Nations Week Resolution of July 17, 1959.

7) Finally, we appeal to the American people to take an active part in the Captive Nations Week observances of July 12-18, 1970 and to manifest their unstinting support and sympathy for the just aspirations of all the captive nations of Europe and Asia, to express their full understanding and to pledge their moral support in their unequal struggle for freedom and national statehood.

The Rt. Rev. Msgr. JOHN BALKUNAS,
President, Conference of Americans of
Central and Eastern European Descent
(CACEED).

JUMBO JETS POSE PROBLEM FOR LIGHT AIRCRAFT

HON. WILLIAM B. SPONG, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, July 27, 1970

MR. SPONG. Mr. President, for all the advantages they may bring, the new generation of jumbo jets poses a serious problem for light aircraft which venture into their wake.

According to a recent Federal Aviation Administration study, the air turbulence that streams off the wingtips of some of these giant jets is capable of "rolling over" smaller aircraft following as far behind as 2 or 3 miles.

Mr. President, this wake-turbulence hazard is produced by many of the commercial jet aircraft flying today, but it is most pronounced in the new generation of jets just coming into operation or off the assembly lines. The Boeing 747, for example, develops wingtip vortices about twice the strength of those coming from the Boeing 727. The new three-engine air buses will create a wake-turbulence more than twice that of the Boeing 737.

This phenomenon presents a significant safety hazard of the unwary private pilot, and it raises the question of whether our airport and air traffic systems are adequate to deal with it.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the Extension of Remarks of the RECORD an article entitled "Vortex Danger Underestimated," published in the AOPA Pilot of July 1970.

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

[From the AOPA Pilot, July 1970]

VORTEX DANGER UNDERESTIMATED

(By Lew Townsend)

Wake turbulence, one of the most unwelcome hazards for pilots, to say nothing of their passengers, has been vastly underrated in the past, according to details recently released on a Federal test program involving the B-747 and other "heavy generators." The detailed findings require an updated list of pilot recommendations for dealing with the phenomenon.

Emphasizing the importance are new assessments by FAA, based on the test program, that general aviation aircraft can encounter up to a 75° forced roll rate when penetrating, within three miles or less, the wingtip vortices created by the B-747 and other aircraft grossing over 500,000 pounds.

"This fact is very important to the lighter aircraft, from an engineering view," said FAA's William M. Flener, director, Air Traffic Service. It is important, he said, "because, with the structural capability of the aircraft to stand that type of aileron or roll rate, some aircraft just cannot stand up structurally."

"In other words, what we're saying is, under certain circumstances, a light aircraft would break up structurally."

The wingtip vortices, or wake turbulence, of the B-747s and other large jets are capable of throwing out of control practically all general aviation aircraft, and the bulk of aircraft in the current airline fleet, it was related. Concern over airline aircraft extends up to and includes at least the 90-passenger DC-9 jetliner.

Flener, along with James F. Rudolph, FAA director, Flight Standards Service, provided the FAA's new assessment of wake-turbulence dangers. They revealed that the testing program uncovered some major erroneous beliefs about wake-turbulence characteristics.

One of three major findings was that the wind velocities within the wingtip vortices created by the B-747 and certain other large jets are far greater than FAA officials had anticipated they would be, or had been given credence to that they could be.

They also surfaced the fact that, contrary to long-held beliefs, the wingtip vortices of the big jets *do not dissipate* when they are formed in the higher altitudes around 30,000 feet, where most airliners normally cruise during their en route stages between large airport terminals. The wingtip vortices in the higher altitudes remain intact, complete with their compact balls of high-velocity winds churning in circular fashion.

If they could be seen, which they cannot, unless the jets are giving off an inordinate amount of engine smoke or are kicking up dust near the ground, the wingtip vortices might be likened to huge replicas of ancient reading scrolls. The rolled up portions at either end of the scrolls are the two wingtip vortices.

The third major finding, and also completely opposite from what FAA engineers earlier believed, was that the wingtip vortices do not descend downward ad infinitum. After they take shape aft of the tail, they descend in their scroll-like formation at a rate of about 450-500 f.p.m., as previously thought, but *they then level off somewhere between 700 and 900 feet below the flight path of the generating aircraft*.

Stating that the vortices are 50 to 65 feet in diameter, Rudolph reported, "It does start breaking up in certain atmospheric conditions . . . but, in essence, this vortex does not continue to descend on down ad infinitum as the earlier [research] papers indicated.

"And, in the lower altitudes, in the lower atmosphere below 5,000 feet a.g.l., it does in fact start to break up. The environmental conditions working on it break it up. In the higher altitudes, however, this breaking up does not necessarily take place. But in the higher altitudes where it does not break up at all, we're talking about 30,000 feet."

Though stating wingtip vortices do begin dissipating below 5,000 feet a.g.l., there was no specific information on how long it takes for the "breaking up" process at these altitudes, nor how complete the dissipation is. There also was no specific word on the breaking-up characteristics of wingtip vortices generated by the big jets between 5,000 and 30,000 feet. The testing program was in two parts, with the first phase completed in

February [April PILOT, page 34]. It was indicated the missing information would be sought in the final phase of the testing program, with results made public possibly in August.

Results of the first-phase testing, according to FAA, confirmed that wingtip vortices begin taking shape off the wingtips. As the wings plow through the air, wakes of disrupted air spill off the wingtips and create progressively growing wakes, much like the wakes created by the bow of a boat in motion.

Air wakes, however, drift back and toward the aft of the tail, fall in-trail behind the generating aircraft, and join together to produce two large and separate air masses of high-velocity winds, the wingtip vortices. Completely the reverse of what was earlier believed, FAA said the two vortices remain linked together by air currents and do not spread farther and farther apart behind the generating aircraft, as do the wakes behind a boat. The distance between the two swirling air masses of the B-747 is about 200 feet, FAA said.

Though failing to provide any estimates of the wind velocities within the vortices at the higher altitudes, FAA did give estimates of those created by various types of large aircraft when they are flying as slow as 150 knots at sea level in a maximum takeoff configuration. It earlier had been determined that the intensity—wind velocities—of the big jets' wingtip vortices is greatest when the aircraft are flying comparatively slow and during the landing and takeoff phases.

The calculated "vortex strength" of various airline aircraft ranged from 2,355 feet per second, for the 98,000-pound British Aircraft Corporation 111 (BAC-111), to 7,700 feet per second for the 710,000-pound Boeing 747. A chart accompanies this article, listing the calculated vortex strengths for all major types of airline aircraft. It also includes the calculated vortex strength for the still-to-fly Boeing SST, a supersonic aircraft that has been under fire in Congress over FAA's role and that of the Government in financing its development and manufacture.

According to FAA, the Boeing SST will create wingtip vortices having wind velocities on the order of 11,200 feet per second, about 1½ times that of the B-747, and nearly three times that of the 302,000-pound Boeing 707-300, an aircraft now in wide use.

The potentially increased dangers to other aircraft operations from the SST wake turbulence can readily be seen by the fact that the B-707-300 itself, as well as some other existing aircraft, already unleashes vortices capable of literally knocking a large number of today's smaller aircraft right out of the skies.

The B-747 and the coming SST, however, are only two of an especially troublesome trio of Boeing aircraft, where wake turbulence is concerned, it was learned. The third aircraft drawing FAA's attention is the B-727. Like the B-707-300, the B-727 currently is used extensively by a host of airlines. The B-727 is unique in that it sports tail-mounted engines, as opposed to the more conventional wing-mounted engines.

FAA officials said the wake-turbulence tests showed that the B-727's wingtip vortices are disproportionately greater in intensity than those spawned by comparably sized large jets. "For some unknown reason," said FAA, "that airplane develops a very high vortex. And we guess it's the tail-mounted engines. But we don't know why."

Flener reported the FAA was not considering the establishment of special restrictions on those aircraft creating the largest safety hazards to other aircraft operations. Rather than confine and limit such aircraft operations, the FAA indicated that if the big jets' wake turbulence caused problems, the agency

would restrict and/or eliminate operations of those aircraft the big jets endanger.

Such an approach was viewed as deviating from past governmental practices in almost all fields of endeavor, where curbs and restraints are placed on known dangerous persons and activities to guard the general public from unnecessary harm.

Flener strongly indicated that at some point in the future the FAA would attempt to publicly embark on a program of "splitting out" and prohibiting certain aircraft from using airports and airspace now used or planned for use by the big jets. The "splitting out" process probably would be based on a still undefined program of "aircraft compatibility," it was said.

In connection with such a program, and likely the yardstick for bringing about such a radical change within the air transportation system, is a new formula FAA said it developed from the tests for determining capability of aircraft to withstand wake turbulence. Without delving too deeply into the formula, it can be said that the formula has led FAA officials to believe that the larger the wingspan of an aircraft, the greater its ability to cope with the high-velocity winds with the vortices created by the "heavy generators." Currently, heavy generators are designated as those having a gross takeoff weight of 300,000 pounds or more.

Though the final portion of the wake-turbulence tests had not been completed at the time of FAA's recent reassessment, Flener and Rudolph left little doubt that previously established five-mile separation standards between "heavy generators" and general aviation aircraft would soon be increased to at least seven miles. Changes in flight rules to accommodate the B-747 were detailed in an April *Pilot* article entitled "B-747 Turbulence Represents Danger."

In presenting the reassessment, Flener said, "One of the things that we feel we honestly must do, and do as thoroughly as we can, is get the word to everybody, particularly the general aviation pilot . . . The 'name of the game,' as far as the pilot is concerned, is just 'use more caution than you have used in the past,' because this bird [B-747] develops something much stronger than anything we've encountered before—this bird and some others."

Rudolph, who described most of the details of the testing program, as well as provided new tips for pilots, said, "The en route is not the problem. The problem is in the final approach and in the whole traffic area." He, like Flener, contended that though the vortices are now known to remain completely intact and in scroll-like formation at high altitudes, the odds were minimal that another aircraft would hit them in the en route stages.

Regarding the airport terminal area, and specifically the final approach, Rudolph reported, "The vortex does descend from the airplane [and contact the ground] and it does roll out. In a no-wind condition, the vortex from the right wingtip rolls outward to the right, and the left vortex rolls outward to the left. It rolls out at about five knots."

"Now, what happens when you put a crosswind on it? Well, they [earlier researchers] predicted for us what would happen. And it happens just that way, so we still have problems with parallel runways that are close together, such as those at Los Angeles and San Francisco [LAX and SFO]. With a slight crosswind, this vortex will actually move right out and across the parallel runway where another aircraft may be landing or taking off adjacent to and close to the heavy generating aircraft [on the main runway]. There is a point where this crosswind will get above 15 knots—and I wish we knew exactly what this is, but we have not been

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

able to find out yet—where above 15 knots, and in that area, the vortex is destroyed and no longer becomes a concern to us.

"Visualize vortices 50 to 65 feet in diameter, very tight vortices that have velocities in them of 140 feet per second—*tangential* velocities, that is—and put a small airplane in it. If he gets into it, he'll get thrown out of it. And he won't stay in it at three miles. If he gets into it, he'll get thrown out the way he drifted into it."

Continuing, Rudolph related, "The final approach to the airport is a point of concern to us . . . If you were to fly in a no-wind condition, or if you were to fly with a slight headwind condition and you stayed right on this airplane's [big jet's] flightpath, or right on the glideslope if you're shooting the glideslope, you might in fact encounter no vortex.

"If you had a slight tailwind, or quartering tailwind, the vortex could be blown above the airplane's flightpath," he noted, then, emphasizing his first three words carefully, added, "Boeing tells us, from their limited testing program, that someplace around 70 feet [when jet is 70 feet a.g.l.], on approach or takeoff, we need not concern ourselves with it because the vortex is no longer wrapped up tight—it is very loose."

"We do not necessarily disagree or agree with them," Rudolph said of Boeing's evaluations. "The vortices do settle behind the airplane [unless blown above the flightpath by tailwind or quartering tailwind—Ed.], they do draw together to about a quarter to a half a span [wingspan], and they do sit there on the ground. And, in a still-wind condition, they have been measured to sit in there for 160 seconds."

Flener said that VFR pilots are on their own in assuring avoidance of the invisible wingtip vortices, and that FAA's air traffic controllers would play only a minimal role in aiding pilots in the terminal area. In many of our big airports today," he said, "the tower is way to hell and gone at the far end. We have to place the dependence upon the pilot, particularly the general aviation pilot, to be aware and understand what this [wake turbulence] is. The controller is not in a position to make a determination, hour after hour, aircraft after aircraft, as to what he [the pilot] should or should not do."

Controllers have been instructed to provide position reports on the "heavy generators" to VFR pilots in radio contact, Flener said. Limited frequencies and controller personnel, of course, preclude the possibility that every aircraft can be in radio contact with controllers at all times and thereby be constantly advised as to the location of the big jets and their dangerous wake turbulence.

Asked whether controller assistance was worded in FAA instructions as they "shall" provide position reports on the big jets, or whether they "can" provide it on a workload-permitting basis, Flener said, "They shall."

"Remember," he added, "we're talking VFR. When we're talking instrument conditions and radar separation, the responsibility is the controller's. But, you see, under VFR the pilot is on his own as far as his separation. He makes his own determination as to how far back he should be. We're still placing the responsibility on the pilot, as far as that VFR pilot is concerned. We can't do anything else. There are too many of them, and there's such a volume of traffic at some of these locations. We spoonfeed a great deal of the system as it is today, and we're trying to place the responsibility where it belongs."

In the way of a quickie recommendation on wake turbulence, Flener offered, "Land high and long. Take off quick and climb high." The main thing for VFR pilots to learn, it was pointed out, is that they now

should maintain a greater distance between themselves and the "heavy generators" than they have in the past.

Following are comments offered by Rudolph that were interpreted as updated recommendations for pilots, general aviation pilots in particular, for coping with airborne wake turbulence:

FLIGHT AT LOWER ALTITUDES

"As far as the general aviation man is concerned, if he's in the lower altitudes and he encounters one of these heavy generators, I would not want him to fly underneath it at a couple of hundred feet, or even two, three, four, or five hundred feet. I want him to evade it. I don't want him to be flying under the flightpath of the big generator."

SINGLE RUNWAY OPERATIONS

"The worst condition will be with a quartering crosswind of about five knots from either side. These vortices come down and [in a no-wind condition] spread outward at about a five-knot progression. You put a five-knot wind on either of them [wingtip vortices]—it almost cancels its movement out and it will blow right upon that runway and will lie up there. It takes someplace up to 160 seconds for it to clear out."

INTERSECTION TAKEOFFS

"If the heavy generator is taking off and it goes through the intersection without rotation—the nosewheel is still on the ground—there is no vortex, because vortex is only generated when you put lift on the wings. If he goes through the intersection and rotates further down the runway, the only thing you have to concern yourself with is the jet blast of the engines [see chart on these pages]. If he [big jet] rotates before reaching that intersection, it will take at least 160 seconds to clear out of there."

STANDARD TAKEOFFS AND LANDINGS

"On landing, as long as the pilot stays above, or at least on, the generating aircraft's flightpath—in a no-wind condition—he can follow the same flightpath. He shouldn't land below it, because if he does, he's going to have one whale of a ride, if he doesn't have an accident. In the takeoff phase, the best procedures here have been printed in the AIM, and if these disciplines are not maintained, we're in trouble."

The FAA officials reiterated that the big jets' heaviest wakes are generated when they are in a clean, or near-clean, configuration, such as with maximum takeoff weight, takeoff flaps, and full power. Flener stressed that the direction of the wind should now mean more to the average pilot, based on the new wake-turbulence information revealed by the recent tests.

"That wind means more to him now than it did before, because it means that vortices are moving one way or the other," Flener said, referring primarily to takeoff and landing operations. He said good takeoff procedures behind heavy wake generators include a wheels-up position prior to the point where the preceding heavy jet rotated. "Plus, if he's got a good strong wind, move over to the side of the runway that's pertinent [upwind] and take off that way. The same on landing. If he knows that he's got a crosswind and this aircraft lands ahead of him, then move over the edge of the runway in lining up. Get over to that side of the centerline where the vortices are going the other way."

Asked about the crosswind effect aloft, Rudolph replied, "The crosswind aloft moves the vortex if it's in the higher elevations where the environmental conditions—the temperatures of the ground—are not affecting it. [Earlier FAA statements indicated the "higher altitudes" referred to here are those above 5,000 feet a.g.l.—Ed.] The velocity of the wind at 30,000 feet takes the whole

July 27, 1970

system and just moves it out. It literally stays information behind the generator until the wind floats it out of the way. And the farther it floats, the better we like it."

On possible FAA recommendations to manufacturers to beef up aircraft structures to withstand the intense winds in the vortices and the resulting excessive roll rates, Rudolph said, "Structural strength doesn't have anything to do with it, basically, because you're talking about wingspan [as being the key factor in being able to withstand the vortices]. You're going to lose control of the airplane if you get tied into one of these things real close-in," he warned general aviation pilots.

Rudolph also provided a description of what happens when two separate sets of wingtip vortices are created by jets making successive takeoffs or landings. "The two vortices don't combine to produce one vortex system of greater intensity," he said. "In fact, if one is stacked on top of the other, the more the better, because the heat and tension from the second one destroys the original one."

"They are humping this thing, remember [full throttle on takeoff], and the vortex starts descending immediately upon leaving the wings, at its rate of about 450 f.p.m. [descent rate varies slightly, based on aircraft weight], and this vortex system will never be found on the generating aircraft's flight-path. So, you can clear lightplanes one right out on top of the other, and those vortices from the heavy generators, lying on top of each other, are just fine with us. They tear each other up."

Fleener said the FAA planned to update wake-turbulence information in the AIM to reflect the new knowledge about wingtip-vortex behavior and other details learned from the recent tests involving the B-747 and other aircraft. He helped stress the new importance that should be given this aspect of safe flight operations by announcing that FAA also planned to add specific questions relating to wake turbulence in future tests for receiving pilot certificates.

VORTEX STRENGTHS¹ (150 KNOTS IAS AT SEA LEVEL²)

Aircraft	Gross takeoff weight	Wingspan	Vortex strength (in feet per second)
BAC 111	98,000	88 feet	2,355
B-737	107,000	93 feet	2,433
DC-9-30	108,000	93 feet 3 inches	2,500
Trident	143,000	98 feet	3,086
CV-880	184,000	120 feet	3,243
B-727	169,000	108 feet	3,309
B-720	213,000	130 feet 10 inches	3,439
B-720B	230,000	do	3,705
B-707-100	247,000	do	3,988
B-707-100B	258,000	do	4,165
C141	316,000	159 feet	4,203
CV-990	246,000	120 feet	4,335
B-707-300	302,000	145 feet 9 inches	4,375
DC-8-61	325,000	148 feet 5 inches	4,644
DC-8-30	314,000	142 feet 5 inches	4,677
B-707-300-B/C	323,500	145 feet 9 inches	4,759
DC-8-62	335,000	148 feet 5 inches	4,771
VC 10	335,000	146 feet	4,853
DC-8-63	355,000	148 feet 5 inches	5,056
B-52	488,000	185 feet	5,580
L-1011	409,000	155 feet	5,581
DC-10	410,000	do	5,595
C5A	764,000	222 feet	7,260
B-747	710,000	195 feet	7,700
Concorde	385,000	84 feet	9,650
B-2707 (SST)	750,000	141 feet 10 inches	11,200
B-70	530,000	105 feet	10,675

¹ Source: FAA.

² Despite calculated figure for B-727, FAA officials said "for some unknown reason" this aircraft develops wingtip vortices having higher wind velocities than comparably sized jetliners. No estimates other than that shown here were provided.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

A YOUNG BOY COMBATS POLLUTION

HON. JACK H. McDONALD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. McDONALD of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I have just forwarded to the Treasury of the United States the sum of 48 cents in the form of a quarter, two dimes, and three pennies. The money, Mr. Speaker, came from Clayton Edmonds, a young Walled Lake, Mich., boy who wanted me to spend it to combat pollution. He collected the money in a door-to-door campaign in which he claimed he was unsuccessful. He wrote:

I didn't do so good. I got 48 cents from three houses out of five and am sending it to you to help stop pollution.

But Clayton's interest did not stop at collecting money for a cause in which he had faith. He said he went around, and I quote:

Picking up garbage and other stuff.

It is this sort of personal commitment, and only this sort of commitment which will make any attempts against pollution meaningful. The Congress can legislate against pollution by major industry; the Congress can legislate against pollution by municipalities; the Congress can even legislate against individual pollution. But until each of us accepts the responsibility for his own actions, pollution will not end. Clayton, at his young age, has already shown his willingness to shoulder this responsibility. But how many other Claytons are there in this Nation? Millions? Thousands? Or only hundreds? Who among us has not witnessed the effects of litter and garbage on our city's streets? Our Nation's highways? Who is it that litters the landscape thusly? Everyone denies guilt, yet everyone must share in the blame. Water is in critical supply in many areas of this country. Yet those who most vigorously tout the cause of pollution will not part with the many creature comforts which use copious amounts of that precious liquid.

Electricity is another item which is in short supply. And again many save-our-environment elocutionists list their grievances against the polluters in air-conditioned comfort, refusing to yield a modicum of comfort to reduce the demand for electric power.

I present this young boy's letter to be reprinted in today's RECORD. There are other Clayton Edmonds, I know. But by inserting his poignant letter in the RECORD, my colleague and many others will have the opportunity to see for themselves this eloquent plea for our environment.

In addition to this action, I have forwarded a letter to the President asking that he establish and help promote a national environmental campaign giving the same emphasis to it that is given to the Easter Seal, March of Dimes, and other national campaigns. Each year a poster child is selected who most typifies the problem identified with

each particular drive. I propose that the environmental campaign use Clayton Edmonds as its poster child the first year.

Clayton Edmonds is not just a Walled Lake boy. He is the Johnny Appleseed of environment. I would hope that Clayton's 48 cents be considered seed, and grow into a nationwide, personal commitment against pollution.

Clayton's letter follows:

JULY 7, 1970.

DEAR MR. McDONALD: My name is Clayton Edmonds. I live in Walled Lake.

On Earth Day, 1970 we went around picking up garbage and other stuff.

And after that I went around collecting money, I didn't do so good. I got forty 8 cents from three houses out of five and I am sending it to help stop pollution.

LOSS OF HOWARD HEIMBACH

HON. JAMES G. FULTON

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. FULTON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, in the loss of Howard Heimbach, we in Pittsburgh have lost a warm-hearted leader with a friendly and human approach toward everybody. Howard Heimbach made friends easily and had the fine characteristic of being a top level Pittsburgh executive with many loyal friends and the ability to give much in time and energy on outside projects and the welfare of our people.

Howard Heimbach was vice president and executive assistant to the president of Rockwell Manufacturing Co. He previously held positions with the company as vice president, headquarters personnel, and administrative vice president. Howard and his wife, Dorothea, lived at 926½ South Aiken Avenue, Shadyside.

He is survived by his wife, Dorothea; and a daughter, Mrs. Norman C. Logan (Ada) of Wilmington, Del.; three grandchildren; and two brothers, Dr. Alvin Heimbach of Altoona, Pa., and William Heimbach of Washington, D.C.

Howard was president and director of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh in 1969, a director of the Pennsylvania State Chamber of Commerce and a director of the Better Business Bureau of Greater Pittsburgh, Inc., the Hospital Planning Association of Allegheny County, a director of the Pittsburgh Urban Transit Council, and a director and vice chairman of the Allegheny Housing Rehabilitation Corp. He served on the Antitrust and Trade Regulation Committee and was recently appointed to the Government Operations and Expenditures Committee of the National Chamber of Commerce.

Mr. Heimbach was a member of the Pennsylvania Governor's Commission on Charitable Organization, the State Advisory Board for the Neighborhood Assistance Program, the Advisory Committee of Pittsburgh Labor and Industry, and the Advisory Committee of Pittsburgh Home Rule Charter.

He also was a member of the World Affairs Council of Pittsburgh, the American Management Association, the Na-

tional Industrial Conference Board, the American Ordnance Association, the Harvard Business School Association, the Dartmouth Alumni Association, the Masonic Order and the Pennsylvania Society.

Prior to joining Rockwell in 1960, he headed his own industrial relations consulting service. He was formerly vice president of industrial relations at the National Electric Products Corp. in Pittsburgh and personnel relations manager of Kaufmann's Department Store, Pittsburgh.

From 1946 to 1948 Heimbach was assistant director of personnel relations for the General Cable Corporation, New York. As a commissioned officer of the U.S. Navy he headed the employee relations branch of the Office of Industrial Relations, Navy Department, Washington, D.C., from 1944 to 1946. He was also employed as labor relations manager for the Dravo Corp., in Wilmington, Del.

After graduating from Dartmouth College in 1930, he attended the Harvard Business School. He acquired specialized training at Columbia University, Bureau of Personnel Administration and the American Management Association.

He was a member of the Duquesne Club and the Longue Vue Club, both in Pittsburgh; and the Capitol Hill Club in Washington, D.C.

I am enclosing for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the excellent statement on Howard Heimbach from the Dartmouth College 40th year report:

DARTMOUTH COLLEGE

HOWARD ANDERS HEIMBACH

Vice President and Executive Assistant to the President, Rockwell Manufacturing Co., 400 North Lexington Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. Residence: 926½ South Aiken Ave., Pittsburgh, Pa. 15232.

Heimie has been with the above firm since 1960, and is involved with personnel, public relations, and long-range planning. He left his job as Director of Personnel with Kaufmann's Department Store in 1956 to become Vice President for Industrial Relations of National Electric Products Co. From 1959 to 1960 he was self-employed as an industrial relations consultant.

Heimie has been a director, vice president, and president (1969) of the Chamber of Commerce of Greater Pittsburgh, as well as a director of the Pennsylvania Chamber of Commerce, the Allegheny Rehabilitation Corporation, the Better Business Bureau of Greater Pittsburgh, the Hospital Planning Association of Allegheny County, A Modern Constitution for Pennsylvania, Inc., and the Southern States Industrial Council. He is also a member of the Pennsylvania Governor's Commission on Charitable Organizations, the Advisory Board of the Neighborhood Assistance Program (under the Community Affairs Department), and the Advisory Committees for Pittsburgh Home Rule Charter and for Allegheny County, Pennsylvania Department of Labor and Industry. He serves on the Antitrust and Trade Regulation Committee of the National Chamber of Commerce.

Heimie published "Responsibility for Change" in *The Iron Age* in 1963 and "Central Staff Coordination in a Decentralized Company" in *Atlanta Economic Review* in 1964.

On August 27, 1934 he married Dorothea Guja (Pratt Institute) of Brooklyn. They have a daughter, Ada (Connecticut College), who is Mrs. Norman Logan, and three grandchildren.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

THE 18-YEAR-OLD VOTE

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, during my campaign for election to Congress, I pledged to reflect the views of the citizens of New Mexico—and further, when I took the oath of office, I swore to support and defend the Constitution. Now from this base, let us take a look at the issue of the 18-year-old vote.

I have always said that I would vote to submit to the several States a constitutional amendment fixing the voting age at 18. Recent campus riots have not changed my mind because I would not penalize the vast majority for the transgressions of a small minority. However, I am opposed to a simple Federal statute. I am opposed for two reasons. First, I consider such a statute unconstitutional. Second, even if constitutional, such a statute, as distinguished from a constitutional amendment, is unwise.

Article 1, section 2, provides that those voting for Federal officers—representatives—"shall have the qualifications requisite" for those who are eligible to vote for members of "the most numerous branch of the state legislature."

The 17th amendment contains the same language as it applies to those voting for U.S. Senators.

Implicit in that language is the acknowledgment that States are authorized to fix voter qualifications in both State and Federal elections. There is no language in the Constitution or the amendments to the Constitution which says otherwise. Indeed, three of those amendments (the 15th, 19th, and 24th) which deal with voter qualification in all elections (race, sex, and the poll tax) acknowledge that the power to fix voter qualifications cannot be taken from the States except by constitutional change.

Notwithstanding what appears to have been the clear intent of the authors of the Constitution, some argue that Congress can fix voter qualifications by simple statute. Here is the substance of that argument:

The equal protection clause of the 14th amendment prohibits any State law whose purpose is discrimination. Under the 1966 Supreme Court decision in *Katzenbach v. Morgan*, the 14th amendment prohibits any State law whose effect Congress finds discriminatory, even when the purpose was non-discriminatory. And under section 5 of the 14th amendment, Congress has the power, when it makes a finding that the effect of State laws is discriminatory, to adopt "appropriate legislation" to cure the effect.

Thus, it is argued that if Congress makes a finding that 21-year-old voter laws passed by the States have the effect of discriminating against 18-year-old citizens, Congress has the power to adopt a statute fixing the voting age at 18 in all elections, Federal and State.

So the argument goes with respect to literacy tests, such an argument may be plausible. Congress can reasonably make a finding that the effect—if not the purpose—of such testing is discrimination.

Unequal educational facilities may deny some citizens an equal opportunity to become literate and therefore voter tests based on literacy could be said to have the effect of offending the equal protection clause of the 14th amendment.

The same is true with respect to residency requirements in presidential elections. Congress can reasonably make a finding that the effect of State residency laws is discrimination against new residents who, because they have moved from one State to another in the months preceding a presidential election, have lost their vote under the laws of the State from which they moved.

Although I am conversant with the arguments to the contrary, it is difficult to see how Congress can reasonably make a finding that 21-year-old voter laws have either the purpose or effect of discrimination. An arbitrary age line must be drawn somewhere, and how can it be argued that whatever age a State chooses is more discriminatory than any other? Everyone has an equal opportunity to attain the age of 21. Indeed, to make a finding that denial of the franchise to those under 21 has the effect of discrimination would be to violate the norm set by the 14th amendment itself. In section 2, the 14th amendment mandates a loss of representation in the U.S. House of Representatives in the same ratio as the State denies the right to vote to persons over the age of 21.

Even if Congress has the constitutional power to lower the voting age by simple statute—which I dispute—this does not mean that it is wise for Congress to exercise that power. It is, I believe, unwise for three reasons:

First, it is unwise because it would cast a cloud of uncertainty over the 1971 elections. Even if the Court tests could be concluded and a judgment of constitutionality rendered before January, it might come too late for voter applicants in voter registration periods preceding elections scheduled early in 1971. All elections, primary and general, legislative and municipal and even popular referendums are covered by the proposed statute. Even if the new age requirement could be timely applied to all elections, if it should be ignored, either willfully or innocently by some voting registrar in some remote precinct, and if the result of the election might have been thereby affected, there could be chaos. If the election were a bond referendum, no lawyer could safely certify the bond issue.

Second, a Federal statute is unwise because it would tend to erode the federal system. In the last 5 years, 20 States have rejected propositions to lower the voting age, one of them twice. Last year, the citizens of New Mexico voted down a new constitution that would have permitted lowering the voting age. On my 1969 annual legislative questionnaire poll on this matter, the citizens voted 2 to 1 against this provision. This year 15 States have the proposition on their ballots. For the sake of the federal system, is it wise for the Congress, even if it has the raw power to do so, to veto the will of half of the States?

Third, a Federal statute with a built-in constitutionality court test is unwise because it confronts the Supreme Court

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 27, 1970

with an impossible dilemma. If it sustains the statute, the Court will be accused of amending the Constitution by judicial fiat. If it declares the statute unconstitutional, the Court will be blamed for frustrating the expectations of 11 million young Americans between the ages of 18 and 21.

It is, I repeat, unwise to expose the Court to such needless abuse. It is unwise to encourage and then perhaps disappoint the young men and women of our country at a time when they are already concerned about the broader gap between promise and performance.

The wise course, the safe course, the unchallengeable course, the tried-and-true course, is to amend the Constitution in the manner which the charter itself provides.

SUNSHINE IS THE BEST
DISINFECTANT

HON. FRANK J. BRASCO

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. BRASCO. Mr. Speaker, ours is an open society. It is a pluralistic society. Its strength lies in its institutions. Those institutions remain viable only as long as the majority of our citizens retain a meaningful belief in them. As long as Americans feel that their institutions are responsive to the wishes of the people, we shall endure and prevail.

Everyone will admit freely that today there is a crisis in our institutions and the faith people have in them. No institution is more basic than the Congress—in this case the House of Representatives, which we have the privilege of being a part of.

Over the past year or so, the Nation has been awakened to the fact that in more than one way the House—this House—our institution—has been less than responsive to the requirements of modern times.

The Nation has read one article after the other on how this institution is lacking. One of the most pertinent and irrefutable accusations has to do with the fact that the House operates with too great an emphasis on secrecy, with too great an imbalance of power and too little attention paid to the wishes of the majority of its Members. In effect, this House of the people has been operating all too often in an undemocratic manner.

We cannot pretend to stand for pluralistic democracy for the Nation if we daily deny the democratic process in our deliberations and procedures. This is what is going on each day, nonetheless. It is folly to deny the need for reform. We only add fuel to the fires already being set by reactionaries of every stripe who have a vested interest in the failure of democracy. They anticipate reaction, claiming our lack of response as reason enough for seeking the overthrow of the society we are all a part of. Reform on our part in response to a proven need is to cut short the fuse of rebellion, to cut short those who seek the defeat of democracy.

Such reform can only be accomplished through existing institutions; it can only be accomplished through reform of them, beginning with the rules and procedures of the House of Representatives. We must let the people and their news media see what is transpiring here in their name, rather than shut them out in the name of fear of breach of security. This is their House, and they have a right to know what is happening here.

I believe that every vote that is meaningful must be recorded so the people will know how their elected representatives voted. Recorded teller votes are an essential reform. There is no excuse in the world why any Member of this body should be afraid of allowing his constituents to know how he voted. I favor the recorded teller vote.

The 3-day conference report layover is another essential reform. Often the conference between House and Senate results in a measure that is considerably different from the version we pass. Often the conferees disregard their instructions, even refusing by their makeup or decisions to reflect the wishes of the majority of this body. It is imperative that this body have a chance to study conference reports rather than be required to vote on them immediately.

Open committee sessions are not even negotiable as far as I am concerned. More than 40 percent of all committee sessions of the House are now closed to the public. It is also true that this trend is accelerating . . . fewer sessions of committees, where the really meaningful business of the Congress is transacted, are open to the public. This is, in effect, a denial of the democratic process, rather than an affirmation.

Disclosure of record votes in committees is another laudable effort to let the people know what is going on in their name within the committee structure. Often the people at large have no knowledge of what is happening. When other Members of this body return home, they are asked how such a thing could have occurred . . . how such a bill passed. We are often at a loss as to a reply. It is imperative that other Members of this body be informed of what committees decide and how they arrive at these decisions. For these reasons alone, disclosure of record votes within the confines of committees is essential.

This House is often a cumbersome thing. Its size does not allow for too many lengthy debates. It is often necessary for us to pass legislation swiftly in the interests of time. Nevertheless, there must be greater time for debate on motions to recommit. Too many times the wishes of the majority of Members and the people they represent have been closed off because of the limit on debate in such cases.

The last reform is elementary participatory democracy . . . guaranteed debate time on amendments. To close off debate is to negate the entire democratic process. To close off bills from amendment and discussion, as has often been the case in this body, is to deliberately enrage significant segments of the public. There is often good reason for the cries of outrage vented by many Ameri-

can citizens. When we do not reflect their wishes . . . even in the discussion and amending process . . . we are courting destructive dissent rather than constructive amendment and compromise.

Mr. Speaker, this House really should have little to hide from the people. The national security argument has been worked to death. Recently, an article in the *Wall Street Journal* by Dr. Edward Teller, no raving liberal, attacks secrecy for its own sake. We defeat our own purposes by being overly secretive.

By closing the House of the people to those very same people, we only alienate growing segments of society, stifle the democratic process and undermine the foundations of the institution and Nation we all love so deeply. If we do not take the initiative in instituting reform, we merely reaffirm the worst that has been stated about the lack of progressivism in the Congress. We add strength to the arguments of the radical revolutionaries among us. We contribute to the erosion of this House and its role.

History's pendulum swings in inexorable, wide arcs. Power swings away from the legislative branch to the executive, and then back again. Strong Presidents take power to themselves at the expense of the Congress. Weak ones lose it back to assertive Congresses.

In recent years, the legislative branch, particularly the House, has been watching helplessly as its power has drained away to the executive branch. However, by concentrating power in the House, we take it away from the broad number of Members. In effect, the mass of the House becomes less responsive because of the inner concentration of ability to act and respond.

We end up by becoming weaker as a body—as a branch of Government. We become less able to counterbalance the executive branch because we make ourselves weaker. Only by willing, internal reform can we reverse the trend—make the House stronger through greater diffusion of power to individual Members. If we make each Member stronger through fairer distribution of initiatives, we allow Members to reflect the wishes of their constituents. There is a great spread of pressure upon the House, and a broader expression of the wishes of the people of this country.

If we do not reflect the will of the people, which calls out for reform, we condemn ourselves and this institution to worse than failure—we pronounce it—and ourselves by inference irrelevant.

REPEATING McCARTHYISM

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, the *Washington Star* on Saturday night carried a letter to the editor that defined the term "McCarthyism." I believe it needs repeating in the light of some of the smears being leveled against President Nixon these days:

McCarthyism: a tired cliche of the radical left; Pavlovian in its origin; evil in its purpose; slanderous in its implications and intentions, but meaningless except as an instrument of deliberate smear and vilification as accepted by the empty minds for whom it is intended.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks we have seen a resurgence of this kind of McCarthyism in the area of racism that does full justice to that definition. I refer to attempts by a few Democrats to tar President Nixon with the brush of prejudice, of racism, and of indifference in the matter of equal rights and equal opportunities for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, a check of the record easily proves the falseness of those charges, leveled by some, both inside and outside of the Congress. But then those who indulge in McCarthyism of either the left or the right have little regard for the truth or for the reputations and sensitivities of those they malign or for the damage they can do.

DICKEY-LINCOLN NEEDED

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that officials of New York's Consolidated Edison Co. would welcome at this time the presence of the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric power project.

The recent failure and shutdown of New York's largest power generator, the million-kilowatt "Big Allis," coupled with other recent large-scale electric utility failures, has proven once again the need for the kind of reserve power that Federal hydroelectric facilities such as Dickey can provide.

Consumers of electricity in New York and the Northeast again face the threat of power shortages, inconveniences, and the danger to property and life which would accompany a massive blackout.

The Ravenswood failure all but eliminates Con-Ed's reserve capacity, and another breakdown or a heat wave could place New York and several neighboring States in an emergency situation.

What will it take in the way of such emergencies before Congress begins a needed all-out effort starting with construction of the Dickey project, to fill the obvious power gap in the Northeast? The need for doing so is so great and its emergency nature so obvious that the major private power producers and other former detractors of hydroelectric plants must be beginning to see the light.

The current crisis demands swift and immediate congressional attention and action. Many rely on nuclear power as a solution. In numerous statements to the RECORD, I have revealed the dubious character of this solution. In its stead I have advocated hydroelectric plants as a more viable solution.

I was greatly disappointed by the House's refusal to include the \$807,000 for the Dickey-Lincoln hydroelectric project preconstruction funds in the public works bill for fiscal 1971. I am confident,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

however, that the Senate Appropriations Committee will reinsert these funds and that this action will receive full Senate approval. After conference, the matter will come back to the House for another vote.

In a recent statement to the RECORD, I included a July 13 Newsweek article warning of Consolidated Edison's inadequate power facilities as well as the ever-increasing possibility of mechanical breakdown. A July 23 article in the Washington Post demonstrates the veracity of the Newsweek predictions. In the hope that my colleagues find it both interesting and informative, I am submitting a Washington Post article on the same subject for the RECORD:

FAILURE SHUTS BIGGEST N.Y. GENERATOR

(By Robert K. Warner)

New York's City's largest generator has failed, dealing a second major blow to the city's already overburdened electric power system.

The million-kilowatt "Big Allis" generator at Ravenswood, Queens, was shut down Tuesday night because of an electrical fault in a high-pressure turbine. A smaller 275,000-kilowatt nuclear plant at Indians Point failed in late June, and neither is expected to be working again until September.

A Consolidated Edison Co. spokesman said the Ravenswood failure "all but eliminates" the utility's reserve capacity, which stood at about 13 per cent before the breakdown. The Federal Power Commission recommends a reserve capacity of 20 per cent.

An FPC engineer said New York's power situation "is not yet in an emergency," but he warned, "It doesn't take much at this point to upset the applecart. A heat wave, for instance, could cause serious problems."

Con Ed said that if such an emergency arose it could buy enough electricity from neighboring power pools to meet peak demands.

Last March, however, before the current breakdowns, Con Ed had warned that "A prolonged hot spell and unusual mechanical difficulties this year could require power conservation methods," such as small decreases in voltage or short blackouts in different areas of the city.

The failure of the Ravenswood generator, which accounts by itself for more than 10 per cent of Con Ed's capacity—cuts the utility's remaining installed capacity to about 7.5 million kilowatts, 225,000 kilowatts short of estimated peak demand.

Yesterday, New York City's electric demands were about 6,400,000 kilowatts, well within Con Ed's generating capacity. The highest demand so far this summer has been about 7 million kilowatts, the company said.

The utility has buying agreements with a number of electric power pools, in New York State, New England, Canada and the Middle Atlantic States. The Con Ed spokesman said the company has "firm commitments" to buy up to 520,000 kilowatts to supplement its own power.

In a crisis, Con Ed might also buy electricity from adjoining power pools such as Pennsylvania-New Jersey-Maryland Interconnections (PJM), the pool that includes Potomac Electric Power Co.

An official at PJM said the pool could provide as much as 400,000 kilowatts for Con Ed "in an emergency situation, as long as the 12 companies in PJM had adequate reserves."

PJM's reserve capacity now stands at about 8 per cent, after the failure of an 820,000-kilowatt plant in Keystone, Pa., on July 12. "We would not weaken PEPCO or any of our other utilities to get power to New York," the PJM official said. "But I don't know how far we might cut our reserve capacity if there was a serious emergency."

IN THE NATION: NO SALE ON PREVENTIVE DETENTION

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the following article from the New York Times of July 19:

IN THE NATION: NO SALE ON PREVENTIVE DETENTION

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, July 18.—Rarely if ever does a member of Congress or any other politician have to face a clear-cut choice between going down in flames for virtue or going to bed with the devil. Few choices are ever that simple for anyone, and one of the classic examples of recent times is the District of Columbia crime bill now before the Senate.

Not, of course, that anyone elsewhere in the nation cares what happens to the 800,000 voteless, helpless, hapless residents of the District; and the nation's history is replete with instances of the callous indifference of the rest of the country to the plight of those who live in its capital—a large majority of whom are black. The D.C. crime bill is nevertheless important as a sort of blueprint—a dress rehearsal or a pilot program for what the jingoes of law enforcement hope to do to the rest of the nation.

What they hope to do is chilling—preventive detention of those who *might* commit a crime if released on bail; "no-knock" searches and seizures; expanded police wiretapping; a lowering from eighteen to sixteen of the age at which juveniles must be tried as adults; stiff mandatory sentencing provisions. Anyway you look at it, these sections make the D.C. crime bill punitive and raise grave constitutional and libertarian questions.

On the other hand, this massive document—about 400 pages long, leading Senator Edward Kennedy to say that the courts would be "clogged for years unraveling the bill's mysteries and undoing its mischief"—does provide a desperately needed court reform for the District, as well as a public defender system.

THE LINKAGE

The trouble is that the House is attempting to force the acceptance of such measures as preventive detention by coupling them to the generally approved court reform; and Senator Joseph Tydings of Maryland, the bill's Senate sponsor, has warned his colleagues that those who are under the "dangerous illusion" that the House will agree to a simple court-reform measure are "only kidding themselves."

No doubt they are; but Senators can play that game, too. If the House will not accept a court-reform bill devoid of preventive detention and other evils, the Senate has the power to let the whole D.C. crime bill die a well-deserved death. That would be preferable to passing it as it is.

The case of preventive detention alone is enough to justify this contention. If a suspension of the presumption of innocence is allowed to imbed itself in the processes of law enforcement in the District, we are going to be stuck with this dubious doctrine for years to come—because, as Senator Charles Goodell pointed out, "This legislation may well be setting a precedent for the rest of the country." That is precisely what it is doing and the best reason why it ought to be opposed.

In the first place, preventive detention is class legislation, particularly in the District, where its burden will fall with precision on the black people. As the foremost victims of a discriminatory social system the blacks pro-

vide the heft of the street criminals who are most likely to be jailed "preventively."

DIFFICULT TO JUDGE

In the second place, no judge can determine accurately, even in the adversary hearings set up by the D.C. crime bill, who may go out and commit a crime, and who may not. In one limited survey conducted here, of 2,776 persons who came before Federal District Court, 207 or 7.5 percent were charged with committing a new crime while on bail; but only 124 or 4.5 percent were charged with a crime of actual or potential violence. By what means could these 207 or 124 persons have been certainly identified in advance?

In the third place, the courts are already so overcrowded that trials are delayed for years, which is the basic cause of the high rate of recidivism here and elsewhere; and the D.C. crime bill would over-burden courts further with the hearings necessary to impose preventive detention.

In the fourth place, prisons and correctional institutions are physically too jammed to accommodate easily the preventively detained; and so, far from reducing crime, further incarceration of defendants in these squalid institutions, with their inadequate rehabilitation programs and their populations of hardened criminals, homosexual aggressors, and mentally deficient persons, makes new criminals rather than correcting old ones.

In the fifth place, those preventively detained in prison, all of whom will already have been charged with one crime, will be materially damaged in the preparation of a defense against that charge; and in the sixth place, they will thus become pushovers for "plea bargaining"—an arrangement in which defendants plead guilty in return for a shorter prison term. Such bargaining circumvents rather than insures due process, and justice itself.

In the seventh place—although one hesitates to mention it in the current climate of fear and hysteria—preventive detention in all too many cases will wrongfully deny liberty to innocent persons. That fact alone should cause the Senate to tell the House that if preventive detention is the price of a D.C. court reform, it's no sale.

YOUR COUNTY—A NEW TOWN DEVELOPER

HON. THOMAS L. ASHLEY

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. ASHLEY. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Bernard F. Hillenbrand, executive director of the National Association of Counties, recently testified before the Housing Subcommittee on my bill, H.R. 16647, the proposed Urban Growth and New Community Development Act of 1970.

In his testimony, Mr. Hillenbrand discussed the important role that counties would play as developers of new towns if the bill is enacted. He has incorporated much of his noteworthy testimony in a recent editorial for the National Association of Counties newsletter and I commend it to the attention of my colleagues.

The editorial follows:

YOUR COUNTY—A NEW TOWN DEVELOPER
(By Bernard F. Hillenbrand, NACO Executive Director)

Your county can join the wave of the future and become a "New Town" developer. That is, it can if the New Community Development Act of 1970, drafted by a House

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

subcommittee under Congressman Thomas L. Ashley, becomes law.

The legislation is the outgrowth of a two-year Ford Foundation financed study, conducted by the National Association of Counties and our sister organizations, the National League of Cities, the U.S. Conference of Mayors, and several other key groups. NACO Past President James Aldredge represented NACO. In our final report entitled, "New City," we assembled a list of major recommendations for a national urban growth policy and new towns legislation. Most of the proposals have been incorporated in the Ashley legislation (H.R. 16647).

From our point of view, the most important aspect of the legislation is that it would make it possible for the county, as a public body, to sponsor a new town.

COUNTY AS SPONSOR

The idea of counties being a sponsor of new towns was suggested to NACO by James Rouse, the private developer of a new town in Columbia, Maryland, and one of the most knowledgeable individuals of the new towns concept.

Rouse points out that most counties already have the machinery necessary to be an effective new towns sponsor. Among the county's most important facilities is the power of planning and zoning, which were never available to private developers. Control of vital public works and services such as water and sewers, recreational areas, airports and roads, hospitals and schools, etc., are the responsibility of many counties, and are essential ingredients in the development of a new community.

However, the most significant asset of the county is the power of eminent domain which allows for the orderly development of large tracts of land including public utilities. The experience of private developers is that there can be a single individual who refuses to sell his land at more than adequate compensation, and thus endangers the entire plan. Eminent domain, used responsibly by the county, would correct this hold-out situation.

Financial controls are already a part of the county's administrative function; and, as a municipality, it has the power to receive grants and developmental funds and the right to enter into legal contract.

Within the county are policemen, firemen, prosecutors, judges and administrative personnel, all charged with the responsibility of protecting, regulating and controlling functions and services of the county.

The property tax is also a major problem that private developers agree may continue to diminish the possibility of private new town development. It's simply beyond the financial capability of even giant industries to pay property taxes of non-productive land, as it awaits revenue-producing development. This situation would not occur if a public body were the new town sponsor.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

We believe the heart of this legislation is the creation of a National Community Development Corporation (NCDC), within the Department of Housing and Urban Development patterned after a similar mechanism now in operation in New York State. The NCDC would be the triggering mechanism to approve a county as a sponsoring agency. It would work with the county, giving technical assistance and planning grants to develop the overall plan. It would then be a coordinating mechanism to channel public and private loans, grants and community facilities into the area.

KEY PROVISIONS

Of special interest are:

1. payments-in-lieu of taxes to local government during the development period;
2. 75% federal funds for planning;
3. technical assistance resources;
4. New Towns-in-town on vacant public

July 27, 1970

and private land and in "air rights" over public facilities;

5. development of fringe areas suffering from economic depression;
6. public-private cooperation;
7. a national body, the Council on Urban Growth, to develop suggested national urban growth policies;
8. truly balanced communities: at the outset economic, racial and social integration, which if maintained, would never result in racial confrontation;
9. an economic base as the only true base for a new town and an employment potential for every kind of worker; and finally,
10. the maximum participation by small home builders.

NIXON HITS DEMOCRATS' SPENDING AS DIVERSION IN SLOW UPTURN

HON. HALE BOGGS

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks we have enjoyed a continuing and lively dialog in this Chamber on the subject of the Nation's economy.

It is right that we should discuss this subject, for the plight of our economy is a subject of concern to every American citizen. Growing unemployment, skyrocketing interest rates, galloping inflation, combined with increasing signs of economic recession permit few of our people the luxuries of contentment or apathy.

In the interest of enlightening our dialog, I am inserting in the RECORD a column by Joseph Kraft which appeared in last Thursday's Washington Post. Mr. Kraft makes a thoughtful analysis of the interplay between contemporary economics and politics, and I wish to call it to the attention of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle. The article follows:

[From the Washington Post, July 23, 1970]
NIXON HITS DEMOCRATS' SPENDING AS DIVERSION IN SLOW UPTURN

(By Joseph Kraft)

Hardly anybody disputes President Nixon's recent claim that the economic recession has "bottomed out." So why, instead of pointing with pride at its own record, is the White House viewing with such alarm the "big spending" habits of the Democrats?

The answer is that the coming economic upturn recovery is going to be slow and painful to the point of looking like a continuing recession. And the reason has been presented with exceptional clarity by Professor Otto Eckstein of Harvard in testimony to the Joint Economic Committee of the Congress.

Professor Eckstein's thesis is that the steps taken to slow the recent decline leave few actions available to hasten recovery. The upshot is a "stretched recession" apt to last from 1969 through 1971.

In the Eckstein view, the downturn which began last year was caused by four main factors. First, as usual in periods of economic softness, there was a falling off in consumer spending. On top of that came unusually slow growth in state and local spending, a drop in defense spending, and a fall in housing starts.

Left to themselves, these factors could have precipitated a truly sharp recession—with employment falling off dramatically and

profits declining by as much as a third. But the Nixon administration, true to its philosophy of "gradualism," took deliberate measures to ease the pinch.

Under Arthur Burns, the Federal Reserve which had previously tended to hold money supply in check during periods of economic decline, raised the amount available at a rate of 4 per cent between February and May. At the same time, federal taxes were decreased. And in that atmosphere, business continued to plan large outlays for new plant and equipment.

The result was an exceedingly mild recession. Profits fell only 10 per cent. The number of jobless rose slowly to a point only slightly above what economists in the early Kennedy years set as a target for recovery. And the statistical evidence of decline in Gross National Product was so ambiguous that the turn-around occurred before it was absolutely certain there had been a recession.

But all the medicine used to ease the patient's pain has left the cabinet bare of drugs to stimulate a brisk recovery. A tax cut, for instance, would probably foster increased spending in the private sector. And the new Deputy Director of the Budget, Caspar Weinberger, seemed to point in that direction in a press conference on July 16.

But yet another tax cut would leave the federal government short of funds for essential domestic and foreign services. So President Nixon, in his press conference Monday, and Budget Director George Shultz, in congressional testimony Tuesday, knocked down any tax cut speculation.

Another shot in the arm could come from further easing of the money supply. That could lower interest rates, thus pushing housing and outlays by local and state governments.

But any big rise above the 4 per cent level would have severe inflationary impact. Indeed, for technical reasons the Federal Reserve Board curtailed the growth of the money supply in June; and now the administration is huffing and puffing just to get Dr. Burns to bring the rate of increase back to 4 per cent.

What this means is that the upturn will be feeble. Unemployment will probably hang at about 5 per cent for the next year or so. Profits are due to stay flat. And the growth in Gross National Product will not be impressive.

That kind of recovery, whatever its economic justification, is not exactly political magic. So when election day comes round, the voters will probably be more in a mood to distribute blame than cheers. And that is why the White House, rather than getting in position to gather bouquets, is doing what it can to set up Democratic spending as a target for the rotten eggs.

ROCKWELL EXECUTIVE LAUDS SPACE PROGRAM

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on July 15 Mr. James L. Daniell, vice president, marketing services, North American Rockwell Corp., gave a most interesting talk on the U.S. space program to the Washington Rotary Club here in the Nation's Capital.

Mr. Daniell took what I think is a quite novel approach to evaluating the space program; he discussed it in light of the Rotary Club's four-way test, a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

procedure by which the club evaluates various issues and programs of interest to its membership. The four-way test involves posing and answering certain questions with regard to a subject under consideration; three of which apply to the space program—First, is it fair to all concerned? Second, will it build good will and better friendships? And third, will it be beneficial to all concerned?

Mr. Speaker, in his remarks Mr. Daniell made it abundantly clear that this Nation's space program more than meets the four-way test. I think his thoughts are of particular interest because Mr. Daniell represents North American Rockwell Corp., the corporation that has contributed so much to man's efforts to conquer space. I commend his remarks to the attention of my colleagues.

The speech follows:

AMERICA'S SPACE PROGRAM TAKES THE ROTARY TEST

Thank you President Glenn for having me here to talk to the Washington Rotary Club. It is a sincere pleasure for me to have an opportunity to speak to a group of your stature. My subject for today deals with a topic that is very much in the public consciousness these days. It is getting a great deal of media coverage, it is a major political question, and it is a subject that will influence the course of your lives.

Rather than talk about the space program in some of the more customary terms, I thought I could turn the tables a bit and discuss it in terms of the Rotary Club Four-Way Test. In the Rotary Four-Way Test, there are three questions that could apply: First, is it fair to all concerned? Second, will it build good will and better friendships? And third, will it be beneficial to all concerned? So, for the next few moments, I am going to talk to you about America's space efforts and examine them in the light of those three questions from the Rotary Four-Way Test.

Leading off with, is the space program fair to all concerned? . . . let's talk about fairness to the taxpayer. After all is said and done, it is the taxpayer that is supplying the money that has put our space vehicles on the moon, and it is the taxpayer who must pay the bill for our future efforts, whatever they turn out to be. It's only fair then, that it is to the taxpayer that the first accounting for the program must be made.

The space budget request for 1971 is for 3.3 billion dollars, for a stretched-out, decelerating program. This is 12% under the 1970 budget, which in turn, was less than the 1969 budget. It is worth pointing out that the space program in general, and the Apollo series in particular, have been among the best managed, major government efforts ever undertaken in the history of this country, and as a matter of fact, in the history of the world.

Think back for a minute to 1961 when President Kennedy first established the landing of men on the moon as a major national goal. Shortly after that, in 1962, and seven years before the actual landing, a National Aeronautics and Space Administration official predicted the cost of achieving a manned landing on the moon at 20 billion dollars. As you all know, the landing took place on July 20, 1969, and when the figures on the cost of achieving the objective were totaled, they came to 21.3 billion dollars, only a 5% variation over a period of seven years. That, gentlemen, I think you will agree, is very good estimating and very excellent management of a major program over a pretty long term.

In addition to judging the fairness of the space program in terms of what is accomplished for the taxpayers' dollars, there is

another kind of accountability that is worth considering. That is, is the space program fair to all the nation and all the people of the world?

One good measure of the fairness of the space program in relation to the people of the world is the fact that it has been carried out openly and with complete disclosure, not only with our own media people, but with foreign media representatives as well. America's approach to her space program has been, that, this is an effort of world significance to be shared with all of the people that populate the earth. There is not a nation of the world that has not had the opportunity to observe and examine the different elements of this country's efforts in space.

The obvious and very significant contrast to the way the Russian space program has been conducted is an important lesson that has largely been lost on many people in this country and particularly many of the younger people who are so concerned with the system of government that we have.

Another test of the fairness of the program is how widely its economic impact is felt. On this score, over 90% of the NASA procurement dollars goes to private industry and over 163 million dollars went to small business firms. During 1969, 48 states as well as your own District of Columbia participated in NASA work. All told, 1,289 different companies, 203 universities and 69 non-profit organizations were involved one way or another in the contracting.

The next question in the Four-Way Test is, will it build good will and better friendships? In answering that question, I believe we must give special credit to the men who have manned the vehicles that the United States has sent into space and the teams that have successfully been on the moon and returned. The incredible ability that these men have demonstrated represent the best qualities of this nation. Above all, with all the skill and concentration that has been required by these astronauts, they have achieved their marvelous accomplishments with great humility, humanity, and in many instances, with a beautiful sense of humor.

Despite all of the pressures on the crews of our space vehicles, they have been willing to take the time to bring the message home to all of the peoples of the world that efforts in space are important to them as well as to the United States. Perhaps the number of miles that these men have traveled outside of the United States talking about our space program and representing our country have been just as important as the miles that they have traveled in space exploration and in traveling to the moon and back. A check with NASA reveals that over the past years our astronauts have traveled over a million miles to spread the message of good will inherent in our space efforts. I suggest to you gentlemen, that the good will and friendships that they have developed internationally are a most significant fringe benefit from which future generations in this country will continue to benefit. This aspect alone of the space program is a positive, affirmative answer to the test, will it build good will and friendships?

But, beyond the good will and international friendship generated by the astronauts, there are other reasons why the space program is building good will for us throughout the world. Already, scientists from 78 nations are involved in our space programs and these joint ventures have resulted in international agreements for further cooperative programs. Sixteen international satellites have been agreed upon and ten of these have already been placed in orbit with Britain, Canada, Italy, and France taking part. We have agreements with 19 countries for a variety of sounding rocket projects. Additionally, many countries have built their own ground receiving stations so that they

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

can benefit from data transmitted from our weather satellites.

The final item in the Four-way Test is, is it beneficial to all concerned? Let me outline a number of the beneficial by-products of space development which have great implications for all Americans as well as other people in the world. First, consider the laser beam, which is a direct result of materials and technology associated with the space program and which is proving itself quite valuable in the treatment of eyes, particularly detached retinas. The laser beam will also soon be part of a major non-wiring communications system which will be used more and more in the field of communications technology.

New mineral locations are being uncovered as a direct result of space activity. Recently, for example, one of North American Rockwell's geologists used Gemini 2 photos to locate a mineral deposit in the middle of the Egyptian desert that had been unknown previously. The geologist's study of the photos revealed that most of the oil fields in the Middle East lie on previously undetected earth faults. This is a fact that is of considerable interest not only to geologists, but to the oil producers of the world as well.

From space, we can detect the beginnings of huge insect infestations which have plagued man's crops since the beginning of civilization. From outer space, we can trace the movement of marine life, which is essential if we are to harvest the ocean for badly needed supplies of nutrition, particularly protein, in the future. This type of information and use of space technology will be a great boon to developing nations in the future.

The transfer of aerospace technology to present-day commercial applications is also astounding. To date, more than 12,000 technology items with commercial applications have been uncovered and put to work. Many of these applications are being used now in the rehabilitation of crippled children, manufacture of automobiles, ships and airplanes, as well as in hospital work.

Systems management techniques which evolved from management of the complex space program are now being used in crime prevention, in urban affairs, and in transportation planning.

These preceding benefits from America's space program are by no means all, but they are representative of the ways the space program has benefited all of us and they also demonstrate that, the space program is providing important means for solving many of the most serious problems of the human race today. How these capabilities are used in the future, and to what degree, remains to be seen but the fact that I want to drive home with you is that the technological and scientific means of solving many of the world's most pressing problems are now in our hands and they are in our hands because of the exploration, development, sweat, and investment that have gone into America's space efforts.

If America's space program measures up as well as I think it does to the Rotary Four-Way Test, I hope you will also agree with me that it is worth pursuing and it is worth pursuing vigorously. However, we are now hearing prominent people in high places calling for the end of manned space flights. The risk is too great, we are told. Where would America be today if she turned back in the face of great risk in the past? There would probably be no civilization west of the Allegheny Mountains, for example. I'm sure on every wagon train there were men urging that the train turn back, that the risk was too great. But they did go forward and history proves that their efforts and sacrifices were well worthwhile.

For just a few more minutes, I would like to give you a quick view of what we might anticipate in the future for the space program, because there are some very exciting

and important future achievements that we are currently working toward in space.

Topping the list of goals which have been approved by the President are two unmanned "grand tours" of the solar system to begin in the late 1970's. The special vehicles involved in these voyages of scientific discovery will be commanded by a computer which will be capable of making repairs, alterations, and modifications of the space craft as they move into space, according to Dr. Payne, head of NASA.

One tour will begin in 1977 with Neptune as its ultimate objective. It will take four years for this part of the tour to be completed. The craft will orbit Jupiter, and then head out to Uranus, another four year journey. After orbiting Uranus, it will set out for Neptune arriving in 1988.

The second tour will be launched in 1979, with Pluto, our most distant planet, the objective at the end of a 3.7 billion mile flight. On the way, it will swing by Jupiter in that same year, and Saturn in 1980, reaching Pluto in 1985.

About 1978, we can look for the first launch of a nuclear propulsion rocket, an essential program if man himself is ever to journey to the distant planets.

For the short term there are four additional manned Apollo moon flights on order. Apollo 14 is scheduled to fly next year. In 1971 Apollo 15 and Apollo 16 will fly with 16 carrying the first lunar rover vehicle which will allow the astronauts to roam up to 25 miles outward from their lunar landing craft. In 1972, Apollo 17 will be launched.

Apollo flights will be suspended then while emphasis is put on Skylab, an experimental space workshop where astronauts will be able to work up to 56 days at a time. Skylab is a forerunner of the space station which will be bigger. We have the hardware for Skylab and the space station is now in the design stage. In describing this program in a front page feature on the 2nd of July, The New York Times referred to it this way: "...the future the National Aeronautics and Space Administration sees flowing from this project involves massive space stations to orbit the earth for ten years and manned mission to Mars taking two or three years."

The final, tiny paragraph of the Times feature makes a point that I will not belabour: "The Soviet Union has indicated that it may be orbiting large space stations in the next five years. The recent Soyuz flights are presumably forerunners to such missions."

Interspersed throughout the major United States projects I have described will be flights to Mercury, Mars, Venus, and Jupiter.

This is indeed an ambitious program, but if the program measures up as well as I believe it does, particularly in terms of the Rotary Four-Way Test, then you and your children are going to reap rich rewards in scientific and human progress, rewards that will provide for a quality of life that may seem like a distant dream today. But if the realization of this dream seems somewhat remote as we sit in this room this minute, remember how remote the idea of landing a man on the moon was in 1960 ... Just ten years ago. And now, stretch your minds and imagine where American space program can take us by 1980. Gentlemen, I hope I'll meet you there.

FLOOD INSURANCE FOR TOPEKA—
GOOD PROTECTION AT REASONABLE COST

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, our colleagues with long and distinguished service in

July 27, 1970

the Congress know there is no occasion more gratifying than the implementation and efficient administration of laws to protect the public interest, promote private enterprise and protect private property—especially when those laws originate in the committee on which they serve.

My service on the Banking and Currency Committee has been relatively short—only 6 years—but I am deeply pleased that our National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 is well on the way to full operation.

The past 2 years have been devoted to comprehensive studies of flood-loss statistics in an effort to determine appropriate premium rates for high-risk areas. Following the guidelines of our committee, the Department of Housing and Urban Development is now prepared to underwrite premiums for flood insurance in metropolitan areas where high water has historically ravaged the community, thus making private insurance an unacceptable risk without Federal assistance.

Now, beginning in August, the citizens of Topeka will be able to purchase flood insurance at very reasonable rates. This insurance will protect private homes and businesses. It will promote commercial development and provide the people of Topeka in flood-prone areas with the sort of protection from natural disaster that each American deserves.

Under leave to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD, I will include for interested readers an analysis of the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968, and an article by Sue Webster that appeared in the Topeka State Journal, on page 1, July 22, 1970. These items follow:

NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE ACT OF 1968

Under this act, the Secretary of HUD is authorized to establish and carry out a national flood insurance program to enable persons to purchase insurance against losses resulting from physical damage to or loss of real property or personal property arising from any flood occurring in the United States. He is directed to encourage and arrange for maximum participation in the program by insurance companies and other insurers, and by related agents, brokers, and organizations.

The act provides for the operation of the flood insurance program as a joint venture between the Federal Government and the private insurance industry (with the industry participating on a risk-sharing basis). However, as an alternative, the Secretary may, if necessary, operate the program without the companies participating on other than a fiscal agency basis.

The Secretary is authorized to borrow up to \$250 million from the Treasury to carry out the insurance program. A National Flood Insurance Fund is established for making payments authorized by the bill, including premium equalization payments and reinsurance for losses in excess of losses assumed by insurance company pools formed to provide flood insurance.

Coverage will be available initially for one-to four-family dwellings and small business establishments but it is to be extended to additional types and classes of property as found feasible by the Secretary. In the case of dwellings, the insurance limit, where the rate is less than the full risk rate, will be \$17,500 for any single dwelling and \$30,000 for a two- to four-family structure plus \$5,000 per dwelling for contents. Small business properties can be insured for up to a total of \$30,000 for the structure and \$5,000 for the

contents of each individual business. These limits may be doubled upon the payment of full premium rates for the coverage in excess of such limits by the insured property owner.

After June 30, 1970, no new flood insurance coverage can be provided in any area unless an appropriate public body has adopted permanent land use and control measures which the Secretary finds are consistent with the criteria he has prescribed for land management and use in flood-prone areas.

The face amount of flood insurance coverage outstanding and in force at any one time is limited to \$2.5 billion.

The Secretary of HUD is authorized to undertake studies for the purpose of determining the extent to which insurance protection against earthquakes, or other natural disaster perils, other than flood, is not available, and the feasibility of such insurance protection being made available.

FLOOD INSURANCE HELP OFFERED

(By Sue Webster)

Topekan will be able to buy federally subsidized flood insurance beginning in August, James Schlegel, city-county planning director, announced today.

"It is our understanding that anyone living in the city limits can purchase this insurance from their local broker," he said.

Topeka is only the second city in Kansas to participate in the federal program. The other city is Fairway in Johnson County.

To enable residents to buy the insurance, the city commission passed a resolution May 25 stating its intention to initiate flood plain zoning. The zoning must be in effect by Dec. 31, 1971. The zoning will insure that only flood-proof buildings are built in areas which are continually flooded.

Keith Krause, head of the State Water Resources Board, said the Department of Housing and Urban Development, which is handling the program, has set regulations on rates and the amount of insurance which can be purchased.

Insurance at the federally subsidized premium rate may be purchased in amounts up to \$17,500 for single family homes and up to \$30,000 for two- to four-family homes on structured rates from 40 to 50 cents per \$100 of insurance, depending on the value of the structure.

The premium for a \$17,500 home probably would be about \$70 annually.

Contents may be insured up to \$5,000 with rates ranging from 50 to 60 cents per \$100 of insurance.

For small business coverage, federal subsidized premium rates also will be graduated at 50 cents per \$100 for properties valued up to \$30,000 and increasing to 70 cents per \$100 for properties valued at \$60,000 or more. Contents would be insured at the rate of \$1 per \$100 up to \$5,000 maximum.

Krause explained that if the damage caused by the flood is greater than the amount the premium will cover, the government pays the difference.

Krause added it was his understanding that if a home or business was damaged to a great extent in one year, the property would have to be vacated or made flood-proof.

In other words, a homeowner whose property was wiped out would not be paid again if he rebuilt in the same area and was flooded the next year.

The program is planned to encourage individuals who live in flood-prone areas to pay at least part of the cost of insurance against flood damage in order to reduce the need for special disaster relief measures.

By requiring the city to set up flood plain zoning, the government also is interested in advising prospective developers of the perils incident to building in the flood plain area.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

According to a HUD bulletin on the flood insurance, homes which are in flood plain areas when the areas are identified, will be eligible for a lower-than-normal rate made possible by the government subsidy.

The bulletin adds, however, "structures which are erected in an area after it has been identified as a flood plain area . . . will be insurable only at the full risk premium rate."

Therefore, when the city finalizes its flood plain areas, if a developer goes ahead and builds in that area, he will have to pay the full risk premium.

Planning staff and city engineers are working on drawing up the flood plain areas in Topeka and determining what types of buildings could be erected without being damaged by flooding.

It is possible one of the plains would be the Ward-Martin drainage area in the western section of the city.

Another area could be along Shunganunga Creek, whose drainage area takes in almost all of Topeka on the south side of the Kansas River with the exception of the Ward Martin drainage area.

In flood plain zoning, the most restrictions on construction would be in the areas closest to the creeks.

ALL MEDIA PLEASE COPY: LOWER RATES FOR CANDIDATES

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure most of my colleagues share my annoyance with newspapers, radio, and television stations which see political campaigns as opportunities for extra profits at the expense of those involved in the political process. And therefore I am sure they will be interested in an important precedent that has been established by one newspaper in Arizona.

Through the years I have noted that the rate charged political candidates by many papers and stations is the highest rate on the rate card. In many cases, there is a special political rate which is higher than any other class of advertising.

Since political advertising invariably requires cash in advance—something not required of other advertisers—the justification for these higher rates is hard to find.

Mr. Speaker, the thing that is most disturbing about this is that the money spent in political campaigns represents the contributions of ordinary citizens having an interest in their government. They cannot even take a tax deduction for the money they contribute. Yet a great many newspapers and broadcasting stations in this country see these contributions as some kind of gravy train to be exploited for profit.

Having observed these practices for many years, I was most pleased recently to come across an editorial in the Scottsdale Daily Progress, of Scottsdale, Ariz. Its publisher, Jonathan Marshall, hopes the idea will catch on around the country. So do I.

Without objection I will include the editorial at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Scottsdale Daily Progress, Scottsdale, Ariz., June 20, 1970]

LOW RATES FOR CANDIDATES

Over the years it has become traditional for the media to charge political candidates maximum rates for advertising. We think the tradition is wrong. The cost of campaigning is high enough as is.

Political ads are frequently a little more trouble than others, but the difference is not enough to justify higher charges.

Most candidates make a financial sacrifice to run for office. They are performing a public service, and they are essential to the success of our democratic system. For these reasons we believe that candidates deserve to be helped and not penalized.

From now on the Progress will have a new political advertising rate. Instead of charging our one-time open rate of \$2.10 per inch, as in the past, candidates will be charged only \$1.35 per inch, which is our special rate for churches, civic groups and non-profit organizations.

HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT, BEFORE YOU REPLY?

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, on July 23, Congressmen STOKES, HAWKINS, and I wrote to President Nixon indicating our concern for the President's failure to give audience to black representatives or consideration to the problems of black Americans.

It is important to point out, I believe, that a memorandum from the President's own special advisory counsel on student unrest was made public July 24 which indicates similar concerns. Chancellor Alexander Heard of Vanderbilt University, leads off the June 19 memorandum to the President by saying:

We do not believe that our national government really understands that a national crisis confronts us.

Chancellor Heard leaned heavily on the necessity and urgency for President Nixon to listen to blacks, to gain exposure to blacks, and to respond and use his office to develop a climate of racial understanding.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the President could show good faith with his advisory counsel by inviting audience with black elected officials and representatives—for a start. We anxiously await a reply from the President indicating his view of the need to invite or to accommodate black views and concerns.

For the interest of my colleagues, I submit a copy of our letter to the President.

I also submit for their attention an article from the Washington Post of July 24 wherein the memorandum of the advisory counsel is discussed. The material follows:

JULY 23, 1970.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: The patience of many black Americans is exhausted. The Constitution gave us our rights. The Civil War confirmed those rights. Court decisions have documented them. Acts of Congress over the last decade elaborated upon them. Unfortunately, the policies of your Administra-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tion have tended towards limiting those rights.

In your inaugural address you stated, "To go forward at all is to go forward together. This means black and white together, as one nation, not two." But your course of the past 18 months, in our opinion, is destined to destroy all possibilities of unity and brotherhood. The dream of complete racial equality cannot become a reality in the absence of a firm commitment from you, our Nation's leader, to attain that goal.

Since you assumed office, you have traveled to all corners of the earth emphasizing your concern for many problems and pledging American efforts towards solutions. But you have not come to black America. Race relations have not improved since the request of black Members of Congress to bring their concerns to you, but have advanced to a more critical state. If this country is to enjoy internal domestic tranquility, it is imperative that you have an audience with the legitimate and representative leaders of black America to discuss the grievances of 25 million black citizens. The request and invitation should come from you.

Of equal importance, you have not gone to white America with the case for racial equality or for civil rights.

White Americans look to their President for what is right. You can inspire white America to embrace and work for changes in society which will appropriately accommodate the full rights of black Americans. To date, you have not responded to this fundamental obligation. You have not used your powers of leadership to move this country forward to "one Nation."

Mr. President, when nine black members of Congress indicated five months ago our desire and willingness to bring black American concerns to you, we were turned away in a manner which showed disrespect for our offices and callous disregard for our views.

When questioned about your April response to the black House Members, Presidential Assistant John Erlichman was reported by Time Magazine to have replied, "We try not to permit opportunists to use the Presidency as a grandstand. That group has been going around, with Adam Clayton Powell, holding hearings and taking extremist positions. This looked to me like a set up."

We are disturbed and distressed that you would permit that kind of allegation to be made with reference to men who have been elected within the legitimate processes of this system to represent American citizens in the United States Congress.

Since April 18, when we were advised your schedule would not permit your meeting with us, you have issued nineteen comprehensive policy statements without touching upon a policy for the improvement of race relations. You have taken your concerns to the American public via the television media during prime broadcasting time, but you have not acknowledged that the problem of separate and "unequal" societies moving steadily and dangerously apart deserves equal time.

Mr. President, the national dialogue on black/white relations has consisted of charges and countercharges which produce further confusion and serve only to solidify the prejudices and frustrations of racial conflict.

It is appropriate, we believe, that you be reminded of your words as well as of your deeds. On February 14, 1969, shortly after assuming office, you stated,

"I hope that by what we do in terms of dealing with the problems of all Americans, it will be made clear that the President of the United States is an elected official, has no state constituency, he has no Congressional constituency, he does not represent any special group, he represents all the people. He is a friend of all the people."

Black Americans have waited and have observed. We have learned that there is no virtue in endless patience. We have observed that it contributes to injustice and is construed as "political impotency."

The important question is not whether an individual black person or black group believes the policies of your Administration are "anti-black" or not. It is a question of whether you, Mr. President, can justify economic, social and political policies which are clearly detrimental to the welfare and survival of 25 million black Americans.

We note that you have had a record 30,600 personal guests at the White House. Mr. President, the time has come for you to invite discussion with the black elected officials and try to come up with answers to the number one problem confronting this country.

WILLIAM L. "BILL" CLAY.
AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS.
LOUIS STOKES.

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 1970]

CAMPUS ADVISERS ASK NIXON TO HEED
STUDENTS, NEGROES
(By Eric Wentworth)

President Nixon's special advisers on campus unrest have recommended that he and his White House staff develop a better grasp of the intense political and social concerns among university communities and racial minorities.

"We do not believe that our national government really understands that a national crisis confronts us," one adviser, Chancellor Alexander Heard of Vanderbilt University, told the President in a June 19 memorandum on student attitudes.

"The condition," Heard told the President on that occasion, "cannot be conceived as a temporary, aberrational outburst by the young, or simply as a 'campus crisis' or a 'student crisis'."

Heard said last night in a telephone interview "I believe the President and his associates are much more fully aware of the scope and the depth of concerns on the campuses and in the black community than they were two months ago." He declined to take any special credit for this fuller awareness.

In a summary statement which the White House released yesterday with several memoranda by Heard and President James E. Cheek of Howard University during their two-month tenure as presidential advisers, the Vanderbilt chancellor also said that Mr. Nixon had shown "serious concern . . . openness and a searching interest in what we had to say."

Heard's summary statement outlined a number of recommendations which he and Cheek had made. Some of these advised the President to:

"Increase his exposure" to campus spokesmen, "so that he can better take into account their views, and the intensity of those views in formulating domestic and foreign policy";

Gain more exposure also to blacks and other racial minorities, and "use the moral influence of his office in new ways" to reduce tensions and develop a climate of racial understanding;

Provide more aid for needy students and primarily black colleges in the coming academic year, and make a long-term commitment to help the growth and quality of those colleges;

Take steps to include young people in politics and government, and increase blacks' involvement in developing domestic policy;

Seek to understand the fears of "representation" among some groups, and "the realities underlying those fears".

Robert H. Finch, White House counselor, told reporters that Mr. Nixon has already acted on one recommendation for high-level

staff liaison with the academic world. Finch said that he would play that role.

Finch also said that aid to 116 black colleges through the Health, Education and Welfare Department would be boosted to \$100 million from \$80 million through reprogramming funds in the new fiscal year.

Finch said other recommendations would be studied.

The chancellor wrote that on numerous occasions the President acted in accord with his and Cheek's recommendations—though he declined to assess what influence their recommendations had. He mentioned Mr. Nixon's signing the voting rights bill, and the Internal Revenue Service abolition of tax exemptions for segregated private academies, among others.

On other occasions, Heard continued, proposals "for one reason or another" were not followed. He cited his own suggestion at the outset that Mr. Nixon meet with members of the American Council on Education's Special Campus Tensions Committee. The panel, chaired by Sol M. Linowitz, published a detailed report in April.

Heard made it clear that his statement did not include all the recommendations that he and Cheek had made to the President. "Implementation of some of the proposals," he stated, "might be handicapped by making them public."

But the fact that a number of recommendations were made clashed with remarks Tuesday by unidentifiable "White House sources" that Heard's and Cheek's role was primarily to provide the President and his staff with information and to educate them about campus problems.

4-H IN THE GHETTO

HON. FRANK THOMPSON, JR.
OF NEW JERSEY
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as you know, the 4-H clubs have provided over the years a magnificent opportunity for youth to practice those qualities of good citizenship and to learn those skills which would make them useful and productive members of our rural community. Quite recently, the scope of our 4-H clubs has taken on a wider view. These youngsters are now applying their energies to the problems of our cities and urban areas realizing that the well-being of rural America depends in great measure upon the health of our cities. For that reason, it gives me great pleasure to place before the House a statement by Miss Dianna R. Dennis entitled "4-H in the Ghetto." I commend it to my colleagues, and I congratulate Miss Dennis for her insight and dedication to the problems of her fellow man. Her statement follows:

4-H IN THE GHETTO
(By Dianna Dennis)

In the special report, the Urban 4-H Staff Institute states, "If 4-H is to have a viable, growing, on-the-move kind of program, it is necessary to look beyond rural America, to the towns and cities, where a growing majority of youth, especially unreached youth, live."

4-H is one of the few organizations that can possibly reach and help the estimated 15 million young people living in poverty today. This is because the main goal is youth development and the only rule is that a

person goes out and does the things that will help youths develop to their full potential.

There are tremendous unmet needs in our cities. Lower income families need something that can teach them—something that will bridge the communications gap between one person and his neighbor, rich and poor, educated and not-so-educated. 4-H can do this and more.

What the 4-H program must do, is try to reach those who have the lack of proper food and medical care; whose recreational and personal needs are not always met; and who lack the benefit of a good education. It must relate to young people who have known more failures than successes in school and community. They are those who have been subjected to prolonged economic or social deprivation and may have learned a repertoire of responses that protect their integrity as persons—thus their behavior is characterized by hostility to authority, generally termed insolence; by caution in relating to or being uncommunicative with strangers; and by having difficulty in concentrating on tasks that seem irrelevant, useless and without immediate tangible rewards. 4-H must show that it is truly concerned, and this can only be done through working and communicating directly with the people.

The overall purpose of the current Inner Cities programs is, and I quote, "To develop, implement, conduct, and evaluate a meaningful educative program to help disadvantaged youth in central cities lead more enjoyable and productive lives." In trying to achieve this goal, the program is also trying to help young people appreciate the fact that someone cares. Through reading projects, the young people are broadening their education without the hassles of a formal classroom. They are also learning to communicate more effectively with others, and learning the need for a formal education.

Practical learning experiences are emphasized, so to help the young people develop individual responsibility, and to prepare them for employment. Work-study programs have been set up as experience for employment, and also to acquaint the youths with, not only the resources available in their community, but the people responsible for them—the elected representatives.

4-H creates an atmosphere to provide experience in the democratic procedures, in contrast to the autocratic or authoritarian climate so prevalent in most low-income families. It gives an opportunity for young people to share their experiences with others. It develops the leadership qualities in young people, that would otherwise be lost, by involving them in planning and conducting their own meetings and projects. Older youths have even more opportunity through the "teen" or "jr" leaders programs.

Through Conservation, Home Beautification, Flower and Garden projects, youths can learn to improve their surroundings by learning lawn care, landscaping, and even "ornamental horticulture". These can stimulate youths to try and clean up their surroundings, and rejuvenate their neighborhood. Exploratory experiences, such as indoor gardening, are offered in plant and soil science projects, and can open new horizons for the underprivileged youth. Trips to farms and rural communities may prove to be firsts for many, and will show them another side of life.

Health and Physical Fitness can be stressed through Foods-Nutrition, Bicycle Safety, and organized active sports programs. In cooperation with Health Departments, Social Welfare, and other groups, programs in Child Care and Sex Education may be worked out. Young people and their families can learn how to make effective use of surplus foods products. Recreational activities can be organized by 4-H'ers for reaching other people in their communities. Art and Music Projects

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

offer new outlets for young peoples' creative abilities.

4-H can prepare youths for improved family and home life. Clothing and cooking projects are directed at making the girls better homemakers. Youths can improve their own food supply through vegetable projects. Programs can be centered around the home, and give the youths a chance at their own Home Improvement. 4-H can be used as a vehicle to build communications between parent and child.

In order to start in a community, news of a 4-H program should be physically introduced. Telephoning alone will help one's efforts for a beginning. Meeting the community personally will give its members the feeling of being wanted. The leader of a 4-H club in an underprivileged area must have an understanding of the child in order to develop an understanding by the child of this world and his place in it.

"Inner City" 4-H programs have been started in many major cities across the United States. In New Jersey, successful programs are working in Trenton, and New Brunswick.

The main thing to remember is that if we don't work with the less advantaged, we are depriving ourselves of understanding a segment of our own democracy. Let's live up to our motto and let's "Make the best better"!

FUEL INDUSTRY WARNINGS ARE COMING TRUE

HON. ED EDMONDSON

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. EDMONDSON. Mr. Speaker, a very timely article by Mr. William D. Smith appeared last Sunday on the front page of the New York Times' business and finance section.

The Times' article accurately points out that many of the warnings voiced by the oil and gas industries in recent years against our increasing reliance upon foreign fuel sources, and against Government policies which destroy industry incentive for exploration and development, are today coming true. In 1969, U.S. natural gas reserves suffered the greatest reduction—12.2 trillion cubic feet—in the Nation's history. Mr. Smith warns consumers that a significant increase in gasoline and natural gas prices will come this fall.

Mr. Speaker, several witnesses before the House Mines and Mining Subcommittee's recent oil import hearings testified as to the tremendous savings available to the American consumer if only we would increase our dependence upon Middle Eastern oil. The Times' article tells a different story—that the current average price per barrel from the Middle East is 75 cents greater than the same domestic barrel of crude; that at this time it is cheaper to supply the east coast of the United States with a barrel of crude shipped from Louisiana (\$3.75) than it is to import Persian Gulf Oil, at \$4.50 per barrel.

I commend Mr. Smith on his very perceptive analysis of the causes behind many of our most severe energy problems, and I include his article in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues:

U.S. OIL INDUSTRY REGRETS IT WAS RIGHT

(By William D. Smith)

If an industry could have a facial expression, the United States oil industry would be wearing a bittersweet smile.

The smile would be a result of having seen recent events prove some of its serious forecasts and urgent warnings correct.

The pleasure, however, is mitigated by the pain that the industry is nonetheless suffering from having seen its predictions come true.

Throughout the long and heated political controversy over oil imports, the industry has maintained that foreign sources of petroleum were relatively dependable and that their lower-than-domestic price levels could be quite ephemeral. For this thesis oilmen were raked over the political coals. The price of Middle East crude oil is now at least 75 cents a barrel more than domestic.

For more than a decade oil and gas producers have warned that Federally set "low" natural gas prices would dampen the incentive to look for gas and thus produce a future shortage. Again this was treated as a totally self-serving ploy—"There is a shortage of natural gas today," Secretary of the Interior Walter Hickel reportedly explained.

John Emerson, energy economist of the Chase Manhattan Bank recently went even farther, "Never before in this century have we faced such serious and wide-spread shortages of energy. These shortages are upon us now."

The industry warned that rushing into low-sulphur, anti-pollution legislation and regulations might produce supply problems.—There appears a very good chance that there will be a shortage of low-sulphur residual fuel oil this winter, forcing cities and corporations to choose between lack of heat and power and the present practicality of recent anti-pollution laws.

Being correct, at least on the surface level, gives the industry no reason to gloat. In each instance it is costing the oil companies money. If they pass on the cost, as they probably will have to, it cuts into what little affection the public has left for the industry.

"No one will remember that Senator Kennedy or Senator Muskie and other so-called consumer representatives have advocated policies that have often ultimately resulted in higher costs. They will only blame us for rising the price of gasoline or heating oil," a vice president and counsel for a major company commented last week.

The executive's statement is probably too one-sided. The present situations are the result of many complex forces; some alterable, some not.

Nonetheless, some politicians and academicians, past and present, may have been guilty of thinking that a big desk and pet theories were a substitute for the hard facts of industrial life.

There is a very good chance that by fall the American consumer may be paying more for gasoline, natural gas and residual fuel. This means that the cost of running his car, his home and his factory will cost more.

These major impacts on the battle with inflation have not gone unnoticed in Washington although it appears that no major constructive actions have as yet occurred.

The leap in the price of overseas crude oil is a result of soaring tanker costs. Few analysts expect these costs to go down in the very near future.

But if tankers are the central reason, the Arab-Israeli war is the underlying cause.

On May 3 in Syria, the Trans Arabian Pipeline was knocked out of commission by an errant or deliberately aggressive bulldozer. The Syrian Government has not allowed its repair, preventing 500,000 barrels a day of Saudi Arabian crude from reaching the Mediterranean.

At the other end of the Mediterranean the Libyan Government cut back oil production by 15 per cent, or 500,000 barrels a day.

The loss of almost 1 million barrels a day of oil west of Suez and close to world markets has strained tanker capacity. Replacement of this oil with oil from the Persian Gulf around South Africa takes six to eight times the tanker capacity.

CHARTER RATES RISE

Spot charter rates have risen to their highest level since the 1956 Suez crisis and are more than 50 per cent higher than during the 1967 Arab-Israeli war.

Persian Gulf oil is now coming into the United States at about \$4.50 a barrel compared with Louisiana crude delivered to East Coast refineries at \$3.75.

There is no chance of a shortage, however, because Texas and Louisiana will increase their production to meet the need. There is a very real chance of consumer price increases.

The *Oil and Gas Journal*, a trade publication, reports that Professors Phillip Areeda and James McKie, two of the chief advocates of sharply increased oil imports, have now backed off considerably from that position.

F.P.C. REGULATION UPHELD

The natural gas supply and demand controversy is a far older argument. In 1954 the Supreme Court ruled that natural-gas producers were subject to Power Commission. In 1960 the regulatory agency began fixing well-head prices for all gas sold interstate. The Supreme Court upheld this right again in 1965 despite vigorous cry of outrage from producers, who said it would kill incentive to drill.

Time has proven the oilmen right. Wildcat drilling dropped 40 per cent between 1956 and 1968. Geophysical activity fell 56 per cent.

Some of the drop off may have been artificial; just to show the Government. Nonetheless the results are uncontested. In 1969 the United States proved reserves of natural gas fell 12,241 trillion cubic feet, the largest in the nation's history.

The previous record drop was in 1968, when they fell 5,548 trillion cubic feet. These are the only declines in the history of the industry.

POSITIONS CHANGED

The F.P.C. is now trying to rectify the situation by raising prices. Some of the people who supported the lower prices several years ago are now in the forefront of those pushing higher prices.

The Interior Department is trying to speed up lease sales of suspected gas fields, but is running into opposition from Conservationists. But even if this opposition is overcome, it will take from three to seven years for these areas to begin producing.

In the meantime Canadian sources of gas can be tapped although Canadian-American relations on energy matters are at an all-time low. Liquefied natural gas quite possibly will reach this country from Algeria, Nigeria or Venezuela. Contracts have already been signed to import Algerian L.N.G., but the Algerian Government's recent nationalization of American oil company properties puts this source of L.N.G. in a very questionable position.

SUPPLY OUTLOOK TIGHT

The supply outlook for this winter is tight. Industry sources say that there will be enough to heat homes, but that the industrial market, which accounts for about 50 per cent of total sales, may be in bad shape. Many distributors already have been forced to impose severe limitations on new industrial loads, and there is a real possibility that deliveries to existing customers may have to be curtailed, according to J. W. Heiney, president of the American Gas Association.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

It would seem almost certain that consumer prices will have to go up, and possibly sharply.

The crude oil reserve situation is not much better, according to the American Petroleum Institute. Last year crude oil reserves dropped to 29,632 billion barrels the lowest level in 15 years.

The A.P.I. explained the situation simply by saying that lack of incentives had led to a long and steady decline in exploratory drilling during a period of mushrooming production and consumption.

The oil industry in recent weeks seems to have won a lot of points, but through no fault of its own, it well may be losing the game.

S. 30

HON. EMANUEL CELLER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, a subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary has been conducting searching and extensive public hearings on the proposed Organized Crime Control Act (S. 30). This legislation has prompted marked reaction and concern in the legal community, and has been analyzed and reported upon by a number of outstanding and respectable bar associations as well as individual attorneys and Federal judges. In the 7 days of hearings held on this proposal to date, the judiciary subcommittee has received testimony or statements recommending amendments or indicating opposition in whole or in part from the Judicial Conference of the United States, the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association, the Association of the Bar of the City of New York, the New York County Lawyers Association, the National League of Cities—United States Conference of Mayors, professors of law, and others. The charges of vague and unworkable draftsmanship and constitutional unsoundness fully warrant the patient scrutiny which the subcommittee is devoting to this complex and far-reaching proposal.

There has been substantial confusion, I believe, in what the Organized Crime Control Act really does provide and what it may, as presently written, actually accomplish. Several amendments have in fact even been proposed by the Senate sponsor of the measure and the Department of Justice, both of whom recommend passage of the legislation. An article appearing in the July 27, 1970, issue of *Time* magazine provides some insight into the complexities of this legislation. In view of the importance of informed opinion on the part of the Members on this vitally important proposal, I believe it may be helpful to reprint the *Time* magazine article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

PUBLIC SAFETY AND PRIVATE RIGHTS

"If we get the tools from Congress," Richard Nixon promised the country just one month ago, "we will use them and we will reduce this rate of crime." The President was addressing himself to a major national concern, but not one of the Administration's 20 major anticrime bills has yet become law.

July 27, 1970

The main reason: bipartisan fear that many of their provisions would jeopardize the rights of the innocent without really giving much practical aid to the forces of law and order.

Last week a House-Senate conference committee agreed on a crime bill for the District of Columbia with its most controversial provisions intact, and the House promptly passed it. Just as promptly, the Senate reopened a vigorous debate. One of the most vociferous opponents is a Democrat who is frequently sympathetic to Administration causes. But North Carolina's Sam J. Ervin Jr. has long been convinced that much of the measure is "as full of unconstitutional, unjust and unwise provisions as a mangy hound dog is full of fleas." Meanwhile the governing board of the American Bar Association, after a special meeting in Chicago, expressed reservations about parts of a separate bill aimed at subduing the organized underworld. Originally devised by another Democrat, Arkansas's John McClellan, the mobster measure was expanded with the help of Justice Department staffers and whisked through the Senate in January. Legal experts have now detected a startling number of sleeper clauses. Their objections have provoked close scrutiny from the House Judiciary Committee.

No-Knock. The D.C. crime bill puts heavy emphasis on strengthening police power to gather evidence. The Fourth Amendment guarantees a person's right to be "secure" against "unreasonable searches and seizures." But what is reasonable? The measure would expand police authority to use bugs and wiretaps against suspected drug pushers, violence-prone radicals, bribers and blackmailers. Critics insist the measure's inclusive language might permit scrutiny of the traditionally privileged conversations between lawyers and clients, doctors and patients, or priests and penitents. Under another provision, policemen could enter private homes without knocking if they had reason to believe that a warning would allow suspects to destroy evidence or prepare for a shootout.

The most violent opposition to the D.C. bill stems from its acceptance of preventive detention—a procedure that another Administration bill would apply to all federal courts. Some alleged offenders released on bail are rearrested for fresh crimes during long waits for trial in the clogged D.C. courts; preventive detention would permit judges to hold potentially dangerous suspects for up to 60 days. The effort to check recidivist crime, critics charge, would surely result in denial of bail to some innocent suspects, and to others who would not commit further crimes. Moreover, detention hearings might jam the courts still further. Repeater crimes could be cut more fairly, the opposition argues, by surveillance of bailed suspects and speedier trials. In fact, some of the bill's best sections take just that approach. Bail supervision would be expanded and \$5,000,000 allocated to add 17 trial judges and merge three separate court systems.

McClellan's anti-mobster bill is advertised as an attempt to deal with the frustrations that police and prosecutors meet in dealing with organized racketeers. Recent Supreme Court decisions have knocked down such heavyhanded police practices as raids without search warrants, third-degree interrogations and indiscriminate wiretaps. Even evidence developed as a result of leads from illegal techniques is not admissible in a trial. If a defendant thinks the Government has used forbidden tactics in developing its case against him, he can ask to see all the raw material in order to establish his right to have it thrown out—which occasionally has made prosecutors turn over to mob lawyers years of tap-recorded phone conversations.

The bill would weaken the legal deterrence to unconstitutional police work. A judge

could not disclose any illegally obtained material unless the defendant convinced him that the revelation would be "in the interest of justice." Indeed, if the specific crime for which a defendant was being tried took place five years after any general evidence was improperly obtained, leads derived from that evidence could not be challenged at all.

Official Lawlessness. Such a time limit on rights is clearly unconstitutional, argues the Association of the Bar of the City of New York. With the proliferation of electronic data banks, an association report charges, prosecutors would be encouraged to maintain illegal files on suspects and use the leads after a five-year wait had "cleansed" them. Legal authorities claim that the proposed law is not really needed by prosecutors anyway: when they have justification for thinking that crime is going on, they can make most searches and tapes by obtaining warrants first. Says Herman Schwartz, a wiretap-law expert at the State University of New York at Buffalo: "The provision blows a hole in the entire fabric that the Supreme Court has woven to deter official lawlessness."

Though the measure increases the authority of prosecutors to make witnesses talk by granting them immunity from subsequent prosecution, those who remain silent could be given up to three years in jail for contempt, with no trial and with virtually no chance of bail if they appeal. More might be accomplished by another provision of the bill that authorizes money for protecting witnesses too fearful of revenge to testify. Nor is there much controversy over a section authorizing injunctions against entire gangster-run enterprises which could confiscate their property or require them to sell it off.

Bonus Sentences. Both bills proposed stiff sentences for offenders. In the District of Columbia, judges would be prohibited from giving less than five years to anyone convicted of a second armed crime. The organized crime act would let federal judges anywhere give up to 30 years to criminals who had two previous felony convictions or whose crime was part of a vague "pattern of criminal conduct." This would permit not only long terms for mobsters convicted of penny-ante crimes, but it would also let judges impose bonus sentences for alleged conduct that was never proved in a trial. It also gives judges immense discretion in cases not involving organized crime. The New York City bar association contends that a youth who got a suspended sentence on a marijuana conviction and served a few days in jail for unlawful assembly during a demonstration could get a 30-year stretch long afterward for an income tax violation—even if the tax charge normally carried a penalty of only three years.

Some opponents say they would accept many of the Administration's proposals if they were redrawn in such a way that they could not be turned against those whose offenses are trivial—or merely unpopular. Others go further. In a democracy, they say, mobsters have rights too. The most trenchant criticism against both bills is that they tinker with the tools of law enforcement instead of attacking more basic problems: crime-breeding courts and prisons, social inequities and public complacency about vice and corruption.

APPROPRIATIONS HEARINGS VOLUMES RELEASED

HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Appropriations has released

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the following committee hearings volumes in recent weeks:

One additional volume—Defense, part 7 (testimony of Admiral Rickover)—is yet to be released.

Copies are available to Members and others at the committee room, H-218, Capitol Building, extension 2771, as long as the supply lasts.

Bill and volume	Released
Labor-HEW:	
Pt. 6—Related agencies (includes Office of Economic Opportunity).	Tuesday, July 7.
Pt. 7—Testimony of Members of Congress and other individuals and organizations.	Saturday, July 11.
Defense:	
Pt. 6—Research, development test, and evaluation; and various other items, including the Secretary of Defense and testimony of Members of Congress and other individuals and organizations.	Monday, July 27.

THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD AND AIR FARES

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, I am inserting in the RECORD today two letters I have directed to the Honorable Secor D. Browne, Chairman of the Civil Aeronautics Board, concerning domestic passenger air fares. The letters follow:

JULY 14, 1970.

Hon. SECOR D. BROWNE,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In view of the decision of the United States Court of Appeals for the District Court of Columbia Circuit rendered on July 9, 1970, relating to domestic passenger air fares, I am writing to make the following requests:

1. That there be no *ex parte* communications of any kind between the Board and any of the carriers regarding rates. In particular, should there be any meetings scheduled between the carriers and any members or employees of the Board, I would like to be informed promptly in order that I may make my views known. I should also like you to send promptly to me and my attorneys, Stanford G. Ross, H. David Rosenbloom, and Ronald B. Lewis, of Caplin & Drysdale, 1101 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036, copies of any communications with respect to rates directed by any of the carriers to any member or employee of the Board, and vice versa.

2. That the Board notify me and my attorneys of any and all actions taken by the Board in connection with this case; in particular, I ask that we be informed promptly of any and all proposals for remedying the present unlawful fares, whether instituted by carrier filings or by the Board's own actions.

I have asked Mr. Ross to send a copy of this letter to the attorneys for all domestic air carriers subject to the Board's jurisdiction.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

JULY 22, 1970.

Honorable SECOR D. BROWNE,
Chairman, Civil Aeronautics Board,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I wanted to let you know that I appreciate your having called

upon me on Monday, on your own initiative, to acquaint me with some of the thinking that is going on at the Board regarding possible changes in Board procedures for the future. As to those proposals you are considering which would require legislative change, we of course stand ready to give them thorough consideration when they are presented in concrete form.

You understand, however, that in our capacity as litigants in the case currently pending before the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit we intend to pursue fully the rights we believe inure to the public under the Federal Aviation Act. Until the issues involved in that case are fully determined, we shall continue to act as litigants representing the interests of the traveling public as a class and to pursue the case vigorously. We have instructed our attorneys to advise us as to appropriate methods of following up on the Court's decision to gain the relief for the public which we believe the decision requires.

I am sure you understand the difference in my roles as a Congressman and as a litigant in the case and appreciate the fact that I intend to discharge both my responsibilities to the best of my ability. I want you to know that I understand your roles both as a litigant in this case and as a Government agency's principal official who is charged with the continuing conduct of the affairs of the agency. Naturally, any communications between us dealing with the issues raised in the litigation in which we are engaged, as opposed to the possible changes in the Board's future procedures which we discussed Monday, are to be made only in proceedings conducted on the record.

Again, I thank you for coming by and will be pleased to consider further any legislative proposals that may come out of your thinking.

Sincerely,

JOHN E. MOSS,
Member of Congress.

WARNING TO AMERICANS

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, Adolf Hitler told the world what his objectives were in "Mein Kampf." Either the world did not believe him or they considered him incapable of becoming the danger to world peace that history eventually recorded. Stopping Hitler's legions cost millions of lives, billions of dollars, and untold human suffering.

Today, right here in the United States, the Black Panther organization publicly declares its intention of revolution by violence. Not only does this group distribute pamphlets describing how to make bombs and explosives at home, but in not so thinly veiled language it advocates using them on whitey the pig.

In an introduction to a publication of March 1, 1968, entitled "Essays from the Minister of Defense (of the Panthers) George Murray" the so-called minister of education of the Panthers states flatly:

What we believe in is armed revolution, a permanent revolution, the creation of as many Viet Nams as are necessary to defeat U.S. racism and imperialism throughout the world.

Freedom does not and cannot include the right to destroy freedom itself in this

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

country. There is no constitutional right of free speech that gives any individual or any organization the right to inflame, incite, advocate, and teach subversion of our Government and our way of life. This must be applicable to all in America regardless of race, color, or religion, or we are plain darned fools.

The same applies to Messrs. Rubin and Cleaver and all who deliberately tell inflammatory lies about the United States of America with intention to pit brother against brother, black against white, have against have-not in a life and death struggle marked by violence. No Supreme Court worthy of the name would stand quiescently by while the last great free nation on earth goes up in flames from this abuse of freedom of speech. These individuals should be indicted and convicted for sedition and subversion of both State and Federal Governments. And they should not be admitted to bail if when once permitted bail they do as the Chicago 7 have, and violate the conditions of that bail.

In this connection the following column by William Buckley, Jr., and writings of the Black Panther organization suggest a 1970 model *Mein Kampf*, paperback edition. They are a caution to all Americans and a signal to the Justice Department to prosecute.

The material mentioned above follows:

JERRY RUBIN'S SPONSORS

(By William F. Buckley, Jr.)

I do not care about the depravities of Jerry Rubin, who is one of the lost souls sentenced at the Chicago conspiracy trial, except that he is a fellow human being, bent on destroying himself, preferably in *cinemascope*. But I do care very much that Jerry Rubin should have found a panderer this side of the underground.

Mr. Rubin's book is called "Do It!" Do what? Well, whatever you like, provided it involves enormous amounts of drugs, sex, protests, obstructionism, obscenity, and the killing of non-members of the sect, herein-after called pigs. Mr. Rubin went all the way to Algeria to get an introduction for his book from Eldridge Cleaver. He could not have gone to a more appropriate person to open the gates to Mr. Rubin's lower intestine for the long long passage ahead.

Mr. Cleaver, the spiritual leader of the Black Panthers, urges that "the people" "rise up and kill pigs and destroy their power." From his asylum in Algeria (he is wanted by the courts in California to resume his sentence for rape), he recalls as the sweetest moment of his politically active life, the shoot-out at Oakland when "the shadow of death was created by the blaze leaping from the barrel of a gun. A pig white lay dead, deep fried in the fat of his own b—." The hyphens are mine.

Rubin's book has only the single virtue that it confirms the hypocrisy of many of the activists. He reveals quite unabashedly that their campaigns are often based on consciously invented lies. "Our tactic was exaggeration. Everything was 'the biggest,' the most massive." His use of obscenity is so witless as really to all but drive it out of fashion. One thinks of Norman Mailer's "Why Are We in Vietnam," and is tempted to advocate legislation that will forbid printed obscenity by those who, if one may say so, debase it. The book is filled with drawings and photographs of porcine nudes who could not have qualified to pose for Sunshine and Health. They all look like Jerry Rubin, and one begins to suspect that in

those circles the love is free because they couldn't possibly sell it.

So much for Rubin. What about the distinguished firm of Simon and Schuster? Listen to what is printed on the back jacket—by the publishers. "This book will become a Molotov cocktail in your very hands." (Who wants a Molotov cocktail in his very hands?) "Jerry Rubin has written the Communist Manifesto of our era." (If that's the case, *Hair!* is the Paradise Lost of our era, and our era may as well give up.) "This book is the most important political statement made by a white revolutionary in America today. Do It! is to be danced to. Read aloud. Studied. Memorized. Debated. Burned. Swallowed. Eaten. But most important, after living through the experience of this book, take its final advice: Do It!" the promotion editor who wrote that, you see, tries to swing by using the words, "swallowed, eaten."

It is not to come out for censorship to wonder at the sponsorship of this book. Though arguments—very sound arguments—could certainly be mustered for suppressing a book which incites to sedition, and arson, and killing, and which is guilty of criminally libelous charges against named individuals, my own disposition would have been against suppressing these pages of human and political ordure. But I want my dirty pictures sold to me by dirty little men and hidden in Russian easter eggs. Not passed out ceremoniously by men and women who pride themselves on their contributions to thought and literature and who regularly publish great tracts of prose devoted to the maintenance of humane standards.

So, Simon and Schuster will make themselves a hundred grand or so from the publication of this book, forever reminding us of Lenin's wry dictum that when the last of the bourgeois is hanged, a capitalist will sell the rope. I shall think of Simon and Schuster when I think of Jerry Rubin, as no doubt will the estates of Bertrand Russell and Winston Churchill, and Charles de Gaulle and Malcolm Muggeridge and Joseph Alsop, who no doubt will wonder at the company they keep.

STATEMENTS OF BLACK PANTHERS

Political power grows out of the barrel of a gun.

Everyone must be a guerrilla.

Hot town—pigs in the streets . . . but the streets belong to the people! Dig it?

1. No Horse Playing in the office.
2. No one is authorized to be in the office unless on business.
3. Security measures must be maintained at all times.
4. The office must be kept clean, neat and orderly at all times.
5. No unauthorized calls will be made on the office phone.
6. Only persons working in the office will be allowed to eat in the office.
7. Office hours 10 A.M.—10 P.M.
8. No one is to tamper with office equipment unless authorized.
9. All visitors and members on official business must report to the receptionist.
10. No unauthorized person is allowed behind the counter.
11. No one is to stay in the office overnight unless authorized by the O.D.

"We are advocates of the abolition of war . . . we do not want war; but war can only be abolished through war and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun." (Chairman Mao.)

[From the Black Panther, Mar. 28, 1970]

ORGANIZING SELF DEFENSE GROUPS—I

In organizing self-defense groups at this stage of the struggle the most important consideration is whether or not the person to be incorporated into the group under-

July 27, 1970

stands fully that what he or she is doing is the right thing to do. At this stage of the struggle if any members of a self-defense group are weak minded or do not understand that the only way to put an end to brutality & murder by this racist power structure is to organize self-defense groups & counter-attack, practice has shown that if this weak minded person is ever captured he or she will certainly not be able to withstand the methods of persuasion used by the fascist pigs and they will talk, give up information. So the first priority for any self-defense group is to be armed ideologically.

Because of the consequences, if anything goes wrong during an operation, members within the group must maintain a face to face relationship, get to know each other's strengths and weaknesses thoroughly, and participate fully in the planning of operations. Liberalism at this level can cost the lives of comrades and/or jeopardize the success of an operation.

At this time self-defense groups should have no more than four to six members. The struggle at this time requires no operation that can't be handled by four to six people. Also security is sacrificed the larger the group. At this time self-defense groups should be formed all across Babylon, North, South, East and West. However, at this time groups must work autonomously. Under no circumstances should any group seek out and try to make contact with another group. Due to the fact that this level of struggle is in its embryonic stages and fools, agents and provocateurs are scattered all across Babylon if autonomy is maintained when a member of a group is captured he or she will only be able to give up information on one group, their own.

Know the enemy. At this time the pigs have three things going for them:

1. Communication
2. Mobility
3. Information
- C.M.I.

When planning any operation the pigs' C.M.I. must be taken into consideration when planning tactics.

Part No. 2 will appear at a later date and will deal with self-defense weapons and training.

Counter-Attack D.C.

[From the Black Panther, Apr. 6, 1970]

ORGANIZING SELF DEFENSE GROUPS—II

B.P.P.

Know the enemy. At this time the pigs have three things going for them:

1. Communication—C
2. Mobility—M
3. Information—I

When planning any operation, the pigs' C.M.I. must be taken into consideration in planning tactics.

Due to the brainwashing done by TV, movies, comics, etc., there are a lot of incorrect ideas about firearms that must be cleared up. The first thing to understand is, there is no one piece (gun) that covers any and all situations. Although they show pigs on TV and in the movies killing people a block away with a snub-nose .38 revolver, in reality this is not very practical and shouldn't even be attempted unless you are an expert's expert. From seeing too much Wyatt Earp and Mat Dillon too many people think that if they have a hand gun either pistol or revolver that they are ready for anything. All that is necessary to give you a different perspective is to examine the armament of the pigs that occupy our Black communities anywhere in Babylon. When you do that you will discover that most pig cars have at least one .12 gauge pump or automatic shotgun, one or two semiautomatic or automatic assault rifles, one or two bolt-action rifles with a scope mounted for sniping purposes, and, of

course, the pigs have strapped on at least one handgun either an automatic pistol or a revolver. In San Francisco, the S.F. Tactical Squad members carry two handguns, their standard service revolve plus a second handgun which is their personal preference, in many cases an automatic pistol. So at this time let's examine these three types of weapons—the shotgun, the rifle, and the handgun.

.12 GAUGE SHOTGUN: the pigs use the shotgun, either pump or semi-automatic, loaded with 00 buckshot generally in crowd situations such as rebellions. The standard load is nine (9) buckshot pellets per shell, however there is the magnum load of 12 pellets per shell. These magnum loads are to be used only in magnum shotguns. If you use magnum loads in a regular shotgun, you might not live to tell it.

The pigs also use slugs, 1 giant lead ball. In the plans the Berkeley pig dept. had drawn up to attack National Headquarters of the Black Panther Party, they intended to use slugs to knock the armor plate off of our windows and to knock out the doors. This photograph shows what slugs used by Chicago pigs did to the steel plate on the door of our office there.

There is also a tear gas shell now designed to be fired from a .12 gauge shotgun.

Every Black home should have at least one .12 gauge shotgun to be used to protect the door. Use 00 buckshot and it will deal with any criminals trying to enter uninvited. Cuban guerrillas used shotguns very successfully in the revolutionary war led by Fidel Castro. They would set up ambushes close to roads usually only a few feet away and shotguns loaded with 00 buck would have a devastating effect upon the occupants of cars and/or trucks.

There is one thing about shotguns that possibly can be viewed as in our favor at this time that is that the barrel is smooth inside so it doesn't put any marks on the pellets; therefore, the pigs can't make an investigation based on ballistic marks.

Handguns: There are two types, semi-automatic pistols and revolvers. There are so many different brands and calibers, I will only deal with what I consider to be the best choices.

.357 Magnum revolver made by either Colt or Smith & Wesson. It holds six shots and with armor piercing ammo is supposed to crack an engine block. Many pig departments have switched or are switching from .38 special to .357 magnum. The less powerful .38 special just can't match the .357. There was an incident where a brother was defending himself against a pig and fired at the pig with a .38 special. The bullet hit the pigs badge and was deflected. Had the brother been using a .357 magnum that would have been one bar-b-cued pig.

9MM automatic pistol. Although pistols are called "automatic", they really are semi-automatic. The trigger has to be pressed for every shot. I recommend the Browning 9MM automatic. It comes with a 13 shot magazine. If you put one in the chamber that means 14 shots available. If you're up against someone with a 6 shot revolver, they will have to reload 2 times and you've still got two shots left. You can also purchase a 21 shot magazine. That's a lot of fire power for a handgun.

.45 Automatic pistol. This is still the side-arm issued to the U.S. fascist military troops. They also can be purchased in stores. There also seems to be a lot of these available in the streets. Check with your local street merchants.

Even if you have the finest self-defense weapons they are no better than clubs if you don't know how to use them. By the same token if you practice, it is possible to get good enough to kill elephants with a .22. However with enough practice with the above

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

mentioned weapons and being armed ideologically with the invincible thought of the Black Panther Party, it is possible like the Panthers who were attacked in Los Angeles in December to be a match for one hundred.

Counter Attack D.C.

Part #3 at a later date will deal with training.

[From the Black Panther, Apr. 18, 1970]

TRAINING—III

Know the enemy. At this point the pigs have three things going for them.

Communication—C

Mobility—M

Information—I

When planning any operation, the pigs' C.M.I. must be taken into consideration in planning tactics.

Practice—Practice—Practice—Practice—Practice—Practice—

In order to perform well in your work on all levels it is necessary to practice, the more you practice the better you perform. Don't think just because you read something you can do it. You can memorize a book on how to drive a car but until you get behind a wheel and practice you still can't drive.

The first things to understand before you ever put a round of ammo in a chamber are basic safety rules. 99% of all accidental shootings happen with guns that aren't "loaded" and/or by people that say "I'm sorry, I didn't know it was loaded." Therefore, rule #1 is: the first thing you do when you pick up a weapon is check to see if it is loaded, keep your finger off the trigger and follow the following procedure. Point gun away from area where someone could possibly be shot. If it is a revolver swing out the cylinder; if it is a pistol remove the magazine and pull back the slide. Even after you have unloaded the gun or see that it is unloaded treat the gun in the manner as if it were still loaded. Never touch the trigger unless you are practicing trigger squeeze (explanation later), firing on training ground or dealing with the enemy. Never point a gun at anyone you don't intend to shoot. I can't stress these points enough, they seem simple enough; however, people that generally haven't had any experience with pieces violate these rules constantly. If I am ever shot accidentally by some idiot it will be very difficult to suppress the desire to blow his or her head off, providing I'm only wounded.

The next step is to learn to disassemble and assemble your pieces, also care and maintenance. Due to the fact that self-defense activity will not be limited to daylight hours you should learn to break your piece down and assemble it even in the dark. Your life depends on it. So do it.

The RIFLE: The bolt-action rifle in .30-06 or .308 (7.62 MM Nato) with a four (4) power scope (or better) mounted is a sniping weapon. A specialist piece. This virulent (deadly) combination is for one purpose, and one purpose only—to fire ONE well placed shot. So each self-defense unit needs only one such weapon at this time. There is nothing else to say about that.

The assault rifle is either semi-automatic or preferable one that can be fired either semi-automatic or fully automatic. The limit here is that posed by the limit of the enemy's arsenal. Here we will discuss the most common seen in our communities carried by the gestapo pig forces. The AR-15 caliber .223 is the semi-automatic civilian model called "sporting" model of the M-16 used in Vietnam. The M-16 fires either semi-auto or fully auto. After the lives of many brothers were lost in Vietnam because the weapon was new and untested, it has now been de-bugged and is fairly reliable. It can be found on all military bases and some gestapo police arsenals. The AR-15 was taken off the public market and has been replaced by the AR-180

caliber .223. The AR-180 does not appear to be as good as the AR-15. However, many pig departments are stocking up on them.

Another very good assault rifle is the M-14 caliber 7.62 MM Nato (.308 in English). This is a very good weapon although it has been replaced by the lighter M-16 in the fascist military. Most national guard units, at least here in California, are equipped with the M-14. Check your local National Guard availability.

The Thompson Sub-Machine gun if in good working order is very reliable in 45ACP caliber. It fires either semi or fully auto. One rewarding feature is it uses the same ammunition as the .45 automatic pistol cutting down on the variety of ammunition necessary for your stash. Check your local police/mafia arsenal.

Finally the age-old M1-Garand caliber .30-06. Very good, plenty of them around, heavy and accurate way out, easy to get and plenty of ammo around. Check your pawn shops and gun shops also some national guard units and college ROTC units have them readily available.

The M1-30 caliber carbine? Use it for target practice and training.

Assault rifles are to be used in fire fights, more commonly known as shoot-outs. People waging wars of liberation around the world also use assault rifles to annihilate (wipe out) their enemy's in ambushes and in counter attacks against fascist military outpost.

After you've gotten this down, the next step is to learn how to aim and fire your weapons properly. All of this is to be done before you ever put your first round of ammo in the chamber, the first thing to deal with is proper sight alignment. Sight alignment is lining up your front sight with your rear sight correctly. Your front sight lined up with your rear sight and both lined up on the target is called the "sight picture." The correct sight picture basically is having the front not too high or too low, not to the right or to the left, but having the target resting on top of the front sight. The sight picture will not always appear perfect, but if the correct sight picture is understood practice will bring improvement.

The next thing to get down with is trigger squeeze. That's right you squeeze the trigger, you don't pull it or jerk it, contrary to what ever you saw on t.v., trigger squeeze is a process of putting slow steady pressure on the trigger until a shot goes off. If you try to anticipate the shot, you will jerk and mess up your aim.

One other thing to watch for is movement of your piece which comes from breathing, which also messes up your aim. One method of breath control is to take a deep breath, let out half of it, hold the rest of it then begin your trigger squeeze.

It would be ideal if you could incorporate into your group a veteran of the pigs' military service. Veterans are of great value and assistance in helping with the above training also when you are ready to begin practice with live ammunition. When practicing with live ammo make sure your location is where you won't be hassled by pigs. Actual combat conditions can be deadly as a training ground. When practicing with live ammo, remember it is valuable. Don't just start popping caps for the heck of it; the whole purpose it to prepare yourself to be "a Match for One Hundred" which will only come about as a result of correct practice.

One thing to guard against is flinching. Flinching is caused by being intimidated by the sound and kick of your weapon. With proper trigger squeeze and breath control, you won't have any problems with flinching. If you have problems keeping all your shots in a fairly small group or if you have a problem just getting your shots on the target anywhere you are probably flinching. Have someone watch you as you fire and they will

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 27, 1970

be able to tell you whether or not you are flinching.

The basic thing in the training of members of a self defense group is to know how to handle fire arms of all types, hand guns, rifles, shotguns, machine guns, etc.

The use of different types of ammunition and explosives should be considered also. Part #4 of this series will deal with some recipes.

All Power to the People D.C.

[From the Black Panther, Apr. 18, 1970]

RECIPES—IV

ORGANIZING SELF-DEFENSE GROUPS

I will begin by pointing out that we must not allow the racist power structure to define our struggle. What I mean is the language that we use like everything else in this society is in the service of the racist capitalist bandits. They control the educational institutions, the news media and the means of production to turn out all the educational material. We sometimes are trapped by the rhetoric (words) of the slavemaster. In our 400 year struggle for survival it has been the guns and force manifested in the racist pig cops that occupy our communities that directly oppress, repress, brutalize and murder us. So for us to talk about survival we must talk about self-defense against this brutality and murder that is defined by the racist power structure as justifiable homicide. So when a self-defense group moves against this oppressive system, by executing a pig by any means, sniping, stabbing, bombing, etc., in defense against the 400 years of racist brutality and murder this can only be defined correctly as self defense. The slavemaster, however, through his lackeys and puppets calls it 'terrorism', the work of crazed men, criminals, insane killers, etc. We must define our struggle not the pigs. Carlos Marighella, an urban guerrilla in Brazil who was assassinated Nov. 4th 1969 just one month before Fred Hampton and Mark Clark, says, "the accusation of assault or terrorism no longer has the pejorative (negative) meaning it used to have. It has acquired new clothing, a new coloration. It does not factionalize, it does not discredit; on the contrary it represents a focal point of attraction."

"Today to be an assailant or terrorist is a quality that ennobles any honorable man because it is an act worthy of a revolutionary engaged in armed struggle against the shameful military dictatorship and its monstrosities.

So with that, I say this, all self-defense groups must strike blows against the slavemaster until we have secured our survival as a people and if this takes shooting every pig and blowing up every pig sty then let's get on up.

Below are some recipes that might help some of you get started.

SELF-IGNITING MOLOTOV COCKTAIL

Caution: Potassium chlorate is very volatile, it can ignite almost spontaneously in this mixture. It can be ignited or detonated by a single spark, or excessive heat or merely by the friction of stirring the ingredients together. So use plastic or wooden utensils for mixing. Do not use metal. Use extreme caution.

Mix 3 parts of potassium chlorate with 2 parts of sugar. Add water to make a solution. Take a large sock, soak in the mixture then dry. Keep dry sock away from heat.

Away from the area or after you have thoroughly cleaned the area where you handled the above mixture take a fifth wine bottle and fill $\frac{1}{2}$ to $\frac{3}{4}$ full of sulphuric acid. Fill the rest of the way up with gasoline. Pour the gas slowly, it could bubble and heat up. Cap the bottle tightly. To make sure it doesn't leak you should test it first with water. To cap the bottle it is preferable to

use a stopper with a rubber plunger because acid eats plastic and metal. Don't shake the bottle hold it upright. When ready to use, put the bottle in the sock soaked in the chlorate sugar mix and knot the sock at the top. Throw at target. When it hits and the glass breaks it will explode as the sulphuric acid contacts the potassium chlorate and sugar mixture on the sock. The gasoline will spread the flame. The principal behind this fire bomb is when sulphuric acid comes into contact with a mixture of potassium chlorate and sugar there is an explosion that gives off a lot of heat. The more potassium chlorate the more explosive, the more sugar the more heat. For your information, this fire bomb will work even if the mixture on the sock is wet. However, it is more volatile when dry.

One more warning. Before placing bottle with gas and acid into sock make sure outside of bottle is clean and is not contaminated with acid.

PEOPLE'S HAND GRENADE

Take a used empty aerosol (spray) can, pull off the little plastic spray device, and with a hammer and nail pound the little plastic nipple down into the can. Widen the hole large enough so that large shot can be inserted through the hole. Fill with $\frac{1}{4}$ black powder and $\frac{1}{4}$ shot, small headed nails or anything to use for shrapnel. Insert fuse well into can and leave about $1\frac{1}{2}$ inches outside. If fuse is too short, you will blow yourself up. If the fuse is too long, when you throw it, it could be thrown back at you. If thrown in the open, it will kill within a 25 foot radius and maim within 100 feet. I suggest that you familiarize yourself with this weapon by practicing with a sand filled dummy. Try this and see how long the fuse that you use takes. For a strictly anti-property grenade fill can with black powder and don't use any shrapnel. The greatest advantage in this type of grenade is that you can legally buy all the ingredients needed. Buy black powder from your local gun store reloading counter. You've probably got some spray cans around the house.

Reproduced here is a list of books available with many more recipes and technical information.

Use what you got to get what you need. D.C.

Books can be purchased at Normount Armament, Box 211 Gas, Forest Grove, Oregon 97116 U.S.A.:

Japanese Infantry Weapons.

German Infantry Weapons.

U.S. .30 Carbines, M1, M1A1, M2 and M3.

U.S. Garand Rifles M1, M1C, M1D.

U.S. Springfield Rifles M1903, M1903A1,

M1903A3, M1903A4.

U.S. Rifle 7.62mm M-14.

U.S. .45 Pistols and Revolvers.

Machineguns and Gunnery for Machine-guns (U.S.).

Mortars and Mortar Gunnery (U.S.).

The Lewis Light Machinegun.

The Browning Hi-Power Pistols.

The Parabellum ("Luger") Pistol.

The Thompson Sub-Machineguns.

Use and Installation of Boobytraps.

Guerrilla Warfare and Special Forces Operations.

Operations Against Irregular Forces.

Guerrilla Warfare: A Method (Che Guevara) and Special War (Nguyen Van Hieu).

Leader's Guide for Operations in Southeast Asia.

Colt 223 AR-15 Semi and Fully Automatic Rifles (M-16).

U.S. Shotguns, All Types.

M1917 "Enfield" Rifle.

Ranger Training.

Evasion and Escape.

Hand to Hand Combat.

Explosives and Demolitions.

ESSAYS FROM THE MINISTER OF DEFENSE

INTRODUCTION

"Essays From the Minister of Defense" is a collection of truths, principles and beliefs practiced by the Black Panther Party. The writings come from the pen of Huey Newton, the Minister of Defense of the Black Panther Party but the spirit of the writings, the faith expressed and the undying love for black people exhibited therein comes from the souls of colonized black people. The people are the heroes.

The Black Panther Party is a vanguard party for we Africans in U.S. What we believe is in armed revolution, a permanent revolution, the creation of as many Viet Nams as are necessary to defeat U.S. racism and imperialism throughout the world. As you read "Essays From the Minister of Defense" you will begin to understand the principles for the armed revolution that is beginning in the U.S. If you carry out the principles, you will be a people's warrior, and will be bringing black people and the oppressed people everywhere closer to freedom, justice, and equality throughout the world. The Minister of Defense is currently held in Alameda County jail.

Our slogan is Huey will be set free by any means necessary and if he is not set free the sky is the limit. (George Murray, Minister of Education, Black Panther Party.)

IN DEFENSE OF SELF DEFENSE

(By Huey P. Newton)

Introduction: Huey P. Newton's column in the Black Panther newspaper was entitled "In Defense of Self Defense." The following articles by the Minister of Defense were taken from those columns.

"In Defense of Self Defense," June 20, 1967

Laws and rules have always been made to serve people. Rules of society are set up by people so that they will be able to function in a harmonious way. In other words, in order to promote the general welfare of society, rules and laws are established by men. Rules should serve men, and not men serve rules. Much of the time, the laws and rules which officials attempt to inflict upon poor people are non-functional in relation to the status of the poor in society.

These officials are blind to the fact that people should not respect rules that are not serving them. It is the duty of the poor to write and construct rules and laws that are in their better interests. This is one of the basic human rights of all men.

Before 1776, white people were colonized by the English. The English government had certain laws and rules that the colonized Americans viewed as not in their best interests but as a colonized people. At that time the English government felt that the colonized Americans had no right to establish laws to promote the general welfare of the people living here in America. The colonized American felt he had no choice but to raise the gun in defense of the welfare of the colonized people. At this time, he made certain laws insuring his protection from external and internal aggressions from governments and agencies. One such form of protection was the Declaration of Independence, which states: ". . . whenever any government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new government, laying its foundations on such principles and organizing its powers in such forms as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness."

Now these same colonized white people, these ex-slaves, robbers, and thieves, have denied the colonized black man the right to even speak of abolishing this oppressive system which the white colonized American created. They have carried their madness to the four corners of the earth, and now there

is universal rebellion against their continued rule and power. The Black people in America are the only people who can free the world, loosen the yoke of colonialism and destroy the war machine. As long as the wheels of the imperialistic war machine are turning there is no country that can defeat this monster of the West. But Black people can make a malfunction of this machine from within. Black people can destroy the machinery that's enslaving the world. America cannot stand to fight every Black country in the world and fight a civil war at the same time. It is militarily impossible to do both of these things at once.

The slavery of Blacks in this country provides the oil for the machinery of war that America uses to enslave the peoples of the world. Without this oil the machinery cannot function. We are the driving shaft; we are in such a strategic position in this machinery that, once we become dislocated, the functioning of the remainder of the machinery breaks down.

Penned up in the ghettos of America, surrounded by his factories and all the physical components of his economic system, we have been made into "the wretched of the earth," who are relegated to the position of spectators while the white racists run their international con game on the suffering peoples. We have been brainwashed to believe that we are powerless and that there is nothing we can do for ourselves to bring about a speedy liberation for our people. We have been taught that we must please our oppressors, that we are only ten percent of the population, and therefore, we must confine our tactics to categories calculated not to disturb the sleep of our tormentors.

The power structure inflicts pain and brutality upon the peoples and then provides controlled outlets for the pain in ways least likely to upset them or interfere with the process of exploitation. The people must repudiate the channels established as tricks and deceitful snares by the exploiting oppressors. The people must oppose everything the oppressor supports and support everything that he opposes. If Black people go about their struggle for liberation in the way that the oppressor dictates and sponsors, then we will have degenerated to the level of grovelling flunkies for the oppressor himself. When the oppressor makes a vicious attack against freedom fighters because of the way that such freedom fighters choose to go about their liberation, then we know we are moving in the direction of our liberation. The racist dog oppressors have no rights which oppressed Black people are bound to respect. As long as the racist dogs pollute the earth with the evil of their actions, they do not deserve any respect at all, and the rules of their game, written in the people's blood, are beneath contempt.

The oppressor must be harassed until his doom. He must have no peace by day or by night. The slaves have always outnumbered the slaveholders. The power of the oppressor rests upon the submission of the people. When Black people really unite and rise up in all their splendid millions, they will have the strength to smash injustice. We do not understand the power in our numbers. We are millions and millions of Black people scattered across the continent and throughout the Western hemisphere. There are more Black people in America than the total population of many countries that now enjoy full membership in the United Nations. They have power and their power is based primarily on the fact that they are organized and united with each other. They are recognized by the powers of the world.

We, with all our numbers, are recognized by no one. In fact, we do not even recognize our own selves. We are unaware of

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the potential power latent in our numbers. In 1967, in the midst of a hostile racist nation whose hidden racism is rising to the surface at a phenomenal speed, we are still so blind to our critical fight for our very survival that we are continuing to function in petty, futile ways. Divided, confused, fighting among ourselves, we are still in the elementary stage of throwing rocks, sticks, empty wine bottles and beer cans at racist cops who lie in wait for a chance to murder unarmed Black people. The racist cops have worked out a system for suppressing these spontaneous rebellions that flare up from the anger, frustration, and desperation of the masses of Black people. We can no longer afford the dubious luxury of the terrible casualties wantonly inflicted upon us by the cops during these spontaneous rebellions.

Black people must now move, from the grassroots up through the perfumed circles of the Black bourgeoisie, to seize by any means necessary a proportionate share of the power vested and collected in the structure of America. We must organize and unite to combat by long resistance the brutal force used against us daily. The power structure depends upon the use of force within retaliation. This is why they have made it a felony to teach guerrilla warfare. This is why they want the people unarmed.

The racist dog oppressor fears the armed people; they fear most of all Black people armed with weapons and the ideology of the Black Panther Party For Self Defense. An unarmed people are slaves or are subject to slavery at any given moment. If a government is not afraid of the people it will arm the people from foreign aggression. Black people are held captive in the midst of their oppressors. There is a world of difference between thirty million unarmed, submissive Black people and thirty million Black people armed with freedom and defense guns and the strategic methods of liberation.

When a mechanic wants to fix a broken-down car engine, he must have the necessary tools to do the job. When the people move for liberation, they must have the basic tool of liberation: the gun. Only with the power of the gun can the Black masses halt the terror and brutality perpetuated against them by the armed racist power structure; and in one sense only by the power of the gun can the whole world be transformed into the earthly paradise dreamed of by the people from time immemorial. One successful practitioner of the art and science of national liberation and self-defense, Brother Mao Tsetung, put it this way: "We are advocates of the abolition of war, we do not want war; but war can only be abolished through war, and in order to get rid of the gun it is necessary to take up the gun."

The blood, sweat, tears and suffering of Black people are the foundations of the wealth and power of the United States of America. We were forced to build America, and if forced to, we will tear it down. The immediate result of this destruction will be suffering and bloodshed. But the end result will be the perpetual peace for all mankind.

"In Defense of Self-Defense," July 3, 1967

Historically, the power structure has demanded that Black leaders cater to their desires and to the ends of the imperialistic racism of the oppressor. The power structure has endorsed those Black leaders who have reduced themselves to nothing more than apologizing parrots. They have divided the so-called black leaders within the political arena. The oppressors sponsor radio programs, give space in their racist newspapers, and have shown them the luxury enjoyed only by the oppressor. The Black leaders serve the oppressor by purposely keeping the people submissive and passive—non-violent. At any moment that these so-called Black leaders respond to the cries of the suffering and

downtrodden, unemployed and welfare recipients who hunger for liberation by any means necessary.

Historically, there have been a few Black men who have rejected the handouts of the oppressor and who have refused to spread the oppressor's treacherous principles of deceit, gradual indoctrination and brainwashing, and who have refused to indulge in the criminal activity of teaching submission, fear, and love for an enemy who hates the very color black and is determined to commit genocide on an international scale.

There has always existed in the Black colony of Afro-America a fundamental difference over which tactics from the broad spectrum of alternatives Black people should employ in their struggle for national liberation.

One side of this difference contends that Black people are in the peculiar position where, in order to gain acceptance into the "mainstream" of American life, they must employ no tactic that will anger the oppressor whites. This view holds that Black people constitute a hopeless minority and that salvation for Black people lies in developing brotherly relations. There are certain tactics that are taboo. Violence against the oppressor must be avoided at all costs, because the oppressor will retaliate with superior violence. So Black people may protest, but not protect. They can complain, but not cut and shoot. In short, Black people must at all costs remain non-violent.

On the other side of the difference, we find that the point of departure is the principle that the oppressor has no rights that the oppressed is bound to respect. Kill the slavemaster, destroy him utterly, move against him with implacable fortitude. Break his oppressive power by any means necessary. Men who have stood before the Black masses and recommended this response to the oppression have been held in fear by the oppressor. The Blacks in the colony who were wed to the non-violent alternative could not relate to the advocates of implacable opposition to the oppressor. Because the oppressor always prefers to deal with the less radical, i.e., less dangerous, spokesmen for his subjects. He would prefer that his subjects had no spokesmen at all, or better yet, he wishes to speak for them himself. Unable to do this practically, he does the next best thing, and endorses spokesmen who will allow him to speak through them to the masses. Paramount amongst his imperatives is to see to it that implacable spokesmen are never allowed to communicate their message to the masses. They are never allowed to communicate their message to the masses. Their oppressor will resort to any means necessary to silence the implacables.

The oppressor, the endorsed spokesmen, and the implacables form the three points of a triangle of death. The oppressor looks upon the endorsed spokesmen as a tool to use against the implacables to keep the masses passive within the acceptable limits of the tactics he is capable of containing. The endorsed spokesmen look upon the oppressor as a guardian angel who can always be depended upon to protect them from the wrath of the implacables, while he looks upon the implacables as dangerous and irresponsible madmen who, by angering the oppressor, will certainly provoke a blood bath in which they themselves might get washed away. The implacables view both the oppressors and the endorsed leaders as his deadly enemies. If anything, he has a more profound hatred for the endorsed leaders than he has for the oppressor himself, because the implacables know that they can deal with the oppressor only after they have driven the endorsed spokesmen off the scene.

Historically, the endorsed spokesmen have

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 27, 1970

always held the upper hand on the implacables. In Afro-American history, there are shining brief moments when the implacables have outmaneuvered the oppressor and the endorsed spokesmen and gained the attention of the Black masses. The Black masses, recognizing the implacables in the depths of their despair, respond magnetically to the implacables and bestow a devotion and loyalty to them that frightens the oppressor and endorsed spokesmen into a panic-stricken frenzy, and they leap into a rash act—murder, imprisonment, or exile—to silence the implacables and to get their show back on the road.

The masses of Black people have always been deeply entrenched and involved in the basic necessities of life. They have not had time to abstract their situation. Abstractions come only with leisure. The people have not had the luxury of leisure. Therefore, the people have been very aware of the true definition of politics: politics are merely the desire of individuals and groups to satisfy first, their basic needs—food, shelter and clothing, and security for themselves and their loved ones. The Black leaders endorsed by the power structure have attempted to sell the people the simple-minded theory that politics is holding a political office; being able to move into a \$40,000 home; being able to sit near white people in a restaurant (while in fact the Black masses have not been able to pay the rent of a \$40.00 rat-infested hovel.)

The Black leaders have led the community to believe that brutality and force could be ended by subjecting the people to this very force of self-sacrificing demonstrations. The Black people realize brutality and force can only be inflicted if there is submission. The community has not responded in the past or in the present to the absurd and erroneous, deceitful tactics of so-called legitimate Black leaders. The community realizes that force and brutality can only be eliminated by counter force through self defense. Leaders who have recommended these tactics have never had the support and following of the downtrodden black masses who comprise the bulk of the community. Grassroots—the downtrodden of the Black community, even though they rejected the handpicked handkerchief heads endorsed by the power structure, the people have not had the academic or administrative knowledge to form themselves in long resistance to the brutality.

Marcus Garvey and Malcolm X were the two Black men of the twentieth century who posed an implacable challenge to both the oppressor and the endorsed spokesmen that could be dealt with in any other way than precisely the foul manner recorded by history. Malcolm in our time, stood on the threshold with the oppressor and the endorsed spokesmen in a bag that they couldn't get out of. Malcolm, implacable to the ultimate degree, held out to the Black masses the historical, stupendous victory of Black collective salvation and liberation from the chains of the oppressor and the treacherous embrace of the endorsed spokesmen. Only with the gun were the black masses denied this victory. But they learned from Malcolm that with the gun, they can recapture their dreams and bring them into reality.

The heirs of Malcolm now stand millions strong on their corner of the triangle, facing the racist dog oppressor and the soulless endorsed spokesmen. The heirs of Malcolm have picked up the gun and, taking first things first, are moving to expose the endorsed spokesmen for the Black masses to see them for what they are and always have been. The choice offered by the heirs of Malcolm to the endorsed spokesmen is to repudiate the oppressor and to crawl back to their people and earn a speedy reprieve or face a merciless, speedy and most timely execution for treason and being too wrong for too long.

"In Defense of Self Defense: The Correct Handling of a Revolution," July 20, 1967

Most human behavior is learned behavior. Most things the human being learns are gained through an indirect relationship to the object. Humans do not act from instinct as lower animals do. Those things learned indirectly many times stimulate very effective responses to what might be later a direct experience. At this time the black masses are handling the resistance incorrectly. The brothers in East Oakland learned from Watts a means of resistance fighting by amassing the people in the streets, throwing bricks and molotov cocktails to destroy property and create disruption. The brothers and sisters in the streets were herded into a small area by the gestapo police and immediately contained by the brutal violence of the oppressor's storm troops. This manner of resistance is sporadic, short-lived, and costly in violence against the people. This method has been transmitted to all the ghettos of the black nation across the country. The first man who threw a molotov cocktail is not personally known by the masses, but yet the action was respected and followed by the people.

The Vanguard Party must provide leadership for the people. It must teach the correct strategic methods of prolonged resistance through literature and activities. If the activities of the party are respected by the people, the people will follow the example. This is the primary job of the party. This knowledge will probably be gained second-hand by the masses just as the above mentioned was gained indirectly. When the people learn that it is no longer advantageous for them to resist by going into the streets in large numbers, and when they see the advantage in the activities of the guerrilla warfare method, they will quickly follow this example.

But first, they must respect the party which is transmitting this message. When the Vanguard group destroys the machinery of the oppressor by dealing with him in small groups of three and four, and then escapes the might of the oppressor, the masses will be overjoyed and will adhere to this correct strategy. When the masses hear that a gestapo policeman has been executed while sipping coffee at a counter, and the revolutionary executioners fled without being traced, the masses will see the validity of this type of approach to resistance. It is not necessary to organize thirty million Black people in primary groups of two's and three's but it is important for the party to show the people how to go about revolution. During slavery, in which no vanguard party existed and forms of communications were severely restricted and insufficient, many slave revolts occurred.

There are basically three ways one can learn: through study, through observation, and through actual experience. The black community is basically composed of activists. The community learns through activity, either through observation or participation in the activity. To study and learn is good but the actual experience is the best means of learning. The party must engage in activities that will teach the people. The black community is basically not a reading community. Therefore it is very significant that the vanguard group first be activists. Without this knowledge of the black community, one could not gain the fundamental knowledge of the black revolution in racist America.

The main function of the party is to awaken the people and to teach them the strategic method of resisting the power structure, which is prepared not only to combat the resistance of the people with massive brutality, but to totally annihilate the black community, the black population.

If it is learned by the power structures that black people have "x" amount of guns in their possession, this will not stimulate

the power structure to prepare itself with guns, because it is already more than prepared.

The end result of this education will be positive for Black people in their resistance and negative for the power structure in its oppression, because the party always exemplifies revolutionary defiance. If the party is not going to make the people aware of the tools of liberation and the strategic method that is to be used, there will be no means by which the people will be mobilized properly.

The relationship between the vanguard party and the masses is a secondary relationship. The relationship between the members of the vanguard party is a primary relationship. It is important that the members of the vanguard group maintain a face-to-face relationship with each other. This is important if the party machinery is to be effective. It is impossible to put together functional party machinery or programs without this direct relationship. The members of the vanguard group should be tested revolutionaries. This will minimize the danger of Uncle Tom informers and opportunists.

The main purpose of vanguard group should be to raise the consciousness of the masses through educational programs and certain physical activities the party will participate in. The sleeping masses must be bombarded with the correct approach to struggle through the activities of the vanguard party. Therefore, the masses must know that the party exists. The party must use all means available to get this information across to the masses. If the masses do not have knowledge of the party, it will be impossible for the masses to follow the program of the party.

The vanguard party is never underground in the beginning of its existence, because this would limit its effectiveness and educational processes. How can you teach people if the people do not know and respect you? The party must exist above ground as long as the dog power structure will allow, and hopefully when the party is forced to go underground the message of the party will already have been put across to the people. The vanguard party's activities on the surface will necessarily be short-lived.

This is why it is so important that the party make a tremendous impact upon the people before it is driven into secrecy.

At this time, the people know the party exists, and they will seek out further information on the activities of this underground party.

Many would-be revolutionaries work under the fallacious illusion that the vanguard party is to be a secret organization that the power structure knows nothing about, and the masses know nothing about, except for occasional letters that come to their homes by night. Underground parties cannot distribute leaflets announcing an underground meeting. These are contradictions and inconsistencies of the so-called revolutionaries. The so-called revolutionaries are in fact afraid of the very danger that they are advocating for the people. These so-called revolutionaries want the people to say what they themselves are afraid to say, and the people to do what they themselves are afraid to do. This makes the so-called revolutionary a coward and a hypocrite.

If these imposters would investigate the history of revolution, they would see that the vanguard group always starts out above ground and is later driven underground by the aggressor. The Cuban Revolution exemplifies this fact; when Fidel Castro started to resist the butcher Batista and the American running dogs, he started by speaking on the campus of the University of Havana in public. He was later driven to the hills. His impact upon the dispossessed people of Cuba was very great and received with much re-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

spect. When he went into secrecy, Cuban people searched him out. People went to the hills to find him and his band of twelve. Castro handled the revolutionary struggle correctly. If the Chinese Revolution is investigated, it will be seen that the Communist Party was quite on the surface so that they would be able to muster support from the masses. There are many areas one can read about to learn the correct approach, such as the revolution in Kenya, the Algerian Revolution, Fanon's *The Wretched of the Earth*, the Russian Revolution, the works of Chairman Mao Tse-tung, and a host of others.

A revolutionary must realize that if he is sincere, death is imminent due to the fact that the things he is saying and doing are extremely dangerous. Without this realization, it is impossible to proceed as a revolutionary. The masses are constantly looking for a guide, a Messiah, to liberate them from the hands of the oppressor. The vanguard party must exemplify the characteristics of worthy leadership. Millions and millions of oppressed people might not know members of the vanguard party personally or directly, but they will gain through an indirect acquaintance the proper strategy for liberation via the mass media and the physical activities of the party. It is of prime importance that the vanguard party develop a political organ, such as a newspaper produced by the party, as well as employ strategically revolutionary art and destruction of the oppressor's machinery. For example, Watts. The economy and property of the oppressor was destroyed to such an extent that no matter how the oppressor tried to whitewash the activities of the black brothers, the real nature and the real cause of the activity was communicated to every black community. For further example, no matter how the oppressor tries to distort and confuse the message of Brother Stokely Carmichael, Black people all over the country understand it perfectly and welcome it.

The Black Panther Party for Self Defense teaches that in the final analysis, the amount of guns and defense weapons, such as hand grenades, bazookas, and other necessary equipment, will be supplied by taking these weapons from the power structure, as exemplified by the Viet Cong. Therefore, the greater the military preparation on the part of the oppressor, the greater is the availability of weapons for the black community. It is believed by some hypocrites that when the people are taught by the vanguard group to prepare for resistance, this only brings the man down on them with increasing violence and brutality; but the fact of the matter is that when the man becomes more oppressive, this only heightens the revolutionary fervor. The people never make revolution. The oppressors by their brutal actions cause the resistance by the people. The vanguard party only teaches the correct methods of resistance. So, if things can get worse for oppressed people, then they will feel no need for revolution or resistance. The complaint of the hypocrites that the Black Panther Party for Self Defense is exposing the people to deeper suffering is an incorrect observation. People have proved that they will not tolerate any more oppression by the racist dog police through their rebellions in the black communities across the country. The people are looking now for guidance to extend and strengthen their resistance struggle.

FEAR AND DOUBT

(By Huey P. Newton, May 15, 1967)

The lower socio-economic Black male is a man of confusion. He faces a hostile environment and is not sure that it is not his own sins that have attracted the hostilities of society. All his life he has been taught (explicitly and implicitly) that he is an inferior approximation of humanity. As a man, he finds himself void of those things that bring respect and a feeling of worthiness. He

looks around for something to blame for his situation, but because he is not sophisticated regarding the socio-economic milieu and because of negativistic parental and institutional teachings, he ultimately blames himself.

When he was a child, his parents told him that they were not affluent because "we didn't have the opportunity to become educated," or "we did not take advantage of the educational opportunities that were offered to us." They tell their children that things will be different for them if they are educated and skilled, but that there is absolutely nothing other than this occasional warning (and often not even this) to stimulate education. Black people are great worshippers of education, even the lower socio-economic Black person, but at the same time, they are afraid of exposing themselves to it. They are afraid because they are vulnerable to having their fears verified; perhaps they will find that they can't compete with white students. The Black person tells himself that he could have done much more if he had really wanted to. The fact is, of course, that the assumed educational opportunities were never available to the lower socio-economic Black person due to the unique position assigned him in life.

It is a two-headed monster that haunts this man. First, his attitude is that he lacks innate ability to cope with the socio-economic problems confronting him, and second, he tells himself that he has the ability but he simply has not felt strongly enough to try to acquire the skills needed to manipulate his environment. In a desperate effort to assume self-respect, he rationalizes that he is lethargic; in this way, he denies a possible lack of innate ability. If he openly attempts to discover his abilities, he and others may see him for what he is—or is not, and this is the real fear. He then withdraws into the world of the invisible, but not without a struggle. He may attempt to make himself visible by processing his hair, acquiring a "boss mop", or driving a long car, even though he can't afford it. He may father several illegitimate children by several different women in order to display his masculinity. But in the end, he realizes that he is ineffectual in his efforts.

Society responds to him as a thing, a beast, a non-entity, something to be ignored or stepped on. He is asked to respect laws that do not respect him. He is asked to digest a code of ethics that acts upon him but not for him. He is confused and in a constant state of rage, of shame and doubt. This psychological set permeates all his interpersonal relationships. It determines his view of the social system. His psychological development has been prematurely arrested. This doubt begins at a very early age and continues through his life. The parents pass it on to the child and the social system reinforces the fear, the shame, and the doubt. In the third or fourth grade, he may find that he shares the classroom with white students, but when the class is engaged in reading exercises, all the Black students find themselves in a group at a table reserved for slow readers. This may be quite an innocent effort on the part of the school system. The teacher may not realize that the Black students feared (in fact, feel certain) that Black means dumb and white means smart. The children do not realize that the head start the children got at home is what accounts for the situation. It is generally accepted that the child is the father of the man; this holds true for the lower socio-economic Black people.

With whom, with what can he, a man, identify? As a child he had no permanent male figure with whom to identify; as a man, he sees nothing in society with which he can identify as an extension of himself. His life is built on mistrust, shame, doubt, guilt, inferiority, role confusion, isolation and de-

spair. He feels that he is something less than a man, and it is evident in his conversation: "the white man is 'The Man', he got everything, and he knows everything, and a nigger ain't nothing." In a society where a man is valued according to occupation and material possessions, he is without possessions. He is unskilled and more often than not, either marginally employed or unemployed. Often his wife (who is able to secure a job as a maid cleaning for white people) is the breadwinner. He is, therefore, viewed as quite worthless by his wife and children. He is ineffectual both in and out of the home. He cannot provide for or protect his family. He is invisible, a non-entity. Society will not acknowledge him as a man. He is a consumer and not a producer. He is dependent upon the white man ('The Man') to feed his family, to give him a job, educate his children, serve as the model that he tries to emulate. He is dependent and he hates 'The Man' and he hates himself. Who is he? Is he a very old adolescent or is he the slave he used to be?

What did he do to be so Black and blue?

EXECUTIVE MANDATE NO. 1: STATEMENT BY THE MINISTER OF DEFENSE

(Delivered May 2, 1967, at Sacramento, California, State Capitol Building.)

The Black Panther Party for Self Defense calls upon the American people in general and the Black people in particular to take careful note of the racist California Legislature which is now considering legislation aimed at keeping the Black people disarmed and powerless at the very same time that racist police agencies throughout the country are intensifying the terror, brutality, murder and repression of Black people.

At the same time that the American government is waging a racist war of genocide in Vietnam, the concentration camps (see "Concentration Camps U.S.A." by Charles R. Allen, Jr., and "American Concentration Camps" by Boswell) in which Japanese Americans were interned during World War II are being renovated and expanded. Since America has historically reserved the most barbaric treatment for non-white people, we are forced to conclude that these concentration camps are being prepared for Black people who are determined to gain their freedom by any means necessary. The enslavement of Black people from the very beginning of this country, the genocide practiced on the American Indians and the confining of the survivors on reservations, the savage lynching of thousands of Black men and women, the dropping of atomic bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki, and now the cowardly massacre in Vietnam, all testify to the fact that towards people of color the racist power structure of America has but one policy: repression, genocide, terror, and the big stick.

Black people have begged, prayed, petitioned, demonstrated and everything else to get the racist power structure of America to right the wrongs which have historically been perpetrated against Black people. All of these efforts have been answered by more repression, deceit, and hypocrisy. As the aggression of the racist American government escalates in Vietnam, the police agencies of America escalate the repression of Black people throughout the ghettos of America. Vicious police dogs, cattle prods and increased patrols have become familiar sights in black communities. City Hall turns a deaf ear to the pleas of Black people for relief from this increasing terror.

The Black Panther Party for Self Defense believes that the time has come for Black people to arm themselves against this terror before it is too late. The pending Mulford Act brings the hour of doom one step nearer. A people who have suffered so much for so long at the hands of a racist society, must draw the line somewhere. We believe that the

Black communities of America must rise up as one man to halt the progression of a trend that leads inevitably to their total destruction. (Huey P. Newton, Minister of Defense.)

EXECUTIVE MANDATE NO. 2: STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF DEFENSE

(Delivered June 29, 1967.)

So Let This Be Heard. . . Brother Stokely Carmichael:

Because you have distinguished yourself in the struggle for the total liberation of Black people from oppression in racist white America;

Because you have acted courageously and shown great fortitude under the most adverse circumstances;

Because you have proven yourself as a true revolutionary guided by a great feeling of love for our people;

Because you have set such a fine example, in the tradition of Brother Malcolm for dedicating your entire life to the struggle of Black Liberation, inspiring our youth and providing a model for others to emulate;

Because you have refused to serve in the oppressor's racist mercenary, aggressive war machine, showing that you know who your true friends and enemies are;

Because of your new endeavor to organize and liberate the Crown Colony of Washington, D.C., you will inevitably be forced to confront, deal with, and conquer the racist Washington Police Department which functions as the protector of the racist dog power structure, occupying the Black Community in the same manner and for the same reasons that the racist U.S. Armed Forces occupy South Vietnam;

You are hereby drafted into the Black Panther Party for Self Defense, invested with the rank of Field Marshal, delegated the following authority, power, and responsibility: To establish revolutionary law, order and justice in the territory lying between the Continental Divide East to the Atlantic Ocean; North of the Mason-Dixon Line to the Canadian Border; South of the Mason-Dixon Line to the Gulf of Mexico. . . . So Let It Be Done. (Huey P. Newton, Minister of Defense, June 29, 1967.)

EXECUTIVE MANDATE NO. 3: STATEMENT OF THE MINISTER OF DEFENSE

(Delivered on March 1, 1968.)

So Let This Be Heard: Because of the St. Valentine Day massacre of February 14, 1929, in which outlaws donned the uniforms of Policemen, posed as such, and thereby gained entrance to locked doors controlled by rival outlaws with whom they were contending for control of the bootlegging industry in Chicago; and because these gangsters, gaining entry through their disguise as Policemen, proceeded to exterminate their rivals with machinegun fire, we believe that prudence would dictate that one should be alert when opening one's door to strangers, late at night, in the wee hours of the morning—even when these strangers wear the uniform of policemen. History teaches us that the man in the uniform may or may not be a policeman authorized to enter the homes of the people, and

Taking notice of the fact that (1) on January 16, 1968, at 3:30 A.M., members of the San Francisco Police Department kicked down the door and made an illegal entry, and search of the home of Eldridge Cleaver, Minister of Information. These Pigs had no search warrant, no arrest warrant, and were therefore not authorized to enter. They were not invited in. Permission for them to enter was explicitly denied by the Minister of Information. Present were Sister Kathleen Cleaver, our Communications Secretary and wife to our Minister of Information, and Brother Emory Douglas, our Revolutionary Artist.

Taking further notice of the fact that (2) on February 25, 1968, several uniformed ges-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

tapos of the Berkeley Pig Department, accompanied by several other white men in plainclothes, bearing an assortment of shotguns, rifles, and service revolvers, made a forceful, unlawful entry and search of the home of Bobby Seale, Chairman of our Party, and his wife, Sister Artie Seale. These Pigs had no warrant either to search or to arrest. When asked by Chairman Bobby to produce a warrant, they arrogantly stated that they did not need one. They had no authority to enter—what they did have was the power of the gun. Thus we are confronted with a critical situation. Our organization has received serious threats from certain racist elements of White America, including the Oakland, Berkeley, and San Francisco Pig Departments. Threats to take our lives, to exterminate us. We cannot determine when any of these elements, or a combination of them, may move to implement these threats. We must be alert to the danger at all times. We will not fall victim to a St. Valentine's Massacre. Therefore, those who approach our doors in the manner of outlaws, who seek to enter our homes illegally, unlawfully and in a rowdy fashion, those who kick our doors down with no authority and seek to ransack our homes in violation of our HUMAN RIGHTS, will henceforth be treated as outlaws, as gangsters, as evildoers. We have no way of determining that a man in a uniform involved in a forced outlaw entry into our home is in fact a Guardian of the Law. He is acting like a lawbreaker and we must make an appropriate response.

We draw the line at the threshold of our doors. It is therefore mandated as a general order to all members of the Black Panther Party for Self Defense that all members must acquire the technical equipment to defend their homes and their dependents and shall do so. Any member of the Party having such technical equipment who fails to defend his threshold shall be expelled from the Party for Life. . . . So Let This Be Done.—Huey P. Newton, Minister of Defense, March 1, 1968.

—
Black Panther Party Nat'l Headquarters,
3106 Shattuck Avenue, Berkeley, Ca. 94705.

FOR CONTINUOUS ACTION TOWARDS WORLD

PEACE

Black people should strongly support the demand for immediate withdrawal of all United States troops from Vietnam and should support the Moratorium actions, but Black people should understand that there is no unity of will between Black people and the leadership of the New Mobilization because the New Mobilization has either failed to see or does not want to see the importance of Black Peoples' just struggle or its direct relationship with the struggles of the Vietnamese people. We Black people clearly understand that the best "care package" that we can send to the Vietnamese people is our continued and intensified resistance to fascist repression from the same enemy here in America.

We demand: That the peace movement, and in particular the New Mobilization Committee select one or two of its responsible representatives to take the place of Rene Davis and Dave Dellinger, who are prohibited by the fascist U.S. Power Structure from taking an active part in the exchange of Political Prisoners, Huey Newton and Bobby Seale for American prisoners of war now being held in Vietnam. The Vietnamese people are ready to deal. All we need are trustworthy people. The selected representatives will proceed to Hanoi where negotiations would be carried out under the supervision of our Minister of Information, Eldridge Cleaver, to insure that the proceedings would be agreeable to the progressive factors, both Black and White of the American Society.

That a massive international action be held to protest the Sato-Nixon meeting to solidify Japan's role as a springboard for further imperialistic aggression on the Continent of Asia and in particular in Vietnam, Laos, and Korea. CP USA and the New Mobilization Committee and other progressive forces contact the CP and other fraternal anti-war organizations in Japan to plan a series of simultaneous international demonstrations for this purpose.

That the CP USA address themselves to enlisting massive active support from the Soviet Union for the Vietnamese People in particular and the National Liberation struggles of the World in general. This must also include active and meaningful support for the liberation struggle of Black people in America.

For further information contact National Headquarters or: Black Panther Party, 113 W. 30th St., Indianapolis, Ind.

THE COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT AGAINST AID TO CAMBODIA

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, on June 30, after 7 long weeks of debate, the U.S. Senate passed the Cooper-Church amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act, barring further action by our Government, under present law, to aid in the defense of Cambodia directly or indirectly.

This measure then came to the floor of the House of Representatives on July 9 where it was rejected, after considerable parliamentary maneuvering, by a vote of 237 to 153. My vote was cast against it.

The Cooper-Church amendment has been widely publicized as a means of getting American ground troops out of Cambodia. But President Nixon, keeping his promise to the American people, had already withdrawn all American ground forces from Cambodia before either the Senate or the House voted on this measure. Its really significant provision went comparatively unnoticed:

a prohibition on spending any U.S. funds for the purpose of entering into or carrying out any contract or agreement to provide military instruction in Cambodia, or to provide persons to engage in any combat activity in support of Cambodian forces.

This would apply not only to American troops or military instructors—covered by a preceding section of the amendment—but to any country, receiving American military aid, which might use any part of such aid to help defend Cambodia. Countries such as Thailand and South Vietnam itself, whose security is intimately involved with the defense of Cambodia, would jeopardize all their military aid from the United States if they made any move to help Cambodia. should this measure become law. This is directly contrary to the fundamental objective of President Nixon's program of disengaging American forces from Southeast Asia while encouraging the threatened nations there to defend themselves.

—
This measure is not limited to the
Cooper-Church amendment to the Foreign Military Sales Act, but applies to any other legislation that may be introduced in the future.

Since it seems clear that Cambodia is unable to defend herself now without some outside assistance, adoption of the Cooper-Church amendment would virtually assure the immediate handing over of Cambodia to the Communists or, at the very least, the prompt return of the procommunist Sihanouk government. This would reopen the port of Sihanoukville, which for the past 3 years has been a major source of resupply for North Vietnamese troops.

The strategic importance of Sihanoukville is tremendous. Over a year ago it assumed the primary position as port of entry for war materials in support of North Vietnamese forces in South Vietnam. A report presented July 6 to the House Select Committee on United States Involvement in Southeast Asia, supported by reliable evidence from the combat zone, shows that about 85 percent of all the military supplies the Communist enemy was receiving in the southern part of South Vietnam came through Sihanoukville, until its use against us was ended by the new Lon Nol government in Cambodia.

It is true that we should not permanently commit American ground troops

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

in Cambodia. But there is no justification for congressional action to ban all military aid to Cambodia from any source, leaving its people to become helpless victims of the massacres which have accompanied every Communist conquest. All aside from the necessity of protecting our own troops by preventing the resupply of their combat foes through Cambodia, such abandonment of a whole people would be profoundly immoral.

The words of Douglas Pike, in his recent study entitled "The Viet Cong Strategy of Terror" and circulated by the U.S. Information Agency, on the fate South Vietnam would suffer in a Communist conquest apply equally well to Cambodia:

The meaning of the Hue Massacre seems clear. If the communists win decisively in South Vietnam (and the key word is decisively), what is the prospect? First, all foreigners would be cleared out of the South, especially the hundreds of foreign newsmen who are in and out of Saigon. A curtain of ignorance would descend. Then would begin the night of long knives. There would be a new order to build. The war was long and so are memories of old scores to be settled. All political opposition, actual or potential, would be systematically eliminated . . .

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

The world would call it peace.

1970 CONGRESSIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE TABULATED

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, my 1970 congressional questionnaire has been tabulated and I would like to share the findings with my colleagues in the Congress.

I mailed out over 200,000 questionnaires to residents of my First Congressional District, and received back some 36,000 for a 17.8-percent response—the best I have ever had.

Mr. Speaker, the views that my constituents express are of vital importance to me. I am grateful to all those who took the time to return their questionnaire, and I am particularly pleased that so many wrote additional comments and letters:

[In percent]

	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No
		opinion			opinion	opinion
1. Do you approve of the way the Nixon administration is handling the conduct of the Vietnam war?	60.1	34.0	3.1	1. Inflation	36.7	4.8
2. Should the President order an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia?	24.3	70.1	3.0	2. Law and order	28.4	4.3
3. The United States has never established diplomatic relations with Red China. Do you favor softening of the U.S. position and talks leading to possible diplomatic recognition of mainland China?	49.0	39.4	8.3	3. Environment	9.0	1.6
4. Do you favor the limited ABM system recommended by President Nixon?	44.0	31.5	18.8	4. Campus disorders	8.6	4.2
5. Foreign aid:				10. Should Congress place a ceiling on the total amount any 1 person may receive under the Federal farm subsidy program?	83.8	5.1
(a) Should the United States continue to extend military aid to other nations?	34.0	54.9	4.7	11. Do you favor the President's proposal for automatic cost-of-living adjustments in social security benefit payments?	79.0	12.5
(b) Should the United States continue to extend economic aid to other nations?	56.8	31.6	4.3	12. Would you favor passage of a constitutional amendment by the Congress to permit voluntary nondenominational prayer in public schools?	77.2	14.9
6. When the Vietnam conflict is resolved, would you favor abolishing the present draft system for an all-volunteer Army?	55.8	36.1	5.1	13. Do you favor the proposal before Congress amending the Constitution to lower the voting age to 18?	27.6	69.0
7. Do you support President Nixon's action in closing the U.S. Consulate in Rhodesia?	33.3	24.6	38.1	14. President Nixon and Vice President Agnew—How would you rate their performance in office?		
8. To get families off welfare, President Nixon has proposed a work incentive and job training program while guaranteeing a basic level of financial assistance. Do you favor this alternative to the present welfare system?	79.6	11.1	5.6	President Nixon:		
9. What, in your opinion, are the top domestic issues confronting the United States today?				Excellent	25.4	27.5
				Good	36.3	29.2
				Fair	22.1	17.8
				Poor	13.7	20.7
				Vice-President Agnew:		
				Excellent		
				Good		
				Fair		
				Poor		

MOTORBOAT SAFETY

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, the outgoing Chief of the Office of Boating Safety, U.S. Coast Guard, Rear Adm. Joseph J. McClelland, has written an informative and timely report about the current status of recreational boating and particularly the Coast Guard's efforts to promote safety on the Nation's waterways. With more than 40 million people participating in this activity each year, I know there are many who are deeply concerned over the problems that accompany our growing boating population. I commend the article "Problems and Programs," appearing in the June 1970 issue of *Coast Guard: Proceedings of the Merchant Marine Council*, to the attention of my colleagues:

(By Rear Adm. Joseph J. McClelland)

PROBLEMS AND PROGRAMS

Recreational boating has been experiencing a tremendous rate of growth and has been demanding increasing time and attention from the Coast Guard. The problems of recreational boating safety are becoming of increasing importance to us, and we have given new emphasis to the development of an effective boating safety program.

It may appear that these problems have very little relationship to the shipping industry. I suggest that there are several areas of common concern. The environment is the same, and the hazards are similar; many items of marine equipment, such as life-saving devices, are common on all types of vessels. Aids to navigation are of concern as much to the recreational boatman as they are to the ship master. The rules of the road affect all users on our waterways, and provisions affecting such items as navigation lights are of common concern.

Environmental pollution problems are very much in the forefront these days. Pollution of the oceans and inland waters from oil and vessel wastes, and from sewage disposal, is a common problem.

The Coast Guard's Merchant Marine inspection program is an intensive, extensive safety program well known to the shipping industry. It could readily be considered as a pattern for insuring the safety and reliability of recreational boats, but the standards required are of an entirely different nature, and a suitable inspection program must have a different approach. We do not intend to adopt similar procedures, and this approach may have a marked effect upon the vessel inspection program. I will cover this more specifically later.

There are other areas of common concern, but these which I have mentioned will, I hope, be sufficient to illustrate for you that this tremendously expanding recreational boating activity does relate directly to the shipping community. In addition, I am sure there are many boat owners reading this who are interested in what the Coast Guard is doing about boating safety.

STATISTICS

We estimate that there are over 8½ million recreational boats now in use, and we know that more than 300,000 new boats are being manufactured every year. More than 40 million people are estimated to go boating

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 27, 1970

every year. That amounts to one boat for approximately every 25 people in our country, and about one out of every five persons goes boating. The boating business is a \$3.2 billion industry. Looking into the future, it seems certain that with increasing leisure time, with our society becoming ever more affluent, and with the areas and facilities for other types of recreation becoming more and more crowded, boating is going to continue to increase at an extravagant rate.

Inevitably, with this many boats and so many millions of people engaged in boating sports, there are going to be accidents. In 1969, 1,350 people lost their lives in boating accidents. These deaths, along with thousands of injuries and many millions of dollars' worth of damage to property, have brought the boating safety problem into the limelight and identified it as an important element of the public safety and consumer protection program.

There are a number of lesser boating problems, such as lack of uniformity in laws of States concerning numbering of boats and requirements for safety equipment. This is important for boatmen who move back and forth between jurisdictions, and the boating population is very mobile these days. This affects the manufacturers too, because it is difficult for any manufacturer with extensive distribution to know precisely how he must equip a boat or design associated equipment in order to comply with the laws.

There are problems with law enforcement also. As you know, present Federal boating laws apply only upon navigable waters of the United States. We know that approximately one-third of all boating accidents occur on waters that are solely under State jurisdiction and that almost one-half of all deaths from boating accidents occur on these waters. Thus, effective State boating safety programs are essential, and unfortunately not all States do have such effective programs.

THE FOUR "E'S"

In response to these problems, the Coast Guard has developed a program which basically includes four areas of activity. These are: Education, engineering standards, law enforcement, and a sort of catch-all which I call environmental concerns. Let me briefly consider each of these in turn.

Education

Education is, in my opinion, our greatest concern and yet our greatest opportunity. It is generally concluded from accident records that human error is the principal cause of boating accidents, since the specific cause is usually difficult to identify, and after all, the boatman is the last safety check in the chain of events which culminates in an accident. This error may result from lack of knowledge, lack of competence or judgment, or perhaps lack of information. There is, of course, an extensive educational effort in being. Several States have boating safety education programs, including courses given in the schools. The Coast Guard Auxiliary, the U.S. Power Squadrons, the American Red Cross, and other organizations offer free education courses all over the country. Hundreds of thousands of boatmen take advantage of these courses every year.

The Coast Guard and several of the States carry out modest public education programs through the public information media, through training films, and through displays at boat shows. Our boating safety detachments, which are mobile safety crews with a trailerable boat, do an outstanding job of public education. The combination of all these activities makes an educational program of considerable extent. We hope to improve this effort in the future by expansion and better coordination. We rely heavily upon the Coast Guard Auxiliary, and I anticipate significant increases in the Auxiliary's education program.

Engineering standards

The purpose of a Federal boat safety standards program for recreational boats is to insure that the boat and associated equipment which reaches the consumer is reliable. Last year the Coast Guard responded to more than 31,000 calls for assistance from recreational boats. More than 48 percent of the search and rescue cases resulted from engine breakdown or boat systems failure of some nature. This would indicate that there is some room for improvement in the reliability of boats and their equipment.

The Motorboat Act of 1940 currently prescribes the Federal requirements for motorboats and equipment. The items regulated are limited to six specific items such as fire extinguishers, lifesaving devices, and navigation lights. No doubt the scope of these requirements was felt to be adequate in 1940, but the tremendous increase in recreational boating, technological changes such as the development of the inboard-outboard drive, and the use of new materials such as fiber-glass in boat construction, have long ago created requirements far beyond these limited regulations. In addition, the development of factual information through collection of data in accordance with the 1958 Boating Act has helped to identify items for which regulations are needed.

Many States have developed their own safety requirements for State waters, and the boating industry has developed quite extensive voluntary standards for their own use. However, such voluntary standards do not provide the minimums needed, they are not universally accepted and followed, and there is no requirement for compliance. The Coast Guard is, therefore, now seeking new legislation which would update and expand Federal authority. It is intended to promulgate minimum safety standards required for boating safety which will be established only where there is a demonstrated need. Such standards will be reasonable, and will be expressed in terms of performance insofar as practicable.

The 1940 act places responsibility for compliance with the law solely upon the boat owner/operator. This is true even for such things as backfire flame control equipment, which is almost always sold as an integral part of the boat. Responsibility for the design and construction of a boat, and for providing the boatman with a boat and equipment which meet Federal safety standards should properly lie with the manufacturer. A single set of standards, therefore, becomes mandatory. We intend to preempt the boating standards field in order that the manufacturer may more readily comply with the regulations, and the boatman will not have to be concerned when he moves between jurisdictions.

Enforcement

The Coast Guard's law enforcement activity with respect to boating involves enforcement of the requirements for equipment and numbering, and of the rules against reckless or negligent operation of boats. We work closely with the States, and in fact have cooperative agreements with the great majority of them. These agreements generally provide for joint enforcement of the law on waters which lie within the State and yet are navigable waters of the United States. We feel that local enforcement of the law with respect to individuals is most effective, and through our proposal for a program of financial assistance we hope to encourage local law enforcement activity.

Environment

Those concerns of the boating safety program which relate directly to the environment include aids to navigation, the collection and dissemination of weather and marine information, and the efficient utilization of water areas by means of controls such as

zoning. The Coast Guard is currently engaged in an extensive study of our Aids to Navigation System, and the needs of the Recreational Boatman are being kept very much in mind.

Presently the amount of weather information being disseminated to the boatman is quite considerable. Those of you who go boating in many areas know that you can tune in to current weather broadcasts many times during the day. However, some boatmen simply neglect to tune in the weather, and many small craft aren't even equipped with radios. So we face a difficult problem in attempting to warn boatmen of impending squalls or heavy weather. Inability to reach the boatman while he is boating has resulted in a number of tragedies in recent years, such as the *Coho Salmon* disaster on Lake Michigan in 1967. We are hoping that a research and development effort will develop an inexpensive device for this purpose.

I am sure that zoning is going to come into greater use as our water areas become more crowded. Of course, we already have zoning of certain types, such as for anchorage and swimming, and we have speed limits in many places. No doubt areas will be set aside for water skiing and fishing, as well as for other purposes, as demand develops.

MEETING THE CASUALTY PROBLEM

It scarcely needs to be mentioned that the accident problem in boating is entirely different in nature from that with motor vehicles. A motor vehicle accident is almost always a collision with another vehicle, or at least an impact with some object which results in death and injury. Only a small minority of boating accidents are of this nature. The greatest single cause of deaths in boating accidents is drowning from capsizings or falls overboard. Thus the hazard of boating results largely from the environment.

This emphasizes what is perhaps our number one concern, the problem of lifesaving devices. The majority of drownings occur as a result of a sudden type of casualty in which there is no opportunity or time to get or put on a lifesaving device. Possibly as many as 1,000 of the 1,260 victims that drowned in 1969 did not have time to don a lifesaving device before going overboard. It appears that the only solution is to have the lifesaving device on or in hand at all times. At the very least, devices should be worn by all occupants when boating conditions are hazardous, and by children and nonswimmers at all times.

But how can we get people to wear life jackets? Much can be done through education, and regulations can have some effect. However, we hope to make the job easier by providing the boatman with a device which he will want to wear. Research and development assistance has been available recently in our efforts to determine how changes in design will affect the performance of flotation devices. We hope to use data from this study in conjunction with wear acceptability research to help us to develop improved specifications. This could significantly reduce the number of drownings.

Another project which has been in progress for some time is the updating and unification of the inland, western rivers, and Great Lakes rules of the road into a single set of U.S. rules, patterned generally after the international rules. A bill has been introduced before the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries to accomplish this.

Each of the sets of rules we are seeking to unify are, with some changes, still quite close to their original form. There are problems involved in asking three different groups of sailors to break with 100 years of tradition. But we believe the unified package to be a much improved version of all three sets of rules.

I hope that this brief article has indicated to you the balanced nature of our Coast Guard boating safety program. We hope that it will meet the needs of boating safety within the practical limitations of funds and resources. There are, however, two points which I would like to emphasize. First, although I have been talking about the Coast Guard program of boating safety, this Federal program can by no means operate successfully on its own. Full cooperation and coordination with the States is essential, and the extensive contributions of industry and of the many fine boating organizations are of paramount importance. The cooperation of all and the dedication of our legions of boatmen to boating safety are of the greatest value.

Secondly, I want to say that foremost in every element of this program is the interest of the boating citizen. It is the Coast Guard's mission to make his boating recreation as safe as reasonably possible, and yet insure that it will always continue to be recreation.

As part of the maritime community, I hope you will give whatever support you can to this challenging program.

URBAN PROBLEMS

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the attention which has been focused upon them in the past several years, the cities of our Nation continue to face ever-growing difficulties.

The main problem is one of insufficient money.

Cities are caught in a vicious circle. As families and businesses move out to the suburbs, they reduce the cities' financial resources, decreasing the ability of the city government to maintain its services, and stimulating additional outward flight.

Abandoned by the affluent middle class, the cities are left with a host of problems. Decent housing is desperately needed, and the need is increasing despite the fact that many dwellings lie vacant. Without exception, however, these buildings are old and decaying, as are the streets and sewers which service them. No one wants to live in them in this condition, and those with the resources to rehabilitate them prefer to live elsewhere.

Inflation causes additional problems. The cost of providing services at last year's levels increases, but revenues fail to keep pace. Shrinking tax bases and cutbacks in State and Federal funds make it extremely difficult to meet the growing needs of the remaining population.

One of the most perceptive statements to be made recently about the condition of our cities appeared recently in the New York Times under the authorship of Jack Rosenthal. I recommend it to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD at this time:

[From the New York Times, May 22, 1970]
URBANISTS FIND SUBURBS HOSTILE TO CITIES,
PINCHED FOR MONEY

(By Jack Rosenthal)

ST. LOUIS.—A patrolman gestures at the dark, three-block corridor of small stores,

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

cafes, and row houses. "Not even a rat," he says drily. "Abandoned."

A few minutes later, the car passes Gaslight Square, renowned not long ago for chic restaurants, cabarets, night life. One restaurant is open. But the gaslights—and everything else—are dark. Abandoned.

"You think this is bad," says a resident urbanist. "Across the river, they're saying the most booming business in East St. Louis is Bob's Board-Up Service."

Abandonment, evident in St. Louis, is increasing in older cities across the country. In New York, Philadelphia, Detroit and elsewhere, not just houses, not just blocks but even whole neighborhoods are being evacuated.

A Federal official says: "There are parts of these cities so empty they look like someone dropped nerve gas." A suburban official in St. Louis asserts: "It's not urban blight any more. It's urban leprosy."

Whatever the label, abandonment furnishes a striking illustration of two dominant urban themes evident from visits to cities across the country:

What was once a financial pinch for cities now approaches financial strangulation. Funds from almost all sources are slowing down or drying up, while increased needs and inflation are pushing costs steadily higher.

The middle class, once the strength of the city, has largely fled to the suburbs and becomes an enemy. Officials of both cities and suburbs acknowledge that suburban residents are apathetic or hostile to the problems of the working class, the old, the black, and the poor left behind.

Like abandonment, these are not new themes. What is striking about them is their increasing impact. Some authorities already foresee payless municipal paydays. Others fear an even more decisive impact: the death not merely of neighborhoods but of the city as well.

There is hyperbole in such fears, but not much, close students of the urban field say. The city will not literally die. What is dying is the general conception of the city—radiating outward from a downtown employment and shopping hub.

KEY PROBLEM IS AGE

Shining, rebuilt downtown core areas will remain. Suburban rings, increasingly distant, will continue to flower. But the area in between is, in the eyes of the suburban middle-class, becoming a no-man's land.

It is, however, a no-man's land in which large numbers of poor and discriminated-against people must continue to live. And, increasingly, city governments are becoming financially powerless to help.

The constriction of funds available to city governments coincides with spiraling increases in two kinds of need.

Mayor Roman S. Gribbs of Detroit identifies one: "The problem with cities is that they're old." And age means costly repair and replacement of rotting sewers, deteriorating schools, and other municipal facilities.

Urban officials say age applies with equal force to private investment in the city, and is one of the reasons for abandonment.

For private owners, too, age means rising maintenance costs. Add declining rent and increasing taxes, officials say, mix in fear of crime and riot and loss of insurance, and it is no wonder that landlords and businesses decide to jump to placid suburbs.

Mayor A. J. Cervantes of St. Louis asks in frustration: "Do you know how many houses were started in the city last year? Fourteen." Fourteen hundred? "No, fourteen."

The second underlying city need is caused by the influx of rural poor. "In the last 10 years, 200,000 middle-class whites have moved out of St. Louis," Mayor Cervantes says, "and 100,000 blacks, many of them poor, have moved in. It costs us eight times as much to provide city services to the poor as to the middle class."

Meanwhile, where is the money to come from? Interviews with scores of city officials, civic leaders, and urban experts elicit a discouraging scorecard.

Federal aid: Sources unanimously and despairingly agree that Federal assistance is tailing off. Spending for urban renewal, summer jobs and other programs has been cut or slowed.

One Mayor has gone from despair to bitterness. "At this rate," he says, "we're all going to be like people in the Nazi concentration camps, scrambling against each other for the Federal crumbs necessary even to stay alive." He insists on anonymity in order to protect his capacity to scramble.

State aid: Mayors declare that state legislatures are unfeeling and unyielding on funds for city problems. "Reapportionment was meant to correct the rural overbalance in state legislatures," Mayor Cervantes says. "So what happened? The legislatures are now dominated by suburbia—and that's just as bad for us."

In Michigan, according to Lynn Townsend, Chrysler Corporation's president, Gov. William Milliken is alert to Detroit's problems, "but there just isn't any state money. It's not very encouraging."

City revenues: In city after city, taxes have risen to what some officials describe as near-suicidal levels. "Even if we had the authority to tax ourselves to death," Mayor Gribbs of Detroit says, "all it would do is drive more business out and further reduce our tax base."

Mayors are ironic about suburban free-loading by commuters who use city services but pay no city taxes. In St. Louis, the energetic Mayor Cervantes succeeded in establishing a 1 per cent earnings tax. "It is one salvation," he says. The tax brings in some \$12-million in commuter dollars, about 10 per cent of the city's annual budget.

Foundations: "They now have pressures on their social action work because of the inhibitions in the new tax law," says Jerome Page, director of the Seattle Urban League, reflecting views expressed elsewhere. "All this at a time when organizations like the Urban League need to increase their work."

Even this fiscal scorecard understates the problem, authorities believe. Continuing inflation—for which many now blame the Nixon Administration—has eaten up available funds in increased construction and municipal borrowing costs.

For all the talk about Government spending, what about the incredible amount of Government stealing?" asks James Ellis, a Seattle lawyer and central force in city campaigns to raise hundreds of millions for pollution control, health, and mass transit.

"Why, if we had built our mass transit system 20 years ago, we could have done it cheaper all by ourselves than we could now with 30 per cent Federal grants."

What answers are available to cities? Some cities are seeking increased convention and tourist revenues by rebuilding downtown and creating attractions like Hemisfair in San Antonio, Century 21 in Seattle, and the St. Louis Gateway Arch Development. St. Louis officials claim a near-doubling of tourist and convention revenues.

Washington has proposed several other solutions. The most notable is the President's program for revenue-sharing—returning some Federally collected tax money to states and cities. But urban officials doubt that Congress and state legislatures will pass on meaningful amounts.

"And as for things like the Administration's voluntarism plan, or the black entrepreneurship program, they're all a cop-out for no money," says Jerome Cavanagh, former Mayor of Detroit and an outspoken Democrat. "I know it's trite to say money is the answer. I know that some academics now find it's stylish to deny that there is an urban crisis at all, let alone one that money

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

can solve. But once—just once—I'd like to try money."

But new public money is not coming in fast enough, and, as illustrated by abandonment, private investment is going out. St. Louis County, a separate entity girdling the city, now has nearly twice the city's population (1.1 million to 668,000), more jobs, greater retail sales, more construction.

These changes exemplify what has happened nationally. The Census Bureau estimates that since 1965 an average of 900,000 whites have moved each year from central cities to suburbs.

That white population of central cities in 1969 was estimated at 45.3 million—the same as it was in 1950. In the same period, the white population of suburban areas almost doubled, from 35 million to some 67 million.

Various urban scholars, recognizing the increasing suburban imbalance, argue that consolidated metropolitan government is the answer. It would spread out the burden of providing essential services to the poor. And would improve responsiveness and efficiency, they contend.

But there are few major metropolitan areas in which such consolidation appears even imaginable. A common suburban view is expressed by Gerald Rimmel, a St. Louis County councilman: "The people are here. The wealth is here. St. Louis has become just another neighborhood in the whole community. They're the poor cousin and we're the rich cousin and they have to accept that."

Mr. Rimmel acknowledges that relations between the city and the county "are sometimes like two hostile countries."

Suburban hostilities are mirrored in a downtown merchant's account of a telephone conversation with a suburban woman seeking air-conditioner repairs. The company could not send a man out immediately, she was told. "Well, no wonder," she responded. "All you got left down there is niggers and hippies."

A suburban lawyer says: "Yes I go downtown to see the Cardinals play, especially now that they have the freeway bypassing the, you know, bad areas."

Some in the suburbs take a longer view, recognizing that urban torments cannot be contained by the city limits. They note that decay is infectious, citing Wellston, a small municipality adjacent to St. Louis. There, 20 per cent of the homes are abandoned—and not even boarded-up.

"For years, many of our residents took the attitude that they came to escape center city problems," says Charles T. Henry, City Manager of University City, a suburb of 53,000 adjoining St. Louis. "But that's changing. A lot of people here now are asking, 'How long can we run?'"

TO MIKE BARTLEY

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the city of Alameda, Calif., has lost a great citizen in the passing of William M. "Mike" Bartley, who died recently after a long illness.

Mike Bartley was a retired commander in the Navy who had seen very fine service and, turning to civilian life, served our city well as a member of its city council and as a public-spirited citizen. Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to include with them an editorial which appeared in the Alameda Times-Star and pays tribute to this extraordinary person:

[From the Alameda (Calif.) Times-Star, July 18, 1970]

To MIKE BARTLEY

Occasionally when a person is taken from a community through death, it leaves a "gap," a "hole."

This is because the deceased was imaginative, aggressive, and gave of himself—(himself) to the community, contributing as well as taking.

Such a person was William M. "Mike" Bartley whose death the Times-Star regretfully reported last week.

Those who knew him from close association, either businesswise or civically, knew him as a person of warm personality, with weaknesses as well as strengths—which after all, made him a human being.

It is for his strengths he will be remembered. And rightly.

The tributes paid him by Mayor Terry La Croix and Planning Director Don Johnson were earned. Mike Bartley was a pragmatist, he also was able to dream—or visualize, whichever you prefer.

He saw Alameda with a tremendous potential as a community for pleasant living. He realized that here as in every community a certain amount of planning is essential if the community is to maintain a balance between past, present and future. He realized that apathy, inertia, slavery to habit or self could be destructive of the common good. He knew that a collection of people (city) needs guidelines (plan) for orderly development just as individuals need a code (self-discipline, ethics) for the good life.

And so he was instrumental in bringing to Alameda a professionally-conceived general plan which was duly adopted by city government after public discussion and debate.

Mike Bartley knew, too, that that plan or any plan is useful only to the degree it is implemented. It can serve the community well, or it can be allowed to gather dust in the confines of City Hall, used only when convenient, ignored the rest of the time.

Perhaps the best tribute Alameda can pay to a man whose leadership and vision—and his courage and integrity to the ideal of "communityness"—a principle to which he was faithful though it was not popular with many of his colleagues in real estate—would be to keep the general plan viable, to make it an instrument of community betterment, to let it work for us instead of choking it out of existence by disuse.

Mike would have liked it that way.

THE CASE OF THE MISSING CHILD SUPPORT PAYMENTS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in any discussion of welfare reforms we cannot overlook the factor of the individual's responsibility to care for himself and his family to the best of his ability.

Mrs. Jean Temple, of Northridge, Calif., has founded an organization titled the Association for Children Deprived of Support—CDS. The goal of CDS includes finding ways to aid divorced women in being assured of receiving court ordered child support payments from the children's fathers. Mrs. Temple claims that too often a welfare check has to substitute for child support that is not forthcoming, and that available

July 27, 1970

enforcement procedures are extremely inadequate.

The conclusion would be, then that a large amount of welfare funds could be saved through adequate laws and enforcement on behalf of the children of the divorced.

I feel that the article below, from the Van Nuys News, July 12, 1970, contains an extremely interesting discussion of this problem.

The article follows:

GROUP FORMED TO TAP ERRANT FATHERS FOR CHILD SUPPORT

(By Ruth Croft)

A kept woman with no strings attached who jets about with the country club set and vamps other women's husbands—that's the image divorcees claim they have been given in novels, television and motion pictures and they don't like it one bit.

Despite new divorce—or dissolution of marriage—laws, Jean Temple of Northridge says that divorced women "really clean up in California."

The mother of three children suggests that these fairy tales prejudice the general public and consequently thwart efforts of a divorced woman to establish herself as a responsible individual in the community.

She also maintains the biased picture affects the attitude of attorneys and courts when a divorcee seeks their aid in obtaining enforcement of court orders and state laws regarding child support payments.

In an effort to dispel these attitudes, as well as aid women who have been unsuccessful in getting their ex-husbands to live up to financial commitments, Mrs. Temple has founded the Association for Children Deprived of Support (CDS).

Goals of the group are threefold:

To focus public attention on the failure-to-provide problem, stressing its effect on dependent children and the resulting costs forced on the taxpayer.

To demand more aggressive enforcement of current laws and court orders connected with child support payments.

To lobby for better child support legislation.

"For too many years the stock answer to our problems has been—'oh quit bothering your old man, just apply to welfare,'" Mrs. Temple told The News, adding that resorting to government handouts is degrading to mothers and children involved as well as an unnecessary added burden to the taxpayer.

It is Mrs. Temple's contention that a father first must be compelled to pay a fair share toward the support of his children, even if they are in the custody of his ex-wife.

Then if the man is unable to live on the remaining amount of his salary, it should be he who seeks public assistance.

"Once a man and his new spouse face the possibility of shopping with food stamps and having their life style inspected by social workers, it is my bet that all kinds of hidden income would come to the fore," she said suggesting that men, especially those in business for themselves, have a multitude of accounting means at their disposal to create the impression they earn minimal wages and consequently can make only token payments.

"If a man is made to realize that the children continue to be his financial responsibility, whether or not he remains married to their mother, perhaps he will not be so quick to start family after family after family," she said.

"If the current trend continues, this country has but two ways to go on the issue. We either will have our doorways cluttered with children abandoned by both parents as is the situation in many South American countries, or we will find ourselves practicing socialism where the state takes care of the kids," she said.

DENY CHARGES

Mrs. Temple maintains that the district attorney's office encourages this creeping socialism by advising women to seek welfare aid and by being lax in prosecuting errant fathers.

These charges are vigorously denied by the DA's office.

Dep. Dist. Atty. Earl Osadchey, who heads the Child Support Division, told The News it is strictly against policy to recommend the welfare route and he would welcome the name of any investigator who breaks this rule.

"One of our principal functions is to bring to court errant fathers who are not complying with court child support orders—either to recover for the county funds which have been paid to a welfare family or to have allowances remitted so a family will not be forced to resort to welfare," he said.

FILES COMPLAINT

"Admittedly one of the first questions we ask a woman seeking enforcement of court-ordered child support is whether or not she receives public assistance," Osadchey said. "But this should not be construed as a recommendation she do so."

"What we actually are trying to do is avoid duplication of work. The Dept. of Public Social Services automatically files a complaint with us 45 days after one of its recipients fails to receive a support payment," he said, adding that many women are not aware of this arrangement and proceed on their own.

If a woman and her children do receive welfare benefits, then child support payments are made through the court trustee and the funds are used to offset taxpayer's costs for welfare.

Consequently, the DA's office is obligated to press for payments in this situation and during the past three years has reimbursed the welfare fund with more than \$12,000,000 it has collected, Osadchey said.

In answer to charges that his staff is disinterested in prosecuting cases, Osadchey explained that many women misunderstand the exact functions of his division.

AGREES ON POINT

"Principally, we only cite for contempt of court orders in these domestic relations cases . . . we are not authorized by Superior Court to garnishee a man's wages or seek to collect arrearages . . . we cannot represent a mother who wants the payments increased," he said.

Osadchey agrees with Mrs. Temple on the point that society in general must change its attitude toward fathers who fail to provide for their children, although each has a different approach to the problem.

"Courts treat the men as bad little boys and let them off with a hand slap and gentle tongue-lashing," Mrs. Temple said. "They are criminals and should be dealt with accordingly."

EXPRESSES VIEW

She maintains if maximum penalties were given first-time offenders, it would serve as a deterrent to those men who contemplate reneging on their responsibilities.

"But in reality, judges place the men on probation, accept partial payment of amounts due or continue cases week after week. It's discouraging and frustrating and only encourages the men to ignore their obligation," she said.

While claiming that his staff always presses for the maximum penalty, Osadchey believes the court's seemingly more lenient attitude is justified.

MAY LOSE JOB

"The maximum penalty for contempt is five days in jail on each count," he said. "If this sentence were handed down in every case, it is feasible the whole situation would worsen."

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

"Understandably, the man might lose his job or most certainly a week's pay and as a result there could be two families dependent on welfare, thus doubling the taxpayers' burden."

The basic problem in most child support cases is that both parties involved are sensitive and highly emotional, according to Osadchey, who says the man envisions his ex-wife squandering his contributions on herself while the woman pictures her former spouse living a swinging life at the expense of their children.

MAKES SUGGESTION

A certain amount of counseling should accompany each dissolution of marriage when children are involved, he said. These couples must be helped to rise above their bitterness and recognize their respective responsibilities.

And the woman should make every effort to be self-supporting and contribute her fair share toward the children's financial well being, he suggested.

Mrs. Temple maintains that most divorced women want to work.

TELLS EXPENSE

But after five to 10 years of being unemployed, a woman naturally reenters the job market as low man on the salary totem pole. She may be able to sustain herself, but definitely needs support money to clothe and feed her children and, most important, to pay for child care.

One CDS member told The News she had been forced to give up a clerical position with the Los Angeles Police Dept. because her former husband stopped making child support payments when he learned she was working.

"He just wouldn't believe that it took the entire \$100 a month he sent me plus part of my wages to pay a sitter for our two girls while I worked," she said.

Jobs are hard to come by, according to another CDS member who spent the major part of her adult life as a homemaker.

"Employers seem to think divorced mothers always will be taking time off to care for their kids—or they anticipate we're out to find a new husband and will concentrate our energy and talents in that direction," she said.

CHAPTERS INCREASE

Others contend that property managers are prejudiced against divorcees and refuse to rent houses and apartments to them, while another woman maintains it has been impossible to get credit cards and department store charge privileges since she was divorced.

Whether CDS will be able to right all these purported wrongs remains to be seen, but the organization which started with one group here in the Valley is building steam and has grown to 10 chapters including units in Florida and Indiana.

Surprisingly, there are several intrepid men on its rosters.

For the most part these male members are carrying the financial burden of two families—their own and the children of a second wife who is receiving no child payments from her ex-husband.

GAINS ATTENTION

Others are men who claim to have experienced an unhappy childhood due to their fathers' failure to provide, while a few have joined as taxpayers interested in stopping unnecessary drains on the welfare budget.

In recent weeks the CDS group's major concern—the child support issue—has gained statewide attention.

Three bills (AB 1360, AB 2446 and SB 735), designed to strengthen procedures by which the state can more effectively locate absent fathers and collect child support money, have been introduced in the California Legislature.

VOICES CONCERN

The State Social Welfare Board also has announced it is forming a task force to initiate a major drive against the failure of absent fathers to pay child support.

Chairman Robert E. Mitchell who announced the plan said, "Although the high percentage of nonsupport cases among publicly dependent families is a matter of great concern in California, we are equally concerned about the family degeneration throughout society that finds children being victimized by irresponsibility on the part of absent fathers who simply walk away from their financial as well as moral obligations."

CDS members will be following the task force investigation with great interest.

EQUAL PAY FOR WOMEN

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, recently Mrs. Lucile H. Shriver, director of the National Federation of Business and Professional Women's Clubs Inc., appear before the General Subcommittee on Labor of the House Education and Labor Committee.

Mrs. Shriver testified in support of H.R. 15971 and urged equal pay for women doing the same work as men. Her testimony included a number of facts and figures which I feel would be of interest to other Members of the House.

I am inserting Mrs. Shriver's complete testimony in the RECORD and I invite the attention of my colleagues to this informative document:

TESTIMONY PRESENTED ON THE PART OF THE NATIONAL FEDERATION OF BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL WOMEN'S CLUBS, INC., BY MRS. LUCILLE H. SHRIVER, FEDERATION DIRECTOR, BEFORE THE GENERAL SUBCOMMITTEE ON LABOR OF THE HOUSE EDUCATION AND LABOR COMMITTEE, THE HONORABLE JOHN H. DENT, CHAIRMAN, JULY 9, 1970

Mr. Chairman, we are honored to be here today to testify in support of H.R. 15971.

Seven years ago one of the BPW clubs wrote the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the House Committee on Education and Labor urging passage of the Equal Pay Bill which H.R. 15971 would amend. They offered the following resolution:

A double standard of pay for men and women has long existed in industry. The Women's Bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor has recently released a new publication entitled "Economic Indicators Relating to Equal Pay," prepared in response to numerous requests for factual information about wages paid to men and women performing similar work. This pamphlet provides an overall view of the differences in pay levels of men and women. According to the Bureau of the Census the median wage or salary income in 1960 was \$3,293 for women and \$5,417 for men.

They went on to say that "The members of our national, state, and local federations of Business and Professional Women's clubs feel strongly that this differential should not prevail . . ."

Today, Mr. Chairman, we find many similarities to that time and situation. Inequity in pay between the sexes continues. Again, the U.S. Department of Labor Women's Bu-

Footnotes at end of article.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 27, 1970

reau has released a report, this one on the earnings gap between men and women, revealing that in 1968 the median salary for women was \$4,457; for men, \$7,664. In other words, in 1960 women made 60.8% of what men made; in 1968, the percentage was down to 58.2%.²

We are here once more to petition you regarding equal pay for equal work, this time to extend the guarantee of equal pay for equal work law passed in 1963 to cover administrative, executive, and professional positions. The Equal Pay Act of 1963 was recently described in a Federal court as a "broad charter of women's rights in the economic field."³ We are here to petition the Congress to broaden that charter. For that purpose we appear before you today, somewhat repeating history from seven years ago.

As we look at the labor picture today we find that 43% of all women are in the labor force; that women have accounted for the largest growth percentage in that labor force since 1947. In fact the number of women in the civilian labor force increased by 75% between 1947 and 1968, while the number of men rose only 16%.⁴

Today the average woman is 11 years older (39 years of age) than she was when women got the suffrage and she is married instead of single. Women today work for the same reasons as men, whether married, single, widowed, divorced, namely to support themselves, their families and other dependents.⁵

In proportion to their increasing participation in the growth of the economy, American women are certainly not receiving a fair share of the profits thereof, quite the contrary, as the earnings gap so clearly reveals.

A comparison of the median wage or salary incomes of women and men who worked full time year round between 1955 and 1968 reveals not only that incomes of women are considerably less than those of men but also that the gap has widened in recent years. In 1955 for example, women's median wage or salary income of \$2,719 was 64% of the \$4,252 received by men. In 1968 women's median earnings of \$4,457 was only 58% of the \$7,664 received by men.

The type of occupation does not make too much difference. In 1968, this same report shows that women professional and technical workers had a median wage of \$6,691 compared to \$10,151 for men. Women clerical workers, sales workers, operatives, and service workers all had an income of between 55 and 65.9% of what men received in the same categories.

This is happening now, today, when more women than ever work; when women clearly work to provide an adequate standard of living for themselves, their families and their other dependents.

The radical difference in wages for men and women today is revealed also by the fact that only 8% of men full time year round workers in 1968 earned less than \$3,000 while there were 20% of the women at that pay level; and that 60% of the women but only 20% of the men earned less than \$5,000. At the other end of the scale, only 3% of the women but 28% of the men had earnings of \$10,000 or more.⁶

Basically there are two types of discrimination in employment against women. Women are often consigned to low-paying, low-skilled jobs, different from those of men. I refer you to the Earnings Gap report for verification of this fact as well as the 1970 survey on the *Employment of Women* conducted by the American Society for Personnel Administration and The Bureau of National Affairs. Both indicate that women are placed in less challenging, less responsible and less remunerative positions on the basis of their sex. The legislation at hand today does not deal with this matter directly. However, it does deal with the other kind of discrimination in employment that women experience, namely the many examples of women doing

equal work to that of men but not receiving the same pay.

Extension of the Equal Pay Act to administrative, executive, and professional positions would encompass those individuals who have the same background, experience, and education, but who make different wages. Here it is not so much a problem of different jobs, or being secretaries rather than managers, but of receiving different, i.e. less pay for equivalent work, based on sex as the determinant of that difference.

Our organization was founded in 1919 to serve the best interests of working women. We now represent 180,000 working women throughout the fifty states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

While our membership has increased, so has the percentage of American women who now work. Working women constituted 20.4% of all workers when our organization began. Today that representation has almost doubled, it is presently 37% of the labor force.⁷

BPW began as an organization for working women urging equal pay for equal work in all jobs. One of our earliest endeavors was to secure the extension of civil service classification to more jobs with the hope that this would not only elevate the calibre of government employment but insure that employees would be chosen on the basis of qualification without consideration of sex.

During World War II American women showed their dedication, ability, versatility, and endurance as workers. The first major Equal Pay Bill was introduced at the end of that war with BPW support and we remained on the legislative front until victory in 1963. We helped form and work with the National Committee for Equal Pay and enthusiastically cooperated with other women's organizations to secure passage of that bill. I am sure that the records of the House of Representatives reflect our concern.

Thus our interest in this legislation is well established. But, when the Equal Pay Bill was finally passed, something was left out of grave importance to our members and to thousands of working women, namely coverage of administrative, executive, and professional positions.

The history of the Equal Pay Act shows that attachment of this bill to the Fair Labor Standards Act was indeed the "catalyst" that made victory possible, as Congressman Frelinghuysen of New Jersey pointed out during debate on the House floor. But, this same tactic also made equal pay coverage co-extensive with minimum wage coverage. If a job is not covered under the minimum wage provision, the law then does not require equal pay standards for such a job. As a result equal pay is required for only about half of the jobs in America today, according to Mr. Robert Moran, Administrator, Wage and Hour Division of the U.S. Department of Labor.⁸ This is the situation that we deplore and that we would change.

Actually the Administration-supported equal pay bills, as introduced in both Houses of the Congress in 1961 and 1963 (after the 1961 proposal failed of passage) contained no provision which would have resulted in the bills becoming a part of the Fair Labor Standards Act. There was nothing in the original Administration-supported proposals, therefore, which would have exempted executive, administrative, or professional employees from equal pay protection.

It was on the original bills that BPW and others presented their testimony in Congressional hearings in support of the 1961 bill and the 1963 measure.

Only after the completion of committee hearings in 1963, did the Chairmen of the Labor Subcommittees (who had held the hearings in the House and Senate) find that they did not have the votes to report out the Administration's original proposal and that the bills would die in committee.

Since there was basically little choice, i.e. the original Administration's proposals stood no chance of further consideration on the Hill, telephone calls were made to legislative representatives of the major women's groups whose members would be affected by the move to make the equal pay bill a part of the Fair Labor Standards Act (including BPW) and the situation was carefully explained to all of us. It was decided that we should take what we could get for the time being, hoping that action would later be taken on the Hill to restore the protections of the equal pay provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act to, for example, executive, administrative, and professional employees, at the earliest possible date. It was a question of half a loaf or none. We took that half a loaf. We are now asking for the rest of that loaf.

H.R. 15971 would bring the protections of the Equal Pay Act to the executive, administrative, and professional employees who had every right to feel "betrayed" by the action taken by the Congress when the equal pay bill was made a part of the Fair Labor Standards Act in 1963.

At present Title VII, Section 703(a)(1), of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibits employment discrimination in hiring, discharging, terms, conditions, or privileges of employment, including that of compensation. However, the EEOC which is burdened with administering Title VII has an overload of case work. Moreover, the EEOC has very little power, a situation we have sought to remedy by testifying in support of legislative efforts to grant the EEOC the right to issue judicially enforceable cease and desist powers, to back up its findings of discrimination based on race, color, religion, sex or national origin, which currently it does not have. The EEOC's authority is limited to conciliation efforts. If a state or local Fair Employment Practices law exists a waiting period is required. If conciliation fails, the aggrieved party must initiate and finance his/her own suit.

On the other hand, the Equal Pay Act is administered by the Wage and Hour Division of the U.S. Department of Labor. This agency is generally able to obtain compliance. If there is a refusal to comply, or deliberate violation of the law, the Secretary of Labor may obtain a court injunction to restrain continued violation or withholding of back wages legally due. The Secretary of Labor may also bring suit for the back wages upon written request of an aggrieved employee. Also important is the fact that complaints are treated in strict confidence and, unless court action is necessary, the name of the aggrieved party is not revealed, whereas under the protection of Title VII such anonymity is impossible. Indeed, the strength and effectiveness of enforcement proceedings under the Fair Labor Standards Act was one of the compelling reasons for BPW's support for attaching the Equal Pay Bill to the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Mr. Chairman, The National Federation believes that there is no more justification or reason for discrimination at the professional or administrative levels than at any other. By Executive Order and by Congressional mandate our nation is committed to equal employment opportunity for all Americans. We urgently request passage of this legislation before us to move us a step closer to that goal.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Hearings Before the Special Subcommittee on Labor of the Committee on Education and Labor, U.S. House of Representatives, 88th Congress, 1st session (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1963), p. 323.

² Fact Sheet on the Earnings Gap, Women's Bureau, Wage and Labor Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Lab (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1970) pp. 1-2.

¹ *Shultz v. Wheaton Glass Company*, 421 F. 2d 259 (3rd Cir. 1970).

² 1969 Handbook on Women Workers, Bulletin 294, Women's Bureau, Wage and Labor Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor (Washington, D.C.: GPO, 1969), pp. 5, 3, 9, 15.

³ *Changing Patterns of Women's Lives*, Women's Bureau, Wage and Labor Standards Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, 1970.

⁴ *Fact Sheet on the Earning Gap*, pp. 1-2.

⁵ 1969 Handbook, p. 10.

⁶ Robert D. Moran, "A Rate For the Job Regardless of Sex: The Mandate of the Equal Pay Act of 1963," Speech at Equal Pay Act Briefing Conference, May 11, 1970, Washington, D.C.

ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ACT OF 1970

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, in March of this year, the Environmental Protection Act, that would finally recognize the direct concern of each citizen with the environment in which he lives, was introduced by Senator HART, of Michigan, who has long been recognized as an outstanding conservationist and fighter for the protection and improvement of our environment. This bill, S. 3575, would give our citizens the right to bring suit in a court of law to protect themselves and their children from pollution. I am introducing a similar bill in the House, today, because I believe that this legislation could be the most effective weapon to date in our fight against pollution.

The past decade has seen increasing concern over the problems relating to the destruction of our environment. Congress has repeatedly responded to this problem with the enactment of such legislation as the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, the Land and Water Conservation Act, the Water Quality Act of 1965, the Air Quality Act of 1967, and others. Yet, in spite of congressional attention to environmental problems, pollution remains a monumental threat to the health and well-being of our entire society.

The American public has repeatedly and conscientiously voiced concern over the effects of pollution in our air and waters, but the people have been denied the means to directly challenge those whose actions are most responsible for the destruction of our environment.

The Environmental Protection Act of 1970, would enable responsible citizens to become directly involved by opening up the Federal and State court system to antipollution suits by ordinary citizens against other citizens or against Government agencies. It would guarantee all citizens the right to a pollution-free environment, and would enable citizens to challenge the organization and implementation of administrative policies when they appear inadequate.

The American people have proven their concern and should be granted a

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

direct role in the solving of our environmental problems. Our Government agencies have not done enough to deal with the threat of pollution and should be spurred to more effective action. The Environmental Protection Act of 1970 will serve both these ends and hasten the day when we can once again take pride in the natural beauty of America.

A SECOND LOOK AT CAMPUS UNREST

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, today certain radicals seem to use violence as the catalytic cry of change. This cry has meant the burning of buildings and senseless destruction of property on or near the campuses of American universities and colleges.

Hundreds of thousands of words have been written about campus violence. It has been analyzed and scrutinized and investigated, but many people still wonder why it has occurred or where it will happen next. In fact, most students cannot tell me how their campuses are disrupted by a small minority of the student body. None have told me how violence has accomplished anything useful.

The sole purpose of a university is one of service to society through education. Universities are not designed to be an arena in which opposing groups do battle while carrying the standards of their political causes.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to reaffirm my conviction that universities can find their own solutions to problems existing within their faculties and student bodies. I have evidence of responsible student groups working within the university system of Illinois through letters to my office.

In the July 24 edition of the Chicago Tribune, I found an article that has re-established my faith in the faculty and administrations of several Illinois institutions of higher learning. I would like to commend them and share this article with my colleagues:

GETTING THE CAMPUS BACK ON COURSE

There are a few encouraging signs that the nation's universities, badly shaken by the violence of recent years, may be returning to their true function—the cultivation of the mind and the advancement of knowledge. Student disruption has sought to subvert the universities by committing them to political causes thru militant and violent methods.

Robert H. Strotz, the new president of Northwestern University, has perceived this purpose in saying, "I will resist any attempts by anyone to make the institution itself an instrument for political action."

University of Illinois trustees, in reprimanding 13 faculty members who issued a manifesto last May couched in revolutionary language, warned that "any infractions . . . in the performance of university duties will receive prompt and appropriate attention by responsible administrative offices and faculty committees."

Of 15 signers of the statement, 12 were assistant professors, instructors, or graduate teaching assistants in the political science department. Banding together in what they called a Faculty for Resistance, they announced they would indoctrinate a student "resistance force" and would "orient" all their courses to "the problem of political repression and resistance to the abuses of official authority."

The trustees condemned the use of such epithets as "societal madness", "official racism" and the implication that we live under a "criminal regime" responsible for slaughter, murder, and "systematic elimination of black militants."

While the trustees have taken a form of action, the university has been more reticent. The issue of tenure and retention is certainly pertinent in cases like this, as the presence at the board meeting of a representative of the American Association of University Professors attests. This organization always closes in for the protection of its own.

It would appear that it is imperative for Illinois as well as other institutions of higher learning to adopt rational criteria in faculty appointments before they get stuck with sour apples. This is not a job for newspapers or even for university trustees. It is a job for department heads, for faculty selection committees, and for the university administration; and the renewal of contracts and the granting of tenure are part of it.

Meanwhile, a show of firmness by Delyte Morris, president of Southern Illinois University, has provoked howls of protest from two liberal state representatives and the American Civil Liberties Union. Morris held up the registration of 61 returning students because of their political activity during the recent academic term and the part played by some of them in campus disorders last May.

The university was compelled to close down for the remainder of the term after 10 days of violence, during which an R. O. T. C. building was invaded; windows were smashed and looting took place in the Carbondale business district; highways and railroad tracks were blocked; and the home of President Morris was sacked. Three students were injured in an explosion in a house where they were assembling bombs.

S. I. U. can justifiably feel that students engaged in such activities are hardly persona grata, and if there is a question of individual rights involved most taxpayers won't see it.

TRIBUTE TO IGOR I. SIKORSKY

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take the opportunity to pay tribute to a recent book written about a great American, Igor I. Sikorsky, who also happens to be a constituent of mine. The book, "Igor Sikorsky, His Three Careers in Aviation," is an interesting and inspiring account of the life of the man who Senator Prescott Bush once called "a scientific genius and a man of deep spiritual qualities."

The author, Frank J. Delear, is a man of great literary talent who is well acquainted with his subject. Mr. Delear has served as public relations manager of the Sikorsky Aircraft Division of the United Aircraft Corp. and has been closely associated with Mr. Sikorsky since 1940. He

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

is a graduate of Boston College and a member of the Aviation/Space Writers Association and the American Helicopter Society. He is also the author of "The New World of Helicopters" and presently lives in Stratford, Conn., with his wife and five children.

The biography is centered around Sikorsky's three greatest achievements: the first multiengined airplane, the ocean spanning Flying Clippers of the 1930's, and the first practical helicopter. Igor Sikorsky was born in Kiev, Russia, on May 25, 1889, the youngest of five children. His father was a university professor of psychology at St. Vladimir University in Kiev. At 14 he entered the Imperial Naval College in St. Petersburg and later attended the Mechanical College of the Polytechnic Institute in Kiev. He was always fascinated with flight, and throughout his life, dreamed of bringing da Vinci's idea of a wingless aircraft to realization. He went to work on this idea directly after graduation, but after many early failures, abandoned the idea for the time being.

In 1911, after returning to fixed winged aircraft, he built the S-5, and set a new world record by carrying three men for 30 miles at seventy miles an hour. This success brought about a contract with the Russo-Baltic Railroad Car Works, which enabled Sikorsky to build the first four-motored plane in history, the Grand.

After fleeing Russia during the Revolution, Sikorsky was faced with the situation of having to start from scratch and begin anew as an immigrant in the United States.

Beginning on Long Island, he shortly afterward moved to Bridgeport, Conn., and established the Sikorsky Aviation Corp. This led to the development of the S-29, S-38, and later the S-40, which became known as the American Clipper. This plane, with later developments became one of the first planes of commercial transoceanic aviation.

In 1937, Sikorsky started work on his original dream and life-long ambition, to build the first helicopter. On September 14, 1938, Sikorsky realized his dream and piloted the first successful wingless aircraft flight in his first helicopter, the VS-300. From this first attempt of welded pipes and other jerry-rigged parts, the helicopter became a functional machine and was used quite extensively during World War II.

However, the most stirring part of the biography is the insight into Igor Sikorsky's personality. He is portrayed as a combination of scientist and mystic who has the ability to combine the two and result in great creativity. He is a man of great religious belief and is concerned with the future of humanity.

I enthusiastically suggest this book to anyone who is interested in people who have a dream and who have the perseverance to see it through. As attested by the countless awards and tributes paid to this man, he is a credit to our community and to the Nation as a whole.

My thanks to Frank J. Delear for making this valuable literary and historical contribution.

BUS ACCIDENT WAS MANMADE TRAGEDY

HON. ALLARD K. LOWENSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. LOWENSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, seven children are dead and 52 others were injured as a result of the tragic bus accident July 15 in Allentown, Pa., a tragedy that cannot be blamed on the caprice of fate.

The bus in which they were riding skidded off a curve where more than a dozen vehicles have crashed in the last 2 years; it had two treadless rear tires; its steering mechanism was apparently defective; and it was driven by a man whose driver's license had been suspended five times and whose traffic record constitutes a three-page dossier of nine accidents and six convictions, two for careless driving.

The last fact is simply beyond belief. What turned out to be a horrible reality would make bad fiction because nobody would believe that a man with such a driving record could plausibly find himself behind any steering wheel, much less the wheel of a bus load of children on a summer outing. The driver's heart attack and the death of his wife as he was being arraigned on Tuesday adds to the sadness and anger about this needless tragedy.

How is it that a man whose driver's license had been suspended five times and who had been in nine accidents had a license of any kind? How is it that a bus carrying 49 young day campers and their 10 adult supervisors could have two rear tires so worn that no tread was left on them as well as a faulty steering mechanism? How is it that nothing was done about a curve so deceptive that more than a dozen wrecks have occurred there in the last 2 years? And how is it that buses, particularly school buses, continue to have the most lethal interiors of any vehicles on the road today?

Some or all of those children might have been saved had they been wearing safety belts or had the interior of the bus been designed for passenger safety instead of to achieve the scrimping economies that make buses unpadded death chambers in the event of a collision. And the wreck would probably never have occurred if the bus and driver had been kept off the highway as they should have been.

Various degrees of human negligence account for each of these factors that came together in such a tragic equation.

We cannot begin to share the anguish of the parents and relatives of the dead children; but we can share the concern to see that such an absurd conjunction of human errors do not cost any more lives on the highways. And we can make sure that a thorough investigation reveals who was responsible for the administrative laxity that permitted a driver's license to be issued under the circumstances and how a bus with bald tires and defective steering was permitted to operate.

July 27, 1970

We in Congress have to look into the whole question of bus safety, about which the Federal Government has done virtually nothing. A measure of the seriousness of the bus safety problem is seen in statistics compiled by Interstate Commerce Commission inspectors showing that of the 397 buses inspected last year more than 300 had mechanical defects and 47 of these were so seriously defective that they were immediately ordered out of service.

There are over 5,000 commercial buses sanctioned by the ICC for interstate travel, and the Commission's inspection staff is so shorthanded that only 397 of these buses were inspected last year. We have to remedy that dangerous situation by providing adequate staffing for these inspection teams.

We have to come up with stiff licensing procedures and safety regulations for charter bus companies like the one involved in the Allentown crash. Millions of children are participating each summer in charter tours run by these companies. When they cross State lines they come under the jurisdiction of the ICC, but according to ICC officials most of these companies, which tend to be marginal one or two bus operations, are running charter trips without OCC authorization. A preliminary investigation of the Allentown accident showed that the bus did not even have an ICC certificate.

Besides the lack of personnel to regulate these companies and carry out inspections, there are loopholes and jurisdictional problems in the law regulating bus tours that have to be eliminated. One of these loopholes, cited in a story in Wednesday's New York Times, involves school buses, which are exempt from Bureau of Motor Carrier Safety regulations that govern bus travel on major highways even when they are being used on highways for touring purposes.

We are reminded of the overall question of school buses by the startling realization that the death toll in last week's accident would have been higher had the children been riding in a school bus, whose stripped down interior leaves steel tubing exposed on the seat frames, instead of a better cushioned touring bus. And thanks to an investigation by the Washington Post's fine reporter, Colman McCarthy, earlier this year we know something about the general shoddiness of school bus construction. Mr. McCarthy's articles prompted a General Motors recall of 4,269 school buses for possible brake defects. I am inserting these articles in the RECORD to call attention to the kind of measures we must take to insure that the buses on which we send our children to school are not death traps.

It is within our power to do these things. We cannot blame blind fate for tragedies that we ourselves could have averted. And if we do not act on the range of bus safety problems forced upon us by the needless loss of seven young lives last week, we will have squandered the chance to do the one thing that might bring some slight glimmer of light into the appalling tragedy of Allentown.

The articles follow:

BITTER TALES FROM THE GM LEMON GROVES
(By Colman McCarthy)

Last week, General Motors issued a recall of 4,269 school buses for possible brake defects. The recall followed a six-week nationwide survey by GM which was originally prompted by two articles on this page in December detailing the endless safety and mechanical breakdowns of three new GM school buses. These were owned by John Donovan, a local school teacher with an immense frustration capacity.

By taking a survey, GM wanted to know whether Donovan's problems were a local fluke or a national epidemic. If the latter, a recall would be made. Martin Caserio, a GM vice president and a Detroit veteran who had been through the recall ritual many times, said that GM was deeply concerned about safety. However, he told a Washington press conference in December he did not think John Donovan's repeated brake failures, rattling transmissions, hanging exhaust pipes, faulty tires, etc., were "safety-related" problems.

After some confusion and delay, GM supplied the press with a partial list of GM bus owners. Entitled "School Bus Owners operating five or more 1969 GMC conventional model school buses," it contained 44 names. These owners were from only 16 states and possessed a total of only 504 buses. This meant that some 3,500 other 1969 model buses could not readily be checked.

On receiving the list from General Motors, The Washington Post began contacting by phone the 44 owners. Apart from the one owner who couldn't be reached because he had been dead four years and the four others who were listed by GM as owning a total of 35 vehicles but in reality owned none, the majority of respondents were unhappy or frustrated over the performance of their new buses. Repeatedly, they told of the time and money wasted hauling the buses to garages for repairs; often they were repairs of repairs. It soon became clear that the safety and mechanical problems of the '69 GM school bus were not isolated in Washington. They were nationwide, all the way from the enraged owners of the Belins Bus Service, Kenilworth, N.J., whose six new buses failed the New Jersey State inspection because of faulty brake equalization to the stoic in Roslyn, N.Y., who said, "I was a GM man at heart, but no more. I don't know what they've done to these buses, but I've bought my last one."

It was quickly discovered that GM's list was incomplete. Regularly, an owner on the list would supply the names of the other multiple-owners in his area who were not on the list. Often it was obvious why they were omitted. Raymond Wilson—a pseudonym—is a GM dealer who owns 15 of the 1969 buses. He saw the stories about Donovan in his local paper in December and was "delighted that the truth was finally being told about GM." He has had massive safety and mechanical problems also. "The power steering cannot be fixed, no matter what;" one new bus being driven back from the factory nearly killed his driver because the gas tank had a hole in it that dropped the fuel onto a heated exhaust line; "the brakes aren't worth a damn and won't stay adjusted. Over all, things have gotten to the point that I hate to face customers."

Other people that Wilson hates to face are reporters. The same morning he read the story about Donovan, he was called by the local GM representative and told "to keep my mouth shut if any newsman called. The rep. told me this kind of publicity could hurt us all." Wilson agreed to talk to the Post only if strict anonymity was given his name and location of business. Even though he is a GM dealer, he is convinced that if the

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

company finds out he has spoken to anyone they will "get even."

Another GM dealer—also not on the list—was so fed up with his seven '69s that this year he bought Fords. Asked if he thought it odd that a GM dealer would buy a competitor's product, he answered: "What should I do—keep on buying buses that I know are nothing but trouble?"

Not all the GM owners on the list were unhappy. A spokesman for the Long Island Bus Co., East Farmingdale, N.Y., said that his mechanics "have been big on preventive maintenance, so we have little trouble." Another owner, the Pace School Bus Service, Independence, Mo., said that aside from frequent clutch adjustments everything was fine. Asked about his exhaust pipe hangers, he replied: "Oh, them. They were so weak when the buses were sold to us that we just tied them up with baling wire. And that was that." The mechanic for the five buses owned by the Lake Orion, Mich., schools said he had no serious complaints. "The brakes are hard to push and get sluggish. But they're safe enough; the driver just has to get used to them."

With a few chilling exceptions, all the dissatisfied owners said they received prompt and polite service from the local GM dealers. Warranty repairs were paid for with little fuss. But what GM does not pay for is the large amounts of time needed to haul the buses to the garage or pick them up after highway breakdowns; nor is there compensation for the always-present frustration. Ben Stanski, with 10 of the 1969 models, of the Berkshire Gray Line, Pittsfield, Mass., has been constantly bedeviled by burned-out clutches. Some have gone at 3,000 miles, when they should have lasted 25,000 or more. But the main irk is getting the buses started in the morning during the winter. "Here they are," said Stanski, "brand new buses. And a crew has been having to come in at 4 a.m. to work on them so they start up. If we let the buses sit until the regular drivers come in, the kids would never get picked up."

One person who conceivably should have no trouble making his voice heard by GM is a mechanic for the Pontiac, Mich., School District, in the very town where GM makes its buses. The mechanic said that along with radiator, electrical and tail pipe problems, he is plagued with brake troubles. The buses on which many children of GM employees ride every day have had no accidents yet due to brake failure, but this may be due to the mechanic's diligence. "If I keep adjusting them every month, they're O.K. When the brakes are the least bit out of adjustment, which happens frequently, they are hard. When you put your foot on them, you think you have plenty of pedal left. But the only problem is you can't stop. So I adjust them every month."

The most recurring complaint of the 39 owners was the tail pipe hanger. This device is on the rear underside of the bus and keeps the exhaust pipe secure. When it is not strong enough, the pipe will jangle until it snaps. The poisonous exhaust fumes are then leaked forward under the passenger compartment. Most states consider a weak pipe hanger a safety hazard and inspectors will flunk any bus that has one. Two months ago, a Washington GM representative admitted to a reporter that the hangers on the '69 buses were too weak to hold the pipe safely. "The factory made them just too flimsy," he said. When Martin Caserio was asked at the December press conference about this problem, he said a weak pipe hanger was certainly a bother, "but it was not safety related." When a pipe broke, said Caserio, the bus driver would surely be alert enough to hear the thing clattering along the ground and have repairs made before any harm might be done to occupants.

From the response of the 39 owners on the GM list, and the many other mysteriously excluded from the list, a fair conclusion is that something is inherently wrong with the 1969 GM school bus. Too many owners in too many places reported too many breakdowns for the problem to be passed off as "one of those things, sorry about that."

Last week, after General Motors had reached the same conclusion and ordered a recall of 4,269 new buses for "possible brake defects," a GM public relations man said that his company had made a survey of 850 buses in December and January and discovered that one bus—only one—had defective brakes. Evidently, though strangely, GM used a different list of owners from the one supplied the press, or else they would have found many more than "one" owner with brake problems—starting with their neighbor in Pontiac, Mich., and including the Belins Bus Service, the Community Charter Bus Co., Stanton, Calif., the Schaumburg Trans. Co., Roselle, Ill., the Guasti School, Guasti, Calif., Morris Hills School District, Rockaway, N.J., the anonymous GM dealer, a private owner in Olean, N.Y., and others. Although none of these had the numbing scare of Mrs. Warren McConnell of Springfield, Va.—last fall, one of her '69 GM buses had total brake failure and ran into a pasture to stop—they all said their brakes had given, or are giving, them serious trouble.

Since the GM recall involves only brakes, questions are raised about other complaints of owners. First, the tall pipe hangers. In a letter to Virginia H. Knauer, special assistant to President Nixon for consumer affairs, on Feb. 11, Martin Caserio admitted that some 300 out of 850 1969 buses had their hangers replaced. Yet, in the recall, this defective part was not mentioned.

A second major complaint not mentioned in the recall involves clutches. Caserio's Feb. 11 letter acknowledges that in some cases "clutch durability (is) unsatisfactory." But rather than admitting the clutches are mechanically flawed, and then recalling them, the GM vice president repeats the standard implication that clutch trouble is usually caused either by foot-happy drivers or by lack of maintenance. But when the anonymous GM dealer has five of seven clutches burn out, even though he adjusts them "every day;" or when a Fullington, Tenn., owner has had to replace four out of six clutches—including one that didn't last 1,000 miles; or when an El Centro, Calif., owner has to adjust his clutches every 600 to 1,000 miles; when complaints like these are regularly heard, something more than foot-happy drivers are to blame.

Last December, GM president Edward Cole said that if his company's survey showed that a recall was necessary, well, a recall it would be. As Martin Caserio said during his press conference, "We'll step up to our responsibility." This is indeed praise-worthy, but the concept of a recall—an outrageous idea in itself, but which a cowed public now accepts calmly—raised fundamental questions. Where was GM's responsibility when their product was being made? Why wasn't it stepped up to then? This is the third consecutive year a recall has been made on GM's school buses, so the notion that something might be wrong in design or in the assembly line must have occurred to some at GM.

Even when a recall is made, the question comes up about retribution for other things besides free labor and parts: such as time spent hauling broken buses in from the roadside waiting at the garage, the mental worry of driving children on vehicles that may be unreliable, the time lost to one's family because the bus needs to be tinkered with or carted to the garage.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 2, 1970]
**THE MARK—OR IS IT THE MOCK?—OF
 EXCELLENCE**
 (By Colman McCarthy)

For the third consecutive year, General Motors has ordered a recall on its school buses. That the world's largest maker of motor vehicles seems not only to make a habit of selling defective goods but, in effect, calmly admits that it does after the victimized owners and the press force the issue, doubtlessly puzzles the general public. But to many GM school bus owners, the recall ritual is no puzzle at all. "In 1967," said Tom Jones of Superior Sales, Omaha, Nebr., and who has new GM buses in his shop constantly, "there was a major model change—in style and engineering. That's where the trouble started." Other owners around the nation agree, saying that buses built earlier than 1967 have never been problems.

What actually happened mechanically between the 1966 model and those made since is unknown to anyone outside of GM. But with a plain ruler and average eyesight, a few facts can be learned. First, the front bumper on the '66 bus—if a local vehicle is representative—is $\frac{1}{4}$ -inch thick; on the '69, it is $\frac{1}{2}$ -inch thick. Thus, in three years, the bumper's thickness is cut in half. A second discovery is that behind the front bumpers of earlier year models is a piece of steel extending from the frame in each direction for about one foot. This reinforces the bumper. On the '69 model, however, this piece of reinforcing steel is gone. A third difference was discovered by Thomas Gist of Sykesville, Md., a harried owner of two defective buses. Wondering why this year's models "ride as if they had solid rubber wheels, like back in the '20s," Gist measured the leaf springs that support the body of the '69 bus. They are seven inches shorter.

How much money GM saves on these simple reductions is known only to the people in the GM budget office and the officials to whom the savings are reported. But it does not appear that GM's pride in production is hurt. The Associated Press recently reported: "A General Motors executive said yesterday that bumpers on GM cars provide 100 per cent protection from any damage—provided the speed of the car doesn't exceed 2.8 miles an hour."

A more serious question is raised by the trimming of the bumper and springs on the '69 bus, since lives and safety are involved. If GM cuts back on parts that a layman can detect, what may it have done to parts hidden under the hood and in the chassis? This is the real worry; and since recalls have been made three straight years—this year for brakes—it is also a frightening worry.

In a simpler day, long before the term *free enterprise system* replaced the term *corporate greed*, a consumer with a complaint—on shoes, say—had only to visit the local shoemaker to get justice. "Here," he would say "these shoes are falling apart." The shoemaker, being both ethical and aware word would spread through the village about his sloppy work, quickly replaced or repaired the shoes. The exchange was pleasant; what's more the shoemaker was *there*; he had a familiar face; he breathed and the only separation between the consumer and him was a door.

Things have changed since yesterday's shoemaker and today's car-maker. The agony of seeking relief or redress from GM, with its 750,000 employees is the same as seeking it from any large bureaucracy where more than one hand works on the final product and where job security is a main concern of the employees. The vice presidents at the top are protected from the consumer's complaints at the bottom by the mass of workers in between; the latter will catch it first if the brass learns the consumers are mad. So the vice

presidents measure the company's success not by the consumer's voice—the way the shoemaker did—but by sales reports, profit charts and the smiles of stockholders. If tens of thousands of cars are sold every year, the high-ups conclude that the public must be happy, or else why are sales still up? When sales aren't up, or when management thinks they can be better, a decision is inevitably made in favor of more chrome, more horses, more gismos.

Meanwhile, the consumer with a defective vehicle can stay trapped. Since no one in the huge corporation takes single responsibility for errors and since it is futile to switch to the competitor's brand—it is just as poorly made—what can he do?

Occasionally, a consumer hits luck. John Donovan happened to catch a reporter's ear one day and told about the endless problems of his three new GM school buses. The story that eventually appeared in The Washington Post led not only to a national recall of 4,000 buses, but also to special treatment for Donovan's three. Over the Christmas holidays, two GM engineers were flown in from Detroit and gave the buses a two-week over-haul, complete and meticulous.

Incredibly, since getting the buses back in early January, Donovan has hauled them into his local GM garage *eight* separate times: the wheels wobbled on two buses (an alarmed motorist spotted this one time), a horn and a governor broke on two, five quarts of oil were needed in one bus's rear end after being out of the shop only one day, the brakes needed adjustment on one, another—loaded with children—wouldn't start one afternoon, and finally one bus failed D.C. inspection.

As if that weren't enough, Donovan received a bill last week from the Firestone Tire Company for \$349.62—even though in December, Kimball Firestone, Harvey's grandson, personally promised Donovan 18 new tires—at no cost—to replace some defective ones. With new tires on his buses that he was told were given free of charge, will Donovan pay Firestone? "Sure. The same day GM pays me for the hundreds of hours of work and bother their three lemons have caused me."

The ordeal of John Donovan and the other luckless owners with '69 GM school buses is reminiscent of the English folk tale about a faulty watch. "I can't understand it," said the watchmaker when confronted by the owner. "I make all my watches with the best butter in town."

**BLACK PERSPECTIVE ON
 CRIME PROBLEMS**

HON. CLAUDE PEPPER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Speaker, this is a transcript of a television broadcast in the important series "Black Perspective on the News." At the invitation of the capable producer, Lionel Monagas, I was pleased to be interviewed at station WHYY-TV, Philadelphia, for the Eastern Educational Network. The three journalists who made up the panel of interviewers were introduced by Warren Dean, who not only was the program host but joined the panelists in a thoughtful examination of work being done by the House Select Committee on Crime.

The introductory statement was made by Mr. Dean:

July 27, 1970

WELCOME TO "BLACK PERSPECTIVE" ON THE NEWS, WARREN DEAN, HOST

Tonight, our subject is "Crime", a national issue, and some of the efforts being taken to reduce the incidents of criminal acts. Our special guest is Congressman Claude Pepper, from Miami, Florida. He is the Chairman of the Select Committee on Crime of the United States House of Representatives.

On our panel of Journalists, we have Ace Moore, from the Philadelphia Inquirer; Pamala Haynes, from the Philadelphia Tribune, and Claude Lewis, of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

The Select Committee on Crime, empowered to probe all aspects and elements of crime in the United States, has held hearings in Washington, D.C.; Boston; Omaha and Lincoln, Nebraska; San Francisco; Miami; Baltimore; New York City; Columbia, South Carolina, and recently, here in Philadelphia.

Congressman Pepper, just what does the Committee expect to do with all the information amassed from the hearings and other investigations?

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. Dean, at the end of this year, which is the end of the 91st Congress, we will make recommendations to the House of Representatives as to what we think the Congress can do and should do to try to reduce crime in the United States.

We can also, as Members of the House of Representatives, introduce legislation to implement our recommendations. Also, as Members of the House, we can report our recommendations and findings to the Executive Branches of the government. Then, we hope we can also stimulate public opinion to an awareness of the problems of crime.

Miss HAYNES. Congressman Pepper, crime and violence have been investigated over and over again in the last few years, and usually the recommendations of these committees are filed and forgotten. Are these investigations really necessary?

Congressman PEPPER. Our Select Committee is in a different category from a Presidential Commission. When a Presidential Commission ordinarily completes its very excellent inquiry and files a very commendable report, it gets a good press at the time, but too often, the report goes on the shelves and stays there. Sometimes someone has the initiative to pick it up and do something about it. President Johnson, you recall, initiated the Omnibus Crime and Safe Streets Act in 1967 and 1968, based to a considerable degree on the findings of the Crime Commission. But little has been done about some of the Presidential Commission Reports. But we are Members of the House of Representatives, and we can be heard in the House. We can bring these recommendations to the attention of the appropriate legislative committees, produce knowledgeable witnesses to support our recommendations and offer legislation to implement our recommendations.

Mr. MOORE. Congressman Pepper, whenever we hear discussions of crime, I think the Americans generally tend to think about black people and poor people. For, is it not in fact a crime—and I call it a crime—to consign people to poor housing, poor schools, poor spirit, as has been done in the United States and by some Congressmen, as well as other government officials?

Congressman PEPPER. There is undoubtedly a social responsibility which should be borne for the commission of crime. The environment out of which a boy or girl comes undoubtedly influences the future conduct of that individual. You cannot escape the fact that the kind of education he has—whether he is a school dropout or not, whether he lives in a community where he didn't have a wholesome environment; whether he learned a trade or a skill by

which he could earn a decent livelihood; whether or not he grew up in a satisfactory home—all those things to a large degree determine what is going to be the character and the performance of the individual.

We have recently visited the correctional institutions in five States, all the way from the Middle West to Pennsylvania. We found that when young men get to the correctional institution, that means that the family, the school, the community, and the church—and this was said to me by a Priest, in discussing the matter—and the church—has failed in respect to that boy or girl. And they get there already a long way down the road to crime. So all the heads of these correctional institutions recommend that our Committee recommend a program way back in the community and in the public schools to try to keep them from ever coming to the correctional institutions.

Mr. LEWIS. I am also concerned about the attitudes of Congressmen. You've seen many examples, I think, of poor attitudes in Congress and even in the White House, and I'm wondering what your Committee is going to do about it.

Congressman PEPPER. Members of Congress who ignore these environmental influences related to the commission of crime are simply blind to reality. It is another contradiction for them to shout about crime—that we need more police—or that we need to be more severe in dealing with the perpetrators of crime—and yet ignore these influences which form criminals. As I say, all those who condone or tolerate those conditions have a certain degree of moral responsibility of what comes out of such an unwholesome environment.

Mr. DEAN. What is the makeup of your Select Committee? Do you have sociologists or criminologists?

Congressman PEPPER. No, by the determination of The Speaker, all of the Members of our Committee are lawyers. There are four Democrats and three Republicans. I'm from the South and Chairman of the Committee as the introducer of the Resolution setting up the Committee; Mrs. Griffiths, a Member of the Ways and Means Committee of the House, from Michigan, is the ranking Democrat. Your very able Representative in the House from Philadelphia, Mr. Robert Nix, is the next one on the Committee, along with Mr. Waldie, of California. There are three Republican Members.

Mr. DEAN. How can you seriously attempt to find out the causes of crime—or the root causes of crime—without having those who would really know the conditions which breed it all? Lawyers are not particularly knowledgeable in that area, are they?

Congressman PEPPER. In the first place, Mr. Dean, it is the function and the necessity of a lawyer to learn the facts. Every case that he has presents the necessity for acquainting himself with the facts of that particular case, and sometimes those facts are involved. He may go from a medical case to a case in chemistry, or something like that. So, we are all lawyers; we have, by virtue of our profession, inquiring minds. But the important aspect of it is, we have a very able staff. We have a staff of twenty-five or thirty. They are knowledgeable, competent people; they help us in the research and in the preparation of hearings, and in the conduct of hearings. We are also able to draw upon technical knowledge from witnesses and from consultants.

Mr. MOORE. Congressman Pepper, you know, I often wonder if the country could really afford a program that would really reduce crime. I think crime has become so much of our economy—so many people are employed directly and indirectly—because of crime. Do you think this factor is considered? Do you think that we can really afford such massive Federal funding?

Congressman PEPPER. Mr. Moore, I have been in the Congress—in the Senate and in the House together—for a period of 22 years now—and it's been my observation that the Government of the United States can do anything that it really wants to do. If we want to fight a war, we don't stop to ask how many billions or hundreds of billions of dollars it's going to cost to fight. I've never heard about our stopping moving munitions up or moving men up because we didn't have enough money to do so. It's the same way about projects. If we undertake the Moon Project—a twenty-five or thirty billion dollar project—we never stopped that until we got a man on the moon. We just went on and did it, because we committed ourselves to it. Now it's the same with—

Mr. MOORE. Does the Government really want to solve this?

Congressman PEPPER. No. The United States public has not yet—and I say it with regret—it is not yet ready to accept the responsibility for the massive effort required to make an all out attack upon crime in this country. It would cost many, many billions of dollars. In fact, I think The Presidential Commission on Violence estimated it cost about twenty billion dollars. But, twenty billion dollars is a small investment. We were told a good many years ago by the F.B.I., I believe, that crime is costing this country forty to fifty billion dollars a year, and we are spending only about five billion dollars a year to combat it—so, you see, it's a losing fight that we are now waging.

Mr. DEAN. Congressman, I understand you have been through several institutions. What percentage of criminals are black?

Congressman PEPPER. The black population is only about twenty percent of the country—but I would say that a disproportionate amount of the men and women who commit crime are black. And I think that is because they have too often been denied the opportunities they should have had—in childhood, in their youth, and in adult life—to develop the skills which would enable them to earn the kind of a livelihood, which perhaps would have prevented them from getting into the area of crime. As I go through the prisons—I noted that a large number of the prisoners who were there—are black people. I don't mean anything like all of them. I'd say half—probably 40 percent—maybe thirty or forty percent—are black people.

Mr. DEAN. Would you say then, that racism in this country—and we know that it exists—would you say that that plays a major role in the way that the prison population is made up?

Congressman PEPPER. Yes, it does. Just recently, I have spent a day in my home City of Miami—at the invitation of the black leaders of my community—hearing witnesses who told about the cause of the riots that we had there in the middle of June and the riot that we had in 1968 during the Republican Convention there. Most of the community leaders—in describing what happened—related the conduct of those who initiated the violence that ended in the riots—to their deprivations in the lack of adequate training in schools—or skills in some sort of trades—or vocations—the lack of a proper home environment. The Vice Mayor of Miami, who is a black lady, said that in one case she knew, 21 people were living in one 1-room apartment. She told of other families in where the family had to divide—live in three different places—the children in one place, more children in another, and the mother and father in another place. The family had to divide up—in three different places—in order to find a place to stay. Now, those things are conducive to the turbulence in the spirit of a child which leads to violence.

Mr. DEAN. I'm concerned about the conditions in the penal institutions, themselves. I think Senator Dodd pointed out sometime

ago that approximately eighty-nine cents out of every dollar spent on the penal system went for things like bars, and whips, and cells and administration—and very little went toward rehabilitation. What can be done about that—and when will something be done?

Congressman PEPPER. Well, we have recently completed the tour of five States—Minnesota, Indiana, Michigan, Connecticut and Pennsylvania—over at Harrisburg—looking at the institution there. We found at Red Wing, Minnesota, the best example we have discovered of humane, wise, compassionate treatment of boys, who were just as bad as others—they were in there for murder, bank robbery—all sorts of offenses. Yet they didn't have bars on the doors or windows. They had no guards on the campus. Boys could run away whenever they wanted to. They actually allowed the boys who constitute a group—nine or ten boys—to make recommendations as to when the members of their group would be released from that institution. One of my colleagues on the Committee and I attended one of their sessions—they met for an hour and a half every evening—at which time the decision was made that one of the boys had come to the point where he can be safely released. By putting that system of confidence and trust into effect, not massive control—but wise and delicate direction, that institution has hardly any run-a-way rate. Their rate of recidivism is down to nineteen percent; whereas, in other institutions of the country—the rate goes as high as seventy-five percent. At Red Wing, they don't spent any money on bars or punishment procedures or anything like that. It is a little difficult for other institutions to understand such a system—to be daring enough to undertake it—and it does require particularly trained personnel. One of the things that we are proposing to do is to provide Federal funds to train people who can operate a system like that. It works.

Mr. LEWIS. The legislature of one of the western states has voted what's been called "A Shoot To Kill Law". It means that anyone who feels that his life or property is in danger can legally shoot their alleged attacker. Did you run into much of this vigilante-type of feeling in your travels?

Congressman PEPPER. No. We didn't happen to encounter that. I suspect it does exist, but we didn't encounter it.

Mr. MOORE. Congressman Pepper, you stated earlier that the public is not ready, not willing to do whatever is necessary. You didn't explain what must the public do? If you're saying that the citizens—

Congressman PEPPER. Well, every one of us who really believes that more can be done than is being done should keep on trying to educate the public. We must urge the need for spending more money, training more people to do more things.

For example, when we started the Omnibus Crime Bill in 1968—the first appropriation was sixty-odd million dollars. Well, you can't do very much with that, in a big country like this, to help the States and local communities to do something about crime. The next year, we got it up to three hundred and seventy-five million. Then I went, on behalf of our Committee, before the Judiciary Committee of the House and recommended that for the 1971 fiscal year, we authorize a billion dollars. That was too little—in a country as big as ours—two hundred million people—with as much crime as we have. I knew that that would hardly make a dent on the problem—but I recommended it and all of us did what we could to arouse public interest. Finally, the Judiciary Committee of the House has now authorized six hundred and fifty million dollars for 1971 and to aid the States, the Counties, and the Cities under the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration—through

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

the Department of Justice. It also recommended a billion dollars in fiscal 1972, and one and a half billion dollars in fiscal 1973. The House of Representatives has already appropriated four hundred and eighty million dollars for fiscal 1971.

Miss HAYNES. With all of this money, are you not just treating the symptom, rather than the disease?

Congressman PEPPER. Yes, to a large degree, we are. It depends on how we spend the money. But we got a provision in the House bill this time—when it was passed recently—that twenty-five percent of the amount of money appropriated to the Omnibus Crime Bill would be devoted to the correctional problem in the country.

The Chief Justice of the United States, in speaking in New York recently, said that we had a recidivism—or repeater—rate of about seventy-five percent in this country. What an abysmal failure for our correctional institutions if three out of every four, who go through those institutions, on being released—commit more crimes. We are just “spinning our wheels”. Now, if we can put into effect really corrective measures, we are reducing crime.

Mr. LEWIS. Congressman, would you say that there must be a link between organized crime, public officials and police for crime to really flourish in the city or state?

Congressman PEPPER. Well, there is undoubtedly a corrupting influence by organized crime upon public authority. It could not exist so successfully as it does. But it is not a simple matter. We found out from our recent hearing in New York on Heroin and Organized Crime that about twelve to fifteen of the leading gangsters—the leading members of organized crime in this country—bring in most of the heroin that is imported into the United States. The difficulty is to get those people up at the top. They keep themselves so well isolated; they have so many layers between them and the perpetration of the crime, that it's hard to reach them. And so, we are striving to find legislation which will enable the government to get to them.

One of the measures that we are proposing is to grant immunity to a witness who is called upon to testify before a Grand Jury or a Congressional Committee, so that he can't claim the Fifth Amendment. We had in our New York Hearing two men whom we had good reason to believe were connected with organized crime's involvement in the heroin traffic. Both of them refused to testify to anything except their names—they took the Fifth Amendment. Now, under this provision that I'm talking about—granting immunity to them—they couldn't claim that they would be criminally prosecuted if they testified—and if they don't testify—they can be sent to jail. But I tell you, the United States Government cannot combat organized crime—which makes seven billion dollars a year on illicit gambling alone, with only twenty-five or fifty million dollars annually.

Mr. DEAN. Are you saying, Congressman, that it's a matter of national priority? Are you saying that the United States Government cannot stop the big people who are dealing with heroin? Is it a matter of whether we want to stop them, or not?

Congressman PEPPER. I doubt that almost any expenditure would stop it all. The coastline of the United States is so long, the many ways of coming into this country are so numerous, that some of it would get in.

We had a case where the gangsters bought out a cannery in Southern Spain. They bought a lot of canned fish from an ordinary factory that produces canned fish—kind of like tuna—and regularly exported it to the United States. They bought a quantity of fish with a lot of empty cans and seals. They

took this to their cannery in Southern Spain, and they filled up sixty cases of those cans with heroin instead of canned fish—and it came in that way. Well, that's typical of the ingenuity with which they bring it in.

Miss HAYNES. Congressman, I've become increasingly concerned about the atmosphere in America relative to crime. And I think it's not unnatural to see the public, aroused about the volume of crime, turning to an easy out. They see an easy, inexpensive expedient, and they don't take too much thought about the serious Constitutional consequences of doing that.

But, they would do far better if they would provide more court rooms, and more judges and more administrative assistants to judges, and assure that there would be a speedier trial for the people that are charged; better correctional institutions; better education and training, and home environment for the children coming up, they'd get better results at less expense.

Mr. DEAN. It's been suggested that a lot of this attitude—this preventive detention, the “No knock” clauses—gained popularity under the current Administration in Washington. I wonder what your feeling is about that?

Congressman PEPPER. Yes, the Administration has obviously taken what we generally call “the hard line”. They have encouraged the point of view that what we need is to be tougher than we have been in the past.

But, as Mr. Justice Tom Clark testified before our Committee—he said this matter is somewhat like a city water system. It doesn't make any difference how much water you have in the reservoir. The amount that goes to the consumers depends upon the quantity that goes through the pipes. In this case, we mean the court system, arrests, the correctional systems, and the efficiency of the courts. All these have a great deal to do with crime. Improvements in these areas probably would be a far more effective than just “a hard line” of denying people what are generally considered to be their constitutional rights.

Miss HAYNES. What do you intend to recommend, Congressman, in the way of rehabilitation programs, when you finally submit your recommendations?

Congressman PEPPER. I would think that we would probably recommend a program under the educational programs of the Federal Government—under which there would be in the high schools—even in the grammar schools—assistance given to boys and girls who indicate some sort of an anti-social attitude or some sort of incapacity to keep up academically with their fellow students. We need to try to do something to help those boys and girls. We need a great deal of emphasis on the preventive aspect.

Then, try to get a humane, efficient, competent system of juvenile justice. We are working now on recommending that kind of a program to the Congress. And then, when they get past the court, there comes the last chance to save about fifty percent of them. About fifty percent who go into those institutions will go on to state prisons at a later time. You're way down the road to the hardened criminal.

The last chance is then to really rehabilitate—that is, to give a new point of view. In Red Wing, Minnesota, of which I spoke, some of those boys for the first time in their lives have had aroused within them a sense of responsibility and concern for their fellowman.

Mr. DEAN. Our thanks to you, Congressman, and we're out of time now.

We've been talking to Congressman Claude Pepper, who is Chairman of the Select Committee on Crime in the United States House of Representatives. Our thanks also to Jour-

nalists Ace Moore, of the Philadelphia Inquirer; Pamela Haynes of the Philadelphia Tribune; and Claude Lewis of the Philadelphia Evening Bulletin.

This is Warren Dean. Thank you, and good evening.

A LETTER FROM A GOOD NEIGHBOR

HON. HENRY B. GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. GONZALEZ. Mr. Speaker, not too long ago a friend of mine, a distinguished and successful businessman of San Antonio, Tex., Mr. W. B. Mathews, sent me a copy of a letter that was most welcome and inspiring.

I consider it worthy of the consideration of my colleagues:

DEAR FELLOW CITIZEN: Here is a message all of us need. It comes from a Canadian neighbor, who apparently appreciates our country's achievements and what we stand for far more than some of our own people.

“Permit me, a Canadian, to express a long overdue ‘thank you America’—not only for putting men on the moon, but for almost 200 years of contributing to the betterment of mankind. For the airplane, radio, cotton gin, phonograph, elevator, movie machine, typewriter, polio vaccine, safety razor, ball-point pen and zipper.

“No other land in all the world has, in so brief a history, contributed so much and asked so little—only that we live together in peace and freedom.

“From the days of Washington and Lincoln, you have demonstrated the creativity, invention and progress of free men living in a free society—where ideas and aspirations may be promoted to the extent of man's willingness to work and build a better mousetrap” with commensurate rewards.

“Thank you for upholding the principles and rights of freedom and liberty; for the American Constitution and Bill of Rights and for protecting those rights even when it results in the burning of your flag and the murder of your President.

“Thank you for those who helped defend freedom on foreign soil in two world wars—a debt we have been able to pay in a small measure by way of some 10,000 Canadian volunteers who stand and fight with you in Vietnam; for the foreign aid you give even when your hand is bitten and your motives impugned; for keeping dignity in the face of insults from nations still wet behind the ears; for your patience with those who seek to steal the world and enslave its people; for keeping your cool even when the Trojan horse mounts the steps of the White House to insolently spew forth its treason. Thank you for keeping alive the concept of individual liberty and faith in God in a world wallowing in humanistic collectivism.

“For these reasons and so much more, I say: ‘Thank you America and God bless you.’

“PATRICIA YOUNG.

“VANCOUVER, BRITISH COLUMBIA.”

If Patricia Young has expressed what you believe, but haven't been able to put in words, I hope you will write her a hearty “thank you,” as I have. I also hope, you will want to circulate her message far and wide among your friends, business acquaintances, public officials and the news media. Let's get America rolling again!

Sincerely,

W. B. MATHEWS,
President, Canada Dry Bottling Co.
of San Antonio.

July 27, 1970

25989

WHO WANTS TO DRIVE ISRAEL
INTO THE SEA?

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON
OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, considering the recent course of events with regard to the American proposal for peace in the Middle East, the following correspondence may be of interest to my colleagues:

JULY 7, 1970.

Hon. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,
Secretary of State, U.S. Department of State,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SECRETARY: I was highly disturbed by President Nixon's comment of July 1 that it is the intention of the Arab states to drive Israel into the sea.

This seems to me to be a most unfortunate statement. My understanding is that the U.A.R., Jordan, and Lebanon have each supported the United Nations' resolution of November 1967 as the basis of settlement. I know there are major differences to be resolved, but it does not advance a peaceful settlement for the President to misstate so grossly the Arab position.

Upon calling the Department of State to determine if this statement reflected the President's interpretation of Mideast events, I was told that it was an "oversimplified" discussion of the situation.

I regard the use of the term "oversimplified" as a wildly inaccurate euphemism that does not adequately portray the potentially damaging impact the President's comment may have on prospects for a peaceful resolution of the conflict.

Sincerely,

LEE H. HAMILTON,
Member of Congress.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 24, 1970.

Hon. LEE H. HAMILTON,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAMILTON: The Secretary has asked me to reply to your letter of July 7 in which you commented on the statement of the President in his July television interview that it is the intention of the Arab states to drive Israel into the sea.

When the President spoke about the Middle East situation in his July 1 television interview, he was emphasizing U.S. policy with particular reference to the greater, more direct and increasingly provocative Soviet military involvement in the area, particularly in Egypt. The President's remarks were intended to bulwark the U.S. political initiative outlined by Secretary Rogers on June 25.

When the President stated that it was the intention of the Arab states to drive Israel into the sea, he was not referring to the Arab moderate states but to certain Arab radical nations and movements whose actions and rhetoric have contributed to the belief that if Israel faltered its existence would be in jeopardy. That, of course, is why we believe it is so important to displace the hate and mistrust of the past 22 years with a just and lasting peace based on the principles contained in the UN Security Council Resolution of November 1967. If the very existence of Israel is not still an open question among some Arab states and movements, then it might be asked why they refuse to accept the provisions of the Security Council Resolution.

A look at the record supports this conclusion, particularly with regard to Syria. Syria has consistently refused to accept the Security Council Resolution which, among other

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

equally important points, calls for: "Termination of all claims or states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secure and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force." Syria also refuses, as called for in the resolution, to accept the Secretary General's Special Representative, Ambassador Jarring, who was mandated to "promote agreement and assist efforts to achieve a peaceful settlement in accordance with the provisions and principles of the resolution." Syria has also been an active supporter of irregular Arab forces—certain radical elements of the fedayeen—whose avowed purpose is to alter fundamentally the nature of the state of Israel.

I am also enclosing for your information the relevant portion of the Assistant Secretary Sisco's interview July 12 on "Meet the Press" dealing with the question you have raised in your letter.

I hope the above explanation and the enclosed material will be helpful to you.

Sincerely,

DAVID M. ABSHIRE,
Assistant Secretary for Congressional
Relations.

EXCERPT FROM MR. SISCO'S INTERVIEW ON
"MEET THE PRESS" JULY 12, 1970

Question: Mr. Sisco, if you were trying to get the Arabs into a very delicate negotiating process, how is it going to help by calling them aggressive and saying they want to drive Israel into the sea?

Mr. SISCO. Mr. Valeriani, what was being referred to there was simply this: Let's look at the record for just a moment. You have Syria that has never accepted the Security Council resolution, has been unwilling to meet with Jarring and has never talked in terms of political solution.

You have the Palestinians, a variety of groups with a variety of opinions but none have come out explicitly for a political solution based on coexistence with Israel.

You have also, as the background, a recent speech by President Nasser which talked in terms of wresting control over the Suez Canal, which would afford an opportunity for pursuing the war of attrition further against Israel.

You have the Egyptian spokesmen in the last two weeks basically repeating this same line.

It is important, Mr. Valeriani, for all concerned to know that we are very anxious to achieve a political solution, that we are quite flexible politically; we have put forward some new propositions, but it is also equally important for all to know that we are keenly aware that the context at which we are pursuing this political initiative, and that the political initiative offers a new opportunity in a very difficult situation.

PEOPLE HELPING PEOPLE

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, last month the Veterans' Agents Association of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts held their annual convention in Lenox, Mass. Deputy Commissioner Joseph P. Mayo of the Department of Veterans' Services gave the following address to this convention, and I am privileged to share his remarks with my colleagues. Having once served as Deputy Administrator of

the Veterans Administration, I know well the vital contributions made by scores of veterans' agents throughout our Nation, and Deputy Commissioner Mayo's heartfelt and stirring speech, delivered after over 23 years of service to our veterans, well typifies the dedication and devoted spirit of those agents who work so selflessly.

The speech follows:

PEOPLE HELPING PEOPLE

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Mayor, Members Of The Head Table, Representatives From The Veterans' Administration, Boston and Providence, Fellow Staff Members From 100 Cambridge Street, Veterans' Agents, And Guests—I was at poolside this afternoon and I, too, waved as the plane flew over head. The plane was not even out of sight when Teddy Handerek jumped into the pool and informed me that I would be at this distinguished Head Table this evening. Teddy wants me to reimburse him for the cost of the plane fare—I might just do that because now I have been afforded this wonderful opportunity to address you.

As you all know, I have been with this Department for twenty-three years—nine of which were as Deputy Commissioner—and this may well be the last time that I will have the opportunity to address you as a Deputy.

I want you to know, with all the sincerity of my heart, that there is one word which stands out in my mind. Which stands out in my mind again. As I look over the sea of faces, that one word is fellowship and fellowship is *people helping people*. May I steal words from the Immortal Scottish Poet, Robert Burns, "Man's Inhumanity To Man." Which is the very antithesis of what I mean. The very antithesis of what I mean, people helping people.

My dear friends, as we sit here and break bread I would mention that on many occasions we have stated that Veterans are very special people. I want you to know that, as long as I live, I will say that Veterans' Agents and the Representatives of the Veterans' Administration are very special people and I will never forget the truly wonderful friendship that has been branded onto my heart.

Friends come and go but true friends are made in an atmosphere of *Love for Your Fellow Man*. And all of you have shown the love for your fellow man. For you have chosen to walk that unselfish road of life that winds and twists, sometimes smooth and sometimes rough and sometimes smooth into a mire. But, because of your tenacity and your love for mankind, you go on until the road smoothens out. You have chosen to walk this road of life *untired* with your spirits held *high*, your shoulders bent with burden and your brow wet from helping those very special people, *Veterans*.

It is on this road of life that you will find the true measure of a man. It is on this road of life that you will find you don't measure a man by his height. You don't measure a man by his girth nor do you measure a man by his weight. But, you measure a man from inside out.

TOWARD SAVING THE ENVIRONMENT: A COMPREHENSIVE PROGRAM

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, the issue of our deteriorating environment is one whose importance is

July 27, 1970

increasing daily. The urgency of bringing pollution under control cannot be underestimated. Having long prided ourselves on our unmatched technological and industrial capabilities, it is not now an easy task to integrate this basic aspect of our national character with a new and vital commitment to merge our productivity with an equally strong program to rescue our environment. In short, this effort requires a rather profound reeducation of both the business community and the citizenry in general.

Communication, rhetoric, and public persuasion all play significant roles in reorienting our society away from ecological suicide, toward a policy of preserving what resources are intact and rebuilding what is not ruined beyond hope. April 22, 1970, was this year designated as Earth Day. Thousands of our citizens and Government leaders participated in programs designed to raise the level of public ecological awareness. This awareness is increasing daily, to the point where citizens are no longer content to hear concern merely voiced; people everywhere want action.

I concur with the growing alarm over the ruinous levels of pollution which blight the landscape nearly everywhere. Accordingly, I have introduced a number of measures which I think will significantly contribute to the vital project of rescuing the environment. However, antipollution is, in my view, one area where we probably cannot do too much. Therefore, I am today introducing eight additional measures which, taken as a whole, constitute a broad and balanced attack on our pollution problems and on our inadequate protection of natural resources. I believe these measures will help us to realize a three-pronged goal of providing both adequate power and adequate protection for our citizens, conserving our environment now and in the future, and preparing our governmental structure to properly cope with ecological matters as our technology continues to advance.

Because the great number of environmental programs which will hopefully be enacted in the near future must be administered by agencies and departments of the executive branch, I am sponsoring a bill to reorganize that branch of the Government by transferring functions of various agencies which relate to the evaluation of the effects of certain activities on the environment to the Environmental Quality Council. This measure would also set forth a badly needed declaration of national environmental policy. Proper coordination of all ecological activities has so far been sadly lacking. This bill will be effective in bringing together all of the information relating to the environment and monitoring the various ecological programs in progress. This centralization will greatly assist in sorting out the maze of environmental programs and information and also serve to point out the proper directions in which we should move with future legislation.

I am also sponsoring a measure which would create a Council of Conservation Advisers, to be composed of three members selected by the President and con-

firmed by the other body. This policy-making body will analyze and interpret existing policies which affect our natural resources, evaluate Government policies and programs relating to the environment, and formulate national policy for the promotion of proper utilization of natural resources with careful regard for conservation and the environment. The Council would be responsible for an annual report.

This bill would further provide for the establishment of a 16-member Joint Conservation Committee to study conservation methods and programs while also acting as a guide to various committees of Congress which deal with conservation activities derived from the Council's programs.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in my presentation I discussed the need for reeducation of our citizenry on the matter of reversing the current tide of ecological destruction. In accordance with that view, I am sponsoring the Environmental Quality Education Act, which calls for the Commissioner of Education to make grants and enter into contracts with various educational and private agencies and institutions so that new and improved curriculums, which will encourage understanding of environmental policies, can be developed. Community education programs would also be devised which would concentrate on preserving and enhancing our ecological balance, along with the quality of our environment.

An Advisory Committee on Environmental Quality Education is also called for in this bill. The committee would be composed of 21 members, each of whom would possess knowledge of education, information media, and of man as a consumer, producer, and citizen of his environment. Progress against environmental destruction will proceed only as rapidly as public knowledge and awareness become prevalent among the population. Education, therefore, plays a very important role in the antipollution effort.

Pesticides, long considered a boon to mankind in terms of increasing growth and production, are now recognized as possessing mixed benefits for our people and our resources. Greater research is very badly needed to determine the overall effects of the great variety of pesticides which are being used, often with too little research or caution, in many areas across the country. For this reason, I am including in this environmental package the Safe Pesticides Act, which would require the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to conduct a thorough study and investigation of the effects of the use of all the various pesticides currently available. We must move to determine the chemical effects on man, animals, and other life forms.

The continuing increases in our population will also demand that we carefully plan for an adequate electrical power supply to meet the needs of our heated, airconditioned, well fed and cleanly laundered populace. The continual fear of "blackouts" and "brownouts" surely points out the need to increase power supplies in an orderly, well-coordinated fashion designed to fill the needs while at the same time preserving our Nation's

natural resources. The Electric Power Coordination Act would provide for the establishment of coordinating agencies on State and national levels. These agencies would be responsible for promulgating service standards and long range goals. They would also safeguard the environment by overseeing the construction of new facilities.

Atomic energy, being a relatively new source of power, can also be hazardous if not carefully regulated. I believe it would be beneficial, therefore, to amend the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 to allow a State to impose radiation standards which are more restrictive than those imposed by the Commission. States which wish to stiffen the protection of their populations against radiation hazards should not be prevented from doing so.

Another concern which is becoming increasingly urgent is that of controlling our booming population. The figures for the future indicate that, here and particularly abroad, a great deal must be done to cut down the birth rate and protect our world from the strangulation of severe overpopulation. With the importance of this project in mind, I am sponsoring legislation to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future. This Commission would examine the impact of population growth in a variety of areas.

Finally, I am sponsoring a resolution which would greatly assist us in planning for the future in an orderly and conservationist manner. A Select Committee on Technology and the Human Environment would be given the responsibility to study the extent of future technological changes, their effects on man's environment and the ramifications of private investments in future technological advances. Necessary powers would be authorized for this 24-member group.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the aforementioned selection of measures designed to promote ecological conservation and a better environment will see action in the near future. I am persuaded that a broad and balanced approach to the antipollution effort will help to undo much of the past environmental ruin and preserve our surroundings in a coordinated and responsible manner. By effectively waging many ecological battles today, I believe we may win the environmental war tomorrow.

PROTECTIONISM AGAINST CONSUMERS

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Ways and Means Committee, after lengthy public hearings on tariff and trade, is presently writing a trade bill that can only be characterized as "protectionist" in nature.

This action has stirred a controversy not only in our own country, but among

foreign countries who trade with us. Repudiation of our "free trade" policies, which have successfully prevailed throughout the administrations of Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson, would have ominous effects on the American economy, our labor market, and not in the least, would strike hardest on the consumer.

An editorial in the July 19 edition of the Los Angeles Times speaks to this subject. I would like to share it with my colleagues for it is certainly "food for thought."

The editorial follows:

PROTECTIONISM VS. CONSUMERS

Thanks to politics as usual on the part of Congress, the Nixon Administration and their counterparts in other countries, the world finds itself on the verge of a potentially disastrous trade war.

The situation has been building for a long time. But it erupted into crisis proportions last week when the House Ways and Means Committee adopted a whole series of protectionist proposals.

As marked up by the committee, the trade bill would impose mandatory quotas on imports of shoes and textiles other than cotton. It would also freeze the current system of oil import quotas into law, and create machinery for the imposition of quotas on many other products.

If enacted into law, the measure as it stands would constitute the most abject surrender to protectionist forces since the Smoot-Hawley tariff law, which helped to plunge the world into depression in the 1930s.

Other major trading countries are threatening to retaliate against American-made goods—a step which, if it materializes, would generate U.S. counter-retaliation, and the world would soon find itself in a trade war which would hurt everybody concerned.

Representatives of the United States and our major trading partners will convene in Geneva late this month for an emergency discussion of the situation.

While Japan and the Common Market countries, in particular, must shoulder much of the responsibility for the dangerous drift toward protectionism, a great deal of the blame should be placed squarely at the door of President Nixon.

The Administration's posture has been basically on the side of the free trade policies which have prevailed for 37 years.

Mr. Nixon, however, has taken the position that textiles are a special case—that the domestic industry is being unreasonably injured by a rising tide of imports, and therefore deserves protection.

The statistics do not bear him out. Suspicion thus is inevitably bred that the President is less interested in the economics of the case than in the political points to be won in the South, where so much of the textile industry is concentrated.

In any event, the refusal of the Japanese to accept a meaningful system of voluntary quotas on textile imports led the Administration last month to throw its "reluctant" support behind legislation to impose formal quotas.

The trouble is that it is not much easier to be a little bit protectionist than a little bit pregnant. Once textile quotas had presidential support, the usually responsible House Ways and Means Committee turned a more sympathetic ear to other protection-minded industries.

The move toward protectionism will be very hard to stop either in the House or Senate, now that it has picked up momentum—unless the American people themselves show an unaccustomed awareness of their stake in the matter.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The fact is that trade barriers are against the overall public interest in two important ways:

If we impose quotas on other people's exports to this country, they will naturally impose quotas on our exports to theirs. Since the United States is a net exporting nation, this game of tit-for-tat eliminates more jobs than it saves. This is particularly true in California, where agricultural and industrial exports are so important to the economy.

Imposition of quotas on imports reduces competition, and therefore results in higher prices and a narrower range of choice for the consumer. When domestic industries ask for protection in the form of quotas or tariffs on foreign goods, they are in effect asking for a subsidy at consumer expense.

It is quite literally true, then, that the protectionist trade bill which is emerging from the House Ways and Means Committee is an anti-consumer bill of potentially massive proportions.

Consumer groups should understand this point and act on it—by pressuring lawmakers to vote against the protectionists, and by urging President Nixon to veto the trade bill unless the quotas are removed.

Finally, voters in California and elsewhere should remember next November which lawmakers voted for the consumer and which did not.

THE BUSINESS OF AMERICA IS BUSINESS

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, a very prominent American, Calvin Coolidge once said:

The business of America is business.

Today, as never before, the business of business must be America.

The following is a speech delivered by Dan W. Lufkin, chairman of Donaldson, Lufkin & Jenrette, Inc., at the April 22 Earth Day proceedings at Harvard Business School.

As a member of the National Steering Committee for Earth Day, and as a leader of one of the outstanding forward thinking and innovation investment banking houses in Wall Street, he is strategically placed to analyze the problems and opportunities of corporate commitment in today's environmental controversy.

Not only is he posing the hard question for businessmen to answer as they stand on the bridge between technology and human beings, but his urgent call should be read by Members of Congress, as it is our responsibility to provide effective leadership.

The speech follows:

THE BUSINESS OF AMERICA IS BUSINESS

Ladies and Gentlemen, Participants in the Teach-In, Friends: Today belongs to the youth of America. Like the child in the ancient legend, they have had the courage to tell us that the emperor is naked. They have stood by the side of the road as we paraded the wonders of our civilization, and they have told us we have been cheated. Instead of glittering success, they see grim failure. Instead of praise for what we have built, they blame us for what we have destroyed. Instead of seeing the magnificence of our technology, they have taken the measure of our inhumanity.

Never before has the perspective of an entire generation and all its youth been so in conflict. And in these conflicting views of our society, there is a grim challenge to all of us—namely, end the conflicts or end everything. End the conflict between black and white. End the conflict between rich and poor. End the conflict between young and old. And as we are here to discuss today, end the conflict between man and his environment.

Whether or not we know it consciously, this doomsday sense on the issue of the environment is what has brought us here today. And this is the reason why I have worked so hard to see this day a success. This meeting, and thousands like it across the country, in a way more real than metaphoric, must be where the peace negotiations begin.

I am not suggesting that our speakers are antagonists; or that their love for their country, their appreciations of nature and their concern for ecological balance differ in intensity or sincerity. But in a very real sense, they do symbolize the two sides of the environmental conflict—the side of *Man the Technologist*, superimposing on nature a home of his own creation, and the side of *Man the Natural Being* trying desperately to preserve the integrity of creation itself.

My sole qualification to arbitrate this issue is a burning conviction that, however agonizing the process, the differences between these two sides—those who speak for man's conscience and those who represent his commerce—must be resolved. Frankly, I believe that the involvement of business in the salvation of our environment will have far-reaching and perhaps even disturbing consequences. I think every one of us here will be personally affected to a degree scarcely comprehensible today, before the fact.

But let me begin by commenting on the reactions of both sides to this situation. As part of my steering-committee activities, I called on a number of key members of the business community. One interview sticks in my mind, a meeting with an officer of a major utilities association in New York. I asked this gentleman how his membership planned to deal with the students and others who would approach them during the teach-in. And he replied: "Oh, our members will participate—definitely—some may even give a nice lunch, a tour of the plant and perhaps a ride in an electric car."

The presence of Charles Luce on this platform testifies that not all utilities executives feel this way about Earth Day and its implications. But as I talk with you now, I find myself wondering how well those electric car operators are faring in the face of today's reality. Not very well, I imagine.

Nor do they deserve to be let off too lightly. To suppose that Earth Day is an incident best handled by the public relations department is the surest evidence of the corporate shortsightedness which has led us to a need for Earth Day in the first place. To underestimate the concern of the public, and especially of your generation, with the environmental crisis is to kindle the fires of tomorrow's disaster. Yet too many members of the business community apparently believe that this crisis can be solved by a tree-planting ceremony on the home office front lawn. In my own visits to business regarding Earth Day, over one-half the time I was ushered into the public relations department and visited with the public relations director.

On the other side of the barricades, I've heard, and no doubt you've heard, equally myopic philosophizing. "Earth Day is a cop-out, a ruse to divert attention from the war." You've heard that. And, "Earth Day is a WASP issue, a middle-class cleanup campaign that doesn't do a thing for blacks." You've heard that, too. All in all, the comments from both sides indicate to me that neither side commands a monopoly on intelligence.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 27, 1970

Meanwhile, the facts make liars out of the footdraggers, whoever they may be.

According to a study done at Carnegie-Mellon University, roughly 25 percent of all respiratory disease is associated with air pollution. During the past ten years, a disease called pulmonary emphysema has become the fastest growing cause of death among city dwellers, and 70 percent of us live in cities. In New York City, the death rate of this clogged-lung disease has increased by 500 percent since 1960, and Paul Ehrlich estimates it will increase another 500 percent in the next five years. In 1968, the life expectancy of the average American actually *declined*, from 70.5 years to 70.2 years. *Time* magazine noted that "the Apollo 10 astronauts could see Los Angeles as a cancerous smudge from 25,000 miles in outer space." And it is a fact that, in Los Angeles, public-school gym classes are cancelled regularly lest the children, when they exercise, breathe too deeply.

In his play, *A Season in the Sun*, the late Wolcott Gibbs made a comic climax of the scene in which the hero, as a hurricane approaches his summer home, goes to the bookshelf to look up "hurricane" in the dictionary. In a sense, we're doing the same thing. But the word we're looking up is "homicide." And I think we've found the definition. Now what do we do, before it's too late, to put our knowledge to use?

Since I myself first became interested in—and then horrified by—what we're doing to ourselves and our environment, I've learned a good deal about the legal and the economic aspects of the environmental crisis. If we had enough time today, I would like to trace for you the history of our so-called environmental protection laws—starting with the first one of consequence put on the books in 1889 and continuing through the Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970. Or we could review together the projections now being made by the econometricians of the cost to clean up our waterways and our atmosphere; and spend time assessing the proposals, from taxes on future junk to fines to direct increases in consumer prices, by which cleanup costs can be transferred to society as a whole.

The legal history of our unconcern and then our concern with the environment is fascinating. The costs of cleanup will rightly preoccupy leadership in the future. These problems, indeed, will preoccupy you as you move on into your careers. If I bypass these issues now, it's not because they're unimportant. Rather, it's because I'm sure that most of you are already thoroughly versed in the costs and legal mechanics by which environmental cleanup will have to begin to be implemented. After all this is the Harvard Business School!

So first today I want to warn you against the argument advanced by some leading industrialists; namely that if we forego short-term profit we may have no long-term future; in the market economy, we will be eaten if we don't advance avariciously on all fours. I disagree with this thinking 100 percent, and this is not an ivory tower planner talking. With others, I have built a business from a \$100,000 equity investment in 1960 to a Company with a net worth of \$28 million as of last year end. In that journey there were many days of no profit, forget short-term profit.

While we must have broad environmental legislation which prescribes uniform treatment—both carrot and stick—for industry, industry must do its part even, and most probably, at the cost of short-term profit. I do not believe that the rightful public anxiety over the environmental crisis will stand for any other course. Nor do I believe it should.

This being the case, I suspect that the crisis of the environment and the related

crisis, as they pertain to the business community, are going to alter that community permanently. Let me take this thought the next step in a familiar context, that of the old argument about the social responsibility of the business organization. In my day here it was called "Business Responsibilities in American Society," although the subject matter was far removed from what I am advocating today. Then we all decided that, yet, the organization does have definite social responsibilities . . . that, in the pursuit of these, short-term profits can be held down in favor of longer-term investments in the betterment of society . . . and that this strategy in truth is the best possible management strategy for a business to adopt, because it constitutes insurance of a better future for all.

In my judgment, the urgent threat to survival posed by our derredations against the environment has brought the future right to our doorstep. As President Nixon has said, "it is now or never." Our whole notion of redirecting some of our resources into socially valuable projects but keeping most of our resources in making money irrespective of the consequences will no longer wash. The trick will be to direct most of our resources to rendering society more humane and more livable and making money in so doing. What I am really suggesting is a reordering of business priorities, of taking the quality of life issue out of the public relations department and putting it right smack on the President's desk, as top priority! In all areas, and in all forms, quality of life must weigh equally with Adam Smith's market mechanism in the allocation of resources.

Does this mean the death of the profit-system and of free enterprise capitalism? In a thousand speeches before a thousand Rotary Clubs, it perhaps will. But in this speech, it obviously doesn't. I do think that the mishandling of the issue by some businessmen will compound the woes of transition. But I also think we're headed for a type of redefinition, not an abolition, of the concept of profit—one that will assess corporate gains and losses not only in terms of dollars but also in terms of social benefits realized or not realized.

At this point, I can almost read the minds of some of you who are thinking: Well and good. But how do you convert social benefit gains into measurable indicators? How do you quantify benevolence?

The assumption that you can measure business performance only by money standards—and its counterpart that you can't assess social beneficence in money terms—is like the assumption that the bumble bee can't fly. No matter what the aerodynamic engineers prove on the drawingboard, it damn well does fly. And the quantification of social gains, despite the abstract logic of some theoreticians, is proceeding apace. As evidence, let me refer you to an article by Robert Beyer in the March, 1969, *Journal of Accountancy*. Mr. Beyer is managing partner of Touche, Ross, Bailey & Smart in New York. Needless to add, his other management credentials are impeccable. In his article, "The Modern Management Approach to a Program of Social Improvement", Mr. Beyer explains what's being done today in Detroit to quantify the results of the city's welfare programs. Among many other insightful comments, the article includes this one:

"The degree to which basic human needs are reduced, and the time it takes for reduction to occur, is the acid test of a social program's success. Continuing measurement, reliably controlled in the best accounting tradition, provides a valuable instrument of continuing evaluation. The absence of this ingredient is responsible for the failure of more social improvement programs in the past than any other single factor."

It can be done and I interpret Mr. Beyer's remark as a direct rebuke to the doubters.

Broadly, he's suggesting that if we apply the same skill and control to managing social improvement that we're applying to managing businesses, we will be able to measure quantitatively the effect of our involvement.

There are those in business today, in the ranks of top management, who object to business involvement in not-for-money-profit social endeavors, or profit endeavors with a socially responsible overtone. They feel sincerely that such endeavors are primarily the concern of government. I disagree. It seems to me that future historians will see much of the American 20th century in terms of brilliant theoretical proposals on the part of government, but of correspondingly dismal administrative realities. I hold with Peter Drucker that the job of government is to propose directions for society and to legislate the rewards and penalties into being. But it's the role of enterprise to act, to manage, to innovate and to bring about social change. This, after all, is what businessmen are good at doing. As a matter of past historical fact, one of the reasons big government arose in the first place was because private enterprise—lacking the motivation of survival—shirked for so long its environmental and social responsibilities.

Now, we have no choice but to assume these responsibilities and we do have the primal motivation of survival. Far from wishing the government to do an incompetent job with them, I'm willing to hope that we recapture from government all kinds of business-related endeavors and make money in so doing. In sum, not only do I hope as a businessman for the lion's share of the work to be done on our environment, but I favor also the "reprivatization"—another phrase of Drucker's—of the postal services, the lending agencies and other unwieldy factories of government administration.

What will business life be like after the millennium of a new definition of profit? Will businessmen be forced to say, like the old wizard in the *Lord of the Rings*, "the Third Age of the world is ended, and the new age is begun; and though much has been saved, much must now pass away"? I don't think we're quite ready to put aside our energy and initiative or to say goodbye to the American Dream. But I do think that our business life, which has changed so much over the past decade, will change even more over the next. I think in many respects it will be even more satisfying to be in business than it has been. Echoing the comments of another sage, John Maynard Keynes, "I look forward, therefore, in days not so very remote, to the greatest change which has ever occurred in the material environment of life for human beings in the aggregate. . . . The critical difference will be realized when prosperity has become so general that the nature of one's duty to one's neighbor is changed."

Ladies and gentlemen, I think the nature of our duty has changed indeed. With Keynes—Keynes the man—I feel that "it will remain reasonable to be economically purposive for others after it has ceased to be reasonable for oneself." This, I think, is to become the major motif of business. It must, if we, our system, and our way of life are to survive.

LEAD POISONING: CHILD KILLER

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, the large number of lead poisoning cases reported in recent months has attracted the attention of concerned public officials

and organizations throughout the United States.

Such poisonings occur among young children, almost always between the ages of 1 and 6, who eat crumbling plaster or paint chips heavy in lead content that they find on the floor or peel off the walls of older mostly slum dwellings. Because the symptoms of lead poisoning are so similar to symptoms of other diseases, such as the common cold, and flu, medical authorities often mistake lead poisoning for other ailments.

Progress is being made, however, not only in diagnosis and treatment, but in the awareness of officialdom and the public. Many citizen groups such as the VITA-D.C. Committee on Lead Poisoning, are engaged in an effort to disseminate information to residents of the inner city where older dwellings abound and to educate them to the hazard to their children of lead poisoning. The importance of these efforts cannot be minimized.

Legislation introduced in the Congress was the subject of recent hearings held by the subcommittee on housing of the House Banking and Currency Committee.

Most significant was the testimony presented by Dr. Hazel Swann, a volunteer with Volunteers for International Technical Assistance (VITA). Accompanying Dr. Swann was Mrs. Romana Parker whose son was the District of Columbia's first recorded lead paint poisoning casualty.

Dr. Swann's statement is a clear delineation of the problem as well as offering sound recommendations for its ultimate solution.

The statement follows:

**STATEMENT BY THE VITA-D.C. COMMITTEE
ON LEAD POISONING**

PRESENTED TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON HOUSING,
CHAIRMAN BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM A. BARRETT, CHAIRMAN

Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, we thank you for this opportunity to address you. Our message is an urgent one that affects potentially thousands of children living in slum housing in the District of Columbia, as well as children in many other parts of the nation.

My name is Dr. Hazel Swann. I'm a volunteer with the VITA-D.C. Office. VITA, or Volunteers for International Technical Assistance, along with a number of D.C. community organizations has formed the VITA-D.C. Committee on Lead Poisoning. I am here representing that broad group, on behalf of our children.

The lady with me is Mrs. Romana Parker, of the North East section of the District of Columbia. Mrs. Parker is the mother of a child, Ricky Parker, whose tragic death in June of this year was a result of lead poisoning.

Ricky Parker was pretty much of a normal three year old. Maybe big for his age, but normal otherwise. Except that he had a habit of sitting on the steps in his house and cramming bits of things into his mouth that he shouldn't eat.

He lived at 229 F Street, N.E. with his mother, Mrs. Romana Parker, and two other children—a sister 21 and a brother 18. His father is ill and in a veteran's hospital.

On June 22, very early, he died. He was dead when his mother reached the hospital.

An autopsy showed he died of lead poisoning. Ricky Parker became the first recorded lead poisoning death in the District, according to health department officials. He was not the first child to die of the disease. The

autopsy showed that Ricky had lead in his knees; bits of paint chips in his colon; and plaster chips and paint chips in his stomach.

His mother said he had been eating paint wherever he could find it in the house for a year, but never showed any adverse signs of lead poisoning. Every time she would catch him, she would make him quit. She patched the walls in the old house with plaster wherever she would find him picking at flaking paint. She said he couldn't stop eating paint and that just before he died, it almost became a mania with him trying to find paint and plaster that he could eat.

Why did Ricky have to die? Lead poisoning is a completely preventable disease that attacks children living in slums. Its victims are most often children between the ages of 1 and 6 who eat bits of crumbling plaster or peeling paint that is heavy in lead content. No one knows for sure just how many children suffer from the disease, but every year children die from it. No one knows how many children die or are irreparably damaged by lead poisoning because the District Government only began in April of this year to require doctors to report cases of lead poisoning. This is the first substantive effort at any kind of legislation to deal with the problem of lead poisoning in the District.

The infant who drops his bottle into a pile of chipped paint on the floor or the toddler who crams bits of broken plaster or putty into his mouth is susceptible to lead poisoning. It has been estimated that one child in 15 between the ages of one and six who lives in slum housing has more lead in his system than is safe.

Parents must know how to detect lead poisoning in their children early before the case is too severe to prevent irreparable damage. That is sometimes hard to do because the early symptoms are vague and could indicate several other types of diseases or illnesses in children. But, if a child who is exposed to old paint, putty or plaster shows these symptoms, medical help should be obtained for him.

Symptoms may be very mild or quite severe. In the very young child, symptoms may appear shortly after exposure to the lead.

Mild symptoms include headache, irritability, inability to sleep, stomach ache, weakness, loss of weight, vomiting, or loss of appetite. In severe cases, the symptoms may include dizziness, staggering, paralysis, pains in joints, convulsions, or blindness.

As you can see, the early symptoms of lead poisoning can be and are easily mistaken for other, less virulent diseases. In terms of medical costs and possible loss of life, it is easier to prevent the disease by removing all old, peeling paint, plaster, and putty from walls within four feet of the floor. These precautions may help prevent the often permanent damages of lead poisoning. May I emphasize that ignorance is widespread. Reportedly Ricky for some time, was treated for Anemia, not Lead Poisoning.

The VITA-D.C. Committee on Lead Poisoning came into being several months ago. It was originally composed of representatives from two social organizations, two VITA-Volunteers and the VITA-D.C. staff. There are now about ten participating community organizations. The goal of the committee has been to launch an informational campaign, directed to the parents of children living in D.C. slum housing; better described as the D.C. Lead Belt.

A simple informational pamphlet was designed by the committee, and through the efforts of the participating community organizations, over 25,000 pamphlets have been distributed. Approximately half were distributed on a door to door basis. Others were distributed through 52 child care centers, and 12 inner-city schools. Well over 400 persons have been involved in this effort. This is not

enough! While we were working, Ricky Parker died of Lead Poisoning!

We are aware of a recent blood testing campaign conducted on a number of children in the District. This is a worthwhile beginning, but it is still only a small step toward a curative measure. Until children can be treated and returned to a home free from the presence of lead, doctors, parents, and helpless children will be caught in a vicious cycle of band-aid remedies, in which the real cause is never stopped. In short, Prevention must be emphasized.

What is to be done first? A massive information/educational campaign must be mounted. It should be directed towards the populations most vulnerable to the disease (slum dwellers), and those persons most involved with the problem, i.e., community health clinics, landlords, MDs, community organizations, etc.

HEW could mount an effective series of public service announcements that would utilize community organization people in the delivery of the message.

Appeals to the news media for research and coverage should be made. Specific appeals should be made to the most popular radio stations in said areas. Persons forced to reside in slum housing should be made very knowledgeable of the high potential danger of peeling paint and crumbling plaster.

OEO could activate distribution of informational materials to Community Action Programs located in areas that have a high concentration of slum housing.

All headstart and childcare centers in lead-belt areas should receive informational materials. All school systems in these areas should be alerted to the problems through informational materials, that could be passed onto the Parent-Teachers Associations, etc.

In addition to the recommended massive informational/educational campaign, we strongly recommend that any national legislation dealing with lead poisoning in children place the greater emphasis on preventive rather than curative approaches. Detection and treatment programs only would see children returning to the same infectious environment, each time coming closer to death or permanent physical damage, such as blindness or mental retardation.

We realize that many people see problems with such legislation—Is the present landlord responsible? What kind of feasible system of removal is available? What are the effective means of enforcement? These are not major problems to those of us who are truly concerned. Landlords are legally responsible for the maintenance of the property they own. Removal of paint from a row-house can be accomplished at far less cost than medical treatment for one child. We know the problem can be solved with adequate funds and legislation. As representatives of the community, our greatest concern is that whatever legislation is enacted be stringently enforced. Too often, the community of the poor has been disillusioned with paper legislation in which there is no strong enforcement provision. Our participating organizations are located in the problem areas and can assure their assistance in the enforcement of whatever provisions are enacted to end the death of small children by lead poisoning.

THE NEGRO IN WORLD HISTORY

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent I include the following article from Tuesday magazine, June 1970:

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

July 27, 1970

THE NEGRO IN WORLD HISTORY

DR. ERNEST E. JUST

A modest, withdrawn man who avoided politics, it would have seemed uncommonly strange to Dr. Ernest Everett Just had he known that after his death he was to become a central figure in a battle which was as much ideological as it was scientific, a battle which pitted scientists from one side of the Iron Curtain against those from the other. But, although during his lifetime Dr. Just had shunned both publicity and controversy except for those quiet, scholarly arguments which might follow from his frequent publications in the scientific journals, it happened. And the quiet, single-minded Dr. Just no doubt would have found it ludicrous to attempt to explain science in terms of politics or politics in terms of science.

Dr. Just was a biologist, one of America's most brilliant and original experimental biologists, a man whose person and work were respected throughout the world's scientific community. But as with most scientists—and especially those of the first half of this century who were black—he was little known outside his tight little community of fellow researchers. What brought him to wider attention after his death was not, finally, the body of his more than 40 years of brilliant work, but the conclusions laymen were to draw from his final book, *The Biology of the Cell Surface*. To say he came to wider attention even then is, perhaps, to overstate the case: He came to the attention of the political polemicists who were fighting the Cold War with words and who were willing to seize on anything at hand to score debating points.

The book Dr. Just published shortly before his death in 1941 represented an attack upon the traditional biology and especially upon the gene theory. And it was an attack somewhat similar to—although Dr. Just's research was entirely independent of—the theories of the Russian scientists, Michurin and Lysenko. Such a coincidence would not usually, in a science so remote to most laymen as biology, have created a furor except that there was much more to it, from a Marxist point of view, than a theory of physical science. The Marxists chose to view the theories of Michurin and Lysenko as theories which bulked their views of the world, history and social organization as well—subjects far removed from the biology of the cell surface. And, in the world of the Cold War, Westerners chose to believe that these theories must, perforce, be wrong.

The core of the argument was the traditional view, first put forth by Gregor Mendel, that hereditary characteristics are transmitted from one generation to another only through the genes attached to the chromosome within the nucleus of the cell and that those characteristics cannot be modified by environment. The Russian Tschernin Lysenko's theories ran directly counter to Mendel's. He maintained that basic physiological changes in individuals may result from their environment and that they may then transmit those changes to the next generation: in short, that heredity may be affected by environment. From the Communist point of view Lysenko's theories assumed an importance beyond the field of biology because they seemed to support in the physical sciences what Marxists already believed in the social sciences—that a carefully controlled environment can lead to specific changes in man's condition and in man himself.

Now it would seem strange that a non-political black American scientist should become embroiled in such an abstract international political argument with ramifications far outside the field in which he spent his life—and, in fact, Dr. Just didn't. It was only after his death that laymen discovered in his last book that he had insisted that the idea that only the nucleus of the cell affected heredity and the rest of the cell did

not was false. And he did not directly support Lysenko's theories, although he arrived at many of the same conclusions.

"... a conception which assumes that either the individual alone or only the outside world is real, has no biological basis," he wrote. "The interdependence between individual and outside world is a postulate which has its sanction not from any abstract philosophical principle, but is true because of the biological basis here set forth [in *Biology of the Cell Surface*]. The best system of philosophy, then, is that which recognizes living thing and outside world as one interdependent continuum."

It was a long, but direct, path which brought Ernest Everett Just to a position as a figure of posthumous international controversy from his beginnings in Charleston, S.C. He was born August 14, 1883, the son of Charles Frazier and Mary Matthews Just. His father was a wharf builder who constructed some of Charleston's largest piers before he died when Ernest was four. His mother supported her three children after their father's death by working in the nearby phosphate fields and by teaching in a school she established with money she got by selling some property. Just went to his mother's school and from there to the Industrial School of Orangeburg, now South Carolina State College.

After he left the industrial school, young Just decided to go North to study, found a job on the Clyde Line (a coastal boat service) and worked his way to New York where he arrived, he later said, "with \$5 and two pairs of shoes, one very worn and the other serviceable." He worked in New York long enough to get money to put himself into Kimball Academy in Meriden, New Hampshire. At Kimball he supported himself with scholarships and with odd jobs, washing dishes, shining shoes and so forth. He completed the four-year course in three years and found time as well to win a prize two years in a row for extemporaneous speaking, become president of the debating society and editor of the school paper.

In later years he told his children that while he was washing dishes one day at Kimball he had a sudden feeling that he must go home. He took off his apron, walked off the campus, stopped in New York long enough to pick up his brother, Hunter, who was working in the city, and made for Charleston. He arrived late at night and knocked several times on his door without getting an answer. Finally a neighbor called from a house next door: "Ernest, is that you?" Yes, he said, it was. "We've been trying to reach you for three days," the neighbor said. "Your mother was buried this morning."

From Kimball, Just went to Dartmouth College. There he seems to have been something of a renaissance man in the sense that his interests were wide-ranging and his grades were extraordinary. During his freshman year he made the highest mark ever by a Dartmouth student in Greek. He thought seriously of specializing in Greek and writing on a phase of the language which interested him when he discovered that a German scholar already had done such work and Just abandoned the project. He was a Rufus Choate scholar for two years at Dartmouth and was elected to the scholastic honor society, Phi Beta Kappa. He won his degree in 1907 with the only magna cum laude honors given that year. He graduated with special honors in both zoology and history—the first Dartmouth student ever to take special honors in two fields—and with honors in botany and sociology.

Bishop Wilbur P. Thirkield, president of Howard University from 1906 to 1912, wrote years later of how he had hired Ernest Just in 1907 as an instructor in English at a salary of \$400 a year because: "I sensed the need

of exalting English in the curriculum." The next year Bishop Thirkield was planning a new science hall for the university and asked Just to switch from English to biology. Having gained the warm admiration of his students in English," the Bishop wrote, "Instructor Just was not favorable to the change. He has since told me how incensed he became over my insistence that he take the instructorship in biology on the plea that while I could secure teachers of English, Just was the only well-equipped man of the colored group whom I could secure for biology."

How right he was, the Bishop could not have known. During his first year of studying biology at Dartmouth Just had discovered how little, comparatively speaking, was known of the development of the egg. The subject intrigued him and he decided to make it his specialty. In 1909 he began graduate work at the Marine Biological Laboratory in Woods Hole, Mass., where he was to spend most of his summers for the next 30 years, and marine eggs became the center of his research. He wrote the first of some 50 papers he produced on the subject in 1912 and, after graduate work at the University of Chicago, won his Doctor of Philosophy degree in biology there in 1916.

Meanwhile, in 1912, he had married Ethel Highwarden, of Columbus, Ohio, a graduate of Ohio State University who was teaching at Dunbar High School in Washington, D.C. The couple had three children: Margaret, now Dr. Margaret Just Butcher, distinguished professor of American Literature at Federal City College in Washington; Highwarden, now a school principal in Cordie, Ga.; and Maribel, now Mrs. Maribel Butler, an employee of the Bureau of Census in Washington. And despite his own hardships at the time, Dr. Just while still in college had managed to put his brother, Hunter, and sister, Inez, through school as well. Both are still living. Inez, now Mrs. Inez Harris, went through Freedman's Nursing School in Washington, later established her own practical nursing school, and now lives in retirement in Los Angeles.

Even before he won his doctorate degree, Dr. Just had become so widely known that in 1915 he was awarded the first Spingarn Medal, awarded by Dr. J. E. Spingarn, first chairman of the board of directors of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People to "the man or woman of African descent and American citizenship who shall have made the highest achievement during the preceding year or years in any honorable field of human endeavor." He won specifically for his work in physiology and for improving the standards of Negro medical schools. He had by this time become head of Howard's Department of Zoology and a professor of physiology at Howard Medical College and, still making less than \$1,000 a year, found the \$100 prize a considerable addition to his salary. Yet, when he won the medal, he wrote the NAACP that he was sorry he had to appear before an audience to go through the ceremony because he felt such publicity was incompatible with scientific endeavor. And when New York Governor Charles S. Whitman gave him the medal, Dr. Just said only, "Thank you."

By 1920, and lasting until 1931, he had become a Julius Rosenwald Fellow in Biology of the National Research Council and was so highly regarded for his work that the Rosenwald Foundation gave Howard an \$80,000, five-year grant with the stipulation that should Dr. Just leave or die within the period of the grant the gift would automatically be cancelled. It was not an idle thought. By the late '20s Dr. Just's fame had spread throughout the world's scientific community and there were many lures put before him. He was a special lecturer at the Congress of Zoologists in Padua, Italy, in 1930. For three consecutive years he did

research at the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute for Biology in Berlin and later worked several times at the Sorbonne in Paris and the Biological Station in Naples. Once, while in Naples for six months' study financed by the Rosenwald Foundation, he was a guest of the Prince of Monaco and conducted experiments in the Prince's private laboratory.

As well, he became a vice-president of the American Society of Zoologists, was an associate editor of the *Biological Bulletin*, the *Journal of Morphology*, *Physiological Zoology*, the *Collaborator Protoplasm* of Berlin and *Cytologia* of Tokyo. In the early 1930s he was one of only four American blacks listed in the *International Who's Who*. The others were W. E. B. DuBois, James Weldon Johnson and Countee Cullen.

His fame and the stringent demands of the teaching and research to which he devoted himself did not, however, turn him into a man whose every waking thought was devoted to science. His daughter Margaret remembers that "he just loved to go to the movies, for instance. They were segregated in Washington then, and three or four times a week he would go up U Street to the Lincoln or the Republic, many times with me when I was old enough. Perhaps it was from boredom, I don't know. He liked to play tennis and played until he was 52 or 53. He loved to sail and enjoyed it particularly the summers he was in Naples. And he learned to ski when he was in Switzerland when he was in his late 40s.

"And he was an inveterate reader of detective stories, the good ones—Dashiell Hammett and Agatha Christie and so forth. He slept naked on the porch—he loved fresh air—and read in bed, with a sheet thrown over him, one of his detective stories every night. He would eat six or eight oranges a night in bed while he was reading and make my mother angry because he would throw the peelings and seeds on the floor.

"And he loved good music. His first gift to me was a phonograph. We had excellent records: Toscanini, Paganini, and he was a Bach enthusiast. Later in life he learned to like good jazz. I remember that when he went to Europe on a Rosenwald grant in 1929 he was permitted to take his wife with him. My mother was afraid of water so he took me instead and took me to see *Showboat* in New York the night before we sailed and loved the tunes. He particularly admired Ethel Waters and Florence Mills, especially a song called *Supper Time* that Florence Mills did in one of the Blackbirds shows."

Perhaps as a result of the days when he had two pairs of shoes, "one very worn and the other serviceable," Dr. Just, his daughter says, "adored good clothes and had them all made to order. He had a black camel's hair overcoat he brushed every day. We all called it 'the cat' and used to tease him by asking him if he'd brushed the cat that day.

"And he was an excellent cook. He bought a huge washtub to soak and boil big 15-pound Smithfield hams in and my mother always said, well, at least she had gained a new washtub from it. He always cooked the Thanksgiving and Christmas meals and made fruit and pound cakes he'd cut up, wrap, put in fancy baskets with nuts and things and deliver them himself to neighbors he liked. And he always did the Christmas tree—one year it was all in red satin ribbon and another time it was entirely decorated with holly. The main thing he gave us at Christmas was books, maybe a dozen each. He always said clothes were a necessity but books were a necessary luxury, his daughter remembers."

And, despite the popular image of him as the always serious scholar, Dr. Just had his amusements. Every Saturday night he gathered with some cronies to play cards but occa-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

asionally the card sessions were adjourned so Dr. Just and his friends could attend a Saturday night performance at a burlesque theater from which he would return with a collection of burlesque jokes, a habit with which his wife continually was at odds. And on Sunday morning, with another set of friends, he habitually walked to downtown Washington for his copy of *The New York Times*.

"I never heard my father raise his voice," Margaret says. "He was very soft-spoken. He would just look at you and it was worse than any shouting." Dr. Just was a tall, five-foot-eleven, thin and handsome man who looked the same in middle-age as he had in his youth and whose hair never grayed. He especially liked either very young scholars—Ralph Bunche was a particular favorite—or very old people.

Dr. Just's domestic situation had steadily deteriorated and, divorced, he was in France in 1939 before the start of World War II. While there he married a Swiss-Jewish woman of German descent named Hedwig Schnitzler. He had intended on that trip to remain in Europe, although there is some dispute between friends and children about whether it was a more comfortable racial climate abroad or his domestic troubles at home that had led him to that decision. The events of history settled any possibility of permanent expatriation: World War II broke out, France fell, and Dr. Just returned to America.

"He called the war, 'My personal Waterloo,'" his daughter recalls. He returned with his new wife in the summer of 1940, taught at Howard in the 1940-41 school year—during which Hedwig had his fourth child, a daughter, Elizabeth—and went to Woods Hole for another summer. During the summer he suffered a sudden attack, was returned home and died of cancer of the pancreas on November 3, 1941, in the same room at 1846 Third St., N.W. in Washington in which daughter Margaret had been born. His first wife also died of cancer of the pancreas some 20 years later.

The problems Dr. Just was belabored with as a man who was both black and a world-famous scientist before society "was ready" for such men, were put poignantly by a white friend and Woods Hole collaborator. Dr. Frank R. Lillie, then chairman of the department of zoology at the University of Chicago, in a memorial article in *Science* magazine. Dr. Just, he said, was "undoubtedly the best investigator in the field of biology that the Negro people have produced in America. He was more widely acquainted with the embryological resources of the marine fauna than probably any other person." Yet, Dr. Lillie said, Dr. Just's career was a constant struggle for the opportunity for research, the breath of life to a scientist.

"He was condemned by race to remain attached to a Negro institution unfitted by means and tradition to give full opportunity to ambitions such as his," Dr. Lillie wrote, a conclusion which may have been true of Howard in the 1920s and 1930s but certainly is no longer so. "For this condition no blame is to be attached to the institution, which indeed cooperated, by constant and prolonged leaves of absence, with Just's friends outside in securing support to enable him to carry on investigations elsewhere."

"An element of tragedy ran through all Just's scientific career due to the limitations imposed by being a Negro in America, to which he could make no lasting psychological adjustment in spite of earnest efforts on his part. The numerous grants for research did not compensate for failure to receive an appointment in one of the large universities or research institutes. He felt this as a social stigma and hence unjust to a scientist of his recognized standing. In Europe he was re-

ceived with universal kindness and made to feel at home in every way; he did not experience social discrimination on account of his race, and this contributed greatly to his happiness there. Hence, in part at least, his prolonged self-imposed exile on many occasions. That a man of his ability, scientific devotion, and of such strong personal loyalties as he gave and received, should have been warped in the land of his birth must remain a matter for regret."

Still, one must wonder if Dr. Lillie was entirely accurate in his insistence that Dr. Just was on a constant search for "larger" fields. Just himself once said, "If I can give the boys and girls a scientific start, it will help them in whatever they do later. It will clarify life. I doubt if I'd leave here [Howard] to go into the best research laboratory in the world. I believe in mass action, and I'm here to help raise the general level of race attainment. I feel as if I ought to do something for my race in the South." And Margaret remembers that Dr. Just had several offers to go to larger, better equipped, schools and turned them all down for one reason or another.

"I remember when he was invited to go to Brown University," she says. "They told him they wanted him, but that he couldn't identify with the social life of the campus, that he had to live in the black section of Providence instead of on the campus. He turned them down. He had other, similar offers. He was a stickler for that. My brother High-warden had eye trouble, and my father, a devoted parent, took him to a Philadelphia oculist several times a year because he didn't think any black oculists in Washington at the time were good enough to treat High-warden and he refused to sit in a segregated waiting room waiting for a white oculist."

Another of Dr. Just's white friends, Dr. Ben Karpman, remembered talking about the black scientist with E. P. Lyons, dean of the University of Minnesota Medical School. "The greatest problem in American biology is Professor Just," Karpman remembered Lyons saying. "He properly belongs to an institution like Rockefeller Institute, and he was the most logical candidate to take the place of Jacques Loeb when he died [in the '30s], but the Rockefeller Foundation, spending millions of dollars to combat disease internationally, couldn't summon enough courage to solve an interracial problem. By its example it could have set a precedent to follow that science knows no race nor creed. What it actually did was only catering to old prejudices in spite of its presumed internationalism."

Dr. Karpman's obituary of Dr. Just in the *Journal of Nervous and Mental Diseases* said perhaps as much about the scientist as could be said:

"America has lost one of the stalwarts of its science and the world one of the most brilliant and original experimental biologists of the present century," he wrote. "Though Professor Just's special field was cytology and he never contributed a single line to psychiatry, the results of his experimental work carry a far-reaching message to us, especially in giving experimentally supported evidence of the tremendous influences that environment has on constitution."

"As a research scientist he had boundless enthusiasm for his chosen field, but it was a quiet rather than explosive enthusiasm. His contributions were models of scientific presentation—succinct, precise, direct with great economy of words. His work was of lasting value; nothing he has done will ever have to be done over again. His work shows a forceful, lucid and penetrating mind, one that does not lose itself in a mass of detail but is capable of divining at a glance the significant from the trivial. Knowledge just oozed out of him."

FEDERAL HIGHWAY TRUST FUND

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Board of Directors of the Pampa, Tex., Chamber of Commerce has met and agreed upon a resolution favoring the extension of the highway trust fund and restricting trust fund disbursements to the construction of highways.

I recommend the text of the resolution to the attention of my colleagues, for it represents the views of a community whose growth and vitality has been greatly promoted by the Federal highway system. I can personally attest to the important role this system has played in the life of the city, because Pampa is my home.

The Federal highway trust fund was created for a particular purpose; namely, to facilitate the development of a national highway network. Since the purpose for which the fund was created has not yet been achieved, I think any allocation of trust fund moneys to unrelated uses would grossly distort the law under which the fund was established. Moreover, it would countenance a backdoor spending practice that I find unjustifiable by law or by conscience.

Mr. Speaker, the Pampa Chamber of Commerce is to be commended for its forthright position on this issue.

The resolution follows:

PAMPA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Pampa, Tex., July 20, 1970.

Congressman BOB PRICE,
Cannon Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR BOB: I am attaching a Resolution passed at a recent meeting of our Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors relative to the Federal Highway Trust Fund, which is self-explanatory.

We would appreciate your favorable consideration of this Resolution.

Sincerely yours,
E. O. WEDGEWORTH,
Manager.

RESOLUTION

Whereas, the development of improved highways is vital for the continued growth of the community and to the saving of lives by reducing traffic fatalities; and

Whereas, financing of major highway facilities has been done through the Federal Highway Trust Fund, which has provided a steady and dependable means of highway financing; and

Whereas, such Trust Fund is provided through taxes of users of such highways, and such funds should be limited to highway construction and not diverted to urban transportation; and

Whereas, existing legislation provided for such Highway Trust Fund will expire by its own provisions in 1972; and

Whereas, work authorizations have been made for work through 1974, and other work is on the drawing boards for construction after that date; and

Whereas, this pay-as-you-go financing is a sound way for construction of highways;

Now, therefore, be it resolved by the Board of Directors of the Pampa Chamber of Commerce that it does hereby go on record as favoring the extension of the Highway Trust Fund and does further favor that such Trust

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Fund shall be used solely for the construction of highways and not for the construction of high-speed transit systems in the metropolitan areas, and that a copy of this resolution be furnished to Senator John Tower, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 2025; Senator Ralph Yarborough, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C. 2025; and Congressman Bob Price, 507 Cannon House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515.

Respectfully submitted.

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
PAMPA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
DON R. LANE,
President.

Duly adopted at a regular meeting of the Board of Directors on the 29th day of June, 1970.

E. O. WEDGEWORTH,
General Manager.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE FILIPINO COMMUNITY OF SANTA CLARA COUNTY

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, on Saturday, the Filipino community of Santa Clara County will launch its drive to build a Philippine Cultural Center. At the same time they will celebrate the final payment on their headquarters building in San Jose. This event is significant far beyond the community of 8,000 persons of Filipino descent who have made Santa Clara County their home. It is a significant step in the emergence of a fine group of Americans whose rich culture, combining the best of Asia and the West, is little known outside the Filipino-American community.

There are historical reasons for our lack of knowledge about this group. Under the national quota system of immigration, only 100 Filipinos were allowed into the country each year. This harshly discriminatory policy caused untold human suffering to the families which were separated by it. The system prevented, to a great extent, the development of stable and progressive communities. All that is changed. The disgraceful quota system was abolished in 1965 and Philippine immigration has increased to the point where it now leads all other nations. Manila is the No. 1 visa issuing post in the world. Most of the new immigrants are highly skilled professionals who bring with them a vast quantity of talent, energy, and enthusiasm for the task of establishing new homes and careers and helping to build up their communities.

This new infusion of humanity from our great Pacific ally will be a source of strength and enrichment to those west coast communities in which they settle. It is timely and appropriate that a cultural center be established, as a channel through which these new arrivals may ease their adjustment to a new homeland, as a means by which the larger community can become acquainted with the rich Filipino culture and customs, and as a vital link between Filipino

July 27, 1970

Americans and their past, a sustaining contact with their ancestral roots.

The Filipino community of Santa Clara County is to be warmly congratulated for taking the lead in this important project.

THE FIGHT AGAINST BIG FEDERAL SPENDING

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government is now spending more than \$200 billion a year of the money earned by productive American citizens.

This figure is so vast as to defy imagination. Even the California State budget of nearly \$7 billion a year pales into insignificance by comparison.

Everyone can think of good reasons for spending money—his own, and still more readily, other people's. Here in Washington, thousands of highly paid and well-organized professionals spend almost all their time developing the most plausible, superficially convincing, and well-documented cases for spending more of the people's money. No one Congressman, or all the Congressmen put together, could match point for point this kind of expertise on why we should spend money.

Therefore, we need a clear, fixed standard by which to judge proposed spending increases. I shall apply in Washington the same standard I used in Sacramento: that no annual spending increase should exceed the annual percentage of population growth and inflation. Furthermore, since Federal deficit spending is primarily responsible for inflation, spending must be cut in every possible area so as to eliminate the Federal deficit entirely.

This may hurt some good people and programs. But inflation hurts more. The inflation rate has been going up steadily and, if this increase continues indefinitely, it will destroy our economy as it has destroyed the economies of other nations. Uncontrolled inflation in Germany during the 1920's was one of the primary factors which brought Hitler and the Nazis to power.

In my first month of service in Congress, I have been deeply disturbed by the steady flow of bills through the House which authorize or appropriate money for continued heavy Federal spending and large spending increases. A relatively small group of Congressmen in nearly every case fights a gallant rear-guard action against these spending bills, usually to little avail. They deserve to become much better known, as the taxpayer's unsung friends. I have been particularly impressed with the work of Congressmen H. R. GROSS of Iowa and DURWARD HALL of Missouri as floor leaders in the daily fight against big Federal spending.

President Nixon has also criticized the record of Congress this year in voting for

spending increases, notably the huge aid to education bill which, as passed by the House on July 16 with only 30 "no" votes including my own, would provide over half a billion dollars more for our often misdirected school systems than the President requested—and his request in turn, represented a substantial increase over what they are now receiving. Even if available, more money is not the answer to the problems of our schools today, as our California experience in recent years has clearly shown.

I hope the President will back up his words with action and veto this and other big spending bills which reach his desk. His leadership could rally enough votes in the House to sustain a veto.

Almost as disturbing as the vote itself approving the half-billion dollar increase in aid to education above the President's request, was the fact that some Congressmen did not want to have a record vote on this issue at all. While it is true that the large number of Members in the House precludes a rollcall on every issue, certainly there should be a record vote on every spending increase of anywhere near this magnitude, so that the people can know whether their Representative approved it or not. Though now one of the most junior Members of the House, I will make every effort to see that votes are recorded on all major Federal spending bills.

MIDDLE EAST

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every American was as dismayed as I was by recent revelations that the Soviet Union is expanding its presence in the Middle East and sending pilots and technicians into Egypt. As a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I am particularly concerned that the Russian assumption of a more aggressive role in this conflict poses a grave threat to world peace.

I believe that this development threatens not only to upset the delicate balance of power in the region but also to involve the major powers more and more deeply in an ever-escalating war. I also believe that it is essential for the Nation to demonstrate its resolve to honor its commitments in the area.

To this end, I recently introduced a resolution in the House urging the President to call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw its personnel. The resolution has the support of many of my colleagues and I am hopeful that favorable action will be taken on it in the near future. The text of the resolution follows:

RESOLUTION

Resolved, That it is the sense of the House of Representatives that the introduction of Russian pilots and the manning of missile sites by Russian technicians in the United Arab Republic is contributing to the increas-

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

ing tension in the Middle East and the President is strongly urged to call upon the Soviet Union to withdraw all Russian personnel as a major step toward encouragement of peace in the Middle East.

OUTSTANDING PERFORMANCE OF DUTY

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the commanding officer of a U.S. Army service unit in Pittsburgh, Pa., recently was cited in a letter of commendation from his superior officer for "outstanding performance of duty" while undergoing annual training at the headquarters of the Army's Military Mail Terminal in Seattle, Wash.

The officer singled out for this tribute was Capt. Walter S. Tyc, who commands the 330th base post office, stationed at the Army Reserve Center, 950 Saw Mill Run Boulevard in Pittsburgh.

Mr. Speaker, the 330th base post office includes many men from my 20th Congressional District and they share in the honor paid Captain Tyc by Lt. Col. Jose Strazzara, commanding officer of the Seattle Military Mail Terminal.

It is with great pleasure I insert a copy of Lieutenant Colonel Strazzara's letter to Captain Tyc in the RECORD, and I invite the attention of my colleagues to its contents:

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. ARMY MILITARY MAIL TERMINAL, SEATTLE, SEATTLE POST OFFICE, LANDER STREET ANNEX,

Seattle, Wash., June 27, 1970.

Subject: Letter of commendation.

Capt. WALTER S. TYC,
Commanding Officer,
330th Base Post Office,
Seattle, Wash.

1. Upon your departure from this installation, I wish to commend you and members of your command for the truly outstanding performance of duty while undergoing annual training at this installation during the period of 14 June 1970 through 27 June 1970.

2. Your extraordinary professional excellence, guidance, leadership, military bearing and sincere concern have been largely responsible for the successful completion of annual training, 1970. Indicative of your responsible attitude was the fact that you personally supervised the training during long and arduous hours without a single complaint. You have insured that the need of your personnel were catered. Your mature guidance, judgment and background experience have been an invaluable tool to the commissioned, non-commissioned officers and enlisted men under your command.

3. The outstanding training tools developed by you and members of your command have increased the efficiency and knowledge of personnel in this installation and, as a result, have greatly improved the capability of this command to conduct its training mission.

4. I request that you convey my respect and deepest appreciation to the officers and men of your command who were responsible for the truly outstanding training. It is truly a response that is in the finest tradition of

the United States Army Reserve and the United States Army.

Lt. Col. JOSE STRAZZARA,
AGC, Commanding.

NUTRITION PROGRAM FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. WILLIAM D. FORD

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. WILLIAM D. FORD. Mr. Speaker, as cosponsor of H.R. 17763, the nutrition program for the elderly, I urge all those who are concerned with the problems faced by our senior citizens to give serious consideration to this bill.

All too often, in our complex technological society we fail to recognize the needs of a segment of our population to whom we owe so much—our senior citizens. Inflation may bring discomfort to us all, but not to the degree faced by our elderly citizens living on fixed incomes. While we may at times find it necessary to forego certain luxuries, our senior citizens struggle to obtain the bare necessities of life. Certainly those who have devoted a lifetime contributing to the progress of our Nation deserve our respect and consideration in their later years.

Recently we celebrated the fifth anniversary of the Older Americans Act. While it is true that a great deal has been accomplished in the past half decade, much remains to be done.

Intensive research has shown the need for a comprehensive nutrition program. Inflation and unemployment have hit the elderly especially hard, and with the constant rise in food prices it becomes increasingly difficult for them to obtain a balanced diet. Consequently, many of our senior citizens suffer from a lack of nutrition which intensifies many of the other physical limitations brought on by the process of aging.

H.R. 17763, the nutrition program for the elderly, would bring us further toward the goal of insuring that our older Americans are provided with balanced meals served in a social setting. In addition to maintaining high standards of health, it would end the depressing isolation suffered by so many of our elder citizens in their later years of life.

Balanced meals would be served in strategically located centers such as schools, senior citizen and community centers, and public and private nonprofit institutions where suitable. The funding of the bill would be provided on a matching basis by Federal, State, and local governments. Commodity surplus programs would also be utilized for the preparation of at least one hot meal per day at a reasonably low cost to participants in the program.

America has long been proud of its efforts to provide a healthy, productive life to all its citizens. The nutrition program for the elderly will aid in the attainment of that goal, and help repay the debt we owe to those whose efforts have helped make our country great.

FEES NOT PAID BY HOUSE

HON. FRANK T. BOW

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. BOW. Mr. Speaker, it has come to my attention that some of the local employment agencies are advertising positions on Capitol Hill with the notice that

all fees are paid by the employer. I am certain it is well known to everyone on the Hill that there is no provision in our system whereby the House of Representatives can pay a fee to an employment agency for recruiting personnel for officers or members of the House. It might be well if the appropriate officials of the House were to investigate the possibility of misleading advertising which could be embarrassing to the House and to prospective employees. I assume that the

same considerations would apply to the other body.

Mr. Speaker, I am as you know a long-time champion of the private employment agencies, feeling that they do a vital, useful, and necessary service in our society. The problem I mention may seem of little significance but it can be of great significance if through misunderstanding or oversight any agency is misleading applicants for positions on the Hill.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Tuesday, July 28, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. Rev. John L. Meares, Evangel Temple, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we bow our heads and hearts before Thee in worship and honor. We need help. There are many perplexing problems that have sprung up around us like a wilderness. We do not know the way. We are like sheep without a shepherd. In Thy divine providence You have ordained these Congressmen to lead us. You said, if any man lack wisdom let him ask of God who giveth liberally. When men set their hearts to seek after Thee, You are faithful to answer. May the ears of each leader of our Nation be open to hear the voice of the Great Shepherd who is the Prince of Peace and the everlasting Father. In the name of our Lord Jesus Christ we pray. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPRESENTATIVE MICHAEL J. KIRWAN

(Mr. HAYS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HAYS. Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand a copy of the Daily News Digest of yesterday from the Republican congressional committee public relations office. One of the items in that paper is as follows:

Representative Michael J. Kirwan, Democrat-Ohio, second oldest member of Congress who since 1937 doled out billions of dollars of "pork barrel" water projects and campaign funds, died today.

Mr. Speaker, this item has a UPI date-line. Somebody down at Republican headquarters probably picked it up and copied the first sentence. I think it is a reprehensible piece of business, both on the part of whoever wrote it downtown in the Republican headquarters, and UPI, for that matter.

Mike Kirwan was responsible for probably more public works projects for the benefit of Americans than any man who ever sat in this body, and he did not make any political decisions about it. They are in every district in the country. I think it is a poor way to honor the memory

of a man who died only yesterday morning and who has such an outstanding record.

I will say that his reputation as a builder of America will live on long after these snide remarks and the people who wrote them are forgotten.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HAYS. I yield to the distinguished minority leader who, I know, deplores this as much as I do.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

Mike Kirwan was a dear personal friend of mine. I served with him on the Committee on Appropriations many, many years. We worked together on innumerable programs and projects. I am saddened by his passing. I apologize for the article or the line or the newscast that appeared in that publication. Mike Kirwan was a great American.

Mr. HAYS. I thank the gentleman. I just want to close, Mr. Speaker, by pointing out that there are some people who think that everything in the past and all the traditions we have had are old-fashioned and outmoded, and there is something better for everything.

I remember my grandfather saying—and I think it is just as applicable today as it was then—"If you cannot say anything good about a person, you ought not to say anything." I think that is as applicable today and I think it ought to be followed.

TRIBUTE TO GIRLS NATION

(Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia, asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HECHLER of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Girls Nation is one of the finest programs for youth citizenship training which has ever been devised. This week 100 young women, two from each of the 50 States in the Union, are gaining practical experience in the functions and procedures of the Federal Government.

I am particularly proud of West Virginia's two senators who are represented in Girls Nation, Miss Teresa Alderson, of Vienna, W. Va., and Miss Charlene Hill, of Elkins, W. Va. It was a great thrill yesterday to get a telephone call from Miss Alderson in which she told me of the success which she and Miss Hill had in getting their bill passed by the senate of Girls Nation. The bill is to authorize

that the crime of possession of marijuanna be reduced from a felony to a misdemeanor.

I wish that all the young people throughout the Nation had the opportunity to have the practical training in citizenship which Girls Nation and Boys Nation provide. I would like to congratulate the American Legion auxiliary for its leadership in arranging and supervising this excellent program.

More especially, I extend my personal congratulations to the 1970 participants in Girls Nation, who I am sure will return to provide leadership in good citizenship as they return to their home communities.

FLY BEFORE YOU BUY

(Mr. BINGHAM asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, since I have not always agreed with Secretary of Defense Laird, I am glad of the opportunity to rise today to commend him on the announcement he made yesterday of the adoption of a new policy in Defense procurement: Fly before you buy.

Last year and this year I offered amendments to military authorization bills, seeking to eliminate the procurement phase of the F-14 contracts until the F-14 had been flight tested. My amendments failed in the face of strenuous opposition by members of the Armed Services Committee, who said in effect that I did not know what I was talking about. I am delighted that the Secretary of Defense has now come around to my point of view.

I do hope that the policy the Secretary has announced will be put into effect immediately and that the requests the Pentagon has made for authorizations that do not comply with the policy of "Fly before you buy" will be withdrawn. This will reduce the military authorization for fiscal year 1971 to \$658 million for the F-14 alone.

TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

(Mr. BOGGS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BOGGS. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I take this time to