

ing the passing of GLEN LIPSCOMB. He was profoundly respected, not only by his constituents, but by people of both parties throughout California who observed his effective work in the Halls of Congress. He had many friends in Congress among Democrats as well as among Republicans. I am happy to have been one of them.

I extend my sympathy to his wife, Virginia, to their two daughters, and to all who will feel this very deep loss.

Mr. MURPHY. Mr. President, I had the pleasure of knowing Representative LIPSCOMB for many years before he became a Member of Congress. I had the great privilege of introducing him the

night he announced his candidacy, and I can say without reservation that I have never known a public servant to offer himself as a candidate for high office for whom I had more respect or more personal regard, or who has done a finer job in the representation of his constituency.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution. The resolution (S. Res. 352) was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair appoints the two Senators from California (Mr. MURPHY and Mr. CRANSTON) as a committee to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that morning business be closed, that the amendment of the Senator from California (Mr. CRANSTON) again be made the pending business for further consideration on tomorrow; and that, in accordance with the previous order and pursuant to Senate Resolution 352, and as a further mark of respect for the late GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, a Representative from the State of California, the Senate do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, February 3, 1970, at 12 o'clock meridian.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

GUIDELINES FOR THE PROBLEMS OF MODERN LIFE

HON. JOHN STENNIS

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, we hear sometimes that there are no guidelines for the problems of modern life. But Mrs. Virginia Weldon Kelly, in the Long Beach, Calif., Independent and Press-Telegram, shares the faith of millions of Americans who believe that the Scriptures offer a comprehensive blueprint for living.

Mrs. Kelly's Christmas editorial is pertinent for all of 1970 because she reminds her readers that Jesus set the standard for the ideal life of humble sacrifice and service when He said:

Whoever would be first among you must be the servant of all.

The wisdom of the admonition is basic to all free societies and applies to all persons whether they are believers or not.

Mrs. Kelly spends much time reading and thinking before she writes these brief editorials on the relevance of faith to modern life. She receives many letters and telephone calls from distinguished persons, including Members of Congress and others in our Government; diplomats; and persons of other faiths. They tell her the world is thirsting for encouragement and spiritual guidance.

I think Mrs. Kelly's remarks are valuable to millions of Americans. I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

[From the Press-Telegram, Dec. 25, 1969]

"I AM THE LIGHT . . ."

(By Virginia Kelly)

Christmas celebrates the birth of Jesus who said, "I am the light of the world: He that followeth me shall not walk in darkness but shall have the light of day."

When Jesus said, "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, with all thy soul, and with all thy mind," and "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself," He gave us direction, purpose and commitment.

Jesus set the standard for the ideal life of humility, sacrifice and service when He said, "Whoever would be first among you must be the servant of all."

But throughout history, men have cried, "All is vanity and vexation of spirit."

In the Eighteenth Century, Giambattista Vico accurately described the ills of today when he wrote, "A society always falls into a second barbarism when rising luxury, materialism, and egoism have destroyed the social bonds to which religious faith is indispensable."

The revitalization of the family, government, education and the church depends upon Jesus' warning that we must be born again.

The rediscovery of Christ has preceded every great spiritual renaissance in the western world from St. Augustine to St. Francis of Assisi, to Martin Luther, to John Wesley.

Rediscovering Christ, Malcolm Muggeridge recently wrote, "To keep Jesus' light in one's eyes is heaven, to be without it is hell."

At Christmas may we all wear "the armor of light" and know with St. Paul that ". . . neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come . . . shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in Christ Jesus our Lord."

VALUABLE RESOURCES BEING LOST BY COUNTRY TOWNS BECAUSE OF LACK OF ADEQUATE RETIREMENT FACILITIES FOR THE ELDERLY

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, some time ago I introduced H.R. 16098 providing for the establishment of a Countryside Development Commission designed to assist in bringing about a more rational balance between the urban and countryside economies.

I was heartened when President Nixon recently appointed a Rural Affairs Council for much this same purpose.

One of the aspects of countryside living which has been relatively neglected has been in the field of health care and retirement facilities for the elderly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a recent study of this lack of health and retirement fa-

cilities made for G. B. Gunlogson of the Countryside Development Foundation:

VALUABLE RESOURCES BEING LOST BY COUNTRY TOWNS BECAUSE OF LACK OF ADEQUATE RETIREMENT FACILITIES FOR ELDERLY

Country towns may be losing in excess of a billion dollars annually from their economy because adequate retirement and health facilities are not available to their elderly residents. This estimate is based on studies in a few states, and the revelation is so interrelated with the whole of the countryside that much more thorough studies are being sponsored by the Countryside Development Foundation of Racine, Wisconsin.

At least 2,000 new retirement homes are needed now in country towns and small cities and the need is growing, according to G. B. Gunlogson, the foundation's founder. Although a number of such facilities are being planned, far too little progress is being made because of rising costs and lack of appreciation of what this constant drain of material and human resources is costing these communities.

"Such facilities should not be looked on as expenses," Gunlogson concludes, "since they could prove to be the best investment the community ever made. They offer the only way to turn potential losses into a profit and improve the whole community." Every thriving community is going to have an increasing number of elderly people in the future. They will be increasingly able to pay their way either locally or somewhere else. Certain numbers will inevitably leave to live in larger cities and in distant states. The number who remain will depend largely on the quality of the living accommodations and health facilities that may be available locally.

When they must go somewhere else to seek these facilities, their lifetime earnings usually go with them. They are lost as customers in the community, and the social and civic contribution these citizens can make are transferred elsewhere. These events are more regrettable because so many would have preferred to remain in the community where their lifetime interests have been. But most disturbing of all is the fact that more mental illness and even shortened life expectancy may be the price that many elderly people have to pay when they must move to new environments.

The Countryside Development Foundation is sponsoring studies to obtain a better understanding of the status of elderly people who have left the countryside type of environment in which most of their lives were spent. It is often reported that older people from the countryside and small cities find it more difficult to adjust to city environment than people from metropolitan areas.

Their pattern of living is different. They tend to be more independent and self-sufficient. They are more resistant to regimentation and institutionalization.

Most older people wish to remain self-sufficient and to pursue their way of life as long as they are able. The aging process comes by stages. First, people reach a point when the responsibility of their own home becomes too much for them. Some have no home. They are not ready to enter a nursing home. That is why there is a need for a complex that includes suitable housekeeping units. It should also have other accommodations for those who are unable or wish to avoid the "housekeeping." A nursing home or convalescent center is essential.

As people get older, infirmities and sickness are usually not far away. It could be doing them an injustice to offer living facilities while they are in good health and then expect them to look for a nursing home when sickness and inability to care for themselves overtake them. This is the most critical stage for older people.

There is another very important bonus such a complex brings to the community. It helps to support more doctors and better health facilities for the entire community.

Actually, there may be little new in these observations by themselves. There are excellent retirement and nursing homes in many country communities. And there are many agencies and individual workers who recognize these problems. What is new and what lends special significance to these facts is their relevance to the economy and future welfare of the countryside. The lack of adequate facilities in country towns and cities up to 15,000 population runs into a staggering total, which will become increasingly crippling unless these communities take adequate measures to provide facilities designed to meet the needs of people growing older.

For a long time the countryside has been losing its younger generation because of lack of opportunities for them to make a living and get ahead in life. It cannot afford to lose its older generation for lack of comfortable living accommodations and health facilities. Neither of these losses is necessary. The countryside has all the cards in the deck to deal with these problems, states Mr. Gunlogson.

This contention is based on actual developments that are now going on. Actually, there are hundreds of small cities throughout the country that have grown into model communities. The first requisite in this development is diversification. Every study the foundation has made discloses the necessity of economic diversification for survival of smaller towns.

Studies are now going on in various states of industrial plants in small cities concerning production efficiency, employee attitude, and community relations. These studies have been of value to hundreds of communities and industry interested in locating facilities away from big population centers.

There are no less than 6,000 country towns and small cities up to 15,000 population scattered throughout the United States that share in the same systems of transportation, communications, and power as the big cities. In most of these the record of literacy and high school attendance is higher than in the cities of New York or Washington. Most of these are almost ideally situated to accommodate more business development, more industry, and more people. Every one is ideally suited for the development of outstanding accommodations for elderly people.

Some of the studies now to be sponsored by the foundation relate to the status of elderly people in country towns and the need for more retirement and nursing homes. The Countryside Development Foundation is a non-profit corporation established to provide

information and sponsor studies and programs aimed at improving the economy and living conditions in the countryside.

CRISIS IN POVERTY EDUCATION

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, I cosponsored an amendment to the fiscal year 1969 Labor-HEW appropriations bill, which gave \$20.9 million to the Teacher Corps. As demonstrated in an article from the Philadelphia Sunday Bulletin, the money was well spent.

This particular program at Temple University has aroused our young people's concern with the crisis in poverty education. I would hope for a continuation of interest and participation among all these young people who contribute their great efforts to the betterment of society.

I ask unanimous consent that the article of January 4, 1970, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

A TEACHER TRAINING METHOD THAT MAKES MORE SENSE

(By Edith B. Roth)

"What would you do to convey your personality immediately to the children?" an instructor at Temple University asked a class of Teacher Corps interns.

One girl suggested she might bring in a small rug and invite her young pupils to sit on it.

Another mentioned offering simple food, and one intern said quickly: "You people are laboring under a delusion. The kids who come to my class are already eating something . . . anything that's handy: popcorn, crackers, pop, you name it."

"The point is," the instructor resumed in the midst of the laughter, "to make the kids relax, to move slowly from an authoritarian kind of atmosphere into guidance type. The change has to be gradual."

Teacher Corps interns at Temple are working toward changing the quality and atmosphere of inner-city education. This is being done in many ways, but mainly through involvement in the community and a willingness to share its problems.

These are the conclusions reached by Dr. Evan Sorber, for three years director of the Teacher Corps program at Temple, which is rated one of the most successful of the Corps' 69 programs in 37 states and the District of Columbia.

Sharing community problems is one part of the Corps' three-way approach to preparation of teachers who will stay with the system and work creatively to reach the turned-off, tuned-out residents of ghettos. The other two aspects of intern training are study at the university and work in the classrooms where they will eventually take full-time jobs.

Interns work in teams under the supervision and guidance of an experienced teacher, the team leader.

Dr. Sorber feels that the fine results obtained in Philadelphia's slum schools, where the dropout rate is highest of any of the ten largest cities in the country, are traceable in part to two members of his staff: Elaine

Blake, a full-time community supervisor, and Dr. Charlotte Epstein, a specialist in inter-group relations.

But some credit must be given the Teacher Corps teams' teaching methods and its verve.

Teacher Corps is four years old. In Philadelphia's first "graduation" group in 1968, 27 interns were certified as teachers after two years' training; of these, 24 stayed on to teach in the city's ghetto schools while three others went into related jobs.

In the second group, which finished last June, most of the 35 indicated they would continue to teach in the inner city. This year 45 will finish training and the following year 50 will earn certificates. Any Temple intern is automatically hired by the school system upon completion of the two-year training, if he wishes to stay on.

Ronald Moglia, a teacher of mathematics, science and creative writing to nine- and ten-year-olds at the Hill School in the Strawberry Mansion area, was a member of Teacher Corps' first graduation class. After teaching one year, he said, "You feel a moral obligation to stay and teach after you see what is involved. The only reason I would leave a ghetto school is because I might think that blacks should have a chance to control their own schools."

Once Moglia asked his youngsters: "How many white people have you known?" Most of them answered, "None." Then he said, "Well you're wrong, because I am white." "No," responded the youngsters, "you're not white, you're pink." A nice distinction.

Strawberry Mansion is a black ghetto district that includes six schools. Oscar Goss, principal of Hill School, explains that the people of the neighborhood have lost four major hospitals and have no bank, no health clinic.

"This is an incomplete community, and, since the school remains, we are expected to take on all the responsibilities. This is interference with the priority function of the schools. We are not a restaurant, a social agency, a hospital."

"The interns," says Goss, "have been here three years in all, and if they didn't have a contribution to make they wouldn't have been here. We are taking a hard line on our priority function and everyone here must make a definite contribution to it. The Teacher Corps has added a new dimension to the school program and helped in unexpected ways."

When he speaks of today's preparation for teaching, Dr. Sorber says: "The kinds of people and the kinds of things we teach have both changed."

In the summer of pre-service training before graduate studies and classroom work begin, interns receive sensitivity training. This often verbally rough, group trial-by-dialogue forces candidates to examine their attitudes about race and about themselves in relation to other people. It helps them to see the effect they have on a group.

For most interns, sensitivity training is the most unforgettable and revealing experience of the two years in Teacher Corps.

"In the last few years," says Sorber, "the atmosphere has changed. The black community is more organized now, and it isn't easy for a white person to walk into it and expect to be accepted. He has first to earn the respect of the people. Corps members must go into the ghetto first to learn, and then to help."

Community people themselves help screen applicants.

Dr. Epstein's program and guidance led the interns to make some real community contributions during the past few years. Some of them:

The establishment, with the people in the community, of three cooperative stores. One of them, a food market in the Strawberry

Mansion area, has been in successful operation since August, 1968. Neighborhood people are members and own stock. Alice Freeman, a volunteer worker for a year, is now manager on a small salary.

Prices are lower than in the usual corner store. The eventual goal is to create a real supermarket. Teacher Corps interns helped with the whole venture, made the store physically fit to use, put in shelves, painted walls, worked—and still work—in the store.

The operation of after-school recreation and tutorial centers for children.

The development of programs to teach English to the Spanish-speaking, modern mathematics to parents, basic skills to adults in their own homes.

The inauguration of a nursery school by Ruth Pierson and Diana Swinson, both of whom taught at Hill School as interns and are now full-fledged teachers. The nursery school was for three- and four-year-olds; it was held in a community center. The girls met with the mothers monthly to tell them how to develop their children's potential at home. Most of the mothers had tried to enter their children in Get Set, the Philadelphia equivalent of Head Start, and found that they were on a long waiting list.

Nurturing of the storefront-style satellite school, typified by Gratz Neighborhood High School near 21st Street and Ridge Avenue. Teacher Corps people helped set up a predecessor outpost of Simon Gratz High, and later wrote a proposal which brought \$30,000 from the Board of Education to implement the Gratz Neighborhood High operation, which now has been taken over by its local community. Basic skills are taught to pregnant girls who have had to leave school.

A Bookmobile, selling books for 50 cents each in areas where there are no bookstores. The first day in circulation the whole stock of books, donated or bought as remainders from publishers, was sold out. The interns who set up and ran this venture have been graduated from Teacher Corps. But the neighborhood wants to continue a good idea, and so Mrs. Dorothy Watson, one of the community people hired by Elaine Blake, is looking for funds for the bookmobile's future.

Although Temple has tried hard to attract black interns, there are only 16 among the 50 interns starting training this year. Black Corps members serve on selection panels and are urged to recruit others. It is slow work because most college-educated blacks today are aware of many more lucrative opportunities now open to them. Often the blacks on the panel reject black candidates; they are not looking for color, but for quality of a certain order.

Will Coleman, a black intern at Temple says, "We need people who are sensitized, who can learn what the community is about and deal with the children on their own level. There are blacks who cannot do it and there are whites who cannot do it. Many blacks, too, can be condescending. The job requires people who are interested and will commit themselves regardless of the money."

Bonnie Burgess, an experienced teacher and team leader, thinks that Teacher Corps should ask its interns for at least one year of commitment after graduation. But Bob Stutz, an intern, feels that under Teacher Corps training he has already put in two years of hard, committed work; he says he couldn't have made the grade without his parents' financial help.

"Black people," says Stutz, "want something better after college; they cannot afford to work for a stipend of \$75 a week, less tax."

While college fees are paid by the Corps, there are too many demands on the interns' slim resources. They often need items to make materials for use in classes. They need paperbacks. They have a struggle living in shared rooms or apartments on the \$58 stipend after taxes.

In spite of the struggle, Stutz does say he feels that he has "gotten a lot more out of Teacher Corps than he would have in a conventional school of education program."

While Dr. Sorber gives a lot of credit to his staff, he is the one who has been the truly motivating force for Teacher Corps in Philadelphia. "The Corps," he says, "has had an impact on the College of Education in that the whole thrust now in curriculum and instruction is toward urban education."

Dr. Mark Shedd, Philadelphia Superintendent of Schools, makes the same point even more emphatically: "For several years now," he says, "it has seemed to me that the Teacher Corps' training model makes more sense than the methods we use regularly in our schools of education."

"Young people enlisted in Teacher Corps are looking for ways to change a system that obviously has not worked well in the past and that is certainly not prepared to cope with the 21st Century. They are also eager to serve the educationally impoverished until change can be effected. Temple University's Teacher Corps leads among those programs working for change and offering service to the community."

Dr. Shedd, who has also served as chairman of the Teacher Corps' National Advisory Committee, is expected to give the go-ahead to a proposal to staff two city schools with 50 percent of the teachers from Teacher Corps. This would clear the way for innovations that might be tested and used elsewhere in the school system.

Dr. Sorber, after three years as Director of the Corps in Philadelphia, is now Associate Chairman of Curriculum and Instruction for Elementary Education.

The new director is Dr. Lawrence Hopp. Pennsylvania's State Department of Public Instruction did its own review of the program at Temple recently and found that Teacher Corps had made its mark on the schools and community in the following ways:

1. Had stimulated public school faculty to accept responsibility for community involvement.
2. Had improved the image of the school within the community.
3. Had stimulated individual teachers to accept students as human beings and provided those students with realistic learning environment and expectations.
4. Had improved social and learning attitudes of children.
5. Had developed valuable motivation in creating an advisory council for the school.
6. Had improved pupil attendance in school.

But perhaps the most telling testimonial to Teacher Corps comes from a graduate of the program, DeEdwin Hursey, now working in Washington. He said: "Teacher Corps helped me to find myself as a person. I know now I want to work with people, and I know this is where I should be. A lot of what I am now is due to the university professors. They made me feel that I was worth something."

And that, after all, is what Teacher Corps in turn is trying to do for disadvantaged children: make them feel they are worth something.

STATE OF THE UNION ADDRESS

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon has taken a bold initiative in leading this Nation to the solution of its cur-

rent problems, as well as toward the shaping of "new directions" for the 1970's and in future decades.

The President's outline for progress presented in his state of the Union address last week makes this plain. In both foreign policy and domestic programs, the President set forth new approaches and ideas for reform which have been commended editorially throughout the Nation. I insert editorials from various parts of the country, discussing this state of the Union address, in the RECORD:

[From the Miami Herald, Jan. 23, 1970]

MR. NIXON AT HIS BEST ON STATE OF THE NATION

President Nixon put firm flesh on the bare bones of his New Federalism yesterday in a State of the Union address which must rank—if only for its unifying qualities—as one of the best in modern times.

The speech was full of generalities, as such speeches are. At times they were glittering, but mostly they were hard and sober, though uttered with warmth and smiling good humor. His congressional-cabinet-court-diplomatic audience applauded 28 times and obviously wanted more.

"As we enter the seventies," said the President in his first essay of the federal union, "we should enter also a great age of reform of the institutions of American government," including total reform of the welfare system and reversal of the flow of power from Washington "back to the states and to the people."

There is more than enough of state consciousness left in Congress to make the latter half of this statement, which defines the New Federalism, a popular credo even if Congress realizes that it is possible only in the fiscal sense.

Thus, as the President comes along with the specifics later on, we hope that he will spell out just how the states and the localities will get back more of what they send to Washington to be lost in the fiscal shuffle.

The speech in large part was urban-oriented. A dozen or fewer years ago a President would have been addressing himself in part to the perennial farm problem. That "the federal government must be in the position to assist in the building of new cities and the rebuilding of old ones" is a note which must have shocked some congressional seniors momentarily until they remember it is 1970.

In sheer decibels the audience came on strongest at the promise of a balanced budget.

When it is fulfilled, we hope and believe it will be a genuine operational balance. But it takes two to tangle with profligacy. The record of Congress at the spending pump is not encouraging.

No one, however, will begrudge Mr. Nixon his vow to spend more of a genuine war on crime or to make Washington a municipal model of law and order—if that is any longer possible.

Nor will there be objection to an ongoing war against pollution of the natural environment. As expected, Mr. Nixon made this a major issue. Our only question is whether he underestimated the cost at \$10 billion over five years.

Ten billion dollars is one-third of the cost of maintaining the Vietnam war for one year, and it is too little. Dade County, for illustration, needs to spend a minimum of \$300 million for water treatment alone over the next 10 years. Dade is the 26th largest metropolitan area. Multiply \$300 million by 26 (some will need less but many others much more) and you get \$75 billion-plus. We hope for a more realistic appraisal of the cost of this war from the President in due time.

On everyone's heart and mind, of course,

is the war in Vietnam, the threat of it in the Middle East and the awful agony of Africa.

Without rising the isolationist taint, Americans will subjoin their President in faithfulness to treaty commitments (where they are genuine) but in "reduction of involvement and our presence in other nations' affairs."

Mr. Nixon is living up to his promises on Vietnam. He is grasping for some sort of hard-nosed detente with the Soviet Union rather than growling at it, and he is acknowledging the existence of Red China. We are puzzled by his Middle East policy but we shall expect it to fit at length into his prospects for "a generation of uninterrupted peace."

Thus the State of the Union—confident, buoyant, urged to go forth morally armed for world leadership, hopefully united at home and embarked without pretense on a "quest for a new quality of life" before the planet becomes poisoned beyond redemption and uninhabitable.

This was the new Nixon convincingly at his very best.

[From the Salt Lake Tribune, Jan. 24, 1970]

THE STATE OF THE UNION

"When we speak of America's priorities," President Nixon remarked in his State of the Union Message, "the first priority must always be peace for America and the world." But the chief emphasis of the message was on domestic affairs. In fact, the President said he was leaving for a subsequent report the discussion of new concepts and programs designed to achieve the goal of an America "at peace with every nation in the world."

This was, in truth a message on the State of the Union, both as it is today and as it can be in the future. And the President committed himself to improving both the environment and the quality of American life. The first would be accomplished through a five-year, \$10-billion program attacking water pollution and the use of such additional weapons as research, incentives and new regulations—the latter by stepping up the war against crime and halting inflation. He also will press for congressional action on two major programs submitted last year, welfare reform and revenue sharing with the states.

The Democrats read partisan motives into the message. But what's surprising about that? The President is, among other things, the leader of his political party—and 1970 is an election year. Moreover, Mr. Nixon made a telling point when he said the Democratic-controlled 91st Congress has yet to act on more than two score of his legislative proposals.

The President spoke of the "new federalism," meaning a reversal of the flow of power from the states to Washington. Yet he conceded the continuing need for strong federal leadership in this sharing of power. However, the federal government cannot fulfill its role unless its efficiency of management is improved and old, ineffective programs, which may be politically popular, are abandoned. "It is time to quit putting good money into bad programs," he said. "Otherwise, we will end up with bad money as well as bad programs." We applaud his call for reform. Now to convince Congress and all those who fear they will be the losers if the reforms are voted.

Mr. Nixon offered few details. These undoubtedly will be provided in subsequent messages. And even where he was specific, of the \$10 billion for waste elimination, 40 percent is federal money and 60 percent is to come from the states and cities. The "new federalism" obviously lies some distance in the future, with fulfillment depending on congressional acceptance of the revenue-sharing plan.

It was an unusual State of the Union Message, in both brevity and tone. It also was sound and constructive. We particularly liked the President's accent on the quality of American life. And we will be most interested in hearing about his commitment to develop a "national growth policy" that would reverse the flow of people to crowded urban centers. Such a policy, if successful, would have a profound effect on the quality of American life.

[From the Dallas Morning News, Jan. 24, 1970]

THE ROAD TO REFORM

The state of the Union message supports our belief that the best speech writer Richard Nixon has is Richard Nixon. The President's speech is a splendid work of political literature.

As he noted at the beginning, it departed from the standard form of legislative shopping list. Instead, it was a set of road maps that showed the directions toward which the President hopes to lead the government and the country.

They are new directions—he calls the '70s "a time of new beginnings."

Richard Nixon has developed the road maps over the span of several years. As laid out in the speech, they are entirely logical and consistent with past statements and actions. The road maps are at once conservative and revolutionary, which may seem a contradiction in terms but is not.

Mr. Nixon wants to be remembered for his administration's reforms. Some are so drastic as to be classified as revolutionary, for they change the emphasis and structure of past government programs significantly. Yet, they are also conservative in the sense that they carry out ideas advanced by conservatives in recent years.

In this year of 1970, the status quo is the result of more than three decades of liberal supremacy in Washington. Many of the problems that we have are the results or the side effects of these programs.

Now Mr. Nixon proposes to attack these problems and replace the programs that have failed with new programs built on fresh ideas.

Above all, the idea that government must strive for growth for growth's sake is being set aside. The Nixon administration will make a distinction between "more" and "better," instead of treating them as synonyms, as has been done in the past.

So far as the economy is concerned, he said, "the critical question is not whether we will grow, but how we will use that growth."

We have had all sorts of growth during the past decade, including the greatest growth of crime, the greatest growth of inflation and the greatest growth of social unrest in our history. And, of course, growth of government.

"At heart," he said, "the issue is the effectiveness of government."

We have learned, the hard way, that more government is not always better government. As agencies and programs and payrolls mushroomed, the effectiveness of government dwindled. At the same time, the cost soared—and the cost of government was reflected in painful increases in the family cost of living.

The President put the primary blame for inflation on the federal government's deficit spending in the '60s: "Millions of Americans are forced to go into debt today because the federal government decided to go into debt yesterday."

He undoubtedly spoke for millions when he said, "It is time to quit putting good money into bad programs. Otherwise we will end up with bad money as well as bad programs."

The message was a lucid, straight-forward

document. It pointed out what the President thinks is wrong, what he thinks we should do to get on the right path. It gave an estimated time for arrival, 1976, the nation's 200th birthday.

And, finally, the Nixon road may to the future defined a goal first mentioned by Barry Goldwater in 1964, the achievement of "a new quality of life in America." Even for Americans who disagree with the President's choice of routes, it is hard to deny that that is where we all want to go.

[From the Cleveland Plain Dealer, Jan. 25, 1970]

CLEARING THE FOG: NIXON SHOWS STATURE AS A TRUE STATESMAN

(By John P. Leacacos)

WASHINGTON.—President Richard Nixon did a superb job in his first State of the Union speech. He began to show stature as a true statesman, viz., a leader who combined the arts of politics to encompass the objectives of a nation.

The President's White House intimates in the several days preceding the address, which has been months in gestation, dropped the word that the speech was one of the great challenges that Nixon faced in his career, and that the President so regarded it himself. And it is only fair to add that the hints of the contents of the speech as given to me personally at least two weeks ago were actually borne out by the actual delivery, which, of course speaks well for the candor of the informants.

This reporter by pure chance had a further enlightening contact with the creation-in-process of the speech several days previously when I was sitting in the office of Henry A. Kissinger, the President's assistant for national security affairs.

Kissinger had read various drafts of the speech and he was perusing the latest version of the moment. He marked those pages he liked with a check mark, those he did not care for particularly with an x, and left unmarked those he was neutral about. Kissinger and I then resumed our conversation.

Some minutes later the phone rang and I was asked to step out of the room; the President was on the phone. Naturally I know nothing of what was talked about, but I do know the main topic at the White House for many days was THE SPEECH and I would guess that the President was asking Kissinger about points that the latter had made.

The impression I would like to stress in general is the President's sensitivity to responsible comment and his open-mindedness about revising his own views in the significant nuances that count. In that sense, the speech was a total administration effort, but above all, it was a reflection of everybody to the guidelines laid down by the President's own directions and instincts.

In the liberal rhetoric and conservative anchors of the Nixon proposals could also be seen the fine Irish hand of "Pat" Moynihan, the lone Democrat in the highest echelons of the presidential circles. This does not mean that Democrat Moynihan sold the President a bill of goods, but that the President's vision and needs made use of Moynihan.

All this is prefatory to a series of points the President made which were in the nature of the fine print, but highly illuminating nevertheless. Let us recall several phrases between the declarative sentences. For instance: "harnessing the vast energies . . . new beginning and explorations . . . unfinished business . . . challenge of perfecting . . . the world as it is (as basis for policies) . . . how to use that growth . . . the effectiveness of government . . . reform of the institutions of U.S. government . . . re-direct growth . . . national growth policy (as a national plan)."

In brief, the President in his report to the Congress exemplified the two aspects of a President's function that often are overlooked in the purely partisan political analysis. One was the visions he disclosed in his capacity as the leader of all the people, irrespective of party. The other—and the phrases quoted above are directly pertinent—have to do with managing and administering the affairs of the American society in the most efficacious manner so that desired objectives can be achieved in reality.

It is perhaps in this aspect of tidying up the messes of the past where 400 urban programs went off in almost as many directions; where billions were frittered away with no overall goal of coordinating vast and contradictory approaches; where no concepts of how to do the job were developed, that President Nixon might leave his permanent mark, among others.

Problems have been left to molder for close to 100 years. Programs have been left in abeyance like a pier in the midst of nowhere. Self-interests have never been evaluated and arranged. Priorities and systems have never been organized.

As a noted publisher remarked the other day, "If Nixon can bring modern management to the art of government as Alfred Sloan did for the General Motors, the greatest exemplar of modern capitalism, he will build the base and machinery with which we can truly create a new nation for the next centuries."

[From the Nashville Banner, Jan. 22, 1970]
STATE OF UNION MESSAGE WAS NIXON AT HIS BEST

A President "must lead," said Richard M. Nixon during the 1968 campaign. The Presidency, he added, "is a place where priorities are set and goals established. A President must tell the people what cannot be done immediately as well as what can be done."

He did that yesterday. It was his first State of the Union address as such—having made no such inventory at the outset of his term, and electing to base it on the year in office just concluded; with the pattern of events clarified by closer acquaintance, and legislative requirements charted with this precise orientation in mind as a prime objective. In terms of accounting he touched all bases.

That the President knows the subject and deals in facts is evident to any who have watched his press conferences—noting frank and factual answers to pertinent questions. With equal frankness and informed judgment, processing pertinent disclosures and recommendations on the broad field of domestic and foreign policy distilled into yesterday's message, he lived up to the standards of a Chief Executive with trust in the people keeping faith with the people.

He does not sugar-coat bitter facts such as policy frustration, business unfinished—and objectives not quite achieved. Neither does he seek to exaggerate missions accomplished. As a Chief Executive sensitive to the necessity of team work, he does not berate, accuse, and recriminate. His references to congressional footdragging, or to legislative excesses in some cases, were a reminder of mutual responsibility in areas of national interest where that interest assuredly outweighs considerations of partisanship.

The President is not on the defensive respecting the problems candidly surveyed—the bulk of those problems, foreign and domestic, inherited with no solution a year ago in sight. He has come to grips with most of them, as in the case of his administration's war on crime; and, as another notable case, the steps taken by realistic address on taxes and spending, to reverse the ruinous course of government-induced inflation. He spelled that out in terms of red ink in the added amount of \$47 billion incurred by predecessors in the '60s.

He has not hesitated to confront realistically the problems, multifold, of air and stream pollution—an outline, studiously determined, of what can be done toward improving the environment. It was a recognition that there is no miracle in sight to undo overnight the damages of decades; but it also stressed the essential of an intelligent start.

To finance adequately the war on crime, and to provide the facilities for cleansing the environment, he advocated enlarged appropriations.

The setting of priorities is essential, too—to establish not only the order of importance, but the order of call on resources for these several programs. One other thing distinguishes Richard M. Nixon from his immediate predecessors. Though he knows that the matters thus faced as responsibilities do entail expenditures, he also knows that Treasury outpourings are not in themselves an answer to everything. As a matter of fact, he is well aware that the fiscal irresponsibility of the latter aberration has through the years vastly compounded the nation's most devastating present threat. Thus it is that he has admonished again of the urgent necessity to fight inflation by getting and keeping the public budget under control.

For that he has supplied initiative—and leadership; backed with veto powers on excessive spending for use if necessary.

On the cherished objective of world peace he also stressed the mutual responsibility:

"I would be the last to suggest that the road to peace is not difficult and dangerous, but I believe our new policies have contributed to the prospect that America may have the best chance since World War II to enjoy a generation of uninterrupted peace. That chance will be enormously increased if we continue to have a relationship between Congress and the Executive in which, despite differences in detail, where the security of America and the peace of mankind are concerned, we act not as Republicans or Democrats—but as Americans."

In three domestic areas he called for legislative priorities:

"We cannot delay longer in accomplishing a total reform of our welfare system. When a system penalizes work, breaks up homes and robs recipients of dignity, there is no alternative to abolishing that system and adopting in its place the program of income support, job training and work incentives which I recommended to Congress last year."

"The time has come to assess and reform all of our institutions of government at the federal, state and local level. It is time for a new federalism, in which, after 190 years of power flowing from the people and local and state governments to Washington, it will begin to flow from Washington back to the states and to the people."

"We must adopt reforms which will expand the range of opportunities for all Americans. We can fulfill the American dream only when each person has a fair chance to fulfill his own dreams. This means equal voting rights, equal employment opportunity and new opportunities for expanded ownership. In order to be secure in their human rights, people need access to property rights."

Thus did the Chief Executive address himself to the life and welfare of every citizen, irrespective of race, creed or color; pledging enlightened efforts for national progress; peace and prosperity, not only for the year but for the decade ahead.

It was a state of the Union message ranking with the greatest of state papers.

It was President Richard M. Nixon at his best.

[From the Columbus Dispatch, Jan. 25, 1970]
NATION IS URGED TO MEET CHALLENGES OF NEXT DECADE

President Nixon's first State of the Union address was neither folksy recitation of ac-

complishments nor couched in literary allusion with regard to the future. It was not a formula for a year, but a challenge for a decade.

Because there is a distinct difference between promise and fulfillment, Mr. Nixon's address contained few specifics. The only trailblazing banner raised by the President was with reference to the purification of this nation's environment.

Nevertheless, Mr. Nixon did lay down priorities and in doing so confesses for both the executive and legislative branches of the federal government that future efforts must be greater.

There was no hesitation to mourn the continuing warfare in Vietnam. Nor was there apology for our efforts in that area. An honorable end to the conflict still must be found. In this respect, the President declared America's first priority always must be peace, not only for this nation but for the world.

Thereafter, the President said, we must give priority to a concentrated fight to assure clear air, clean water and more open spaces.

Mr. Nixon's priority list also bulges with the need to curtail an increase in the crime rate, write a total reform of the welfare system, stop inflation and halt the climbing cost of living and reverse the flow of power from Washington and give it back to the states and to the people.

While he said he would propose the most costly program in the field of pollution control in the nation's history, he reported the only increase he would recommend in the budget for fiscal 1971 would be for agencies responsible for law enforcement.

Thus the President said that the 1970s for America will be not only a time for new beginnings but a time for developing better ways of managing what man's genius already has started but left unfinished.

Americans listening to this annual report from their Chief Executive were not enthralled by his words for there was no stirring drumbeat, no call to arms.

But the President did tell it like it is. And he did list the problems facing us and gave us a lineup of priorities. He told us it was time to concern ourselves with ourselves and to convert those priorities into fulfillment.

What the State of the Union message did as much as anything was to reveal that Mr. Nixon is giving us a presidency dedicated to restoration of order and one aware that if America is to exert proper influence in the world it cannot do so without being financially solvent and having a well ordered economy.

[From the Buffalo Evening News,
Jan. 23, 1970]

NIXON SPOTLIGHTS TROUBLE SPOTS

Presidential State of the Union addresses in recent years have tended to offer something for everybody. But this was certainly not President Nixon's approach yesterday in his first such message to a joint session of Congress. And the leanness of his carefully written words add emphasis to those relatively few areas he did dwell upon and helps clarify in the public mind what his foremost priorities are.

To some degree the lack of clutter is due to the fact that Mr. Nixon reserved his detailed comments on foreign policy for a later speech, although he did repeat his 1969 themes of a lowered profile for Uncle Sam around the globe, withdrawal from Vietnam and realistic negotiations based on mutual self-interest, rather than confrontations, with Russia and Communist China. All these initiatives, as we have said before, promise to promote the national interest.

But even in devoting this speech largely to domestic policies, he offered no "laundry list"

of programs. Politically, this may leave his Democratic opposition, which controls Congress, plenty of room for criticism in areas only briefly touched upon, such as health and education. But it tends to pre-empt from that opposition the policy areas on which he chose to concentrate.

These seemed to us clear, at least in general outline, and highly commendable.

The President rightly stressed the need for continued pressures to curb inflation, which he said had increased the monthly cost of living during the 1960s for a family of four by a startling \$200, and he pledged a balanced budget to support that principle of governmental spending restraint. He urged Congress to totally reform the bankrupt welfare system along the lines he suggested last August, and pressed for passage of his anti-crime package.

Throughout his calls for reform of local, state and federal institutions ran the theme of decentralized government, of reversing the flow of long-concentrated power "back from Washington to the states and to the public."

But the President reserved his boldest rhetoric, his urgency, for what he clearly believes a top priority goal of the 1970s—an improvement in the "quality of life," a cleansing of the environment.

He asks for stiffened standards and enforcement concerning auto-caused air pollution. He promised "innovative financing methods" for buying open space and park lands. He would spend \$10 billion to build local waste-treatment plants to clean up the nation's waters wherever needed in the next five years. And he seemed to hand to industry a greater responsibility for purifying the environment, as in his assertion that the "price of goods should be made to include the costs of producing and disposing of them without damage to the environment."

Many details of his "comprehensive and costly" environmental programs remain to be spelled out, so definitive judgments are impossible. Moreover, it is difficult to understand how he could emphasize environmental problems and cures without mentioning the crucial role played by rising population and, therefore, birth-control programs. Nevertheless, the thrust of his message is sound. Neglect of the contamination of our air and water, and the slighting of broad social responsibilities by the polluters, alone dictate intensified urgency for effective remedies now.

Indeed, many of the problem areas highlighted by President Nixon—welfare, pollution, crime, inflation—are not new. They're enduring but neglected trouble spots. Hopefully, his focus on them in a State of the Union message will encourage the action by Congress without which they will continue to blotch the quality of American life.

NIXON BUDGET WILL SET PRIORITIES

HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, although the Congress just received the fiscal 1971 budget today, the Topeka, Kans., Sunday Capital-Journal on January 25 made some perceptive observations about the budget which are worthy of the attention of all of us as we review these requests and the priorities they establish.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to place in the Record this excellent editorial comment, "Nixon Budget Will Set Priorities." The editorial follows:

[From the Topeka Sunday Capital-Journal, Jan. 25, 1970]

NIXON BUDGET WILL SET PRIORITIES

Under any accounting system, \$200 billion is a tremendous amount of money, especially when all of it has to come, one way or another, from the taxpayers.

So when President Nixon delivers his budget message to Congress on or about Jan. 30, it may sound preposterous for him to call it a tight budget, for actually it will set a record.

In the President's behalf, however, it may be explained that the "unified budget" method of accounting in use for the last three years distorts the amount of money available for discretionary federal spending.

Billions included in the unified budget, for example, represent anticipated spending from trust funds, like those which finance the Social Security and interstate highway programs.

These transactions did not appear in the so-called administrative budget—the budget concept which for years was best known to the taxpaying public.

Perhaps the new accounting method does make the budget more meaningful as a guide to overall economic impact of federal spending, but it has made comparisons with prior budgets more difficult. That usually is a relief to presidents forced to spend more money every year than did their predecessors.

It must always be remembered, however, that the money does come from the taxpayers.

President Johnson found it to his advantage in January 1967 to present a fiscal 1968 budget which stressed a National Income Accounts method. He was roundly scolded on Capitol Hill, in the press and by many taxpayers for "budgetary sleight of hand."

LBJ described the NIA budget as one giving the truest account of the actual state of federal finances, but his critics thought he was trying to bury the surge of spending on Vietnam and on social welfare programs.

Now President Nixon finds himself locked into a still newer unified summary budget statement that makes him look like a big spender—even bigger than Johnson.

No matter how it is reported, in terms of appropriated monies, the squeeze is real. Even in advance of his message, major spending cutbacks for fiscal 1971 have been disclosed by both the Defense Dept. and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Painful slashes in medical and other sciences research programs are forecast.

How the Nixon administration chooses to save money, by reducing spending or holding the line, will reveal where its interests lie, even as much as his State of the Union message did. Federal budget making is a process of sorting out national priorities. The complex exercise forces the White House to make hard choices involving competing constituencies and political pressures. It is also true that Congress can—and frequently does—appropriate funds above the budget amounts.

In a sense, this is Nixon's first budget as president. Like all incoming presidents in recent times, Nixon had to live his first year in office with an inherited budget. President Johnson had presented a final budget to Congress on Jan. 15, 1969, just five days before leaving office.

His \$195.3 billion budget covered the 1970 fiscal year—the one that will be with us until next June 30. Nixon sent Congress proposed amendments on April 15, 1969, cutting \$4 billion from Johnson's budget. But Congress

went its own way to some extent, and some of the savings disappeared.

Other presidents have seen fit as a matter of political expediency to submit budgets that overstate expected revenues and/or underestimate spending plans.

But a credible—and balanced—budget is seen as an absolute necessity this year to show the American public that the government is getting tough on inflation.

BLACK PANTHERS AND WHITE LIBERALS

HON. JAMES B. UTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. UTT. Mr. Speaker, the atrocities perpetrated by the Nazis in the 1930's shocked the world and have continued to be cited as the most horrible example of what can happen when power-mad men take the law into their own hands.

Yet in spite of this lesson, and the price in human suffering it caused, we see men today, in the name of civil rights and correction of evil, following the exact same steps toward abrogation of all rights and creation of complete evil.

It is not surprising to see the same "liberal" Communist-sympathizing names prominently allied with the Black Panther movement, itself a Communist organization, using Nazi tactics. Both are antifreedom movements and attract those who want freedom—only for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I believe everyone should read the following article by Allan C. Brownfeld, which appeared in the January 29, 1970, edition of Roll Call:

BLACK PANTHERS AND WHITE LIBERALS

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

In his state of the Union message President Nixon called for a new war on crime. This call was well founded. The city of Washington, D.C. has, for all intents and purposes, become a city of fear. For the first time in its history, policemen were stationed in all 46 of Washington's junior and senior high schools and this past week Mayor Walter Washington said that they would be there indefinitely.

If white citizens of the District of Columbia are concerned about crime, this is equally true of black citizens, perhaps even more true. James G. Banks, the city housing chief, finds in the Negro movement to the suburbs "the end of ambivalence in the black community about crime which has not only made them hostile to the police but has rendered them motionless and passive in the fight against crime."

Police Chief Jerry V. Wilson also spoke of strong, new and encouraging demands from Negroes here for police protection with the implication of black citizen action against crime. Crime analysts say the fear of crime appears now to be growing geometrically among both blacks and whites at perhaps twice or three times the rate of reported offenses. This phenomenon is so marked that the District office of Crime Analysis plans to conduct under a Justice Department Grant, a special survey of fear.

It is in the light of this serious deterioration of our national life and the growth of

crime and violence that it is especially distressing to see the support which the violent and dangerous Black Panther organization has been receiving from a host of self-proclaimed "white liberals"—among them are numbered individuals such as Leonard Bernstein, Otto Preminger, Peter Duchin, and Mrs. August Hecksher, the wife of one of Mayor Lindsay's leading appointees.

Ninety people attended a meeting held in the apartment of orchestra conductor Leonard Bernstein in New York City to hear Donald Cox, the field marshal of the Black Panther Party. Cox told the group that if full employment is not available, "then we must take the means of production and put them in the hands of the people." Cox called America "the most oppressive country in the world." The result: checks totaling \$3,000 were presented to the Panthers, including a \$1,000 check from film producer Otto Preminger.

The Panthers are clearly a violence-prone, revolutionary, Marxist organization. Founded in 1966, its platform states that "We want an end to the robbery by the capitalist of our black community . . . education for our people that exposes the true nature of this decadent American society . . . an immediate end to the police brutality and murder of black people . . . a United Nations-supervised plebiscite to be held throughout the black colony in which only black colonial subjects will be allowed to participate . . ." Required reading for Panthers are the works of Marx and Engels, Lenin, Mao, and Che Guevara.

The Panthers' abstract principles translate into such calls to action as "Dynamite! Black Power! Use the gun! Kill the pig everywhere!" and "in order to stop the slaughter of the people we must accelerate the slaughter of the pigs." Children who receive free breakfasts from the Panthers are taught to chant "Kill the pigs! Kill the pigs." In Illinois all Panthers had to attend three "political orientation classes" weekly, sell his quota of party newspapers, and own and know how to use at least two guns. David Hilliard, the Party's Chief of Staff, is under arrest for threatening the life of President Nixon. What he said was: "We will kill Richard Nixon. We will kill any m - - - r that stands in the way of our freedom."

The ostensible reason for the interest of "white liberals" in the violent and Marxist Panthers is the police raid in Chicago in which two Panthers were killed. Despite the fact that a special coroner's jury ruled that the deaths of two Black Panthers were "justifiable," the moral conscience of the liberal Establishment has somehow been stirred. The day after the meeting at Leonard Bernstein's apartment, "The New York Times" criticized those who had participated in this masochistic session of Hate for America: "Emergence of the Black Panthers as the romanticized darlings of the politico-cultural jet set is an affront to the majority of black Americans. This so-called party, with its confusion of Mao-Marxist ideology and Fascist para-militarism, is fully entitled to protection of its members' constitutional rights . . . the group therapy plus fund-raising soiree at the home of Leonard Bernstein . . . represents the sort of elegant slumming that degrades patrons and patronized alike."

The Times noted that "It might be dismissed as guilt-relieving fun spiked with social consciousness, except for its impact on those blacks and whites seriously working for complete equality and social justice . . . Responsible black leadership is not likely to cheer as the Beautiful People create a new myth that Black Panther is beautiful."

The Panthers do not deny their violence, but proclaim it. The current edition of *The Black Panther* proclaims that "last year (1967) 167 pigs were thinned out by libera-

tion fighters and this year looks as though it will surpass last year." This, most observers believe, is far in excess of the real figures. The real figures are bad enough: in 11 cities, 5 dead and 42 wounded in 26 months, including 4 dead and 23 wounded in the last six months.

Despite all of this, the "white liberals" are proceeding with their plans to lionize the Panthers. Nearly a dozen more parties for the Panthers are being held or planned. They range from 5 to 7 P.M. cocktail parties to buffet suppers with speakers. Invitations are now out for an East Side meeting in New York that will involve more than 100 people. Show business people as well as Panthers have agreed to participate in a large benefit in New Rochelle.

Panther leader Hilliard recently declared that "We advocate the very direct overthrow of the government by way of force and violence, by picking up guns and moving against it because we recognize it as being oppressive and . . . we know that the only solution to it is armed struggle."

No society can remain secure if those who advocate violence are permitted to take up arms against it. And no efforts to take crime and violence off of our streets can succeed, no matter how much federal money is committed to it, if leading citizens and government agencies such as OEO continue to support those who seek to tear our society apart. If Mr. Nixon is serious about fighting crime and violence, he would make certain that not one cent of federal money is used to finance those who advocate it.

We might reminisce about the intellectuals of other societies, such as Nazi Germany, who opposed freedom in order to create their own kind of utopia. The German opponent of tyranny of all forms, Wilhelm Ropke, wrote that: "What gives the anti-capitalism of our intellectuals its distinctive flavor . . . is the wholesale rejection of those values and ideals that we subsume under the, admittedly, somewhat discredited expression of liberalism. . . . They are racing full steam ahead toward the termite state." Those who seek to preserve our freedom and the rule of law must oppose those who present the fallacious defense of totalitarian and violent groups such as the Panther. Would we rather be free and safe, or "in vogue?" It seems clear that Mr. Bernstein, Mr. Preminger and Mr. Duchin prefer to be in vogue. But what of the rest of us?

LIFE BEGINS AT 45—UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS INSTITUTES A PROGRAM TO BRING THE MATURE WOMAN BACK FOR TRAINING AND BUSINESS WANTS TO HIRE THEM

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the ladies are on the move and the University of Texas is providing the impetus. An energetic program is underway to bring back the over-40 set to the university in an effort to regain some of our lost woman-power.

The November issue of *Alcalde* explains the program in detail, along with some illuminating statistics about how the ladies with a little gray in their hair are doing. At this point, I would ask to reprint the article written by Mrs. Doro-

thy Blodgett, one of our State's outstanding writers:

BUSINESS WANTS TO HIRE OLDER WOMEN AND WANTS THE UNIVERSITY TO TRAIN THEM
(By Dorothy Blodgett)

"Well, cut my hair and lower my hem; here comes mother and grandmother back to school—and back to work!"

It's no joke! College students are looking around the classroom and seeing more and more of the allegedly out group, the over 30's; and farther out, the over 40's, clustered about them, pens in hand.

Although the smoke of the protestors has hidden the steady advance of this group from public attention, college and university administrators are aware of their presence. They cannot ignore statistics—pointed out to them by businessmen supporters—showing the number of women 55 to 64 years of age in the nation's work force has quadrupled since 1940. "We need women workers, and we want you to train them," is the message to the academic community from the business world.

Snickering references to the "girls in tennis shoes" and "the rusty ladies" from administrators and faculty members in years past have turned into planning sessions for continuing education programs around the country. And The University of Texas at Austin has this year begun an experimental program to determine how extensive is the need for such a program.

Continuing education is a broad term which means different things in academic circles. It may include both men and women and extend beyond courses offered within regular class periods to evening courses and extension courses instructed by traveling teachers. It may include special counseling to help the older than average college returnee find the job for which he or she is best suited. And, if the returnee is a woman who has not worked in 20 years, counseling helps her find the self-confidence she needs to return to the academic and professional world.

Because women have been responsible since 1940 for the major share of growth in the nation's labor force, many continuing education programs have been planned primarily for this more mature coed.

Some of the programs include such features as: limited course loads in degree or nondegree programs, flexible scheduling of classes at convenient hours, provision for transfer of credits, educational and employment counseling, financial assistance, child care services, and job placement or referral services.

The Texas program has not advanced far beyond the planning stage. It was formerly announced last spring with a colloquium for some 200 women from the business and academic community. Many had recently completed degrees after years of homemaking. Some were working on degrees to help improve their job proficiency and others were completing work to qualify for a job.

Dr. Alice Whatley, who heads the teacher education division in the Department of Home Economics, was introduced at the colloquium as director of the proposed program. She returned to school for refresher courses a number of years ago, stayed for a Ph.D. degree and acquired an unquenchable missionary spirit about women returning to school. The program is headquartered in Speech Building 109 in the Office of the Dean of Students, its "new" aspect is the exploration of the unmet needs of the older scholar. Other special services have long been offered by The University to the older returning man and to women in such specialized areas as teacher training.

Dr. Whatley describes the new program as

a "university-wide service of general educational counseling for returning women students who are older than the average undergraduate." Its objectives as listed by its executive committee of faculty and staff members are:

To serve as a liaison between faculty advisors and returning women students, both undergraduate and graduate.

To focus the academic pattern of women whose formal education was interrupted.

To provide personalized guidance in reviewing earlier education, re-evaluation of abilities, goals, emphasis, and pace.

To assist in the identification of current course offerings, existing degree programs, and student services offered throughout The University that are of interest to women.

To increase knowledge and information related to this selected group of women.

To clarify University procedures and regulations, relieving other campus offices of time consuming conferences.

To promote effective utilization of University facilities, and faculty, staff, and student time.

Dr. Whatley sees the program as one designed to encourage women to develop their potential and enhance their contribution to society. Planning for this venture was funded by a Hogg Foundation for Mental Health grant, implemented by UT funds. Its future financing and scope will depend on the need manifested to the staff of the office of continuing education for women. A survey has already shown that there were 1,300 women over 25 years of age attending classes on the Austin campus in 1968. An orientation coffee this fall invited questions and offered help to returning women.

Funds for large programs have been justified easily by educational institutions in other parts of the country. This points to the increase of women in the work force from one-fourth to more than one-third and to the fact more and more jobs require more education. There are more than 29 million women working today, and the number is expected to keep rising.

Although the young working girl in the mini skirt is more often the subject of the newsman's camera, the woman who is most likely to be a wage earner today is 45 to 54 years of age. This age group has tripled in number since 1940; the 35 to 44 age group has more than doubled; the 55 to 64 age group has quadrupled.

These figures, cited by the U.S. Department of Labor, have been a source of encouragement and inspiration to women who thought they were "too old" to go back to work.

Business is sending out representatives to conduct seminars or participate in seminars originated by others to give the word, *Women, business needs you!* That phrase is the title of a book published by Sabatino A. Russo Jr., founder of American Girl Service which supplies employees to business. Another job service executive, Elmer L. Winter, president of Manpower, Inc., has written, *Women at Work: Every Woman's Guide to Successful Employment*. Winter says he is looking for 100,000 women who want jobs and he expects 40 to 50 per cent of the nation's married women to be working in a few years. Currently, about 30 per cent of America's married women are employed.

Growth of new industries and expanded opportunities in established industries have opened doors for women. Broadened educational opportunities have improved their work potential. Governmental programs such as the President's Commission on the Status of Women, as well as laws such as the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibiting discrimination in employment and the Equal Pay Act of 1963, promising better wage protection, have made work more attractive.

And there are deeper reasons aside from economic influences brewing with the cultural changes of the years.

First of all, women are outliving men. A baby girl born in 1900 could expect to live to 48 years of age. Today she can expect to live, on the average, to the age of nearly 74 years of age. The factors that give her a greater life expectancy decrease the incidence of disease and give her greater vitality for enjoyment of those added years.

Secondly, women are marrying young—half of them by 20, and more at 18 than any other age. They bear their children younger and by the time a majority of women reach their mid-thirties, their children are in school. They still have another 30 to 35 years of active life ahead.

Individual reasons for seeking work vary, but most women need the money—to support a family deprived of a husband or to add extra income. There are 250,000 women in Texas alone who head households. But money is not the only reason women work. The more education a woman acquires, the more likely she is to work, whether she needs the money or not. She wants to use her skills and talents to reap "the psychic rewards that come from achievement and recognition and service to society," says the women's bureau of the U.S. Department of Labor.

Voices in the U.S. and abroad are echoing new attitudes by society toward the woman who works. She is criticized less and it is even acceptable for her to bluntly refuse to accept the old clichés that a successful marriage fulfills a woman and homemaking is a fulltime job; that woman's strength is intuition, not intellect; that it's not feminine to be intelligent; that women can't get along (professionally) with other women.

Dr. Juanita M. Kreps of Duke University, expert on the subject of contemporary women who work or want to go to work, has repeatedly blasted these timeworn themes and helped the woman who wants to go back to work lick her guilt feelings.

"Until we lay these ghosts to rest," she says, women will continue to minimize the long-run importance of intellectual development, and "will continue actually to avoid preparation for a lifetime of learning."

And as for the old "saw" that career women are neurotic and can't get along with other women, she suggests the unhappy woman in the professional world is unhappy at home too. "The important point," Dr. Kreps adds, "is that a woman with a keen intellect, plus the willingness to work at a job outside the home, is likely to find life interesting, and an interest in her work the best insurance against neuroses."

"Working" doesn't have to mean in an office. Community service projects stand waiting for women, and if these activities satisfy her and utilize her talents, they are right for her says Dr. Kreps. She suggests, however, the fact half of the women will be in the labor force by the time they are 45 years old, indicates jobs are increasingly the outlet for qualified women.

Where are women needed? The most glaring shortages are elementary and secondary school teachers, followed by social work posts including public and volunteer agencies in services to families, children and the aged.

In the health profession, there is a shortage of professional nurses, practical nurses, health aides, attendants, medical technicians, and medical secretaries.

Within the manufacturing and commercial areas, projections of manpower needs show that computer programmers, secretarial and technical personnel for banks, insurance companies, etc., will be in great demand.

Of special interest to the academic community and a reason for the University's

experimental program is the fact that practically all the new jobs are white-collar, require a college education, and/or some special training.

Mrs. Walt Rostow, the woman who broke the male ranks as the first woman professor at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and who is now a UT professor, keynoted the spring colloquium on continuing education and summarized the situation in this way: There is no longer a reason to argue about whether women should work. "They do . . . so let's simply talk about the quality of the output."

UT Exes have expressed their approval of the program for continuing education for women by establishing a scholarship in the name of the well-known sociologist, writer, counselor and authority on mental health aspects of family and community relations, Dr. Bernice Milburn Moore, of the Hogg Foundation staff. With two degrees from Texas and a doctorate from the University of North Carolina, Dr. Moore's life experience seems to prove the point of the program. The certificate presented to Dr. Moore is reproduced left.

The future of the program will depend on the response of others to it. The older woman is going back to work and back to college. What is the University of Texas going to do about her special needs? That is a question to be answered more fully in the future.

YOUNG WORLD DEVELOPMENT— YOUTH ARM OF THE AMERICAN FREEDOM FROM HUNGER FOUNDATION

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, January 28, 1970

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, these days we hear a lot about student rebellion, "tuning out," rejection of the "establishment" and more. We do not often hear about the constructive side of our young people.

This year, in 33 States including my own State of Florida, young teenagers will be staging a "Walk for Development," the proceeds of which will be donated to one local and one foreign freedom-from-hunger project.

In Dade County, Fla., the project is being organized by two enthusiastic teenagers, Mike Burk and Jane Rachlin. The Walk for Development there is scheduled for February 21, and, if it proves as successful as last year, thousands of young Miamians will be participating in this effort to gain funds for the hungry. This is done through pledges from adults and community organizations for each mile that the youngsters walk.

The parent organization of Young World Development—the American Freedom From Hunger Foundation—is headed by our former colleague, the Honorable Leonard G. Wolf. I commend the leaders of this organization for their very real concern and efforts in eliminating the sources of hunger both in America and around the world. And I know that everyone is proud that young people are committed and concerned enough to devote their time, energy, and enthusiasm.

A PAINFULLY MODEST HERO

HON. BILL CHAPPELL, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. CHAPPELL. Mr. Speaker, our people thirst today for news about our brave and courageous fighting men. The papers seem to be full enough of information about those they consider contemptible, but most of us would like to have some news about the majority of our American boys—the brave ones who risk their lives to save others; the courageous ones who see a job to be done and so they do it; the valiant men who are putting up with great discomfort and personal sacrifice, but who are willing to give a helping hand to those who need it.

Just recently I received a copy of a news article that tells about one courageous man. He is a friend of mine, having served as a page in 1955 when I was serving in the Florida legislature. How deeply proud I am of David Cook. He exemplifies all the good of our fighting men today.

The article I wish to quote is entitled: "A Painfully Modest Hero." It is written by Helen Musgrove, correspondent for the Jacksonville Journal, who sent the story back from Marble Mountain, Danang, South Vietnam. It reads in part:

A PAINFULLY MODEST HERO

Visibility was so bad that Lt. David Cook, son of Mr. and Mrs. H. T. Cook of St. Augustine, Florida, couldn't see more than a few feet away, but he could see his duty very clearly.

There were wounded and dead men out there and delay could mean they might all be dead soon.

David, a Marine helicopter pilot flying a Huey gunship up around the DMZ at the start of the recent TET offensive, was dismayed at the rising number of casualties, the increased enemy activity and the way the weather was closing in. He knew there were wounded men out there, in their sixth day of being marooned by impossible flying conditions. With them were the bodies of eight buddies killed in action.

A Chinook 46 had tried to get to them and failed. David and his crew decided that it was time to go for broke in a rescue run. Somebody had to get those guys out, so they elected themselves to the job. Flying practically blind and with enemy fire reaching out in the direction of their sound, they did find and rescue the men.

The OFX isn't David's only medal. Some-time back, while flying another mission to pick up the injured, he was wounded by splinters from a bullet-shattered plexiglass windshield on his chopper. That meant he was entitled to the Purple Heart.

A graduate of Bunnell High School in 1962, he later completed a course at Daytona Beach Junior College and graduated from Florida State University in 1965. He joined the Marines two and a half years ago, got his flight training at Pensacola and attended OCS at Quantico, Va. David likes being a Marine and may make a career of it.

Now the Marine Corps has good reason to be proud of him.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to salute David for his courageous and unselfish action. The vast majority of the people in my district are extremely proud of all our

young men in service and we want them all to know how deeply we appreciate the sacrifices they are making in our behalf.

OUR MIDDLE EAST CRISIS

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I have read with great interest the recent remarks made by the Members of this body concerning our Middle East policy.

I share their concern for the direction this policy is apparently taking under the present administration. It appears to be a policy of Soviet and Arab appeasement, turning away from our long-standing policy of friendship and support of the last free nation in the area—Israel.

I regret to say, also, that it is a policy of self-delusion. Self-delusion, in believing that the Soviets will agree to a settlement in the area which is in the best interests of Israel or the United States; self-delusion in the belief that our "sometimes friends" the French, want a settlement in our best interests, and that the Arabs want peace, and that the British have power or influence in the area.

The Members of this body know, and the world knows, that the seeds of the current Middle Eastern situation were sown during the last Republican administration. With the decision on the Aswan Dam, the Arab world was written off. The Soviets were not as short-sighted, as was the Republican administration, and quickly converted the Arab world into Soviet satellites. We also know that the Soviets armed the United Arab Republic prior to the 6-day war, and rearmed the U.A.R. after most of this war material was captured or smashed to bits by the vastly outnumbered and outgunned Israelis.

We also know that the British have withdrawn their presence from the area, only to be replaced by the Soviets. The enterprising French, while withholding arms from Israel, are sending 100 jet aircraft to Libya, a country at war with Israel. One does not need to speculate on the final destination of these aircraft. They are obviously intended for the United Arab Republic.

Our policy appears to be one which would impose preconditions of peace upon Israel and the United Arab Republic. One of these preconditions is the Israeli withdrawal, or agreement to withdraw, from lands occupied during the 6-day war.

It is clear, Mr. Speaker, that the Arabs do not want peace, but the total destruction of the nation of Israel. It is equally and understandably clear that Israel will not withdraw from lands it considers necessary for its survival in the face of Arab threats.

I would urge the administration to face the facts. The Soviets desire a dominant role in the Middle East in support of their Mediterranean and other

ambitions. The French desire economic expansion in the area and an outlet for their growing arms industry. It is no secret that the oil interests in this country believe that they will benefit from a policy of appeasement in the dispute.

I have supported the right of Israel to exist and to peacefully develop its free institutions since its creation over 20 years ago. I have admired the determination of that small nation to survive.

Where aggression is concerned, whether it be a Communist aggression in Vietnam or Arab aggression in Israel, our policy should be one of support for our proven friends in the free world. At the same time, in the interests of peace, we should call upon the parties to cease the series of attacks and reprisals and to negotiate a peace on a face-to-face basis.

For the above reasons, I have joined many of my colleagues in the following declaration:

DECLARATION IN SUPPORT OF PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

We, the undersigned Members of the United States Congress, declare:

A just and lasting peace in the Middle East is essential to world peace.

The parties to the conflict must be parties to the peace achieved by means of direct, unhampered negotiations. We emphasize these significant points of policy to reaffirm our support for the democratic State of Israel which has unremittably appealed for peace for the past 21 years.

Our declaration of friendship for the State of Israel is consistent with the uninterrupted support given by every American President and the Congress of the United States since the establishment of the State of Israel.

It is not in the interest of the United States or in the service of world peace to create the impression that Israel will be left defenseless in face of the continuing flow of sophisticated offensive armaments to the Arab nations supplied by the Soviet Union and other sources. We thus adhere to the principle that the deterrent strength of Israel must not be impaired. This is essential to prevent full-scale war in the Middle East.

All the people of the Middle East have a common goal in striving to wipe out the scourges of disease, poverty, illiteracy and to meet together in good faith to achieve peace and turn their swords into ploughshares.

FACE-TO-FACE-NEGOTIATIONS
REQUIRED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, on January 19 of this year a resolution was introduced by a number of our colleagues calling for direct, face-to-face negotiations between the governments of the nations of the Middle East "as the only path to an effective, long-term peace." Today, I am introducing a similar measure aimed at affirming the U.S. stand in support of this goal.

It is only fitting and just that the parties involved in the dispute resolve their own differences. An arbitrary, forced settlement would inevitably result in further instability and would result in

no real settlement at all. It is doubtful that any lasting peace can result if the two sides do not directly meet at the conference table to establish a working relationship in the Middle East.

It is not in the best interests of the United States to dictate a settlement in the Middle East. Such action would carry with it full responsibility for keeping the peace in that troubled area. As President Nixon noted in his state of the Union message:

The nations of each part of the world should assume the primary responsibility for their own well-being; and they themselves should determine the terms of that well-being.

The resolution I introduce today is in line with this judicious foreign policy stance.

Of course, we have a stake in searching for peace in the Middle East as we do in seeking peace in the whole world. We should continue to work for a just settlement in this trouble spot no less energetically than we do in other crisis areas of the globe. I support our position of a balanced attitude toward the Middle East, but in addition, I believe that the fastest route to a lasting peace is through face-to-face negotiations between the nations involved.

RAILROAD NEGOTIATIONS

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, through the intervention of the Federal court, this Nation has once again been spared the paralyzing effect of a nationwide railroad strike and lockout—but only for a few days. The ball is in our court now and Congress must take remedial steps to avert this transportation disaster.

We simply cannot keep on applying band-aids to a severed artery. Twice in the last 3 years, I have introduced legislation designed to give us better, improved tools and methods for settling strikes in the transportation industry. The railroad strike and lockout that is threatening to bring our country's rail transportation points out again the dire need for Congress to modernize the Railroad Labor Act. The fact that this present railway stoppage would add to our spiraling inflation problem adds emphasis to the need for new railway labor legislation. With the railroads shut down, freight would be moving much slower or not at all, thus product shortages will cause consumer prices to rise even more.

Secretary of Labor Shultz has said that President Nixon is preparing some labor law changes. There has been some talk that the President's proposal would junk the separate Railroad Labor Act covering railroads and airlines and overhaul the 1947 Taft-Hartley Act to cover all labor and management disputes.

This is making the umbrella coverage too broad. I personally feel that we need to keep a separate law governing rail-

road and airline disputes because of a special need to keep the transportation systems of our country operating without the burden of strikes and lockouts, while still protecting the integrity of labor and management. The bill I proposed last session, H.R. 8446, would change section 10 of the Railway Labor Act to give the President a "choice of procedures" in dealing with emergency disputes. This would replace the present system which allows a strike after mediation by a specially appointed emergency board. My bill would empower the President to use other tools, including arbitration by a special board, a form of limited seizure, a congressional remedy, or any combination of these which the President might deem appropriate. Although the bill is designed to prevent crippling strikes, it would protect the traditional freedoms of collective bargaining. Strikes could be allowed—but only if the President chose not to implement any of the tools given him by the bill.

I am preparing to reintroduce my bill again this session. Suggestions for amendments will be welcomed. My chief concern is that we keep the transportation systems on the move, with as little hindrance by disputes as possible. It is the best way to preserve collective bargaining. Time is running out on the administration, the Congress, and labor and management. The public interest demands that we improve our transportation settlement procedure. We simply cannot tolerate a national transportation strike.

ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, in light of the considerable interest in environmental pollution abroad in the land, I should like to remind my colleagues of action taken by the Congress in 1967. In order to make available for application to the entire spectrum of public health and safety the unparalleled resources—professional scientific talent and research facilities—of AEC facilities including its National Laboratories, Public Law 90-190 authorizes the Atomic Energy Commission to assist private facilities and laboratories, which are inadequate for the purpose, in conducting research and development or training activities and studies in any area of public health and safety. As a result of this grant of authority, these AEC laboratories are now engaged in projects for State and Federal agencies concerning biological effects of various pollutants, the treatment and recycling of human and industrial wastes, the production of potable water, the control of thermal effluents, and other fundamental environmental factors. The laboratories are also engaged in acquiring basic design data relative to urban decentralization.

I should like to have printed in the

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the speech of Representative MELVIN PRICE entitled "Universities, National Laboratories and Man's Environment" which was delivered in July of last year at the conference of Argonne Universities Association which manages Argonne National Laboratory near Chicago. In that speech MEL PRICE mentions some more of the activity of the national laboratories and points out the very significant issues of organizing and administering the new popular war—the war on pollution. I commend the reading of that speech to my colleagues and to scientists and academic administrators across the country.

REMARKS OF REPRESENTATIVE MELVIN PRICE

It's a pleasure for me to have the opportunity to address this group on a subject which has long been a matter of interest and concern to me, namely, the role of the universities and national laboratories in the solution of some of the problems facing contemporary society.

As some of you may know, I was for a long time an advocate of increased participation by midwestern universities in the program of the Argonne National Laboratory and I was pleased when that became a reality. I was also delighted to take part in the action of the Joint Committee in 1967 when we removed some of the legislative fetters from laboratory programs. You'll recall that Public Law 90-190 amended the Atomic Energy Act and authorized the AEC to utilize the tremendous resources of the national laboratories not only for programs deemed "appropriate to the development of atomic energy" as before, but also for conducting research and development as well as training activities and studies to assist others in the general field of public health and safety. This was a major step for it opened the doors of the national laboratories and made available some of the finest minds in the country in circumstances where private facilities or laboratories are inadequate.

It is this type of scientific talent which must be brought to bear on these enormous challenges posed by the environmental problems we face today. The scope of these problems is staggering, but no more than that of placing a man on the moon—and that has certainly been accomplished! It occurs to me that our present position relative of defeating environmental pollution is not unlike our status in the space race when Sputnik-I shattered our complacency in 1957. Yet here only 12 years later we not only have placed a man on the moon, but we provided a worldwide TV show of the entire mission! However, that task did not consist of overcoming a steadily deteriorating set of circumstances. The moon was there and it stayed. The environmental problems are multiplying rapidly both in number and in degree as our society increases its population and industrial activity.

I think it interesting to note also that the national laboratories and other AEC facilities were well represented on the Apollo-11 flight. For instance the seismometer left on the moon by astronauts Armstrong and Aldrin contains a plutonium-238 heater system developed by the Mound Laboratory to see it through the lunar nights. The scoop which was used to collect lunar soil samples was designed and fabricated at the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and the vacuum boxes carrying the lunar samples were designed and fabricated at the Oak Ridge Y-12 plant, as was the spectrometer to be used to analyze them. Several national laboratories, including Argonne, will take part in that analysis. For future missions a "space wrench" has been developed at the Oak Ridge Gaseous Diffusion Plant and is now being evaluated and a SNAP-27 nuclear

generator is scheduled to be installed on the moon by the Apollo-12 crew to power the so-called ALSEP or Apollo Lunar Surface Experimental Package.

These examples serve merely to demonstrate the resourcefulness of our scientific community when it is sufficiently motivated and, of course, funded. Perhaps an equally applicable example is the scientific work now proceeding to make available the peaceful uses of atomic energy. The role of the national laboratories in that endeavor is well known. It is precisely this capacity to concentrate a large number of highly skilled scientifically trained personnel encompassing a variety of disciplines which will provide the type of multi-front defense against the pollutants laying siege on the environment.

Let's take a brief look at the conflict. The first problem is to identify the elements causing the damage and assess their effects. We all know the catch phrases now—air pollution, water pollution, and so on. But I'm talking about a detailed, specific identification. For instance, how many of you have considered, as part of the air pollution problem, the question of the effect on the environment of water vapor left in stratosphere by jet aircraft? Moreover, in addition to the situations which immediately come to mind when the word "pollution" is mentioned, we are faced with situations which indirectly lead to pollution. For example, trash disposal is a problem which has enormous economic consequences. It is estimated that Americans generate five pounds of trash—paper, bottles, cans—per person per day. In major cities the cost of collection alone is approaching \$25 per ton. At the present time the annual expenditure for collection and disposal is about \$4.5 billion—and that doesn't include processing of sanitary wastes.

I would be remiss if I failed to mention that we are not without some progress already. A considerable amount of work is going on even now. Studies are being conducted by national laboratories, together with other agencies, concerning the uses of waste heat from nuclear reactor power plants. Such potential uses include central heating and cooling for cities and high density residential areas; water purification by evaporation and recycling; large scale greenhouse agriculture, particularly in colder regions; desalting of sea water; and aquaculture, that is, growing food in water. In fact, today oysters on Long Island are moved into conventional power plant hot water effluent streams to accelerate growth. The Scottish Whitefish Authority has had such success in providing increased food demands by thermal stimulation of sewage nutrients for thermally enhanced fish growth that each nuclear power station in the British Isles includes as part of plant design and siting an aquaculture area.

The disposal of the mountains of waste I mentioned may be accomplished by application of the wet-oxidation process evolved from the study of processing nuclear reactor fuels. You probably noticed from the commercials during the Apollo-11 mission that International Paper Company has developed papers which dissolve in water and is working on others which may be processed into low cost building materials.

Oak Ridge is working on the development of automatic, remotely controlled tunneling equipment. This equipment will utilize high pressure water—about 5,000 pounds per square inch—to drill and line with concrete underground utility tunnels. It will eliminate the cut and cover method, reduce tunneling costs to 10% of the present level, and revolutionize the placement of all utility services. While this may not seem directly related to pollution, just imagine the boon to city planning and the enhancement of city life by noise and congestion reduction.

Some of the studies conducted by the AEC

relative to fallout effects of nuclear weapons have led to an understanding of dispersion of solids and gases in the atmosphere as well as the use of radiation for pest control and increasing the shelf life of food. Here again financial considerations have played an important role in progress. Economics led to the elimination of the food irradiation program in the Administration's budget request for AEC this year, but the Joint Committee considered this to be false economy and restored that program by adding \$750,000 to the Isotopes Division budget and further recommended that an additional \$700,000 be transferred from the general Biology and Medicine category to that program. The Joint Committee also added \$800,000 to the budget to apply space nuclear power technology to the development of an implantable radioisotope heat source power converter to power a heart pump.

But all that we have accomplished and what we are doing now is merely a scratch on the surface. And it is apparent that a consideration perhaps as important as the scientific effort in research in the method of organizing and coordinating that effort. We have come to realize that our cities and the total environment are interdependent systems. The world renowned city planner Doxiadis had coined the word "ekistics" referring to the science of human settlements. As he has clearly demonstrated, each advance must be evaluated in terms of the effect on the entire system. A set of new buildings may well improve a neighborhood, but the result may be that local streets are no longer capable of efficiently moving traffic.

In order to investigate the organization of scientific effort, the Subcommittee on Science, Research and Development of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics held hearings as recently as last week on Centralization of Federal Science Activities. Many of us will be watching these hearings closely. In 1965, The Environmental Pollution Panel of the President's Science Advisory Committee issued a comprehensive report which set forth 91 specific recommendations for action. Among those recommendations were provision of long-term support by HEW to a group of 5 to 10 universities to establish interdepartmental research centers for environmental studies, and the separation of research and development activities from governmental investigative and regulatory enforcement functions. Your organization is uniquely qualified as to both of these criteria of major significance.

As Dr. Seaborg testified in the hearings I just mentioned, the existing government-university partnership in graduate education and scientific research has resulted in a pluralistic organization with a number of advantages such as diversity of emphasis and project orientation of research efforts. Dr. Seaborg expressed his opposition to general centralization at this time until the form of such an organization can be better defined. But the present system also has some major disadvantages, not the least of which is occasional duplication of both effort and facilities with the attendant dissipation of resources. I particularly recall the development of facilities and staff competence by NASA in 1962 relative to sodium systems for space nuclear power. When some of us brought to the attention of NASA and AEC that AEC laboratories already had the desired capacity, I was both surprised and more than a little disturbed at the response. Yes there was the competence but when NASA requested AEC to perform the desired work, none of the national laboratories involved could accommodate the space agency—they were all too busy with "their own" work.

There is, obviously, a tendency to view the other man's project as less important and even as an intrusion. But efficient use of our resources, such as the national laboratories, demands that some means be developed to

establish national goals and priorities and assure cooperative application of those resources to the greatest possible advantage. We should also assure that the system provides a means of relating the scientific efforts to the welfare of the individual and that the program is effectively communicated to the public. The people must know what is being done with their tax dollars and have some reasonable expectation of what may result. I think the taxpayers will support a massive attack on the environmental problems, but only if they are well informed.

I have read with considerable interest the report of your "ad hoc" committee which recommended the establishment of a Center for Socio-Technical Studies. Such a center could provide a valuable yardstick for centralization and coordination of scientific efforts in the socio-environmental field. It could also go far toward maintenance of traditional university independence which has survived notwithstanding the fact that 80% of our colleges and universities receive federal support. Moreover, it would present a valuable means to demonstrate the management ability and social consciousness of the university community. A readily anticipated byproduct would be increased public recognition and acceptance of scientific endeavors. Such public relations possibilities are rare indeed.

Perhaps the greatest national contribution of such a program would be the demonstration to top-rate, young, science trained personnel of the great challenges and potential rewards—and I don't mean just dollars—available in a career in environmental studies. Generation of a high level of scientific involvement and excitement is sure to yield results. We're seeking the solution of the greatest of mysteries—that of life in all its forms and interrelationships. Our young people have evidenced great concern about what's happening to their world and they have demonstrated the usual energy of youth. If we can channel that concern and energy into productive examination of the questions—if we can show them that this is an area where they can make a significant contribution to the betterment of their fellow men—then we shall have moved a giant step closer to the world we all want. There is no question that we shall need the dedicated efforts of large numbers of qualified people.

Another more provincial result of such a center would be its regional effect. I'm sure you are all cognizant of the so-called "Midwest Brain Drain." A 1966 study revealed that universities in Illinois, Indiana, Wisconsin, Ohio and Michigan had conferred 40% of the nation's doctorate degrees, but those states employed only 25% of the nation's Ph. D's. And 7 out of 10 of those obtaining doctorates in these states had graduated from local high schools. Location of the AEC's 200 BeV accelerator at Weston will help to stem the tide. Ironically, we owe much of the credit for the existence of that marvelous tool of science to a Californian who represents a constituency in Southern California where many of our best scientists have located. While there are a number of men in Congress who played significant roles in the successful effort to win congressional authorization of, and appropriations for, the 200 BeV, I think it is fair to say that we would not have carried the day without the strong assistance of my much admired friend, Chet Holifield. Had it not been for Chet, who as you know is Chairman of the Joint Committee, there is not the slightest doubt in my mind that the 200 BeV would not be under construction in Illinois now. The proposed Center for Socio-Technical Studies would do much to assist the 200 BeV not only in retaining the highly skilled but also in attracting others to this region.

The job ahead is unquestionably great. We must develop a better understanding of the biological effect of pollutants in order to de-

termine what action to take. We must learn more about how they move in air, water and life systems in order to decide where further action should be taken. And we must be able to predict to a high degree what the effect of any action will be on the total system. Not only is more basic research required, but also extensive data acquisition and empirical experimentation. Then, of course, this all must be followed by applied research and engineering to transform ideas and knowledge through methodology and instrumentation into the realities of operating systems and programs.

We face problems of governmental organization and cooperation on local, State and national levels. Pollution knows no boundaries and cuts over jurisdictional lines to despoil all. Many of our problems are in fact the result of piecemeal growth and jealously guarded subdivisions of governmental authority.

Economics will obviously be a major factor. The economists also have a new challenge in developing economic terms which express the value of aesthetic enhancement of the environment and the addition of "quality" to human life. What is it worth in dollars to be able to hear a bird sing in a city or to be able to dip a cup in any stream for a drink of cool, clear water? I think most people would be willing to pay for such a world. And it can be as much of a reality as those footprints on the moon.

I wish you great success in this venture. The number of bills before the Congress today calling for environmental reparation attest to the concern of both the elected and the electorate. We look to you scientists and academic administrators for the fulfillment of this dream.

FOURTH GRADERS IN PITTSBURGH HONOR FLAG WITH POETRY PUBLICATION

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, if it was possible to ask every single American what our flag, Old Glory, means to him, I am sure there would be near as many different answers as there were people queried.

The majority would talk in terms of liberty, patriotism, valor, and others of past military victories.

A group of fourth-grade students at the John Minadeo School in Pittsburgh dedicated a class project to our flag. Each student in Miss Roberta Feldman's class wrote a poem about the flag and these poems were printed in a book, titled "Our Flag Still Waves."

I would like to introduce this publication into the RECORD today and ask my colleagues to read these declarations of praise for our flag.

I am quite proud that these youngsters sent me their work. And it is with sincere pleasure that I share with my fellow Members of Congress their efforts:

PITTSBURGH, PA.,
January 23, 1970.

DEAR MR. MOORHEAD: Our fourth grade class, from the John Minadeo School has just finished reading about the American Flag in the book Ventures. "The Rockets Red Glare" was the title of the story.

Our teacher, Miss Feldman, discussed it with us and we decided to write poems

and illustrate them expressing our feelings about the American Flag. The Star Spangled Banner.

We decided to dedicate our booklet to a new age, the seventies, and the hope for world peace. We sincerely hope you like our work. Thank you for reading it.

Sincerely,

GENE TABACHNICK,
ROBERTA FELDMAN.

OUR FLAG STILL WAVES—1776-1970 (By Roberta Feldman)

This is a new year and the beginning of a new decade the seventies. Behind us we remember the unrest, assassination, demonstrations and dissent that became an important part of our lives.

We as the fourth graders of the John Minadeo School feel that our flag still proudly stands. We hope that by showing respect, reverence, honor and allegiance to it we can prove our love and devotion to our great country.

Our wish is to dedicate this poetry booklet to our nation and our flag—The Star Spangled Banner—May it proudly wave over "The Land of the Free and the Home of the Brave."

OLD GLORY (By Sandra Forrest)

Our flag, it was there, on that perilous night,
Where soldiers fought both day and night,
With the bombs bursting in the air,
Old Glory waved as it stood there.

OUR FLAG (By Elissa Barent)

Above the misty clouds at Fort McHenry stood,
Our flag still waving by dawn's early light.
The bombs were bursting in the air,
The colors so flashing, red just glared.
This was the proof that through that cold night,
Our flag was still there.

OUR FLAG (By Beth Kramer)

For the beauty of the earth, we love our flag,
For it symbolizes justice, loyalty and peace.
We are proud of our flag that waved ever so bravely
Over Fort McHenry while the bombs were bursting high.

IT IS MY FLAG (By Howard Berger)

I like my flag,
So I can brag.
There is one star for each state.
I think our flag is so great.
I like the red in the sky,
The bombs bursting certainly do fly,
I see the red,
From my bed.
I think America should fight
For what she believes is right.

THE STARS AND STRIPES (By Rima Cohen)

Let the stars and stripes of our flag always wave,
Let it always stand for freedom, and all the blood that has been shed,
It has been shed by those who died for their country.
Let our country always be free,
Let everyone love one another.
Let our flag always wave
Over the land of the free and the home of the Brave.

THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER (By Gene Tabachnick)

The Star Spangled Banner has flown
through the night,
Men protected it, they went out to fight,

A man was watching while he was writing.
He couldn't see the flag, but he heard the men fighting.

With the tears shedding and blood all around.

The flag was still standing, our freedom was found.

OLD GLORY (By Nell Rothschild)

Old Glory protected the fort at night.
When dawn broke it stood for the fight.
The blood was fierce and so were the dead,
As the men were so brave, while our flag did wave.

OLD GLORY (By Mark Edelstein)

Our flag was still there,
It was waving high in the air.
How beautiful it was,
The stars and stripes of red, white and blue.

OUR FLAG (By John Stefurak)

The bombs, bursting over Fort McHenry couldn't defeat our flag.
The flag stood brave and tall, showing no fear at all.
It waved so beautifully in the cold, dark mist,
Over the shores waters so lightly kissed.

OUR STAR SPANGLED BANNER (By Howard Block)

Our Star Spangled Banner has always flown high,
If there was killing, shooting or bombs bursting sky high,
Our Star Spangled Banner will always stand by.
Proudly we think of the men in the grave,
They fought for our freedom and now they lay.
The men in the grave shall arise as our flag passes by day or night.
They shall think of the time of their great victories and fight.

STARS AND STRIPES (By Brian Breitbard)

Francis Scott Key, Francis Scott Key, what do you see at dawn?
Is our flag still standing?
Will our victory stay?
Can our men keep on fighting,
Or will they lay dead?
Will our flag still fly overhead?

THE AMERICAN FLAG (By Ilene Halpern)

The American flag waves bright and true,
With its colors of red, white and blue.
You can find our flag anyplace,
Hawaii, Alaska or Outer Space.
Our Flag represents our marvelous land.
Freedom, democracy and things so grand.

OH! LONG MAY IT WAVE (By Sarah Heyman)

Stand and salute the red, white and blue.
That means so much to me, and so much to you.
The stars stand for the states, for liberty so true.
The red, white and blue stand for justice and peace that grew.
We all salute you, oh! red, white and blue.

OLD GLORY, OLD GLORY (By Thomas Walsh)

Old Glory, you still stand against the staff limp.
The perilous flight which never seemed to end.
Freedom was found and shall continue forever and ever.
Our flag shall always stand proudly over our land.

AS THE FLAG WAVES

(By Susan Lee)

As the flag waves,
People are being saved.
As the flag proudly stands,
Soldiers have proved they are men.
No matter in what age,
Our flag so proudly waves.

THE RED, WHITE AND BLUE

(By Sam Jacobowitz)

The American flag should wave forever and
ever,
"Tis the Star Spangled Banner by day and
by night.
Old glory shall be forever and ever,
No glory shall be without our Star Spangled
Banner

May our Star Spangled Banner be with us
forever,
For it is our pride and joy.
It shall reign forever by land or by sea.
"O'er the land of the free and the home
of the brave."

OLD GLORY

(By James Tucker)

Old Glory, do you still stand?
Waving your stars and stripes over this
bloodshed land.
Have the British surrendered?
Have we won the war?
Is North Point all right?
Wait look there!
Is it ours or the enemies' flag up there?
The British are turning back.
Old Glory still stands,
The war's victory is in our hands.

OLD GLORY, OH GREAT GLORY

(By Marc Luick)

Oh! Will it ever stand true?
Oh glory of ours,
That there will be lasting peace,
We will never have war.
We wish and we truly hope;
Oh great, great Glory,
We will have peace not vengeance or hate,
We will not worry but be free great Glory,

OUR FLAG

(By Terry Williams)

The battle has ended,
The war it was won.
Three cheers for the flag we all know and
love.
Oh, long may it wave,
Over this land of the brave.
Whose peace and freedom we are part of.

OUR FLAG

(By Brenda Levin)

Our flag still waves through rain and snow.
The bright stars and stripes are shining
below.
The flag still waves for the brave who fought.
To give us the freedom that all Americans
want.

OH BEAUTIFUL FLAG

(By Gary Graff)

A flag by day, a flag by night,
Our flag shows our might.
Our flag withstood many wars
At any fight our flag was there.
It flew high and never went down,
Our soldiers never let it hit the ground.

OUR FLAG

(By Randi Rubin)

Our flag is such a magnificent sight,
The colors are extremely bright.
May the Stars and Stripes forever wave,
For all the men who were so brave.

OLD GLORY, OLD GLORY

(By Marty Wilner)

Old Glory, Old Glory may your stars and
stripes shine at night.
Through the perilous fight may you wave
swiftly with the wind.
May you bravely wave Old Glory through
the night
May the bombs bursting in air shine and be
your nights light.

THE FLAG

(By Lester Frischman)

Watching the bombs in the air,
British ships came from everywhere,
You can see the bombs bursting in the air
But Fort McHenry's flag was still standing
there.

OUR FLAG

(By Maureen Beyer)

Our flag is a sign of the nation.
The flag stands for justice, liberty and peace.
To many our flag is a sign of peace and
freedom.
To some it is a thing to protest against.
To me it is a sign of my homeland.

THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER

(By Tina Bach)

It was an early foggy morning,
Suddenly a ship was sailing.
Mr. Key stood up and gripped a rail.
He strained to see Fort McHenry,
Our flag was still waving.

OUR FLAG

(By Mark Watson)

The men were at war,
All the families were crying.
Because all those men kept dying and dying,
The Star Spangled Banner was created that
night
While the bombs were bursting in the air so
very bright.
May our flag up so high wave.
It waves over "The Land of the Free and the
Home of the Brave."

OUR FLAG

(By Patricia Kennedy)

Our flag has many names because of its
wonderful fame.
All people love it, yes they do.
The stars and stripes or the red, white and
blue.
Our flag is the one that we love, yes that's
true.
Our love for it increased as our country
grew.

OLD GLORY

(By William Crum)

There once was a fight,
It lasted both day and night.
Here men fought for right,
Yet Old Glory was seen through the mist.
The bombs burst in the air.
Our Flag still stood there.

OUR FLAG

(By Valerie Kramer)

I feel proud as I watch over our flag.
Wave high in the sky of blue,
My heart feels glad that I'm part of the flag.
Do you feel the same way too?
The flag stands for our nation,
It couldn't be better stationed.
Our flag should not ever be treated like a toy.
It stands for every girl and boy.

OUR FLAG

(By Ronna Smooke)

Our flag the red, white, and blue,
Its the symbol of our country for me and
for you.

Its the flag of liberty, justice and peace,
With its fifty stars and thirteen stripes to
say the least.

OUR FLAG OF FREEDOM

(By Bruce Valinsky)

Our flag is red, white and blue.
It means a lot to me and you,
It meant a lot to the soldiers,
In the War of 1812.
The soldiers were so brave,
To save our American flag.

MY FLAG

(By Jane Marrone)

The sky was blue and gray,
It came at dawns early day.
I think our flag was brave,
To stand where guns were shooting.
But when it was over,
Our flag was still waving over the rising sun.

WONDERFUL OLD GLORY

(By Nanette Marshall)

Beneath the sun, or beneath the stars,
Old Glory still waves, she is our flag,
Which no one can ever take away,
She stands for our freedom,
Which we fought for many times.
She is our beautiful flag.
Let us remember her wonderful Glory.

OUR FLAG WAS STILL THERE

(By Steven Fleischmann)

Over Fort McHenry, the red, white and blue,
Was flying strongly and bravely too.
Our flag never went down, nor touched the
cold earth.
For it symbolizes freedom,
That's what America is worth.

THE FLAG OF THE UNITED STATES

(By Teresa Svidro)

The flag of our nation,
Is red, white and blue.
It has fifty stars,
On a field of blue.

The flag has thirteen Stripes,
Seven are red and six are white,
They stand for courage and honesty.
They symbolize our country so bright and
free.

OUR FLAG

(By Gina DePaolo)

The flag still stands though the bombs burst
in the air,
Through the dark night and the dawns early
light.
It flies over our land blessed with freedom
tall
It flies over our land blessed with liberty and
justice for all.

THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER

(By Cathy Tomasovich)

The flag that waved over Fort McHenry,
Was seen very dimly one day.
Francis Scott Key, wrote as he watched,
A poem to show that the Star Spangled
Banner yet waved
The flag still waves throughout the United
States.
To show that we have liberty, justice and
progress.

THE RED, WHITE AND BLUE

(By Barry Hackman)

Bombs bursting here,
Bombs bursting there,
Couldn't knock down our dear flag.
Torture it took,
But at Fort McHenry it still stood.
The nation grew,

So did our flag.
Our flag that stands for liberty, justice,
freedom and Peace.

THE FLAG
(By James Lowe)

In 1812 the war began,
We were fighting for our land.
The British were bombing the sea,
The flag was standing for you and me.
Fort McHenry was the name of the fort.
The war had ended.
We had won the fight for our land,
All the time I knew we would win.
Yes, we would win for "In God is Our Trust".

OUR FLAG
(By James Prey)

All of a sudden right in the air
A war has started
Men are being killed
Fighting for peace
British ships coming in close
But the flag stood still
One by one men fell to the ground
Word by word went on to the paper
All of a sudden he started to yell
"Our flag still stands".

OUR FLAG
(By Lisa DeFrancesco)

This flag belongs to me
This flag belongs to you
Brave men have lived and died
To set our people free.

OUR FLAG
(By Eric Malakoff)

The British were bombing
The bombs were bursting in air.
The men were fighting,
Through the rockets red glare.
Our flag stood there through the night.
It did not surrender the fight.

OUR FLAG
(By Freda Foster)

Brave soldiers fought and died
So our country could be free.
Freedom rang from nation wide,
Our truth will never die
The Flag which waved so proudly,
Was such a beautiful sight.
The brave soldiers who fought for their pride
Our truth and freedom will never die.

OUR FLAG
(By Valerie Grise)

Our flag goes back in history,
Which stands upon a staff.
When the winds blows it swings and sways,
To remind us it went through many tragic
days.
But it lasted through the war, just as we
For the land of the brave, and home of the
free.

THE AMERICAN FLAG
(By Susan Mikula)

A flag that's dressed in red, white and blue,
Means so much to me and so much to you,
With the fifty stars that shine so bright.
In the field of blue at night.
Beautiful red that stands for courage.
Lovely white that stands for purity.
Flying over Fort McHenry.
Our flag the red, white and blue.

THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER
(By Ricky Lazar)

Old Glory was waving over Fort McHenry,
Brave men were dying there.
Francis Scott Key looked as the
Star Spangled Banner still waved.
Over the land of the free and the home of
the brave.

OLD GLORY

(By Susan Mayer)

Our flag was standing in the mist,
How beautiful it was.
One dark night the flag was still there
That was the end of the fight.

THE STAR SPANGLED BANNER
(By Foster Dale)

The men were fighting
Key was on the boat.
The bombs were bursting
Yet, Key still wrote.
He wrote of the brave,
He wrote of the free,
While his flag did so wave
Through morning and eve.

THE AMERICAN FLAG
(By Leslie Kuntz)

As the American flag flies over the fort,
Let all freemen stand forever more.
Let the American flag fly year after year.
Yes, let our flag fly and wave.
It flies for liberty and freedom forever more.

OUR FLAG

(By Paula Steele)

Our flag is red, white and blue.
What does our flag mean to you?
Our flag flies high
Yes, up in the sky.
In the night our men did fight,
Yet our flag still proudly waved.

THE AMERICAN FLAG
(By Joseph Ziellinski)

The American flag is made up of red, white
and blue
It means something special to me and to
you.
It waves over schools and other places
It is looked at each morning by millions of
faces

OLD GLORY

(By Stephen Iskovitz)

Our flag was still there,
Waving high in the air.
Francis Scott Key knew we were fighting to
be free.
Francis Scott Key could just barely see,
That there Old Glory waved
That meant we were free and saved.

A VERY SPECIAL MAN

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, recently I learned of the death one of my constituents whose life was the measure of a very special man. Stanley A. Olson, chief photographer of the Jamestown, New York Post-Journal, died January 13, 1970, at the age of 60 of a disease which he was well aware could not be cured. Yet his attitude, even during the final months when the end was near, never changed. He remained cheerful and exercised the agile wit that marked him a truly courageous man.

Stanley Olson spent some 42 years in the newspaper business. During that time, his camera captured all the major happenings in the Jamestown area and here in Washington, D.C., where he covered presidential inaugural ceremonies.

Every national figure who set foot within the environs of Jamestown from Lucille Ball to President Nixon was caught by the lens of Stanley Olson's camera. For 15 years, he was a top award winner in the New York State Associated Press news photo contests. His subjects ranged from a sailing race on placid Chautauqua Lake to huddled passengers marooned at the airport terminal by a raging blizzard. They could not get out but Stanley Olson caught it with his camera.

Besides being a great newspaperman, he was a devoted husband and father. As a citizen of Jamestown all his life, he earned the respect of his fellow men through his tireless devotion to many civic causes. The Optimist Club was a special love of his. He served as its president and was a member of its board for 8 years, having a record of 19 years perfect attendance before his hospitalization.

I know the Members of this House will agree with me that greatness is not always measured by prominence in national headlines but in the day-to-day tasks of citizenship, love of family and friends, and devotion to one's work. These things Stanley Olson typified a hundred times over. It is my desire to extend my sincere sympathy to his widow, Ethel, and his two children, Judy and Ronald; and at the same time place in the RECORD two articles from the Post-Journal which tells so eloquently why Stanley Olson was held in such high regard by all.

The articles follow:

STANLEY A. OLSON, PERFECTIONIST

It is difficult to apply a newspaperman's professional yardstick in commenting upon the passing of Stanley A. Olson, our chief photographer, whose death was recorded Tuesday in the news columns. For Stan has been so much a vital and vibrant part of the Jamestown newspaper picture over so many years, dating back to the days of the former Jamestown Evening Journal, that accepting his untimely passing is extremely difficult.

In all things he did in life, whether in or out of the newspaper office, he was a perfectionist. He lived life to the fullest, gaining countless close friends and admirers as he cheerfully gave of his many and varied talents in his multiple civic associations.

Not even his terminal illness, with which he lived for several years, changed his attitude or philosophy of living. He accepted his fate and observed his own illness with clinical interest as he fought against the inevitable. He remained the devoted husband and father, the expert workman who remained at his post as long as physically able, and the cheerful friend and fellow worker in the face of adversity.

As the cycle of death, as inevitable as birth in man's brief passage from the cradle to the grave, leaves a saddened group of associates and close friends throughout the community, we should remember the gifts he gave us in our association and express our consolation and prayers for the bereaved family in this hour of great personal loss.

FORMER EDITOR OF P-J LAUDS STANLEY OLSON

Among tributes to Stanley A. Olson, Post-Journal chief photographer, whose death occurred Tuesday morning, is one from John A. Hall, former Post-Journal editor-in-chief, sent from his winter home in Naples, Fla. It reads as follows:

"My heart is broken by the death of Stanley Olson after the long suffering he endured with so much courage and a spirit that kept

him working in the profession he so deeply loved.

"No man ever gave greater friendship or loyalty or showed deeper devotion to his work of producing the finest pictures possible for his newspaper.

"His pictures won the highest honors in the industry and in the hearts and minds of the readers of *The Post-Journal*, but aside from that he had his whole heart in the taking of pictures that truly told the story of what was happening.

"Every holiday he depicted the spirit of the day, whether Christmas, Easter, or another, and his feature pictures brought joy and warmth to the hearts of our readers.

"It was a joy and pride to me to have been associated with him through practically all of both our professional careers. He was a true artist and a great craftsman, but, to top it all, he was a great person of the finest friendship, loyalty and devotion to his job.

"It is sad that he should be taken so early."

IMPROVED CLASS ACTION MACHINERY ESSENTIAL FOR EFFECTIVE PROTECTION OF THE CONSUMER

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, effective protection of the consumer requires improved machinery for the class action. My distinguished colleague and friend from Texas (Mr. ECKHARDT) delivered a cogent, informative address on the subject to the Consumer Federation of America January 15 in Washington.

I call your attention to the persuasive arguments he makes in behalf of H.R. 14585, a bill designed to give the wronged consumer recourse where he originally had none because of prohibitive legal costs. His address follows:

CONSUMER CLASS ACTIONS

(By Congressman BOB ECKHARDT)

Most of the great pillars of our legal system are procedural, not substantive—due process, equal protection, the right to be tried by one's peers. Just as these are the wheels on which judicial justice rides, there are similar wheels that keep the economy rolling with a degree of equity and fair play: The process of collective bargaining, commission controls, the technique of using yardsticks like TVA and REA.

I. NEED FOR ADEQUATE PROCESS FOR CONSUMER PROTECTION

But no such vehicle for justice, equity, and fair play exists for the consumer. Congress has the means of making one—one that is self-induced and self-propelling, not one that depends for its impetus upon the good motivations and energetic administration of a commission.

As is all too well known by those dealing with them, government agencies are not always energetic and prompt. Relief is often inadequate. Take, for instance, the Federal Trade Commission. It was created as an administrative agency to protect the consumer against unfair and deceptive trade practices. The Holland Furnace Company case illustrates the inadequacy of this protection.

In December 1936, the company agreed to a Federal Trade Commission consent order against certain misleading advertising claims and the proceedings dragged out through 1954. Not until 1958 was a cease and desist order issued. This prohibited Holland "from engaging in a sales scheme whereby its sales-

men gained access to homes by misrepresenting themselves as official inspectors and heating engineers. Having gained entry they then dismantled furnaces on the pretext that such was necessary to determine the extent of necessary repairs." Holland Furnace Company ignored the court decree enforcing the cease and desist order and was heavily fined for contempt of court in 1965.

If it thus takes 29 years for the consumer to get relief, there is something wrong with the governmental machinery that purports to afford such relief. I have come to have serious misgivings about the ordinary policing agencies' ability to protect the people. Administrative budgets and personnel are limited, and the agency, so to speak, stumbles over its own processes. Hurdles and barriers are written into agency laws by lobbyists for the industries controlled, and the possum is set to guard the chicken coop.

In trying to devise legislation that will work in the consumer field, I have kept these points in mind. Good legislation must envisage the existence of competing interests or of forces which are otherwise self motivated. And it must supply machinery, readily at hand, to accomplish the public purpose.

The public purpose may be the sharing of increased productivity and the furtherance of industrial justice—as in the Labor Act—or it may be the extension of the availability of electric power—as in the TVA and REA programs. Here it is the protection of consumers in the market place—the protection of one who deals occasionally with another who makes it a business to engage in that particular selling activity.

The diffuse interest of the purchaser engaging occasionally in the particular type of transaction does not measure up to the intense interest of the seller in making that transaction highly profitable when repeated thousands of times. The techniques used may include conditions or provisions that are illegal or unenforceable, but it is simply not practicable for the single purchaser to contest them.

For instance, a lodging place alters its room rate, in breach of the desk clerk's stated agreement with the lodger, by placing in effect some special rate for the Sugar Bowl season in New Orleans. The lodger must pay the rate or suffer the inconvenience of having to try to extricate his luggage by judicial process. The practice is one which can be perfected by the landlord over many Sugar Bowl seasons, but the customer confronts the problem perhaps once in a life time.

It is, in my opinion, not practical to try to delineate all the types of practices perpetrated against consumers which entail fraud, deception, overreaching, and vending such shoddy merchandise as to breach an implied warranty that the merchandise is suitable for its apparent use. Neither is it practical to establish at a federal level an entire new substantive law of deceit. And, as we have seen, dependency on governmental nursemaidling is likely to result in disillusionment.

I think it is better to rely on existing statutory and common law, and developing concepts of the duty of the seller to deal fairly in the marketplace—concepts which are developing in the courts in civil cases and in the Federal Trade Commission in proceedings there. Such development should be encouraged by federal procedural law like that contained in H.R. 14585.

Existing substantive law is, or is becoming, adequate to protect the consumer's interest in the marketplace. But the machinery of protection is not adequate. State procedural law is in most instances clumsy and antiquated.

As we have already intimated, the main reason why consumers cannot be properly protected under existing process is that their individual claims are too small and they cannot be aggregated in class actions in most instances and in most jurisdictions.

Deceptive advertising, usurious interest rates, overpriced drugs and food, and adulterated meat are all wrongs involving small amounts of money, many under \$200. Very few would be large enough so that a wronged consumer could effectively secure his rights through the law. The duped consumer is apt to have precious little money to support a test case to establish the rights of the many. The amount he may recover is not likely to pay the court deposit, let alone the lawyer's fee.

Few lawyers, other than the very young and very idealistic, are to be found who are anxious to endure time-consuming litigation for a \$50 fee. A \$200 judgment is not likely to be a powerful deterrent to the wrongdoer. The usury laws prove this. In a study conducted under the auspices of the University of Pennsylvania, it was concluded that "(t)he number of consumers having no redress because the amount lost is not commensurate with the attorney's fee constitute the vast majority." Small claims generally do not warrant individual litigation and the misbehaving corporations that bilk the consumer know it. "In many instances, fraudulent operations carefully avoid cheating individuals out of large sums of money because they realize that no one bilked out of fifty dollars is going to pay a lawyer to get his money back."

II. THE CONSUMER CLASS ACTION ACT

As we have indicated, state laws have gone a fair way to devise substantive provisions for consumer protection. And the State courts have hewed out, by common law process and statutory interpretation, a considerable body of consumer law. But the processes of the State courts do not afford effective means of permitting many persons who have bought from different agents of a given defendant, or from the same agent in different transactions, an opportunity to lump their claims together so as to have a large enough damage claim to finance the suit; the court costs involved, the lawyers' fees, and such notices as must be printed. Therefore, the Consumer Class Action Act, H.R. 14585, establishes Federal policy that this machinery shall be available through use of the Federal courts and their liberal procedure for joining many persons in class actions.

Section 4 contains the gravamen of the bill. It makes an "act in fraud of consumers which affects commerce" an unlawful act which will give rise to a civil action triable in the district courts of the United States. Such suits may be tried without regard to the amount in controversy. An "act in fraud of consumers" is defined as including two distinct things: An unfair or deceptive act or practice as the Federal Trade Commission Act condemns in Section 5(a)(1); and an act which gives rise to a civil action by a consumer or consumers under State statutory or decisional law for the benefit of consumers.

Such a suit in Federal court would apply the law of the States in exactly the same manner that the Federal courts apply such law in a diversity of citizenship cases. Thus, the court in any suit is dealing with a definite body of law in a manner in which it is accustomed to deal with such law. There is nothing unfamiliar in the act which would make it difficult for the court to proceed according to customary practices. For instance, the conflict-of-law law which ordinarily applied in diversity cases would establish the law applicable to any body of facts before the court.

It is very important, however, that these substantive offenses, initially spelled out in State law, be considered as Federal offenses triable in a Federal court and that the basis for jurisdiction be without respect to amount in controversy.

Of course, suits in Federal court on di-

versity of citizenship can presently be tried on the basis of State substantive law, just as suits under this act would be tried—with one exception: There is no requisite of jurisdiction based on jurisdictional amount in this act. This is important because in *Snyder v. Harris*, 89 S. Ct. 1053 (1969), it was held that claims of the individuals in the class action cannot be aggregated toward the \$10,000 minimum.

As is well known, cases come into the Federal court through two doors: First, diversity of citizenship with a \$10,000 jurisdictional amount; and second, Federal question jurisdiction.

In the latter type of case the jurisdictional requisite may apply but the statute involved itself may waive it. That is what is done here.

The Class Action Bill will allow consumers to achieve justice in federal court if state class action statutes are inadequate and too rigid to protect legal rights. Perhaps the most notable failure is in New York where the recent case of *Hall v. Coburn* has been litigated.

This case involved a consumer class action against a finance company which had allegedly violated the New York Retail Installment Sales Act by using contracts printed in less than 8-point type. The NAACP legal defense fund sought refund of the service charge, a statutory penalty, on behalf of all consumers who had signed small-type contracts prepared and repurchased by Coburn Corporation within the period of the statute of limitations. However, the action was dismissed on two grounds; first, aside from the request for identical damages caused by identical conduct, the class was not united in interest; and second, maintenance of the class action would deprive members of the class of other remedies which they might prefer to pursue against the defendant or against the merchants with whom they had dealt.

Neither of these grounds is compelling. The fact that identical damages are sought for identical conduct makes a case more suitable than unsuitable for class action treatment. Furthermore, class members' interest in pursuing other remedies can be preserved by limiting the scope of the judgment in a class action to the remedies that are actually sought. *Hall v. Coburn Corporation* is typical of state class action law. Similar unnecessarily restrictive state decisions can be found in such states as Mississippi, Massachusetts, Indiana, Ohio, Michigan, and Washington. Other states, like North Carolina and West Virginia, have too few reported cases to predict the viability of a consumer class action. In these jurisdictions the status of consumer class actions is, at best, uncertain.

In some states, the class action procedure is wholly adequate. I have, therefore, included a provision in my bill to prevent removal from the state court to the federal court by the defendant where the state forum has been chosen. It provides:

"This section shall not be deemed to prohibit a plaintiff from choosing a State forum without the case being subject to removal on grounds of federal question jurisdiction under Title 28, Section 1441, United States Code."

The election given to the plaintiff to proceed in either the state or federal court is just what is done with respect to *in personam* maritime claims in the "savings clause" of 28 U.S.C. Section 1333. Removal under Section 1441 is not a constitutionally compelled but a prudential disposition, subject to whatever qualification Congress may dictate.

This bill provides that injured consumers may bring class actions in the district courts of the United States under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including Federal Rule 23, the most modern class action procedure in the United States. These class actions would

be available in transactions affecting interstate commerce where violations of state or federal consumer protection law have occurred.

The proposed law dispenses with jurisdictional amount and diversity of citizenship for purposes of class actions.

Let us examine some of the implications and provisions in detail.

III. PRESIDENT'S CONSUMER BILL IS ILL-CONCEIVED

Several months after my bill was introduced, the President endorsed generally the concept of class actions and subsequently introduced his own legislation, H.R. 14931 and S. 3201. I submit, the Nixon bill is itself unfair and deceptive to the public. In theory it purports to establish a buyer's bill of rights. In fact, it attempts to sell to the buyer a bill of goods. It lulls the public into thinking they will be protected. Let us examine what is, in fact, done:

Under the Nixon approach, no action may be brought by an individual or a class until the government has successfully terminated its own lawsuit. There is no precedent in the annals of Federal legislation for this. The Government would decide which private rights are to be enforced. The Attorney General and FTC stand, as it were, like a traffic policeman, giving the green signal to one group of would-be litigants and the red signal to others.

There is, it seems to me, a serious constitutional question here involving procedural due process. Can Government establish that certain acts are prohibited and that their commission may result in civil liability but then afford a remedy only to those injured by that wrongful act which the Government chooses to single out?

It would seem that all consumers affected by the proscribed activity of fraud, deceit or overreaching would constitute a class of persons whose rights under the law have been invaded. But the violation of the right of any one of them gives rise to a remedy subject to the discretionary action of the Department of Justice in bringing a governmental action against the offender.

For instance, suppose Montgomery Ward and Sears Roebuck both manufacture chain saws whose lubrication systems are so defective that the links wear out and the chains fall apart at a time far short of the warranty. By selling the saws under such warranties, exactly the same breach of duty has been committed against the purchasers of both companies. But the Attorney General chooses to sue only Sears Roebuck. The Attorney General, under the Act, can thus choose which potential civil litigants, whose rights have been invaded, shall have a remedy.

If this is not actually unconstitutional, it is a policy which is most reprehensible, one which is conducive to official corruption.

The hypothesis assumes a defective lubrication system and a violation of law. But in any actual case this question cannot be determined until after trial. Suppose the allegations upon which a case must rest cannot be sustained in either the case of Montgomery Ward or Sears Roebuck. The bringing of the case against Sears Roebuck opens up a flood of expensive private, civil litigation against that firm, with attendant bad publicity, but insulates Montgomery Ward. Such a provision of law would invite politics and graft in the governmental process.

The same situation does not exist in the case of the antitrust laws. There a federal civil antitrust action does not have to await a criminal action.

The process provided under the Nixon approach is further defective in that inherent in it are the same defects that presently exist in dependence upon the FTC as the

consumer's watchdog. It merely utilized the Justice Department in the same general way that present law utilizes the Trade Commission. Of the two the Commission is better staffed and better versed in the subject matter than the Department.

The Federal Trade Commission receives 9,000 complaints a year. They are able to investigate only one out of eight or nine of those complaints. Of the 10% or so that are investigated, not even one in ten results in a cease and desist order. To make that kind of record, the FTC has 1,300 people, including 500 lawyers and a \$14 million budget.

The Administration proposes to allow the Justice Department to receive complaints, investigate each one of them, and then decide whether to bring suit.

It may be argued that the existing attorneys can do the job of investigating and bringing suit. Yet one need only examine the record from the Hearings before the Committee on Appropriations for the Justice Department to see how the Department of Justice is already overburdened.

As John Mitchell has himself said "We are convinced, however, that a substantial increase in manpower is absolutely necessary to deal with the magnitude of the problem and the additional manpower can be effectively deployed along the lines indicated." The Solicitor General, Erwin Griswold, said, "A year ago I was overwhelmed with work; yes, I still am." His department is typical yet the Administration proposes additional workloads on an already understaffed department. The consumer will pay the price.

The Justice Department, if we are to be realistic, will have to establish priorities. They will have to decide what they consider important or unimportant. The priorities of the Justice Department may not always coincide with those of the victimized consumer.

The small consumers stand to benefit least from this provision. Poor, uneducated, and somewhat skeptical of the Government to begin with, he probably will have little success in convincing an agent of the Federal Government by letter or in person that he has a valid case. If the small consumer cannot get the Department of Justice to seek relief for him, he is left with very little means of help under the Nixon approach.

The only way that some may get action may be to hire a lawyer to represent them before the Department of Justice. Thus, a consumer may, in effect, have to press his case twice: once before the Justice Department or the FTC and then again, if he is lucky, before the court.

But who is most likely to be able to hire a lawyer to press his case with the Justice Department:

(1) A competing seller who would like to open the gate to civil litigation against his competitor, or

(2) Any seller who would like to keep the gate closed to litigation against him?

The consumer himself is the last person likely to be represented by counsel before the Department of Justice—and is, I submit, the last person likely to get justice. This proposition is not altogether unprecedented.

The Government has hesitated in the past to protect the small man's rights: Antipollution violations and civil rights violations are recent examples. The people best able to protect the rights of the consumer are the consumers themselves. The Government can help but it should not be able to prohibit. That is why our bill allows class actions directly without Government interference.

The potential of delay, though, remains the greatest drawback in the Administration approach. The complaint must come in, be considered, investigated, sent up for further action, and then prosecution may result, just as in the case of the FTC. All of this takes

time. In a case before the FTC involving the Crawford Corporation and interlocking directorates in the prefabricated housing industry, the case was dropped on April 4, 1969, when it was discovered that the Defendant had withdrawn from the prefabricated housing business in the early months of 1964, five years earlier.

On April 4, 1962, the FTC field office in Chicago began to investigate the Vollrath Company of Sheboygan, Wisconsin for "making false savings claims and misrepresentations about the construction, efficacy, and other features of stainless steel cookware." Four years later, the case was given to the Bureau of Deceptive Practices for prosecution. Another year passed before a hearing examiner made the initial decision in the case and still another year before the Commission made its final decision. The time lapse from investigation to decision was six years.

In the Federal Trade Commission the average time lapse is four years with two years of investigation and two years of prosecution in the central office. Until the end of that period, there is no halt upon the activities of the company. The Justice Department, with far less resources than the FTC devoted to consumer affairs, cannot hope to even achieve that degree of promptness.

IV. RECONCILIATION OF APPROACHES AND CONCLUSION

The Consumer Class Action Act would allow a group or class of consumers to sue the defendant directly. This approach needs no government subsidies to pay for it. It needs no department to administer it. In contrast, the Administration bill not only will require lawyers, investigators, and economists all paid for by the Government, but it will require two lawsuits where one is sufficient. The federal courts are already overburdened and it makes little sense to have the Government institute one lawsuit and then the individual litigate the same matter in a different suit later.

Some reconciliations as between the two approaches are, however, quite possible and, I think, desirable. The framework of legislation recommended in the President's consumer report could be implemented by legislation in section 4 of H.R. 14585. There, the first type of "act in fraud of consumers" is defined as "an unfair or deceptive act or practice which is unlawful within the meaning of section 5(a)(1) of the Federal Trade Commission Act." We would invite the use of this as a legislative vehicle to provide private citizen's rights to bring action in a Federal court to recover damages as a result of the several specific fraudulent or deceptive activities which we understand the Justice Department to be framing. In this section of the bill it may be conceded, arguing, that there is merit to the President's rationale expressed in the consumer message:

The legislation I will propose will be of sufficient scope to provide substantial protection to consumers and of sufficient specificity to give the necessary advance notice to businessmen of the activities to be considered illegal.

Yet, under our approach, we have defined "unfair or deceptive practice" as any act or practice which is unlawful within the meaning of section 5(a)(1) of the Federal Trade Commission Act. There is an existing body of law compiled over a 55-year period, consisting of thousands of Commission decisions, which defines these terms. In addition, over 800 court opinions have been rendered which interpret the act. With this backlog of court and agency interpretation, there is considerable guidance available for interpreting "unfair and deceptive."

The eleven specific acts of the Administration bill cannot call upon this vast body

of common law for interpretation. It further cannot reach all of the practices which our broader definition would reach. Collection practices, chain referrals, free gimmick transactions, and usurious credit terms are just some of the practices that will not be covered.

In conclusion, H.R. 14585 affords an extremely practical and effective way of establishing a strong body of consumer law. It acts pragmatically under existing law, permitting a common law approach for remedying and curbing overreaching in the marketplace. It does not attempt to anticipate in exquisite detail every fraud or act of overreaching which might give rise to a consumer class action. But since it adopts State law as Federal law, it gains all of the specificity of existing statutory and common law applicable to the facts: The businessman has notice of what activities are to be considered illegal in exactly the same manner that he has such notice in a case which is in Federal court on the basis of diversity of citizenship.

It is the sponsors' hope that this bill will afford an opportunity, on a nonpartisan basis, for Congress to give the consumer what he has long needed—a fair break in his day-to-day dealings in the marketplace. It is not only the consumer that needs the assurance of the fairness of the marketplace but also the vast majority of merchants who do deal fairly. The good reputation of the marketplace is essential to a healthy free competitive economy.

JUDGE G. HARROLD CARSWELL

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today I testified before the Senate Judiciary Committee in opposition to the appointment of Judge G. Harrold Carswell to serve on the Supreme Court. I include my remarks at this point in the RECORD for the benefit of my colleagues. I also include the full text of Judge Carswell's 1948 campaign speech which I inserted into the record of the committee proceedings. In addition, I place into the RECORD the text of a letter a group of my colleagues and I today sent Senator EASTLAND in regard to Judge Carswell's nomination.

The items follow:

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE JOHN CONYERS, JR., BEFORE THE SENATE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE, FEBRUARY 2, 1970

In coming before this committee to speak against the appointment of Judge Carswell to the Supreme Court, I reflect the considered judgment of my eight other black colleagues who serve in the House of Representatives. They are Shirley Chisholm, New York; William Dawson, Illinois; Adam Clayton Powell, New York; Charles C. Diggs, Michigan; Robert N. C. Nix, Pennsylvania; Augustus Hawkins, California; William Clay, Missouri; and Louis Stokes, Ohio. Our opposition to this nominee is total. Make no mistake about it. As a matter of fact, this is a more unified support against Judge Carswell than there was against Judge Clement Haynsworth. The presentation that I make before you today, however, is my own.

If our argumentation against this nominee and the one before him could be heard and understood by the President of the United States, then perhaps you could be spared

these continued appearances. I am here again to prevail upon you to establish the basic principle that any person of a racist or segregationist persuasion is per se unqualified to serve on the United States Supreme Court. I grant you that this is to some in the Congress a new and strange point of view. There are those who may even consider it un-American—especially when a racist persuasion does not exclude one from either of the other two branches of the federal government. But, we must begin somewhere, must we not?

As is the case so frequently in American politics this daring suggestion is really not as revolutionary as it first sounds but is more a matter of practicing what we preach. It is a matter of putting into effect the lofty platitudes that everyone agrees upon. On August 8, 1968, when he was accepting the Republican nomination to be President, Richard Nixon said:

"Let those who have the responsibility to enforce our laws, and our judges who have the responsibility to interpret them be dedicated to the great principles of civil rights."

I urge that the Senate insist that the President keep his pledge. This is why I urge you to reject the nomination of Judge Carswell to serve on the United States Supreme Court.

To black Americans and their leaders and to the millions of whites who are dedicated participants in the struggle for freedom, this nomination is the second in a series of attempts to subvert the cause of equal justice. What is more, this strategy is becoming clearer to more citizens each day. No amount of obfuscation that may take place during these hearings will change that. How can we come here today and seriously argue that Judge Carswell's unquestionable racist philosophy has changed now that he has been nominated to the Supreme Court? It is hardly sufficient to suggest that this appointment will do him a world of good. In the meantime, it will do the nation a world of harm. We should not have to take that risk. There are 320,250 attorneys, 439 federal judges, and thousands of state court judges in the United States. Why does President Nixon have to nominate someone with a racist background?

You have before this body for consideration a nominee whose record as a judge leaves in my mind no doubt of his inability to sit on the highest court of the land and fairly decide issues that bear upon the question of equality between the races.

Secondly, we have a man who, as a mature leader of this community committed himself to that perverse, sick theory—white supremacy. This theory of racism has created more dissension, ill will and hatred than any other notion in the 194 years of our nation's history. And some would still attempt to rationalize Mr. Carswell's attachment to this contemptible doctrine. How can we put a man on the highest bench who has said, and I quote:

"I am a Southerner by ancestry, birth, training, inclination, belief and practice. I believe that segregation of the races is proper and the only practical and correct way of life in our states. I have always so believed, and I shall always so act. I shall be the last to submit to any attempt on the part of anyone to break down and to weaken this firmly established policy of our people."

"If my own brother were to advocate such a program, I would be compelled to take issue with and to oppose him to the limits of my ability."

"I yield to no man as a fellow candidate, or as a fellow citizen, in the firm, vigorous belief in the principles of white supremacy, and I shall always be so governed."

Thirdly, while a member of the Justice Department, he participated as a director in changing a public golf course to a private

facility for the express purpose of excluding blacks in opposition to court decisions and then denied his activity until he was exposed.

Through 1967, of the four civil rights cases that were decided by Judge Carswell and subsequently appealed to the Circuit Court, four were reversed. In addition, Senator William Proxmire has pointed out:

"Perhaps an even more disturbing phenomenon, however, because it goes beyond interpreting the law, has been Judge Carswell's habit of delaying civil rights litigation as long as possible. For example in Steele against Leon County Board of Education, a school desegregation case, plaintiff led a motion for further relief on May 7, 1964. On May 28, Judge Carswell sustained defendant's objections to the raising of questions looking into teacher segregation. No further hearings were ordered before school opened. On January 20, 1965, the school was found to be in compliance with certain 1963 orders. In February of 1965, plaintiffs filed a further motion for hearings. After a series of legal maneuverings the court reaffirmed a denial of plaintiff's motion for further relief. Finally, on January 18, 1967, the circuit court remanded the case for further consideration in light of its decision in U.S. against Jefferson County Board of Education—tantamount to a reversal. Finally, after almost three years, the Carswell court granted the relief sought. This dilatory behavior in civil rights cases, where justice delayed is certainly justice denied—in this instances for 3 school years—casts serious doubt upon Judge Carswell's judicial temperament.

"In a study done as a Yale Ph.D. dissertation in 1966 by Mary Hannah Curzan, Judge Carswell was found to be one of a group of 10 southern judges whose civil rights decisions merited them the segregationist label. This label was applied, by the way, to only one-third of the southern judges whose civil rights decisions were analyzed."

In a recent interview (N.Y. Times, Jan. 21, 1970), Professor Leroy D. Clark, New York University, who formerly headed the operations of the NAACP Legal Defense Fund in Northern Florida, claimed Judge Carswell "had repeatedly delayed school cases by failing to rule until pressed to do so, and then by often issuing decisions that were palpably wrong and quickly reversed." We would have a hearing and it would take several months for him to rule, Mr. Clark said. I would have to file a motion to ask him "would you please rule?"—which is outrageous." Mr. Clark is also quoted by *Time* magazine as saying that "he was probably the most hostile judge I have ever appeared before; he would rarely let me finish a sentence."

Professor John Lowenthal, a Rutgers University law professor has already testified before your Committee as to the procedural tactics of Judge Carswell in 1964 in a case against civil rights workers trying to help enroll black voters in Florida. Prof. Lowenthal said he found Carswell's behavior consistent with his commitment to white supremacy.

Mr. William Kunstler, a prominent civil rights and civil liberties lawyer, has also expressed to me his intentions to testify before this Committee concerning his own shocking experiences as a trial lawyer in Judge Carswell's court.

To any serious member of the bar, an appointment to the Supreme Court is the highest recognition that can be achieved. In the instant case of the present nominee, there can be found no trace of judicial distinction or scholarship. From his own admission he has never written any legal articles or other papers. Such considerations were apparently irrelevant in President Nixon's search for the right political man, James A. Wechsler has raised the question:

"Was this the worthiest prospect available—even granting the premise that the seat was being reserved for a Southern conservative? The conclusion is an insult to the very

breed of man Carswell is supposed to represent—and which has produced judges widely esteemed for their learning in the law. Such an appointment invites contempt for the nation's highest court. Disrespect for law—and those who practice it—is further heightened when the American Bar Assn. places its seal of approval on so shabby a political product."

As we said on September 24 before this Committee the confirmation of such a nominee would serve notice that our government intends to block off the few avenues that are now available for legal attack on the bastions of racism in our country. For it is the Supreme Court which has given black people a certain measure of faith in the slow moving and creaky legal machinery with which we are afflicted. To impair the Court's ability to deal with racism is to impose strains on the fabric of a society beyond its limits.

We urge you to reject the nomination of Judge Carswell. His appointment would hardly be consistent with the Constitution's uncompromising hostility to segregation and inequality. It would unequivocally tell black people that the one significant route for peaceful resolution of society's racial injustices, now open to them, is gradually being phased out.

In this Nation today, we face more than a credibility gap. Amidst all the rhetoric, the people of our country feel a profound lack of faith in the institutions of American government and their ability to fulfill their charged responsibilities. Therefore, it is incumbent that the United States Senate insist on the appointment to the Supreme Court only of individuals of the highest standard, men who clearly will measure up to the awesome responsibilities and duties of membership on that Court. This should be decided only on the basis of distinctive achievement and a demonstrated record of fidelity the principles of equality inherent in the Constitution. We submit that in the nomination of Judge G. Harrold Carswell this has not been so demonstrated. In our judgment, Judge Carswell is unqualified to sit on the Supreme Court and we urge that you reject his nomination.

[From the New York Times, Jan. 23, 1970]

EXCERPTS FROM CARSWELL TALK

(NOTE.—Following are excerpts from a speech by G. Harrold Carswell that appeared in *The Irwinton Bulletin* on Aug. 13, 1948; Judge Carswell's statement to the Columbia Broadcasting System Wednesday night, and a statement by Attorney General John N. Mitchell.)

CARSWELL'S 1948 SPEECH

I am happy to be a guest of the great patriotic organization, the American Legion. I'd like to discuss with you briefly some of the significant issues in our affairs in 1948.

Those of us who participated in the recent world struggle for existence remember only too well the years shortly before that fateful Sunday in December, 1941, when our nation was plunged into the caldrons of war. We remember Pearl Harbor. And we remember that there were those in our own land who even at that moment were calling for a reduction in armaments, for a general termed "this silly war talk." There were those who said "Oh, this is a European matter, those people over there are always scrapping about their boundary or something or other. Let them have it out alone." Some could not hide their open admiration for Hitler's bold and successful demands upon his smaller neighbors.

There were those who said, in the words of the late and beloved Will Rogers, "Good old Atlantic, good old Pacific." They tried to lull this nation into a sense of false security. They were blasted forever into the camp of the misguided and the mistaken on that December morn when the good old Pacific

turned into a sea of flame and the good old Atlantic suddenly swarmed with underwater vessels of destruction.

BROTHER UNDER THE SKIN

Yes, we all know now that they were wrong. But the saddest and most ironic part of it all is that there are those in our land today, this very hour, who would start this nation on a downward spiral into weakness and defeat by the very same methods. The defeatist and the isolationist of 1941 is a brother under the skin of the Communist front party of Henry the Treacherous Wallace today, who plays Stalin.

Some said the same thing about Hitler in 1941.

Those of us who lost members of our family in the service, those who have been fortunate enough to return home without mishap, will never willingly and of our own accord foment any situation which would lead to war. But by the eternal stars in the folds of Old Glory, we shall not ever sit idly by while the sneaking and persistent efforts of the Communist snake slithers its way into the vitals of our nation. Our answer to them is and will always be, "Keep your hands out of the American Eagle's nest."

The American Legion has long been noted for its advocacy of a strong, prepared ready America. We must not go weak in the knees.

In the midst of all this, we look to the land of the U.S., great, prosperous, the richest and most powerful nation on earth, and ask, "America, are you ready to resume your leadership? Are you prepared to defend if need be your birthright?" It is a sad picture.

Foremost among the raging controversies in America today is the great crisis over the so-called Civil Rights Program. Better be called, "Civil-Wrongs Program."

Any attempts to regulate the internal affairs of a state is an open abrogation of state's rights as provided by the 10th Amendment. These amendments disclosed a widespread fear that the Federal Government might (under the pressure of proposed general welfare) attempt to exercise powers that had not been granted to it.

"Civil Wrongs Program," is just such an attempt.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in 1823, "I believe that the states can best govern over home affairs and the Federal Government over foreign ones. I wish, therefore, to see maintained the wholesome distribution of powers established by the Constitution for the limitation of both and never to see all offices transferred to Washington."

The statement by one who actively participated in the drawing of the Constitution shows that the original framers never intended for the Federal Government to control every phase of American life.

FEDERALIZATION ATTEMPT

By this "Civil Wrongs Program" the Federal Government is asked to go beyond its constitutional powers and usurp the powers of the individual states. This attempt to control the internal affairs of a state is an attempt to complete the federalization of American life. It is an attempt to provide more power to the Federal Government and unbalance the check and balance system.

It doesn't take too much imagination to realize the ultimate outcome of having all power in Washington.

The South has proved it can manage its own affairs. We who live here are the judges. This is a political football, obvious on its face as an attempt to corral the bloc voting of Harlem.

As part and parcel of this same rotten vote-getting scheme, the F.E.P.C., the so-called Fair Employment Practices Committee, is a sham. Every businessman should realize the serious implications of such a piece of preposterous legislation. It would mean that here in Gordon, if we are hiring two telephone operators, both white, and some Negro girl applies for the job, we may get in court

with the Federal Government because we have supposedly "discriminated." It would take thousands of Federal agents to enforce such foolish measures and we shall not tolerate it.

I am a Southerner by ancestry, birth, training, inclination, belief and practice. I believe that segregation of the races is proper and the only practical and correct way of life in our states. I have always so believed and I shall always so act. I shall be the last to submit to any attempt on the part of anyone to break down and to weaken this firmly established policy of our people.

If my own brother were to advocate such a program, I would be compelled to take issue with and to oppose him to the limits of my ability.

I yield to no man as a fellow candidate, of as a fellow citizen, in the firm, vigorous belief in the principles of white supremacy, and I shall always be so governed.

FEBRUARY 2, 1970.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, New
Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EASTLAND: As the legal and political background of Judge G. Harrold Carswell has been publicly scrutinized, it has become increasingly obvious that he has neither the legal credentials nor the jurisprudential qualifications to meet the exacting standards of excellence rightly demanded of Supreme Court nominees. At a time of great stress on all our democratic institutions of government, we cannot afford to choose a man of less than the highest legal qualifications with a demonstrable sensitivity to critical problems facing our society today. The man considered by the Senate this month will, if confirmed, have a profound effect on the direction of Supreme Court decision-making for years to come. We feel that Judge Carswell's mediocre legal background and public statements make it impossible for us to remain silent about his nomination.

Despite his propitious disclaimer of his 1948 statement in support of segregation, his actions since then, both on and off the bench, do not lend credibility to the reputation.

In 1956 we find that while a U.S. attorney, he joined others in Tallahassee, Florida in incorporating a public golf course as a private club to escape the mandate of the Court he now seeks to join.

While a District Judge for the Northern District of Florida, three out of four civil rights cases decided by him were reversed.

In *Steele vs. Leon County Board of Education*, a school desegregation case, it took from 1965 to 1967, three years of delays and denials, to grant the relief sought.

In testimony before your Committee, Professor John Lowenthal of Rutgers University testified that Judge Carswell took unusual steps to block efforts of those seeking to help enroll black voters in Florida.

Only six months ago was he nominated to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals. At that time the Leadership Conference on Civil Rights opposed his appointment on the ground that he had as a District Judge been peculiarly hostile to the civil rights of Negroes. An examination of the civil rights cases tried by Judge Carswell, in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Florida, from 1958-67 bears that testimony out.

The challenge of racism in a democratic society is the most fundamental challenge we face domestically. Both study and sad experience have affirmed that the division between the black and white threatens the very fabric of our nation. If legal processes are not able to bring redress of grievances and equal opportunity to all citizens, then increasing conflict and violence will be an inevitable

result. The Supreme Court has been a fundamental force in maintaining a belief in legal process as an agent of change. It is the Supreme Court which affords citizens ultimate redress of grievance and it is to the Court that many responsible citizens look for guidance.

To consent to the nomination of a man to that Court who has a record of regressive decisions in the most critical area of contemporary law and who in addition has a very mediocre background as a jurist, is an affront not only to blacks, but to all Americans.

Judge Carswell has never published in legal journals, has been a member of the Circuit Court only six months and even a previous supporter of Judge Haynsworth, Professor William Van Alstyne of Duke University Law School, does not believe that Judge Carswell is qualified to be appointed to the Court.

We urge the Senate Judiciary Committee to minutely scrutinize his qualifications, his judicial decisions, and his judicial temperament. On the basis of what has been made public of Judge Carswell's background and racial attitudes, we believe he does not meet the high standards for a Supreme Court Justice and we oppose his confirmation.

We request that this letter be included in the record of the hearings.

GEORGE BROWN, JR.,
PHILLIP BURTON,
JOHN CONYERS, JR.,
DON EDWARDS,
DONALD M. FRASER,
ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER,
ARNER J. MIKVA,
BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL,
WILLIAM F. RYAN,
Members of Congress.

POLLUTING THE TELEVISION AIRWAVES

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

MR. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, if Vice President AGNEW did nothing else in his recent speeches, he was done a great service in arousing the "silent majority" to speak up. At long last, the silent majority are letting their views be known.

I do not believe in censorship of the news but I am inclined to agree with one of my constituents who has written an eloquent letter about the repulsive programs that are polluting the television airwaves.

His letter, which I now submit for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, says better than I could the viewpoint of many who watch television.

I believe that the television industry should do something or it may be necessary for the Federal Communications Commission to do something.

The letter follows:

HON. JOE SKUBITZ,
U.S. House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SKUBITZ: I am writing and pleading, in the interest of the preservation of respect and decency in the American home.

I just turned on my TV a few minutes ago, only to be introduced to one of the most repulsive and obnoxious programs (Laugh In) that ever traveled the air waves. I was greeted, along with perhaps, millions of oth-

ers, to the most filthy, repulsive and repugnant torsal gyrations complete with nasty belly buttons, buttocks, psychedelic lights, and all.

Now, I am an old sailor and not beyond such filth but I don't propose to sit idly by and let such filth be "piped" into my living room. If I want to degenerate to a level lower than the lowest animals, I'll slip down to the red light district or burlesque. If I can't find the "cultural" or "social" pornography there, I'll go to the local respectable theater uptown. There, I'll find a main feature on "how to do it" or if it happens to a Disney film, the previews of attractions yet to come, before and after the "G" rated film will "satisfy" my animalistic natural desires, and how to make love in the raw.

How long is the "silent majority" going to tolerate these cheap, mercenary "artists" and filth peddlers that grind out such trash because of their inability to produce really good, wholesome programs?

We are all "shook up" about our environmental pollution. It is time we start cleaning up our polluted air waves, too.

As one of your constituents, speaking for myself and family, I am looking to you as my elected representative, to give this matter some serious consideration.

BRITAIN IS GOING METRIC

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

MR. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, in 1968 the Congress enacted the Metric Study Act which authorized the Secretary of Commerce to make a study to determine the advantages and disadvantages of increased use of the metric system in the United States. During the hearings before the Committee on Science and Astronautics concerning this matter one conclusion became very evident, and that was the lack of knowledge and understanding of the system of weights and measures known as the metric system, and the problems associated therewith in the event of change. Despite the fact that the system has been legal in the United States since 1866 very few industries have taken advantage of this law to use the system, primarily because of the failure to fully appreciate the problems in connection with such a conversion.

In May 1965 the British Government announced a conversion to the metric system. On January 29, 1970 it was my pleasure to be present at a meeting here in the United States and hear a talk by the Lord-Ritchie-Calder of Balmashanar, chairman of the United Kingdom metrication board. His remarks are very timely, I believe, for they give an up-to-date report on progress being made in the United Kingdom. I was particularly impressed by the description of the step-by-step procedure that the British are using in their conversion. The description of the procedural problems in each industry is a valuable insight into the solution of a national problem of this magnitude. I am sure you will find Lord Ritchie-Calder's remarks very interesting.

The item follows:

BRITAIN IS GOING METRIC
(By The Lord Ritchie-Calder)

The word-merchants of the Oxford English Dictionary were asked to rule on what the term for going over to the metric system should be. They said that it should be "metrification". But the Board of which I am chairman is the Metrication Board. In Britain there is no "if" about going metric. By 1975, we shall have achieved what 200 years ago—July 1790—Jefferson proposed for the new United States—a rational system of measurement. It would have been sensible for the first country to adopt decimal currency (three years ahead of France) in 1792 to have cleared out the lumber-room of left-over measurements at the same time.

It has always struck me as ironical that Quincy Adams, who was personally convinced of the virtues of the metric system, should as Secretary of State in 1821 have advised Congress not to adopt it "because it would be hazardous to deviate from the practice of Great Britain". I say "ironical" because the excuse of British industrialists dragging their feet a century later was that they did not want to deviate from the practice of their biggest customer, the United States. Now that over 53 percent of British trade is with metric countries and that over 90 percent of the peoples of the world have adopted the metric system or are in the process of going over to it, the British industrialists are the pace-makers for conversion. There are still some firms who are a bit nervous about getting out of step with America, but we are over the hill and there is no turning back.

I find the loyalty of the United States to old imperial system rather touching, especially in the Space Age when the calculations and instrumentation needed to get men to the moon are in the scientific number-language of metric. (I should love to see the computer calculating the number of barleycorns to the moon and back. As you no doubt know the foot was standardized all those centuries ago as "thirty-six barleycorns taken from the middle of the ear".) But the astronauts when they come back to earth splash down in so many fathoms—and the fathom is the length of a Viking's embrace—and so many yards from point zero. The yard, of course, was the distance from the tip of the nose to the outstretched finger of King Edgar, the Anglo-Saxon king a thousand years ago. The astronauts have been gathered up and carried off into quarantine to be debugged, decontaminated, debriefed and demetricated so that they can step out into a pound-foot-gallon country.

As the dentist says "It won't hurt a bit". We are finding that going metric is almost painless—apart from a few twinges when the nerve of sentimentality is touched and we drool over our pint. Learning metric is simple. It is unlearning imperial that is difficult. And that is where our younger generation is lucky.

The children who entered primary school in Britain in 1969 will be taught a much simpler system than their forerunners and will emerge thinking metric, to follow their careers in the professions, in factories, on farms, in transport, in construction, and in commerce, all of which will have gone metric to the extent that imperial units will have no more than lingering value, like the spare parts of vintage cars. That generation will have the advantage over their elders of not having to unlearn imperial, which is one of the penalties of the transition which older generations will have to face.

Confidence must not be misread as complacency. We know only too well the difficulties that lie ahead. The Board came into existence only in the middle of 1969, but it inherited the results of many years' effort

by many organizations and of the initiatives taken by Government departments, industrial enterprises and individual firms. From the surveys we have made, consultations we have held and reports received by the Board's committees and staff, a pattern has emerged which is encouraging. A task which might have appeared formidable in its total complexity seems less so once it is broken down and considered as a sum of its parts.

The contemporary phase of British metrication can be dated from the report of The Committee on Weights and Measures Legislation (Hodgson Committee) set up by the President of the Board of Trade which reported in 1950. The Committee resolved the perennial debate by coming down on the side of metric as "a better system of weights and measures than imperial" and recommending that the Government "should take steps, in concert with the Commonwealth and the USA, in favour of the complete adoption of the metric system over a period of about twenty years." In 1965, the Federation of British Industry wrote to Ministers formally stating that the large majority of its members was in favour of the metric system. This was endorsed by the Government and the F.B.I.'s successor-organization, the Confederation of British Industry, has energetically promoted the change-over. We have been the beneficiary of those efforts.

The British Standards Institution has had, and will continue to have, a crucial role. Metrication is meaningless for industry unless it is embodied in codes of industrial standards, acceptable in Britain and, so far as possible, abroad. The B.S.I. is a typically British partnership between Government and business subscribers embodying, like metrication policy, a national programme and the voluntary principle. The B.S.I. having actively promoted metrication, put in hand a systematic examination and revision of over 4,000 standards so that the pace of change throughout the economy would not be impeded by lack of essential metric materials and components. At the same time, the Institution prepared and published, in consultation with interests concerned, agreed metrication timetables for four major industries. Those timetables, in turn, were dependent on the production of B.S.I. metric standards by which they could become operable.

The Royal Society, in the tradition of British science, took a leading role even when "imperial" was paramount in promoting an internationally coherent system, consistent with scientific precision. It held two conferences on metrication in schools and later published booklets embodying the recommendations and conclusions. In advance of the creation of the Metrication Board, this influential initiative led to a series of decisions that examinations in universities, colleges of higher education, technical colleges and professional institutions should henceforth progressively be set in metric.

Government departments, by requiring metric specifications in publicly financed projects and in direct contracts, are decisively influencing the progress of going metric. They can, as the Ministry of Public Building and Works and the Scottish Office have done, issue instructional memoranda and guides to metrication to their own staffs and to the agents and suppliers.

In the nationalized industry sector, substantial progress has been made in planning the change. The Central Electricity Generating Board, for example, has published its programme for the change-over, issued a comprehensive metric manual, and organized training programmes in conjunction with the Electricity Supply Industry Training Board. The construction industry, with an order-

book of \$11.2 billion a year, and involving over 1 million operatives and 80,000 contracting firms, many of them small and most of them dependent on casual labor, might have seemed an intractable problem. Through the initiative of the leaders of the industry and the positive metric policy of the Ministry of Public Building and Works, the construction industry has become a pace-maker in metrication. To assist on-side labor the Construction Industry Training Board produced a substantial range of programme information and of training material.

Many Trade Associations, on their own volition, made plans and began the change-over before the Board came into existence. Their valuable work is described in some detail in this report.

Productivity Councils have prepared the ground. Chambers of Commerce in all parts of the country have promoted discussion. One of the gratifying discoveries of the Board was to find how matter-of-factly metrication had been examined by the farming organizations, without serious misgivings.

The pharmaceutical industry and the pharmacists who began planning as far back as 1945, had changed over to the use of metric units by March 1969. Without any fuss or bother, the traditional grains and scruples disappeared. This is an excellent example of the metric go-between. The industry by its packaging and the dispenser handling the prescriptions could make the conversion with no trouble to the medical profession or to the public. The ease with which the change has been made is a reflection of the wisdom and thoroughness of the planning which preceded it. To the general public it just appeared to happen.

The Board is charged with seeing that the change-over shall proceed as briskly and as smoothly as possible. It is, however, important to say what the Board is not. We are not an executive body, nor do we have statutory nor mandatory powers. We do not dictate to the industrial and non-industrial sectors how they shall plan the change-over, nor do we make decisions about the units of the metric system to be adopted. Our task is to consult, to advise, to inform, to stimulate and to coordinate. In short, we are required to give coherence to the whole process, reassuring and supporting those sectors of the economy which are showing initiative in going metric, and encouraging those which are still hesitant and over-cautious. We can have a panoramic view of the whole economy which the sectors and individual enterprises themselves have not got. We can present a comprehensive picture of dispositions and events. We can establish lines of communications. We can prod the laggards. This includes not only industrialists and traders but any Government departments which do not seem to us to be playing their rightful positive role.

We can do this by ensuring an adequate information service, within, and between, the sectors. We can intervene when there are apparent gaps or where there are dangers of a programme getting out of phase. We can ensure that developments in a main sector, such as education, go forward with an awareness of what is happening in other sectors relevant to its activities. At the same time, by informing the public we can create a climate of opinion responsive to those changes.

The decision that the adoption of metric units should be voluntary has certain major consequences. The Government might have declared that after a given day metric units would be the only legal units throughout the economy. Indeed there are some who, when in difficulty about reconciling their programmes with those of suppliers and customers, have argued for a statutory "M-Day" or "M-Days". This would destroy the whole

voluntary basis of the approach which the Government decided to adopt as the most congenial to the British community, with each sector working out its own programme and the Metrication Board fulfilling a central coordinating role. This approach to metrication takes into account the fact that time-tables will vary for the different sectors, that there must be a good deal of latitude within the individual time-tables, and that in some cases the processes of the change-over will take longer than others. Nevertheless there are implicit sanctions. The forces of the market-place, notably the demands of major customers, including the public authorities in central and local government and the nationalized industries are powerful. The legislative programme will determine dates when the various weights and measures will have to be legally modified, and thereafter enforced. The general adoption of agreed standards metrically based will impose conformity. Individuals and enterprises will find themselves working in a metric environment in which those still unimpressed by the inherent advantages of the metric system will find themselves the odd men out. The decision to proceed on a voluntary basis does mean, however, that the change-over will appear less decisive and less controllable than, for example, the change to decimal currency where the Government is in a position to make firm time-table decisions and to make the switch-over imperatively operative. It also means that in metrication, the exchange of information, publicity and education in the broader sense have an even more critical role to play.

The Board is the instrument of a decision to change and is the purveyor of units which constitute the international system which the Government agreed should be adopted as the basis of the change to metric. There has been, however, a good deal of perplexity about the nature of those S.I. units and this required from the Board a quite simple guide to the metric units which would be used in everyday life. It has also been necessary to explain the advantages of having a logical coherent and internationally agreed system of weights and measures.

Apart from the merits of the units themselves, their introduction provides the opportunity and compels each undertaking to examine its structure and methods of operation when planning for the change-over. In manufacturing industry, the application of rationalization and variety reduction techniques lead to a reduction in stockholdings, simplified tooling, faster and easier calculations, and improved designs. The result should be an all-around increase in efficiency and competitive power. Because the units are in accord with most of the rest of the world, this greater efficiency can lead to greater opportunities for expanded sales, notably in increased exports.

In education, the main benefit is a substantial saving of time and reduction of drudgery through simplified instruction at all levels.

In other sectors of the economy, such as the retail trade and local government, most of these advantages will also be secured, although they are not always self-evident or so immediate.

Throughout the country as a whole there will be a greater simplicity of all calculations because transactions will be conducted in decimal value and metric measure. There will, of course, be a period of familiarization when the imperial and metric systems exist side by side. We believe it is in the best interests of the nation that this period of numerical bilingualism should be kept to a minimum.

Wild unsubstantiated surmises have been made about the costs of Britain going metric. The Board, with all the experience which it

incorporates in its membership, rejects as irresponsible the kind of figures which have been suggested. Indeed, we can find no statistical model on which an estimate of the overall cost to the nation could be calculated and, with the policy already determined by the sober judgment of Government and of industry, we regard the exercise as futile. Similarly, to try to quantify the long-term benefits which will assuredly accrue from increased efficiency and improved competitive power would mean no less than a computation of Britain's role henceforth in world economy. Eschewing such vanity, the Board would say, per contra, that, if the decision to change had not been made, we should be imposing on ourselves an avoidable economic handicap in the years ahead when we shall have to earn our living in a world which will be substantially metric.

Our remit says emphatically "The costs shall lie where they fall." We accept that as the only practical attitude. That does not mean that we are not sensitive and sympathetic to those who are faced with the immediate on-costs of the change. We are undertaking case-studies of the experiences of individual firms and hope that we can count on the cooperation of many more in determining the real expenditure on material changes and retraining programmes incurred by particular enterprises. One thing we can say without hesitation: By planning the necessary changes, with minimum delay, firms can reduce outlay and disturbance and will ensure their share of benefits, the greater and sooner. To do so, the plans of individual enterprises must be synchronized with changes taking place throughout their own sector of the economy. That is where we can help in ensuring coordination within and between the various sectors.

During 1970 substantial progress will be made in many sectors of the economy. The British Standards Institution expects that all important standards relating to construction, industrial materials, engineering components and equipment will be available. This is an essential stage to an orderly advance within these sectors. In education too substantial progress can already be foreseen, the change to metric in examinations being a powerful stimulus.

Freight transport has set the beginning of 1972 as the target date. The road speed levels will be in kilometres per hours in 1973, and prior to that a beginning will be made in erecting new road signs incorporating distances in kilometres.

The measurement of land in metric will begin in 1970, with dual dimensioning in preparation for the full change-over in 1971 when land measurement will be wholly metric. Forestry will take a further year to achieve the complete change-over. Farming as a whole seems likely to begin to go metric in 1972, a change which should be substantially completed in 1973.

Vital industrial supplies such as aluminium, lead, copper, zinc, steel bars, flat steel products, wire mesh and electric cables will be available in 1970 to metric specifications. The production of plastics materials will be in metric terms by the end of 1971, while trade in chemicals in metric units will begin in that year and the change-over will be completed by the beginning of 1973. During 1970 the paper, board and printing industries will complete the change-over to metric.

Broadly speaking, therefore, the materials industries will by the end of 1972 substantially be producing and marketing materials in metric terms.

The engineering industries, including shipbuilding, are now going through the initial period of change, and many new designs, particularly equipment for the Armed Services, will be in metric terms from the

beginning of 1970. Generally, government procurement policy is to give preference to metric supplies. In 1971 the pace will quicken. The shipbuilding industry will be substantially metric by the end of 1972, while in the engineering industry major changes will be evident by about the same time. There is, however, no simple pattern embracing changes in these diverse industries, and the nature of the change and its timing will vary widely from one sector to another.

The construction industry will continue its progress towards metrication and all new designs from now on should be in metric dimensions. Bricks, paving flags, fibre boards, concrete pipes and metal windows are now becoming available from stock. The change to metric measures for softwood, hardwood, plywood and sheet materials should take place about the middle of 1970, and by the end of the year cement and ready mixed concrete will be sold in metric quantities and flat glass to metric dimensions will be generally available.

During 1970/71 there will not be much that the public will notice. Some do-it-yourself materials will be on sale in metric quantities, notably paints and timber. The bedding industry will go metric in the beginning of 1971, and some synthetic and woolen fibres will then be available in metric quantities. Footwear sizing is to be in metric units in the fall of 1972, and generally it is at that time that we would expect the general public to become increasingly aware of the change in the shops. Of particular significance will be the change in the units of sale of beer, milk and petrol. Another noticeable stage will be when changes in the Weights and Measures Act become effective. It will not, however, be possible to organize the change-over in the retail trade on one single M-Day, and the change-over will be progressive.

We see our information task as consisting of two main parts. Our prime objective during 1970 and 1971 is to publicize what programmes the industrial and economic sectors work out, providing encouragement for the vanguard and persuasion for those a little farther behind. By producing films, exhibitions and publications we intend to keep all concerned informed about progress in their own and other sectors thereby helping to share experience. In this we hope to obtain the same measure of willing cooperation from the press and broadcasting organizations as we have already experienced. But concentrating in this initial period on the economic areas where information and advice is most immediately needed does not mean that we will neglect young people and the general public. Our overall task is to help make the metric system of weights and measures intelligible, acceptable and familiar throughout the country as a whole. We intend to take every opportunity of removing misunderstandings and allaying misgivings. When action with a sector is likely to have a general effect we will be ready with advice and information for those sectors of the public who will be involved. But we do not expect to mount large-scale, intensive publicity campaigns for the larger public until nearer the time when metrication will extend into the retail and domestic sectors. To do so could only cause needless concern. Information which is not related to action, whether it be in the shops or the kitchen, would in our view be premature.

The total change on which the country has already embarked is vast in extent, but its apparent complexity is simplified when the detailed elements are identified. We have not encountered as yet any major obstacles, although we are well aware of certain specific difficulties. With proper planning we believe they can be resolved.

We think that there has been a tendency to exaggerate the difficulties and to underestimate the skills of management, the intelligence and the adaptability of the ordinary citizen when the changes required are realistically presented to them. The educational system and the industrial training organizations both as regards new training and retraining of the work force can make a major contribution to easing the problems of the transition.

We do not look for 100 percent perfect planning or a picture complete in every detail as to what is going on. Firms will move at different rates and the extent to which they need to make changes will vary greatly. The change will in the main not be in the physical equipment being used but in the use to which the equipment is put, in product design and in marketing.

We have heard some alarming and widely-quoted estimates of the cost of metrification to the nation. Our examination of such facts as available have shown these estimates cannot be substantiated. For one they don't attempt to assess the benefits to be derived from the change. We have sought to show the nature of those benefits, but like the costs they cannot be quantified except in the context of a particular enterprise.

There is a tendency to exaggerate the retail problem which raises difficulty only in a very narrow sector—What seems clear in all sectors is that the better the planning and the more rapidly the transition can be made, the lower the cost and the sooner the benefits are reaped. It is in factories, offices, schools and shops that the real and vital decisions will be made and where the changes will be accomplished and the benefits gained.

MEMORIAL TO GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I met GLEN LIPSCOMB at a reception the first week that I arrived in Congress. One of my colleagues commented that GLEN is the best liked man in the House. As I got to know him on the floor, I could see why he earned this distinction.

In the newspaper this morning, I was reading of his close friendship with President Nixon, and of his longstanding association with Secretary of Defense Mel Laird. And, his friendships ran all the way from President to the most junior Member in Congress.

GLEN had a friendly manner and a soft, easy personality. I guess the reason that people liked GLEN so much was because he in turn had such a big heart and he himself liked everyone.

LIPSCOMB's record proved him to be one of the most able men that ever served in Congress. He had the educational background of a certified public accountant. He understood basic Government fiscal administration. In the House, he was the champion of the taxpayer and the foe of Government waste.

A great conservative who was open-minded on any issue leaves a seat that will be hard to replace.

To his family, we extend our deepest

sympathy on their loss. And from California and the Nation we all join in paying our respects to our outstanding colleague, GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB.

BEN FRANKLIN'S GATEWAY CITY

HON. JOSHUA EILBERG

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. EILBERG. Mr. Speaker, Ben Franklin may have been born in your fine city but, as we all know, made his fame and fortune in the city I am proud to represent. Boston's loss was certainly Philadelphia's gain.

January 17 marked Ben Franklin's birthday and on that day a delegation from my city was in Paris, where Franklin served the fledgling republic as ambassador, to invite our European friends to visit the United States.

More important my fellow Philadelphians encouraged one and all to make Philadelphia their Gateway City when they visit the United States. This is an outstanding suggestion.

With its traditions deeply rooted in colonial America, Philadelphia looks toward the 21st century. In some ways it is our oldest city and our newest city. I invite my colleagues and my fellow Americans to come and visit with their past, while getting a glimpse of their future.

Under unanimous consent, I include in the RECORD an account of the visit of Philadelphia's delegation to Paris:

PHILADELPHIA DELEGATION VISITS PARIS

Armed with official City of Philadelphia greetings and souvenirs of Benjamin Franklin, three Philadelphia good will ambassadors made calls upon U.S. Ambassador to France R. Sargent Shriver and Paris Council President Etienne Royer de Vericourt as part of a week-long trip to promote Philadelphia as the Gateway to the U.S.A.

Abe S. Rosen, president of the Philadelphia Convention and Tourist Bureau; Mrs. Lilliane Nino, Welcome to Philadelphia Girl from Air France, and Alvin Hornstein, Director of Tourism, were in Paris to meet with French officials, travel agents, tour operators, and travel writers to tell about the advantages of starting a visit to the U.S.A. through Philadelphia.

They visited Ambassador Shriver on Jan. 14 and Paris Council President de Vericourt on Jan. 15. Each was presented with a letter from Mayor James H. Tate of Philadelphia extending official greetings and urging greater flow of citizens through the two cities.

The two officials also received a bust of Benjamin Franklin donated by the Poor Richard Club and special karetsclad gold bonded on sterling silver Franklin medals from the Franklin Mint. The good will trip, sponsored by the Convention and Tourist Bureau, Air France and the Delaware River Port Authority, took place during Benjamin Franklin Week, being observed in both cities.

During the week in Philadelphia, there were special do it yourself tours of Franklin sites and artifacts; special exhibits and events, and a kite-flying contest on his actual birthday, Jan. 17. In Paris the Philadelphia delegation laid wreaths at sites memorialized

by Franklin during his ambassadorship in Paris in 1776.

The Franklin busts presented to Ambassador Shriver and President de Vericourt were created by Jean-Antoine Houdon. It is this bust which has probably given more people the conception of what Franklin looked like. The Franklin Mint medal in nickel silver was also given to travel trade people during the visit, which ran through Saturday Jan. 17. The Franklin Institute and the American Wax Museum in Philadelphia also provided novel souvenirs for the people whom the Philadelphia ambassadors met during the week.

The Benjamin Franklin Week visit of Philadelphians was designed to inform the French public and travel trade of the convenience, accessibility, and attractiveness of using Philadelphia as the Gateway to the U.S.A. Air France inaugurated direct non-stop service this summer between Paris and Philadelphia, and will expand this service even further this year.

CRUSADE AGAINST HUNGER

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the task force leaders attending the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health have prepared a letter addressed to the President, and I believe this message will hold great interest for my colleagues. This letter embodies the spirit spreading across our land that hunger and malnutrition ought not to exist in a nation of plenty.

The text of the letter came to my attention through Father Robert J. McEwen, S.J., a well-known proponent of consumer protection. Father McEwen has devoted many years of study and leadership to the consumer affairs field, and I am certain that his involvement in the crusade against hunger and malnutrition will be a great asset to the growing movement to eradicate these unfortunate ills, both in our country and throughout the world.

I urge the Members of this great body to review the contents of this letter and to give serious consideration to the merits of the suggestions therein.

The letter follows:

DECEMBER 30, 1969.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the United States,
White House,
Washington, D.C.:

We the undersigned leaders of task forces at your White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health wish to congratulate you on the significant series of actions and orders announced by you and your cabinet as immediate emergency measures to implement the recommendations of the conference. We are particularly happy that you were able to announce these steps before Christmas. We are gratified that you have justified our faith in your announced intention to take an active leadership role in alleviating hunger and malnutrition in the United States.

For the future we are deeply concerned that follow-up machinery must be created to

enlist grass roots voluntary support in the campaign against hunger. Steps must be taken to activate your announced programs quickly and to monitor their effectiveness. We urge therefore that you establish a specific food and nutrition liaison office in the White House to accomplish the objectives of the war on hunger. To pursue the long-run programs recommended by the conference report we urge you to use such an office to support and maintain the coalition of industry, government, consumers and private voluntary groups that was created by the conference. The momentum generated by your far-sighted action in calling the conference must not be allowed to wane.

Mrs. Joseph H. Young, Father Robert J. McEwen, S.J., Bishop Raymond J. Gallagher, Dr. John L. S. Holloman, Jr., John J. Gunther, Herman Gallegos, David Ackerman, Rev. Ian McCrae, Dr. Paul Cornely, Rabbi Irving Lehrman, Dr. Arthur Flemming, Dorothy Height, Robert Neptune.

MRS. EUGENE C. PULLIAM INITIATED INTO SIGMA DELTA CHI

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, last week Mrs. Eugene C. Pulliam, author, and journalist in her own right and wife of the publisher of the Indianapolis Star, Indianapolis News, and other papers, became a member of the journalism society founded by her husband over 60 years ago.

The following story from the Indianapolis News describes Mrs. Pulliam's outstanding career:

SDX WILL INITIATE MRS. EUGENE C. PULLIAM
GREENCASTLE, IND.—The final barrier to women's admission to the nation's largest and most prestigious journalism society will be hurdled at DePauw University tomorrow.

That's when, in a remarkable bit of journalistic irony, Mrs. Eugene C. Pulliam, author-journalist and wife of one of the founders of Sigma Delta Chi, will be initiated into the journalism society.

Her initiation marks the first time a woman has been admitted to the membership of the nation's first (Alpha) chapter. Nine DePauw undergraduates—four of them women—will be initiated at the public ceremony at 5 p.m. in the Memorial Student Union building.

The students include Miss Wendy Gifford, Indianapolis; Miss Mary Ganz, Don Mills, Ont., Canada; Miss Mary Leonard, Chicago Heights, Ill.; and Mrs. Mary Roberta Smith Hamer, Carmel.

Also Bruce Bikin, Indianapolis; Harry Rhoads, Fairfax, Va.; Steve Doyle, Winona, Minn.; John Croley, Bartlesville, Okla.; and John McFadden, Decatur, Ill.

Miss Gifford is the daughter of Mrs. Marian Gifford, Indianapolis, and Bikin is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Henry Bikin, 5231 Nob Lane. Mrs. Hamer, who was a summer trainee at The Indianapolis News last year, is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Smith, Carmel.

FOUNDED IN 1909

Sigma Delta Chi was founded by Eugene C. Pulliam, publisher of The Indianapolis News and The Indianapolis Star and other papers, and nine other DePauw students in April, 1909. The organization's nearly 200

campus and professional chapters had been for men only until last November.

In a decisive ballot at its national convention in San Diego, the doors were opened to qualified women journalists. Since the epochal November decision the rush has been on to bring women into the fold.

St. Bonaventure University's chapter holds the honor of initiating the first female undergraduates—among them a nun. The University of Georgia has initiated Charlayne Hunter, New York Times reporter and the first black female graduate of the U. of G. The Headliner Club of Chicago, a professional chapter, outsprinted its kind. It initiated Ann Landers and nine others Dec. 4.

Mrs. Pulliam had been honored many times before her selection for Friday's unprecedented initiation ceremony at SDX's birthplace.

In 1954 she was named national winner of The Headliner of the Year Award by Theta Sigma Phi, journalism society for women. The award goes annually to the woman who has made significant contributions to journalism.

ACTIVE FOR BLIND

The Martinsville, Ind., native serves as secretary-treasurer and as a director of Central Newspapers, Inc., which administers papers in Vincennes, Muncie and Indianapolis. She also serves on the board of newspapers in Phoenix.

Her travels and observations through 93 countries have been reported by her in the nation's press through columns syndicated by the North American Newspaper Alliance. Her book, "I Traveled A Lonely Land," (Bobbs-Merrill), was published not long after an extended tour in Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific Islands.

Mrs. Pulliam has made significant contributions to higher education and to the prevention of blindness. She has served on the board of trustees of Franklin College and been awarded honorary doctorates by the University of Arizona and Indiana University. She received her higher education at the University of New Mexico and Indiana University.

Since 1952 Mrs. Pulliam has served as a member of the board of directors of the National Society for the Prevention of Blindness. She also has served as chairman of the Indiana chapter. Last year she was recipient of its first recognition award conferred on a volunteer who has made significant contributions to the prevention of blindness.

It was Mrs. Pulliam who suggested that proceeds from the Indiana-Kentucky All-Star basketball game be given to help the blind and near-blind.

Mr. and Mrs. Pulliam have homes in Phoenix and Indianapolis.

HOPE FOR ENVIRONMENT

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, skeptics like myself do not accept the words of any politician at face value. We pay more attention to his actions and his legislative programs. Thus, when President Nixon promised action in behalf of our environment, I listened with doubt. Others, even Presidents, have made promises and then acted indecisively. However, I am pleased to say that a

recent event indicates that the President may very well be sincere in his declaration of support for the cause of the environment. Philip Wylie has written an interesting piece on the saving of the Everglades in Florida. A noted conservationist, he states outright:

The Everglades do not make a vital contribution to man's essential environment.

Yet, he sees the administration's decision not to provide any funds for the construction of an airport beside the Everglades as a sign of hope, a symbol of an enlightened attitude on the environment. For he speculates that the decision concerning the environment may very well illustrate the administration's recognition of "the essential human right to an environment free of pollution." Let us hope so. Let us hope that the administration continues as the spokesman for the environment.

Nevertheless, the priority the administration has given to nature over an airport in the Everglades case deserves our praise.

MYLAI HOAX FINANCED BY STERN FAMILY FUND

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an interesting feature article in a local newspaper over the weekend underlines the question of tax exemption for charitable foundations. Apparently only Americans who work for their money are expected to pay taxes.

The list of beneficiaries of this particular philanthropist reads like a roster of the new left, with a few criminals and misunderstood subversives thrown in for good measure.

Of interest to patriotic Americans is the connection between Stern, the radical Institute for Policy Studies, a transparent attempt to whitewash the notorious J. Robert Oppenheimer, and the financing of Seymour Hersh to promote the Mylai massacre hoax.

Although the feature mentioned the source of Stern's wealth as his inheritance from his grandfather, Julius Rosenwald, and mentioned the charitable activities of selected members of his family, it failed to mention his relationship to the Stern who fled New York just as a grand jury returned an espionage indictment, and found a haven in Moscow.

I include the feature in my remarks, as follows:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Star Sunday magazine, Feb. 1, 1970]

THE HAPPY PHILANTHROPIST

(By Barbara Stubbs Cohen)

(NOTE.—Philip Stern, an heir to the Sears Roebuck fortune, is "having a ball out of life" granting money to worthwhile Washington projects and, on the side, dabbling in art-collecting, silk-screening and flying airplanes, among other things.)

"Being rich," says Philip Stern, "is really not very different from having a cleft palate or green hair."

Stern, who has neither, knows what he's talking about. The heir to a Sears Roebuck fortune, fattened over two generations, Stern has shunned further money-making and resorted to giving his wealth away. But even as a philanthropist, the man who has funded such iconoclastic projects as the first research on My Lai and a home for runaway hippies can hardly be classed as normal.

Not that Stern is unhappy about this. At 43, after one unremunerative career in politics and another in newspapering and in the midst of a modestly successful one as a crusading author, Stern exudes an air of satisfaction. "I'm having a ball out of life. I just learned to fly an airplane in the last four years, learned to play the recorder and read music, learned to silk-screen." All these activities are shared with his wife, Leni, and five children aged 7 to 18, who spill out of a 20-room house in Kalorama equipped with swimming pool, tennis court, trampoline, tree house and art studio.

Though they could hire just about anything done for them, the Sterns take pride in their do-it-yourself projects. Leni, who says she has never allowed a decorator across the threshold, is responsible for decorating the house with bright splashes of color on the walls—"which are likely to change at any moment"—and good modern furniture, including a gigantic swing in the middle of the living room. They get engrossed in silk-screening their own Christmas cards or studying Spanish for a trip to Mexico. And the art collection of modern masters has been carefully chosen by the Sterns, not an agent.

But the Philip M. Stern Family Fund is Stern's farthest-reaching plunge into the do-it-yourself realm. His grants, which are his way of effecting change in education, community service and culture, go to people who want to help themselves. Though small by Ford or Carnegie standards, with its endowment of \$832,000, the Stern Fund is behind almost every innovative and controversial project in Washington.

Col. Hassan Jeru-Ahmed, who operates three centers for the free distribution of methadone, a heroin substitute, and who estimates he is returning 450 to 600 addicts to normal life, got his first grant from the Stern Fund.

The Rev. Tom Murphy of Dupont Circle's Church of the Pilgrims has used Stern money to finance Runaway House, Switchboard (a "bulletin board" via telephone), and the Georgetown Free Medical Clinic, all catering to Washington's hippie community.

Students at Eastern High, calling themselves the Modern Strivers, got a Stern grant to start their own classes in black history and other subjects not taught in the school.

Joel Denker has set up, with Stern help, the New Educational Project, to make education relevant for white kids from the suburbs.

Julius Hobson's Washington Institute for Quality Education got a Stern grant for its study of D.C. schools.

And the Washington Theater Club, which received its first Stern grant four years ago, has grown in membership from 40 season subscribers to 9,200 and moved into a new theater.

In fiscal 1968, the most recent year for which figures are available, Stern's foundation made 78 grants totaling \$174,847. It may not have been the most, but it was the most unorthodox in Washington. Some of that comes naturally to Stern, the third generation in a line of philanthropic mavericks.

Stern inherited his fortune and a tradi-

tion of giving from his grandfather, Julius Rosenwald, the Sears Roebuck magnate whose fund built 5,000 schools for Negroes in the South, and from his father, Edgar, whose foundation Stern now heads. Under their father's direction, the Stern children served an apprenticeship on that board, then were given a lump sum to start their own. Stern's brother runs the Six Foundation in New Orleans and his sister manages the Longview Foundation in New York.

None of Stern's careers was undertaken to make new family fortunes. In his favorite role as author, to which he devotes about four times as much time as to philanthropy, he has recently published *The Case of Robert Oppenheimer*, which has been praised by reviewers around the country. He wrote the book, he says, because "it seemed to me it would be useful to lay out the way government power was used, or really abused, to get a guy. It became a book about The System and what I think are the malign effects of that system—the loyalty and security system—on the country." The crusading note runs through his first book, *The Great Treasury Raid*, about tax loopholes; *Oh Say Can You See: A Bifocal Tour of Washington*, a picture book done with his wife juxtaposing Washington's monuments and slums; and *The Shame of the Nation*, photos and essays on poverty.

Politics, though, was Stern's first love. He came to Washington under a now-defunct Rockefeller internship program to give young men a look at the workings of the Hill. He stayed on as a congressional aide to Sen. Henry M. Jackson, when he was a congressman, and to Sen. Paul Douglas before he joined Adlai Stevenson's presidential campaign in 1952. After the campaign he was made research director for the Democratic party. He left that post in 1958 to start the *Northern Virginia Sun* with Clayton Fritchey, George Ball and Arnold Sagalyn. But, except for contributions to the Democratic party, he has given up politics—permanently, he says. "I always thought that I ought to take advantage of the financial means with which I was blessed," he explains, "and one of the main ways is to be independent—genuinely independent—and to say what I believe without being afraid of the consequences. I don't want to be irresponsible in what I say, but I don't want to have to worry about the consequences."

After 13 years of giving money away, Stern has developed a set of criteria for the kind of project he favors. The decision to grant money is not, however, his alone. He is restricted, first of all, to aiding Washington projects, because his foundation is chartered here. He is also restricted to projects approved by the foundation's six-member board, and a group less inclined to rubber-stampism hardly could be found.

The board members, who serve without pay and are selected by Stern and approved by the others on the board, are, besides Stern and his wife, Father Gino Baroni, an activist in civil rights and poverty causes; Patrick Hayes, Washington's Sol Hurok; Mrs. Willie Hardy, a black community leader; and Richard Scammon, head of Elections Research Center. "We chose people," Stern says, "that we thought would add to our intelligence in the fields we were interested in, and whose experience would add judgment as to the merits of the proposal and the people. A board member either knows the person who is bringing in the proposal or he's in a position to look into it in a way that I couldn't."

If there should be a difference among the board members about a request, the matter is decided simply and democratically with a vote. And to make things even less arbi-

trary, Stern and his assistant, Mrs. George Allen, who cull the preliminary requests, list the applications they have turned down so that members have an opportunity to take a second look at a project.

Stern is fond of saying that the chief thing he tries to accomplish in his giving is "bridge-building," not "dock-building." "I like to find out if we are building a dock out into the middle of a pond so that when they get to the end of our grant they'll be in essentially the same fix they're in now, or if we have a chance of helping them build a bridge from one piece of dry land to another piece, so that at the end of the grant they have some prospects of either being self-supporting or getting some other source of funds." It is the long-run future of the organization which is under consideration. "We found," Stern says, "that we were the object of what I call 'oxygen-tent' requests—that is, organizations that were about to go under and were coming to us to be rescued from bankruptcy—in effect, death."

This does not mean that the Stern Fund backs only sure bets. Stern says, "We tend to look with the most favor on people or projects who don't have any other philanthropic constituency. For example, something like the Red Cross has an enormous constituency, if it gets money from all over and we wouldn't even consider the Red Cross for that reason. When the kids at Eastern High School who wanted a new school came in, that attracted our attention right away, partly because they didn't know where to go." Since that initial grant to youngsters who didn't know where to turn, the Modern Strivers have been featured in national magazines, praised by educators and given other grants by larger foundations.

Stern grants are more limited than those by the big foundations. Most are \$5,000 to \$10,000, with \$20,000 being huge, by Stern standards. For that reason, the foundation tries to spend its money where it will have the biggest impact. "We ask how big their total need is. If somebody's got a budget of a million dollars, they're not likely to get any money from us," Stern says, "because even if we gave them a huge grant—on our terms—it would be a spit in the ocean, and it wouldn't make a critical difference whether that project goes or doesn't go. I'd much rather give to something where we can make a critical difference as to whether something exists or not."

The potential success of the projects he finances matters to Stern. "One of the criteria you use when you make the grant is to ask what it is you'd like to see when you stand a year hence and look back. Is what we hope to accomplish (a) realizable and (b) important?"

But he is not frightened of failure, and in the end, the decision to back a project depends on the person proposing it. "A final criterion," Stern says, "is betting on people. When you get a hot person, someone who is clearly gifted, that's when you say we don't know whether it's going to work or not. That's when you begin to take your longest shots."

Neither is Stern embarrassed by failure. He tells of one young heroin addict who had kicked his habit and was going to District schools evangelizing against drugs. When he came to Stern for help he was put in touch with the Psychiatric Institute Foundation so that he could get money and training.

But, say Stern, "That was a long shot that didn't pay off. He fell off. But the way I feel is if you don't make some mistakes and have some failures, you're not really doing your job. That's the main rationale for foundations—to be the real risk-takers. The government can't do it politically, and

corporations won't do it, so that's what foundations are all about."

Grants from the "senior fund," as Stern has nicknamed the national foundation set up by his father, often find their way into the Washington area also. The Washington Gallery of Modern Art got help from that foundation, thanks to the interest of Stern's wife, Leni, who with her husband has selected paintings by Frank Stella, Franz Kline, Joseph Albers and Sam Gilliam for their living room walls, is an artist in her own right. She served as chairman of the Gallery of Modern Art board through its merger with the Corcoran and transformation into the Dupont Center of that museum. Another Washington recipient of senior Stern funds is the radical research center, the Institute for Policy Studies, whose founders include Arthur Waskow and Marcus Raskin. Philip Stern serves as chairman of the trustees of that institution.

The Stern grant that made the biggest splash of 1969 was money given Seymour Hersh to research reports of a massacre of Vietnamese civilians by soldiers at My Lai. Hersh's research, aided by a special fund to promote investigative reporting, led to stories that shocked the nation and the world.

Despite his gratitude to his parents for philanthropy instructions, Stern hesitates at involving his own children. So far they have not expressed much interest themselves in becoming philanthropists. "It's very difficult," Stern says, "for someone to grow up with a lot of money, and they're feeling that now and they're not at all sure that they want to be involved in that."

If they do, their father has some advice for them. "If they're going to do it seriously—and I must say I wouldn't recommend it to them if they weren't—they have to prepare to be bombarded by a lot of people who want things. They have to be comfortable about saying no. And it's not easy to come by, believe me. It took me a long, long time to be comfortable about saying no to people, and particularly to friends. They will have to be prepared to spend a portion of their lives working at this. And that's not everybody's bag."

PARKVILLE SOLDIER WINS ARMY MEDAL

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Army Sp4c. Luther E. Heim, Jr., a fine young man from Maryland, was recently awarded the Army Commendation Medal in Vietnam. I wish to honor him by including the following article in the RECORD:

PARKVILLE SOLDIER WINS ARMY MEDAL

Army Specialist Four Luther E. Heim Jr., 23, son of Mr. and Mrs. Luther E. Heim Sr., 3044 Edgewood Ave., Parkville, receives the Army Commendation Medal during ceremonies near Quang Tri, Vietnam.

Spec. 4 Heim received the award for meritorious service as a tank crewman with Troop A, 4th Squadron, 12th Cavalry, 1st Brigade of the 5th Infantry Division (Mechanized) near Quang Tri.

During the same ceremonies, he was also presented the Purple Heart for wounds received in action.

The specialist entered the Army in July 1968 and was stationed at Ft. Polk, La., before arriving overseas

He is a 1964 graduate of Parkville High School.

The awards were presented Dec. 12.

THE NCAA AGAINST YALE— TRAGI-COMEDY

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. MICHEL), and I have attempted to bring to the attention of this House a great injustice perpetrated against Yale University by the National Collegiate Athletic Association. We plan to discuss in the weeks to come similar actions by the NCAA which have unfairly penalized other schools and other athletes. We hope that by bringing these unfair actions to light our colleagues will see the necessity of conducting a full-scale investigation of the NCAA—an investigation that may be vital to the future of amateur athletics in the United States.

The Yale case, involving basketball player Jack Langer, is tragic. It shows that the NCAA is willing to use any weapon in its continuing power struggle with the Amateur Athletic Union. It shows that the NCAA does not care if it hurts member institutions or individual athletes in the process. It shows once again that the NCAA is no longer a representative body of colleges and universities but is instead a collection of institutions under the control of a stubborn, dictatorial hierarchy that does not hesitate to use athletes and schools alike as mere pawns in a game of power politics.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, there are elements of comedy in this issue. In an excellent and perceptive column, syndicated Columnist Jim Murray has used these elements to depict the total insensitivity and ruthlessness of the NCAA, the moral conviction and courage of Yale University, and the utter stupidity inherent in the NCAA-AAU dispute.

I wish to insert Mr. Murray's column at this point in the RECORD, and I call it to the attention of our colleagues who care about the future of amateur athletics in this country:

ELEVEN MERRIWELLS NOT EVEN ENOUGH

(By Jim Murray)

Oh, fudge! Yale can't come to the Rose Bowl for two years!

(The Rose Bowl, fellows, is due west of Rowayton. You take the New York, New Haven & Hartford south and, if you're driving, you cross the Hudson and stay on the Mohawk Trail and go by night if you see smoke signals.)

I don't know how you could ever explain it to Burt L. Standish, but even if Eli had 11 Frank Merriwells, it couldn't compete in the NCAA. Not even in the 10,000-kilometer walk.

Louisa May Alcott would be bound to faint. Harvard is not surprised. Wall Street is having a fit. The senior class is afraid Dad will cut off the allowance. Mumay has taken to her bed with the vapors. The butler is very cross with the tradesman.

Yale has been (don't noise this around) Put On Probation. They've been caught

cheating athletically like some common vulgar place like the ughotz Big Ten or those ruffians in Texas or Penn State, for heaven's sake!

Oh, it's not a case of smuggling a full grown gorilla in the backfield and passing him off as a dance major or giving him a C in First Aid or Driver Education. They haven't sneaked a swim suit on a shark and walked off with the 1,500-meter butterfly or put a motor on the eight-oared shell.

No, what Yale did was let its second-string basketball center go to Israel.

In doing so, he stepped right in the middle of a war. No, not That one! The one between the NCAA and the AAU, better known as the 30-Years-War.

The AAU and the NCAA, the Hatfields and McCoy's of athletics, are currently in a tug-of-war over the game of basketball, amateur version. It is not a simple conflict. It should be, but it isn't.

BASKETBALL VICTIM

The AAU and NCAA have defied the best efforts of the late Robert Kennedy, the late Douglas MacArthur, three U.S. Presidents and two generations of sports writers to reconcile them. Intransigent, termagant, utterly persuaded of their own self-righteousness, they have all but killed the thing they are fighting over.

About 10 years ago, on the heels of a series of betting scandals, the NCAA laid down a rule that basketball players could not play summer or post-season games in resort hotels in return for board, room and free use of the pool on weekends on the theory that they came into contact with too many betting types that way.

They relaxed the rule for special events like Pan-Am and Olympic Games and, a few years ago, even began to arrange post-season international games for collegians, in concert with the FIBA, the international basketball federation.

One day, the AAU got out the shotgun. It had jurisdiction over international basketball games, it haughtily informed the FIBA. The FIBA sighed ("These crazy Americans!") and agreed to recognize the AAU's jurisdiction.

The NCAA took its ball and went home and sulked. OK, it said, in effect, if we can't run the program, no collegian or college team can participate.

The sport, as usual, was the victim. It hung on the barbed wire out there in the middle of No Man's Land.

NO PICK-UP GAME

The Maccabiah Games are the Jewish religion's version of the Olympics. It collects outstanding Jewish athletes from all over the world once every four years for a friendly but spirited competition. The government takes the position that sport prowess best administers religious and national esteem for that beleaguered country. It is at once a surcease and morale builder. It is not so much that sport builds warriors as that sports builds pride. And the Maccabiah Games are by no means a potato race competition. Times, scores, competition, closely approximate Olympics, or other competitions in which hundreds of religions and cultures are represented.

In the interest of maintaining the high standards of competition, the Israeli government energetically woos the outstanding Jewish athletes in the U.S. For basketball, it collected a half-dozen prime prospects—one from Davidson, one from North Carolina, Rutgers, Cincinnati, UCLA, and Yale. Yale's selectee was Jack Langer, 6-8, 225, 10-point average pivot man.

Jack was the only one who went. The others, including—get this—a Warsaw-born, Israeli-bred player from the University of Cincinnati, were frightened off by the NCAA.

Yale was a Bulldog. Their athletic director and coaches—and team—took the position the Maccabiah Games were hardly Catskill pick-up games and, in fact, on a par with the Pan-Am or even Olympic Games.

Langer played, but the U.S. lost. Yale lost, too. They can participate in no bowl games, no post-season events of any kind, no NCAA playoffs. And one more piece of athletic rubble was added to the NCAA-AAU war.

What a lot of us are hoping now is that a helicopter with a Star of David on its flies over the NCAA headquarters, put a winch around it and carts it off to Tel Aviv. Failing that, maybe that general with the patch over his eye can come over and settle the matter in six days.

NARCE, AGE 49, IS PLANNING ITS CONVENTION IN BUFFALO, JUNE 15

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the National Association of Retired Civil Employees will mark its 49th birthday on February 19.

This fine organization—now headed by an old friend and experienced Capitol Hill personality, Thomas G. Walters—is planning to hold its convention this year in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y.

This 11th biennial national convention will be held June 15 through 17 at the Statler-Hilton Hotel.

NARCE is having a big year, with the combination of its convention and the observance of two anniversaries. Besides its own 49th birthday, the organization also will mark on May 22 the 50th anniversary of the signing into law by President Wilson of the first civil service retirement legislation.

The golden anniversary of the civil service retirement law will be observed officially a week later, on May 28, along with the Civil Service Commission and various active and retiree employee organizations.

Mr. Speaker, in the current issue of NARCE's publication, *Retirement Life*, is recounted the story of the day that NARCE was born.

Following is the text of that article:

THE STORY OF NARCE—THE DAY NARCE WAS BORN

Heavy snow clouds were hanging over Washington that Saturday afternoon in February, 1921. People talked, as usual, about the Washington weather and the forecast of a snowstorm—and now, while a chilly wind was blowing around the corners, they could hardly believe that only three days ago the thermometer had climbed to 73 degrees and even a few spring flowers had appeared on the White House lawn.

Washingtonians also talked about Caruso's illness, about the Soviet drive that threatened Tiflis, about the plan to pay spies who helped in the conviction of whiskey smugglers. On streetcar stops, men discussed a decision of the Attorney General of Maryland that women could not hold public offices, and whether \$1,215 was a fair price for a Dort touring car. Washington women had other topics. Should they wear monacles, following the latest fashion fad? Had anybody read the new chapter in Adele Garrison's "Revela-

tions of a Wife," the one about "Holding a Husband?" And had anybody seen "My Lady's Latchkey" at the Metropolitan, a "photoplay" with the intriguing subtitle "A Stolen Gem for a Stolen Heart?"

At the White House, President Wilson neared the last day of his term. President Harding's inauguration was scheduled for March 4. "Harding's Game of Golf Marked by Determination" headlined the Washington Post of February 19, 1921.

MEETING NEAR WHITE HOUSE

A block and a half from the White House, a group of elderly men entered a big red brick building at 1423 New York Avenue. They were shown to one of the conference rooms where two or three others were already waiting. One of the gentlemen, struggling his way out of his heavy overcoat, counted those present: "... twelve, thirteen, fourteen. It seems we are all here. I suggest we start."

Mr. Theo. F. Swayze, like all the others a retired Federal employee, was called to the chair. Jacob W. Starr, who had been President of the Civil Service Retirement Association, explained the purpose of the meeting. "I have talked," he said, "with a number of those who have been retired at a yearly allowance far below the maximum of sixty dollars per month. I had the object in view of getting together all who are interested, to the end that if possible, steps might be taken looking to the betterment of their status. I have secured, after considerable effort as you might well imagine, a list of all those who had been retired up to the end of December 1920, that is roughly during the first four months since the Retirement Act became effective. This list includes the name and address of each and the amount of annuity granted in every case. It is apparent from this list that many are receiving as low as \$15 per month!"

BEGAN WITH 16,500 ANNUITANTS

Did Jacob Starr realize that forty-nine years later hundreds of thousands of Government retirees would benefit from his "considerable efforts," as he modestly called them? At the time the fourteen gentlemen met in that conference room at 1423 New York Ave., the maximum rate of annuity was \$720 for the 16,500 annuitants at that time. Today, through the efforts of Jacob Starr and his successors, government annuitants have multiplied many times for the over 800,000 annuitants now on the rolls.

But let us go back to the exact moment when our Association was born. After Mr. Starr had spoken, the temporary chairman, Mr. Swayze, suggested that the first business should be the election of a President. He nominated Mr. Starr, reminding those present of the many duties that devolved upon Mr. Starr when President of the Civil Service Retirement Association. He was elected unanimously, as were Robert Armour as Secretary and George Simmons as Treasurer.

What should be the name of the new Association? Several names were suggested and discussed. When deadlock seemed to develop, Mr. Starr had a suggestion.

CHOICE OF NAME IS DEFERRED

"Gentleman," said the newly-elected President, "in view of the fact that this is our first meeting, and that the attendance is small, I suggest that the choice of a name is deferred till a subsequent meeting." Thirteen uplifted arms showed approval.

"All right," said the President, sitting down. "Then, let's get to business."

And, as was typical of these men, the first measure the newly founded Association discussed was a practical one: Minimum (\$360) and maximum (\$1,400) rates for annuities. That the men in charge of NARCE's destiny then as now were firm believers in unified

action is shown in this excerpt from the minutes of the first meeting: "The discussion which ensued ... tended to show that it was thought best that action looking to amendment of the present law should come from committees after thorough consideration of all the facts, rather than by a number of separate bills, or by separate individuals interviewing the Congressmen with whom they might be acquainted."

It was almost four o'clock when the meeting adjourned. A few snow flakes were in the air when the participants left the building to hurry home for the weekend.

"I think we made a good start," remarked one of the fourteen first members of NARCE to another.

TRIBUTE TO SENATOR BOB BARTLETT

HON. EDWARD A. GARMATZ

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, shortly after her nomination as Chairman of the Federal Maritime Commission, Mrs. Helen Bentley was invited to speak at the Bob Bartlett Memorial Fund dinner in Fairbanks, Alaska.

Having known Senator Bartlett so well because of her previous position as maritime editor of the Baltimore Sun, Mrs. Bentley was in a good position to speak of him and especially his work as chairman of the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee. I know that those of us who knew him well, can express our full agreement with her splendid tribute to Bob Bartlett and it is therefore a pleasure to include her remarks in the RECORD:

BOB BARTLETT MEMORIAL DINNER ADDRESS

(By Helen Delich Bentley)

Mr. Stepanovich, Senator Gravel, Mr. Snedden, Vide Bartlett, friends of Bob Bartlett—Ladies, Gentlemen—little did I ever dream last month on my first trip to Alaska that I would have the very good fortune of returning so soon to the most interesting, thrilling, and challenging of the 50 States which make up the great United States.

Just being here in this wonderful atmosphere with rugged individualists gives one a new sense of being ... That is important and exciting to me ... On top of all that, I was accorded what I consider one of the highest honors and privileges of my lifetime when Vide Bartlett asked me to be the principal speaker at this Fairbanks kickoff dinner to raise funds to establish a living memorial in the name of that wonderful man, Bob Bartlett. He will long live in the hearts and minds of all Alaskans as probably the most rugged of all individuals to ever have lived here—even though Bob Bartlett may have been the most soft spoken and gentle of all Alaskans.

As Mr. Snedden said to me while driving from the airport this morning, "within weeks, often days, after the average person dies, he is practically forgotten except by his own family. But with Bob Bartlett, he is just as much in the minds of every Alaskan today as he was before his untimely death last December. It will be 10 to 20 years at least before people begin forgetting about Bob Bartlett, at least in Alaska."

May I echo that remark and say it will be a long, long time before he is forgotten in the halls of Capitol Hill and Washington

as well. I can attest to the fact that the Merchant Marine Subcommittee of the Senate Commerce Committee is still thought of in terms of Bob Bartlett's subcommittee. When he was its chairman, it was a productive committee—just as anything with which he was associated was productive.

Yes, just as you people here in Alaska miss him, so do we in Washington. How well I recall my last luncheon with Bob. He had been more or less out of circulation as far as the heavy business of the Senate was concerned most of the summer of 1968, but was sneaking into the office—against the doctor's and Vide's orders, and the wishes of those of us who knew he shouldn't be doing it—to make certain that everything for his loving constituents and for Alaska was being properly taken care of. Oh, yes, even though he wasn't supposed to, he was still tending to business with that same sense of full responsibility that Bob Bartlett bore during his entire life in Washington.

By my calling up and suggesting that we break bread or chat, he had an excuse to go to the office. He sought such excuses from his friends because he didn't want to be out of touch. On this particular day, he had the thoughtfulness of having a Capitol Hill photographer come into the Senate dining room to take the usual photo and then later autographed it and sent it to me. That photo with Bob Bartlett and the one with President Nixon on the announcement of my appointment are my most prized possessions. He was just that special.

That September day, he was so exuberant because of the new oil discovery on the North Slope. He knew how much all of this activity between Prudhoe and the North Slope meant to the future of Alaska and also that this oil discovery could give to the entire United States and free world assurance that they would have adequate supplies of fuel for decades to come.

How wonderful that he lived long enough to know that a way had been found so that his State could be self-sufficient and not have to wait for dole-outs and budgetary problems in Washington—those problems with which he had lived for a quarter of a century.

Mister Alaska had always been confident that his State would one day be a real asset and when he died, he knew that his faith had been fulfilled.

Throughout my newspaper career, I've worked in an almost male society—covering labor first, then maritime, and then transportation, maritime and labor all together. I can assure you that among all of those, Bob Bartlett with his ever-present smile, his ever-willingness to help, his humility, and his wonderful mind stood head and shoulders above most.

We had several things in common—the first and foremost being our sincere mutual interest in a strong maritime industry and merchant marine for the United States.

I, too, was a Westerner—a Westerner who had grown up in the high mountains of Nevada. I knew something about ruggedness and rugged life of living some 8000 feet above sea level in Ruth and Ely, Nevada, for the first 17 years of my life. I knew from my Yugoslav parents—and both had immigrated from Yugoslavia—what it was like to survive under rough conditions. Since there were so many Yugoslavian people here in Alaska, Bob Bartlett felt a natural affinity towards any others he met anywhere.

My father was a copper miner whose life was crushed out early from silicosis and tuberculosis developed in the mines.

Bob Bartlett had been a gold miner. He also knew the ravages of tuberculosis and fought hard to have it stamped out.

And Bob Bartlett had been a newspaperman—a good one. He understood what it meant to earn a living that way and he had a sort of special compassion for newspapermen who worked at it.

I used to become very amused at the way he would delightfully chuckle in his own inimitable way when I might set the White House on its heels or others because of having developed a story from a simple statement or maybe just a suggestion of whom to call—and sometimes he wouldn't say what about, just call so and so and chat with him—during the course of a conversation.

With that very delightful twinkle in his eyes, the rose in his lapel, that smile and that inevitable cigarette, he would muse "now where did you pick up that bit of information?"

Unfortunately while Bob Bartlett was alive, I never had the good fortune of coming to this wonderful challenging State. The first time was only last month when I flew in from Sachs Harbour after making the historic voyage through the ice of the Northwest Passage aboard the tanker S.S. *Manhattan* as that good ship made history, history that will be so important to Bob Bartlett's State.

The several days I spent in Alaska after debarking on Banks Island provided the perfect touch to the end of a magnificent voyage as the *Manhattan* headed towards its Alaskan goal.

The majestic mountain ranges with their untold beauty, the friendly and sturdy people who seem to have a sense of accomplishment about them, the atmosphere, the beauty that is Alaska—all of this is this last frontier of the United States. It all hits home. You realize full well that Alaska is a frontier society; it is a dynamic, spirited, restless, imaginative, changing society that thrives on hope and challenge.

All of this I loved because it recalled my early years in Nevada—home to me—a society that values a handshake as much as a contract. One of the few places left in the world where that is true.

As the book "This is Alaska" states:

"Alaska is a society that has no desire to boast of the fastest, the biggest, the most. It prefers to forget yesterday and dream of tomorrow. Many have deliberately abandoned comforts in other states, but only paradoxically [sic] to work toward creating similar comforts for themselves in Alaska.

"But with or without comforts, Alaskans are there because they thrive on challenge and have rediscovered the dignity of dreams and labor."

Oh, if only some of this could be transported and transmitted to so many people in the lower 48.

The feeling of this dignity of labor and the pride of the individual is so evident here. When I left last month, it was with sorrow because I hated to depart from such a challenging and exalting atmosphere of people, to leave people who knew what it was to live, work, and appreciate life. I said to many upon returning to the East Coast—if I were in my twenties, I'd move to Alaska to live.

At that time, I did not know that I would be back so soon, and never did I have any idea that I would be accorded tonight's very high honor—one which has made me indeed feel humble when I talk to you about your beloved Mister Alaska. I do think it is particularly fitting that this kickoff dinner for the memorial fund, Bob Bartlett Memorial Fund for the University of Alaska, is being held on the anniversary—the 102nd anniversary—of the purchase by the United States of Alaska from Russia.

Bob Bartlett would be pleased if he knew that the plans being formulated were to

make a living memorial in the field of education in his honor. Yes, he would have liked that.

"Education," Mr. Alaska once said, "is the greatest national investment we can make. It is only through knowledge that men can be free and preserve their liberty."

He was a great believer in teaching people and in helping them to improve themselves. He well knew that only an educated society can remain a free society.

As I understand it, this project being undertaken seeks to establish a basic fund of at least \$100,000 which will provide a minimum income annually—a continuing income—of at least \$5,000 to \$6,000 to have a seminar each year in his name. Naturally, if the fund is larger—and we hope it will be—the seminars can be far more extensive—and they should be in order to honor Bob Bartlett as he should be honored and in order to provide the full stimulus that should be provided to the students and people of Alaska.

If the Bob Bartlett Memorial Fund had an annual income of \$20,000 to \$25,000, the seminars could be far more extensive and all-reaching just as some of the special recent seminars held at the University of Alaska have been. These are helping to establish the University of Alaska firmly in the minds of the world as the leading center in the north—the Arctic area—in many fields.

The Memorial Fund will set up a series of lecture courses which bring to the University of Alaska the finest minds of the world to speak with and to discuss with Alaskan students all the matters of great moments in our society—be this in the area of geophysics, oceanography, merchant marine, communications, forestry, fisheries, and international trade.

Since Senator Bartlett felt so strongly that education is the tool by which dreams will and can be made to come true, and since the University of Alaska is located in his home town, it seems natural that this should be the focal point and the center for this massive drive to give him a living memorial.

The University of Alaska is the farthest north major university in the world. It does, and should continue, to serve as the international center for the North Pacific and for the Arctic area, tying three continents together. It is interesting that Fairbanks is 2,000 miles closer to Moscow than it is to Washington, D.C.

By thus embellishing the minds and spirits of young people passing through the portals and across the campuses where his feet trod, Senator Bartlett will, in effect, live once again, cultivating in the field of learning, new opportunities for the young Alaskans in whom the Senator had such boundless faith and measureless enthusiasm.

In a commencement address he delivered at the University of Alaska in 1960, Bob Bartlett said:

To fulfill our role as a State, Alaska is committed to act with intelligence, honesty and vision . . . Should any of these be lacking, we shall surely fail, even if we possess all other attributes in their highest order.

It is surely obvious that the complication of today's world demands clear intelligence. Nor is there today, nor was there ever in the past, any substitute for honesty, true dedication to a high moral order and willingness to put service to such moral precepts ahead of personal gain or wishes. Vision is that combination of thought, diligence and imagination behind all action.

If vision means this and not nonsense as the modern derogatory use indicates, let us then be visionary. Part of my vision for Alaska is this: The University of Alaska can well be the point from which these virtues come. A university in its highest function

is surely a mighty force injecting moral value, intelligence and vision into the life of the state. A university should be especially the point of vision in our society. Nowhere else is there so nearly the perfect atmosphere for thoughtful, clear examination of our goals and our methods. Nowhere else is there the accumulation of material—the recorded thoughts of all men in this search for the good. But more than all else the university is the home of that rare creativity kindled by the friction of young enthusiasm with mature minds—the flash that comes when age-old values or deep, valid thoughts or new preceptions fire in receptive and inventive brains. And the university is the place where an exchange of ideas is natural and itself creative. The thinker is the hardest working among all working men. And we need men who can and will think overtime.

The proposed seminars would provide the students—the future leaders of Alaska—with the opportunity to think overtime as they prepare themselves to carry on the work of, and nurture, this great land which Bob Bartlett nourished into a full grown star among the 50.

I recall so well that last day that Bob Bartlett sat as chairman of his merchant marine subcommittee. He never chaired again, for the next day he went to the hospital. What had taken place at that hearing caused his heart trouble to recur. After working so hard for more than a year to get a merchant marine program together with the White House—and I might tell you that it was Bob Bartlett who for the first time in years got the Senate Commerce Committee and the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee together and to work united towards improving this country's situation—he felt he had been sabotaged. "I've been sabotaged," he said, "we're going to push through an independent maritime administration program bill."

He wasn't able to participate in the passage of that bill, but his friends in the Senate moved it through while he guided them by telephone and kept urging it on.

It is indeed fitting that this kickoff for the memorial fund be held tonight practically on the eve of when President Nixon does intend to present the country with a new maritime program—the kind of a program Bob Bartlett would have liked because it will contain much of what he, Senator Magnuson, Eddie Garmatz, and Tom Downing had worked out originally.

The need for action in this area is so important. For the United States is so far behind that Democratic and Republican Party lines are unimportant. In fact, they have not been important as far as a maritime program is concerned with these leaders for several years. All the real friends of the merchant marine have ever wanted is action, whether it be Democratic or Republican. Although Bob Bartlett is not here to see it, he certainly helped lay the foundation for this revitalization program that is going to take place within the next decade, as the United States struggles desperately to regain her place in the world on the high seas.

You people in Alaska are probably more aware than anyone of the importance of transportation, whether it be by sea, air or land. And living as close as you do to Russia and the other polar regions, you have a feeling of why this country must have strength on the high seas.

To any country, seapower is all important. No country can survive as a great country without it. Seapower has four corners: Naval, merchant marine, oceanography, and fishing. All four legs are important here.

Bob Bartlett helped the fishing industry by enacting the subsidy bill under which fishermen can build modern fishing trawlers with

Government assistance equal to those of the Russians and Japanese.

He also was a strong proponent of the development of oceanography and had real feelings about the needs of new modern naval craft, particularly when we always realized that the Russian submarine fleet was growing so rapidly and that Russia was so close across the Bering Sea.

When the Senate of the United States held its memorial service to Bob Bartlett last January 3, his accomplishments were cited by Senator Ted Stevens as follows:

"Bob Bartlett's legislative achievements are almost too numerous to mention. The results of his tireless efforts within this Chamber have transformed the State of Alaska. When he arrived in Congress as a delegate in 1944, Americans knew Alaska only as an ice-locked wilderness with names such as Kiska, Attu and Dutch Harbor, more unfamiliar than Guadalcanal or Okinawa. But in 14 years a miracle had occurred: the population had doubled, roads and airports had sprung up, and Alaska was on the threshold of statehood. All of this was traceable to Bob Bartlett's ability and dedication of all his accomplishments and dreams, statehood for Alaska was his greatest triumph. As much as any other man he helped add the forty-ninth star to the American flag. A mark of his pride in this achievement could be seen in the Senate garage. Instead of the prestigious No. 1 license plate of a senior senator, his was Alaska No. 49. But for Bob, statehood was only a beginning. Alaska had become a State, and now her potential had to be developed and her vast resources tapped for the good of the nation and the world. Permission for Japanese pulp mills in Alaska, increased oil and gas revenues to Alaska from Federal leasing, public works projects without number and the infusion of massive amounts of Federal aid after the earthquake in 1964 and the Fairbanks flood of 1967, are but some of his landmark achievements for the State of Alaska.

"But it should not be thought that his only concern was for the citizens of his own State. His legislation reflected a tremendous concern for the welfare of all Americans, with such bills as the radiation safety bill, which set sweeping safety standards for all radiation-emitting equipment from television sets to X-ray machines, and the Bartlett act, which provided that all federally funded buildings be constructed so as to provide easy access and use for the physically handicapped.

"Senator Bartlett led efforts which resulted in the establishment of nine-mile contiguous fishing zone as well as the law which gave the Coast Guard the authority it needs to see that our fishing zone and territorial waters are protected from foreign incursion. His concern for the welfare and growth of the American fishing industry produced such legislative achievements as the addition of fish to the food-for-peace program and the Commercial Fisheries Research and Development Act of 1964."

In 1965, President Johnson wired to a testimonial: "His accomplishments in both houses of Congress match the high mountains and broad plains of Alaska."

When Senator Hart of Michigan prepared to talk, he said that he had to struggle for simple eloquence to express the affection which the Senate had for Mister Alaska.

These were the simple words:

"He was a man of courage, as he showed in casting the deciding vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the debate over the Civil Rights Act of 1968. That vote I shall never forget.

"He was a man of compassion as he showed time after time in efforts to help the poor of the nation.

"He was a man of understanding, who was never too busy to listen to and to help

a fellow man, whether that man was a U.S. senator, a constituent or an elevator operator."

A man who operates the freight elevator in the Senate Office Building recalled that Senator Bartlett was the only member of the Senate who was willing to ride that elevator. And in typical Bob Bartlett fashion, he always asked the elevator operator about his family.

Probably no finer words about Bob Bartlett were expressed than those of Senator Cotton, the ranking Republican on the Commerce Committee. He said that he never knew a single member of either body or either party who did not like and respect Bob Bartlett. Some men do not incur animosities simply because they have negative personalities and have little force or influence—not so in the case of Bob Bartlett, Senator Cotton continued. He fought doggedly and determinedly for the principles in which he believed and instantly gave battle whenever the welfare of Alaska or its people were concerned. But he had the rare and priceless faculty of being always firm but never offensive. He could differ without anger. He could lose without rancor. He could win without exultation. In all the years I was associated with him, Senator Cotton continued, I never saw him show the slightest sign of losing his temper. His courtesy was unfailing because it was born of a deep affection not only for his associates here but for all men everywhere. No wonder he exercised a mighty, though unobtrusive, influence in the Congress. No wonder he accomplished so much for Alaska. No wonder he contributed in such a large measure to the winning of Alaskan statehood.

In speaking of his beloved State, Bob Bartlett himself said:

"I love Alaska. My attachment for it, my concern for it, is so deeply imbedded that it is a very part of me. There I have grown, studied, married and worked. I have toiled in her beautiful natural setting as a gold miner. I have learned the life of her towns as a reporter. I have met her people as an appointed administrator and again as Delegate and Senator. As years pile upon years, there is a greater personal insistence in drawing upon memory's treasure trove."

And Alaska loved Bob Bartlett. And still does. As a result, Alaska today has three Senators in Washington—Senator Gravel who is here with us tonight, Senator Stevens, and Vide Bartlett. She has much of the same naturalness, warmth and human understanding that was so much a part of her husband.

Bob Bartlett was a service senator. He did not seek headlines. He preferred to take care of the homesteads of the people in the backwoods rather than be in the public eye.

As someone said, it has come abundantly clear that he is the most loved and respected man that ever walked across Alaska.

Typical of those was the letter from an Eskimo lady in Kotzebue who wrote that the footsteps of Bob Bartlett across the whole of Alaska will never be dimmed in our memory.

Vide, Donna Anne and citizens of Alaska. It is with deep humility that I say thank you so much for letting me share tonight in honor of this great and good man with you. It is indeed a rare privilege, a privilege I shall always cherish.

RICHARD A. SHAFTER

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, I was deeply saddened to learn of the passing last Thursday of an old and dear friend of mine, Richard Shafter, of Belleville,

N.J. Mr. Shafter was a native of Berlin, Germany, who came to the United States after World War I and worked as a reporter for several newspapers in New Jersey, Michigan, and New York. In 1949 he joined the public relations department of CARE, Inc., the overseas aid agency in New York, and was a vice president of the CARE employees union.

Dick Shafter was a man whose lofty ideals, provided me with a great source of inspiration over the years, and whose wise counsel was gratefully taken. He was a person who cared deeply for his fellowman, and though there is little that one can say to ease his family's sorrow, I know that they can take consolation in the sure knowledge that Dick's compassion and dedicated service touched all who knew him and made all our lives more meaningful.

PROFIT IN POVERTY—\$186,000 TO JULIAN BOND AND SNCC ASSOCIATES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the payment of \$186,000 of taxpayers' hard-earned money to Georgia demagog Julian Bond and his SNCC associate, John Lewis, must be another part of the so-called Southern strategy of the Republicans.

The other two poverty profiteers cutting the melon are from Secretary Finch's Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—in fact one of them, Lonnice King, is still on the HEW payroll. We are apt to find H. Rapp Brown and Stokely Carmichael on the payoff list any time.

I insert a pertinent newsclipping:

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 1, 1970]
BOND'S FIRM IS CLEARED BY OEO—\$186,000 CONTRACT REINSTATED
(By Robert C. Maynard)

The Office of Economic Opportunity has reinstated its contract with an Atlanta consulting firm owned partly by Georgia legislator Julian Bond after a three-month FBI investigation. The former civil rights organizer charged that the probe was racially inspired.

Awarded a \$186,000 contract last July to provide technical assistance to local OEO-funded programs, Frontiers Unlimited was informed in October that it would receive no more assignments until OEO and the FBI completed investigations of several members of the firm.

OEO told Bond and his associates on Friday that both agencies had decided Frontiers should have a clean bill of health.

The investigation focused primarily on whether two officers of Bond's firm—Charles Black and former Washingtonian Lonnice King—were in conflict of interest situations because of their government connections. Black had been an employee of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, where King remains as a civil rights specialist in the Atlanta office.

OEO said the FBI was satisfied that there was no case against either of the men and

OEO's own investigation concluded no impropriety had occurred.

In a statement released here yesterday, the three men said they were relieved that "the snide, racist innuendos for once have been officially laid to rest."

Their lawyers had charged that "political pressure" was exerted on OEO to kill the contract, despite OEO evaluations of the work of the firm as satisfactory.

Donald S. Lowitz, OEO general counsel, denied yesterday that any "pressure" was placed on his agency.

Sen. Richard B. Russell (D-Ga.), chairman of the Senate Appropriations Committee, was among those demanding from OEO a "detailed and complete report" of the Frontiers Unlimited contract.

One Atlanta political leader said pressure for an investigation was demanded because "first of all, the name of Julian Bond is anathema in Georgia and second, because he is a potential political threat."

Bond has been the center of speculation that a black man would run for the Fifth Congressional District seat in Atlanta, now held by Republican Fletcher Thompson.

The fourth member of the firm is John Lewis, former president of Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee.

CLEAN WATER REGIONS TO FACE SHAKEUPS

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker—

WORDS SOUND NICE BUT ACTION COUNTS

Some think it ironic that President Nixon might, with fanfare, remove postmasterships from politics only to use vital agencies such as the Water Pollution Control Commission for political featherbedding.

Mr. Speaker, the above words are the concluding paragraph in a most disturbing article which appears in the Christian Science Monitor of this morning.

That story indicates that experienced personnel in the area of water resources are losing their jobs for political reasons and to persons with little or no training or background in the water pollution field.

A few days ago the Congress and the people of the United States listened to the President give a thoughtful and impressive speech on the state of the Union. That speech contained no details, but certainly gave those of us who heard it the impression that the protection of our environment was to be a key concern of the administration, just as it is to many of us in the Congress.

To date we are still waiting to see the specifics the President spoke of in his state of the Union address, including the purported allocation of \$10 billion in Federal funds to clean up our Nation's waterways.

Nonetheless, Mr. Speaker, the American people must judge the President, the Congress, and all public officials on actions rather than words, on results rather than images, on what we do or try to do, rather than just what we say. Concerned citizens who are so aware of the need for environmental protection

will be doing just that for many months and years to come.

We have heard general proposals and rhetoric from the administration. From the Democrats, Senators MUSKIE and NELSON and Congressman DINGELL, BLATNIK, and many others have introduced numerous proposals giving detailed plans for environmental action on the part of the Congress.

If the actions related in the newspaper this morning are true, they speak much louder than the rhetoric we heard in the President's state of the Union address. Words sound nice, Mr. Speaker, but action counts.

I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

CLEAN WATER REGIONS TO FACE SHAKEUPS

ATLANTA.—As John R. Thoman, Southeast regional director of the Federal Water Pollution Control Commission, prepared last week for a series of crucial conferences on regional water-pollution problems, he wrestled with another problem, as well.

He had to decide whether to accept a transfer to the commission's Charlottesville, Va., regional office or resign after 26 years in federal service. And the decision had to be made by Feb. 6.

Mr. Thoman's civil-service status in his \$25,000-a-year job does not protect him from the kind of transfer-or-quit ultimatum received from David Dominick, new director of the commission. Mr. Dominick, inexperienced in this field, is the nephew of Sen. Peter H. Dominick (R) of Colorado.

Four other regional directors reportedly faced this choice of accepting transfer orders or quitting.

CHICAGO CHIEF RESIGNS

One already has resigned. On Mr. Thoman's desk was a copy of the Chicago Tribune with a story announcing that H. Wallace Poston, head of the Great Lakes region of the Water Pollution Control Commission, had resigned to become head of Mayor Richard J. Daley's new Department of Environmental Control. Mr. Poston was believed to have been slated for transfer to Atlanta.

Mr. Thoman has been Southeast director since 1967. Prior to that, he was director of the Southeast Water Laboratory in Athens, Ga., starting in 1963.

Though he has served in numerous posts in his long government career, Mr. Thoman indicated great reluctance to a move at this stage of his career. He gave the impression he would "retire" in order to keep his family in Atlanta, despite the loss in pension benefits this would mean.

He expressed concern that some of the young staffers he had attracted to the Athens facility and the Atlanta office might quit in disgust. While workers in government bureaus tend to take high-echelon changes in stride, they expect replacements to be competent and to be committed to certain goals.

POLITICS LOOMS IN PICTURE

Reports indicate the replacement for Mr. Poston in Chicago will be a political appointee with no background in the resources field.

There is also at least one local precedent since the Nixon administration took over which causes unease here. William J. Page, highly respected regional director for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, was transferred to Washington and replaced by Cary Hall, apparently at the insistence of Southern Republican Party leaders. Mr. Hall, a retired Navy officer, has little or no background in the fields he will oversee.

And last week William W. Suttle, Southeastern director for the Office of Economic

Opportunity, resigned. He cited "incompatibility" with the new administration's definition of OEO's responsibilities.

Other regional offices of federal agencies here have an air of general unease about how things will be under the administration, and there has been talk of personnel cutbacks because of budget limitations.

Key personnel are waiting to see if there will be a pattern of placing political appointees rather than career civil servants atop agencies handling sensitive social and environmental problems.

Some think it ironic that President Nixon might, with fanfare, remove postmasterships from politics only to use vital agencies such as the Water Pollution Control Commission for political featherbedding.

RESCUING RAIL SERVICE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that rail passenger service in this country leaves much to be desired. Hopefully, the Department of Transportation will move into this long-neglected area in a proper fashion.

This is the theme of a Chicago Daily News editorial Tuesday, January 20, which I insert into the RECORD, believing it to be a very timely commentary on this issue:

RESCUING RAIL SERVICE

The miserable state of passenger train service has finally brought the federal administration and Congress into action. Congress is examining a number of bills designed to preserve the fast-vanishing passenger service on intercity routes, including some that would provide an outright subsidy for the railroads.

The White House has refused to put its stamp of approval on an imaginative proposal produced by the Department of Transportation. But it clearly feels impelled to move in the same general direction. The Transportation Department plan would set up a public-private corporation modeled after the Communication Satellite Corp.

The proposed corporation, tentatively named Railpax, would be charged with operating passenger trains over a single, nationwide network. It presumably would concentrate on short hauls—up to 500 miles—between large population centers, but try also to keep a few transcontinental trains running. The railroads would hold the original stock in the corporation, in exchange for turning over their passenger equipment—such as it is. Later, stock might be sold to the public. Federal aid to upgrade equipment is contemplated.

Few would argue against some sort of drastic action to keep the trains running. Growing congestion on the highways and in the air may one day revive the idea that trains offer a desirable alternative and bring passengers back in droves. Even now, the question is not completely answered as to whether the passengers abandoned the railroads or the railroads abandoned the passengers.

Speedy jet service obviously pulled away most of the long-haul passengers, and super-highways made short trips by train virtually obsolete. Yet many a paying customer who would rather travel medium distances by train has turned away in disgust at run-down equipment, lack of dining facilities,

and an attitude that plainly says "Go away, we don't want you." With few exceptions, the railroads have given more thought to the care and comfort of freight than people.

A rail network devoted solely to caring about people would be something new. And we suspect the people would respond.

No plan can be expected to restore rail passenger service to what it was in its heyday, of course. In 1920, when 20,000 passenger trains were running in this country, there were no attractive alternatives. But it approaches the ridiculous that only 439 trains now carry passengers—a reduction of 1,120 just since 1958.

It is too soon to say whether the Department of Transportation's plan for a quasi-public corporation is the best plan that can be devised. Hearings on this and other proposals could occupy much of Congress' time during the session just beginning. But 1970 could—and should—be the year when the nation starts to pump life back into the dying rail travel business.

H.R. 15660

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in the last few weeks, several significant developments have taken place on the housing scene. First, yearend reports filed by corporations involved in homebuilding revealed falling profits. Second, savings and loan associations, the primary home mortgage lenders, have indicated that emergency measures aimed at halting the outflow of funds did not prevent a further reduction in the volume of savings funds which were on deposit with these home lending institutions. All available evidence seemed to indicate that these funds were shifted to higher yielding instruments, including tax-exempt bonds and Government agency issues. Third, housing starts continued to plunge to the point that they were, in December, approximately 30 percent below the annual rate of activity projected in the President's report on national housing goals. Add to this the fact that in many areas of the land houses stand empty because buyers and sellers are unable to arrange a sales transaction on terms which are within the realm of reason. Further, add the fact that housing sales which are consummated in this period are concluded—in many cases—through the working out of intricate financing techniques. I would suggest to you, that these facts all point to one conclusion—the housing market mechanism is no longer functioning effectively.

Before, we have expressed concern over the failure of efforts to produce enough housing at a low enough price. That alone—is a serious problem. However, it is nowhere near as serious as a breakdown of the housing market because such a collapse carries with it several immense costs. The cost of a housing market breakdown are movement of management, money, and manpower to other sectors of the economy; the strangulation of the specialized thrift institution which concentrates on home mortgage

lending; and, a decline in the public's confidence and participation in a process which, heretofore, has enabled every citizen to acquire a material stake in the stability and progress of his community.

Today, I am introducing a measure aimed at shoring up the housing market by providing indirect tax incentives. This bill has three aspects. It aims to encourage savers to deposit their funds in the institutions which engage in home mortgage lending by excluding from Federal income taxation the first \$750 of interest paid to savers by the institutions. In addition, the bill includes a provision reducing the Federal income tax burden imposed on businessmen engaged in the construction, sale, or financing of housing.

The third aspect of this measure deals with the two classes of entities which have, in recent years, shown the most dramatic growth. Because of their favored Federal income tax treatment, the private foundations and the pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans have grown most dramatically. Presently, it is estimated that they represent \$250 billion. The reasoning behind this tax approach is that in exchange for a public benefit, favored tax treatment, the favored parties should help shoulder a public burden, supplying funds for housing. The bill calls for these entities to shift a quarter of their assets into housing investment within the next 25 years. There will, no doubt, be some who will criticize any tax relief, including this measure to help the housing industry. Before this approach is criticized, I would caution a consideration of the alternative. There is already talk of a massive, federally financed and administered direct housing loan program. The approach I offer would, I suggest, cost but a fraction of the alternative. Also, it would insure the continuing vitality of the housing market and the institutions which participate therein.

The bill follows:

H.R. 15660

A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to encourage the construction of, and investment in, housing

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) (1) subchapter B of chapter 1 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to computation of taxable income) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new part:

PART XI—HOME BUILDING AND FINANCING BUSINESSES

"Sec. 291. Taxable income of home building and financing businesses.

"SEC. 291. TAXABLE INCOME OF HOME BUILDING AND FINANCING BUSINESSES.

"(a) Computation of Taxable Income.—In the case of a home building or finance business, the taxable income for taxable years beginning in 1970 and 1971 shall be determined as follows:

"(1) First determine the taxable income of the taxpayer computed without regard to this section.

"(2) Then subtract from the amount determined under paragraph (1) an amount equal to — percent of the taxpayer's net home building and financing income.

"(b) Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Net home building and financing income.—The term 'net home building and financing income' means—

"(A) the items of gross income of the taxpayer derived from the construction, reconstruction, financing, or sale of—

"(i) new housing financed or sold by the taxpayer, and

"(ii) substantially rehabilitated housing which is financed or sold by the taxpayer and which was never occupied by the taxpayer or a tenant of the taxpayer, less

"(B) the deductions properly attributable to the items described in subparagraph (A).

"(2) Home building or financing business.—The term 'home building or financing business' means a taxpayer engaged in the trade or business of constructing, reconstructing, financing, or selling new or substantially rehabilitated housing.

"(3) Substantially rehabilitated housing.—Housing shall be considered substantially rehabilitated only if over a period of two consecutive taxable years (including the taxable year in which the taxpayer sold or financed such housing) the aggregate amount of rehabilitation expenditures paid or incurred with respect to such housing exceeds the greater of—

"(A) 20 per centum of the fair market value of such housing at the time of such sale or financing, or

"(B) the product of \$3,000 times the number of dwelling units in such housing.

For purposes of this paragraph, the term 'rehabilitation expenditures' means amounts chargeable to capital account and incurred for property or additions or improvements to property (or related facilities) with a useful life of 5 years or more, in connection with the rehabilitation of an existing building for housing purposes; but such term does not include the cost of acquisition of such building or any interest therein."

(2) The table of parts for such subchapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"Part XI—Home Building and Financing Businesses"

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply with respect to taxable years beginning December 31, 1969.

SEC. 2. (a) (1) Chapter 42 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to private foundations) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:

"SEC. 4949. TAX ON FAILURE TO HOLD REQUIRED HOUSING INVESTMENTS."

"(a) Imposition of Tax.—If the actual housing investments for a taxable year of an organization subject to this section for such year are less than the required housing investments of such organization for such year, there is hereby imposed on the failure to hold the required housing investments a tax equal to 100 percent of the amount by which the required housing investments are less than the actual housing investments. Such tax shall be paid by the organization.

"(b) Required Housing Investments.—For purposes of this section, the term 'required housing investments', with respect to an organization for a taxable year, means housing investments held by such organization during such taxable year equal in amount to the lesser of—

"(1) the applicable percentage (determined under subsection (c)(3)) of the fair market value of such organization's assets, or

"(2) the sum of (A) the fair market value of such organization's actual housing investments at the close of the preceding taxable year, plus (B) 25 percent of the net investment income (as defined in section 4940(c)(1)) of such organization for the taxable year.

"(c) Other Definitions.—For purposes of this section—

"(1) Actual housing investments.—The term 'actual housing investments', with respect to an organization for a taxable year, means the amount of housing investments held by such organization, determined at such time or times during such year as the Secretary or his delegate shall by regulations prescribe.

"(2) Housing investment.—The term 'housing investment', with respect to any organization at any particular time, means—

"(A) any loan, purchase of securities, participation certificates, mortgage backed securities, certificate of deposit issued by a federally insured savings and loan association or obligations (including a mortgage), or other capital contribution, made by such organization specifically to aid in the purchase, construction, rehabilitation, or operation and maintenance of real property primarily for residential purposes, to the extent of the legal obligation to repay or redeem the amount thereof which (at such time) is held by such organization; and

"(B) the direct or indirect ownership by such organization of any real property used primarily for residential purposes, to the extent of the fair market value (at such time) of such property or the interest of such organization therein.

"(3) Applicable percentage.—The term 'applicable percentage' means the lesser of—

"(A) 25 percent, or

"(B) 1 percent multiplied by the number of calendar years ending after 1969 and on or before the close of the taxable year.

"(d) Organizations Subject to Tax.—

"(1) In general.—Except as provided in paragraph (2), an organization is subject to this section for a taxable year if for such year it is—

"(A) a private foundation,

"(B) an organization described in section 402(a) (relating to qualified pension, profit-sharing, and stock bonus plans), or

"(C) an organization described in section 501(c)(4), (5), or (6) (relating to social welfare, organizations, labor organizations, business leagues, etc.).

"(2) Exemption.—An organization shall not be subject to this section for a taxable year if the fair market value of its assets at the beginning of such year does not exceed \$4,000,000."

(2) The table of sections for such chapter is amended by adding at the end thereof the following item:

"Sec. 4949. Tax on failure to hold required housing investments."

(b) The amendments made by subsection (a) of this section shall apply to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act.

SEC. 3. (a) (1) Part III of subchapter B of chapter I of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 (relating to items specifically excluded from gross income) is amended by redesignating section 124 as section 125 and by inserting after section 123 the following new section:

"SEC. 123. DIVIDENDS ON DEPOSITS IN CERTAIN SAVINGS INSTITUTIONS."

"(a) General Rule.—Gross income does not include amounts received by, or credited to the account of, a taxpayer as dividends or interest on deposits or withdrawable accounts in a savings institution to which part II of subchapter H is applicable.

"(b) Limitation.—The exclusion allowed to each taxpayer under this section shall in the aggregate not exceed \$750 for any taxable year."

(2) The table of sections for such part is amended by striking out the last item and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"Sec. 123. Dividends on deposits in certain savings institutions."

"SEC. 124. Cross references to other Acts."

(b) The amendments made by this section shall apply only with respect to taxable years ending after the date of enactment of this Act.

NEED AIRPORT NOW

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Worth, Ill., Palos Reporter has earned recognition for maintaining an extremely energetic editorial page which deals not only with issues relevant to the local communities it serves but also with issues of regional and national impact.

In its lead editorial Thursday, January 29, written by its scholarly publisher, Edward E. Roelofs, the Reporter comments on the controversy which has developed over the timing and location of a third major airport to serve the Chicago metropolitan area. The editorial follows:

WE NEED AIRPORT NOW—OUT HERE

(By Edward E. Roelofs)

After two or three years of careful planning for a new large airport for Chicagoland to meet the obvious growth pattern of air traffic, both passenger and freight, it came as a surprise when Mayor Daley told a group of Chicago businessmen last Friday, that we wouldn't need a third airport for 10 to 15 years.

If it came as a surprise that Daley, who has been the chief advocate of putting a third airport in Lake Michigan, changed his mind, a clue to his change of mind is boldly stated in a Daily news headline, which reads: "Daley gives Midway Pitch." The story flatly states that he is putting pressure on the airlines to make more use of Midway Airport.

There were several other clues in reports on reactions to his "surprise" speech. For example, strong opposition has come from many sources, including Gov. Ogilvie, to a lake airport because of its damaging effects on Lake Michigan and to property on the adjacent lake shore.

The charge of polluting the Lake is most often heard, but other considerations include the amount of space needed for ground traffic and for new industry seeking locations near air transports; the fabulous cost of the dikes and tunnels and the time it would take to build such an airport—maybe that is implied in Mayor Daley's new opinion of the time schedule.

We were very much interested by the reaction of the airlines. They were not only surprised but "disputed Daley's timetable" and said they will proceed with their plans for a third airport. They indicate a much earlier start is needed, not only, but say Midway "is not presently suited for 707 jets" or the "many more facilities" now needed.

We have attended numerous conferences and discussions on the future of air traffic and conclude that the preponderance of evidence points to the urgency of proceeding now with a third airport, and that the best location would be in a location which has been carefully engineered and studied known as The Green Garden site near Frankfort. This site offers not only an available 23,000 acres, but plenty of surrounding space for new business and industry, and excellent transportation potential.

The Green Garden site, several miles south of Highway 30 west of Harlem avenue, is beautifully located to serve as a regional airport for all of South Cook County, for the counties south and west, as well as for north-west Indiana. We urge our readers to study area maps and see the vast possibilities of an airport to serve this fast growing region. We appreciate that Daley is the ambitious Mayor of Chicago, but point out that this large city is only a part of a much larger metropolitan area and the southwest area which now offers the space for future development.

THE CANCELLATION OF AN ISRAELI SELLOUT

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, January 29, 1970

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, in deference to the President, and in recognition of his newly found insight into the Middle East crisis, I shall try to speak in a low voice—but that is not going to be an easy task in view of the administration's previous proposals to deal with the Israeli-Arab situation in the Middle East. And in deference to the Vice President, I am going to tell it like it is.

The statement issued by Secretary of State Rogers on December 9 leaves no doubt that the administration was all too eager to trade the blood of the gallant Israeli people for Arabian oil. Some kinder critics have interpreted it as a policy of appeasement, but I do not think they are quite telling it like it is. Look again, I would say, and see if you cannot find the word "sellout" beneath the surface.

In fact, to consider it a policy of any kind is to give it an aura of dignity and statesmanship. Stripped bare of velvet oratory, it was no more than a scheme—a cruel, calculated but transparent scheme devised to serve the best interests of the wealthy power brokers of this country who are fearful of losing some of their millions to an economic squeeze by the Arab States.

To get some idea of how the architects of this scheme operated, one has only to read an article which appeared in the New York Times on December 22. It was written by the paper's Washington correspondent, Tad Szulc, and headlined: "Industrialists Reported To Warn Nixon on Loss of Influence with Arabs." Part of the article read:

President Nixon is reported to have received warnings from a group of top American industry leaders with oil and other interests in the Middle East that the United States is rapidly losing political and economic influence in the Arab states because of its present policies.

The industrialists' concern over the deterioration of the United States position in the Middle East and over the proportional growth of the Soviet Union there—attributed by them in part to Washington's past support for Israel—was expressed at an unpublished meeting at the White House on December 9.

A White House spokesman has confirmed that Mr. Nixon had asked the group to discuss with him the "political situation in the Middle East." The members included:

David Rockefeller, president of the Chase Manhattan Banks.

John J. McCloy, former president of Chase Manhattan, and

Robert B. Anderson, former Secretary of the Treasury and a director of Dresser Industries Company, which has oil interests in Kuwait and Libya.

Administration officials said that the President had invited them to hear their views on the eve of the December 10 session of the National Security Council, which was dedicated to a review of the United States policy in the Middle East.

Attending the industrialists' meeting with Mr. Nixon was Henry A. Kissinger, the President's special assistant for national security affairs. White House officials emphasized that those conferring with the President were people with a political knowledge of the Middle East situation and the oil situation in the Middle East.

According to officials familiar with the discussion, the consensus in the group was that the United States must act immediately to improve its relations with oil-producing and other Arab states. The group was said to feel this was necessary to deflect what the group feared to be an imminent loss of United States standing in the Middle East that might be reflected politically as well as in terms of American petroleum interests in the area.

The December 9 statement by Secretary of State Rogers—issued the very same day the President met with some of these power brokers—represents a very serious departure from the policy our Government had pursued since the 6-day war of 1967. That policy maintained that the parties directly involved in the dispute—namely, Israel and the Arabs, must settle their differences through direct negotiations, and that there should be no withdrawal from occupied territories without direct negotiations.

The statement by Secretary Rogers attempted to reverse this basic principle. It demanded that Israel give up all occupied territory and then negotiate with the Arabs—a naive and dangerous course indeed because Israel would have nothing left for bargaining purposes.

Mr. Rogers also suggested making Jerusalem an international city. During the 20 years that the city was divided this could have been done but was not. Now, since 1967, the entire city is open to all and access to all religious shrines by everyone is a right which Israel encourages. Jerusalem is, without a doubt, an international city now.

Where has Mr. Rogers been since 1967? Perhaps, oil blinds the vision and dulls the sensitivity of some men.

Americans who cherish principle above expediency and value life above property have cried out against the unjust and dangerous implications of our Government's attempt to implement a new policy in the Middle East. To the satisfaction of the power brokers, we were playing roulette with the lives of the Israeli people.

It is not enough that France, Germany, and Great Britain have abandoned this last bastion of democracy in the Middle East while the Soviet Union eagerly supports the Arab States? Yet, Secretary Rogers chose to call the administration's proposal "an even-handed policy." If he meant to imply that our support of Israel

has dissipated into neutrality, he is not even right on that score. The policy he suggested was anything but "even-handed." It was, instead, a policy that would have weighed heavily against Israel—the betrayal of a good, loyal, and unsuspecting friend.

It would be suicidal for Israel to relinquish occupied territory and revert to the obsolete borders of the 1949 armistice which were artificial, overlong, and strategically indefensible—a constant invitation to Arab terrorist excursions.

The present territorial delineation, determined by the cease-fire of June 1967, gives Israel a measure of protection against aggression and invasion.

Israel does not have to apologize for holding to the strategic cease-fire lines. The areas it holds under the cease-fire provisions are not essential for the existence and well-being of the Arab States. But they are most essential for the security and development of Israel. And they are part and parcel of the national territory of the reborn Jewish State which is an organic entity.

It was necessary to speak out, as most Americans did, against a policy which was obviously biased and inequitable and we were morally compelled and democratically obligated to do so. It was our sacred responsibility, as Americans, to let our Government know our outraged feelings against its unreasonable policy proposal in regard to the Arab-Israeli conflict. And I for one am happy to see that the outcries have been heeded—so far. We have done this not only because we regarded the policy as injurious to Israel, but also because it was contrary to the highest interests of our own country. Israel is the only true and tested friend of the United States in the Middle East. Sacrificing Israel to secure economic and political gain in the Arab States for the power brokers of our Nation would have been a severe blow to the honor and integrity of America.

Israel cannot be sold out to the Wall Street interests—and we must not let the United States make the mistake again of thinking that it can ever sell out Israel.

There is no better example of the proper role for Congress. We have urged the State Department to reverse its recent decision and continue its previous policy of unflinching support for Israel and her demands to be recognized as a sovereign nation—and it has taken some effect. The responsibility, however, continues. We must continue to monitor our foreign affairs and bring our opinions and views to bear on those who may feel spurred by selfish interests to promote policies that are blatantly immoral.

"SILENT MAJORITY" FAVORS BIBLE READING IN SCHOOLS

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, I am in receipt of a petition signed by 700 citizens

of Independence, Kans., expressing their support in favor of permitting prayer and the reading of the Bible in schools. This group of citizens urge that immediate steps be taken to stop the sale of and distribution of harmful drugs and all forms of pornography in films, literature, and the news media.

Mr. Speaker, some time ago I introduced legislation which, if enacted into law, would meet these objectives.

I appreciate the support of the "silent majority of Independence" and I hope that other Members of Congress will be hearing from the silent majority in their own districts. The "silent majority" are the ones who go about doing their jobs, paying taxes, attending church, and taking a strong stand on the important issues facing their families and the Nation.

I submit for the RECORD a copy of the petition:

**"SILENT MAJORITY OF INDEPENDENCE"
PETITION**

As a part of a silent majority, we, the undersigned, desire to stand and be counted on the following issues.

I. We affirm our faith in God and believe our nation and its leaders need His divine guidance for the critical problems at hand. We earnestly believe in the power of prayer to give us that guidance. We therefore respectfully request your consideration of the following:

A. We appreciate and commend the astronauts for the Christian testimony they gave by offering prayer and reading from the Bible; and we claim the right so to do.

B. We request that the privilege of prayer be restored to our public schools.

II. We believe in the United States of America and in our leaders. We cherish our liberty and freedom. We believe that with that freedom comes responsibility, and that no one has a right to use this freedom to the detriment of another. We therefore bitterly oppose exploiting, which would tend to enslave or cripple our youth or any other citizen of our nation, physically, morally, or spiritually. We therefore respectfully request your consideration of the following specific points:

A. We urge, and will support, strong and immediate action against the sale, distribution, or use of harmful drugs.

B. We urge, and will support, strong and immediate action against all forms of obscenity and pornography in film, literature, and all news media.

These signatures are willingly and individually given, and each or all may be investigated as to validity.

Signed by more than 700 Independence citizens representing the "Silent Majority."

A TRIBUTE TO A FELLOW-MINNESOTAN, BERTRAM STILLWELL

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues and the people of Minnesota, I would like to read into the RECORD a tribute to a fellow Minnesotan Bertram Stillwell, Director of the Office of Proceedings, Interstate Commerce Commission, who has distinguished himself as an outstanding civil servant in one of the most complex areas of Government—transportation regulation.

CXVI—138—Part 2

Director Stillwell is retiring from public life after 43 years of service with the ICC. During the course of these years, Mr. Stillwell made impressive contributions to improvement of the regulatory process. His expertise will be missed, not only by the members of the Interstate Commerce Commission, but by the people Mr. Stillwell was dedicated to serve—the American public.

A native of Appleton, Minn., Mr. Stillwell was in the Army during World War I and was later graduated from the University of Minnesota Law School. After practicing law in Minneapolis, he joined the ICC in 1926 as an examiner in the Commission's former Bureau of Formal Cases. He became an attorney-adviser to the late Commissioner Clyde D. Aitchison and rose through progressively responsible positions to the directorship of the Office of Proceedings. The Office is responsible for processing the flow of the Commission's cases and the assignment of hearing examiners to handle finance, operating rights, and rates and practices proceedings.

The members of the Commission recently assembled to pay tribute to Director Stillwell and to recognize him as the unofficial "Twelfth Member" of this oldest, independent, regulatory agency. His remarks at the time summarized the key to his philosophy of finding the right decision to make when a multitude of conflicting requests are bounded by a host of freely interpretable laws:

Just follow the Commission's long-standing instances that the "public interest" must first be served, and the issues and the law will line up very clearly.

Across the many years of his service he has heard many nationally significant cases and wrote reports which became hallmarks for development of innovative transportation policy to match the needs of an expanding economy.

Mr. Stillwell will be sincerely missed on the transportation scene, and it is my hope that his years of retirement will prove as worthwhile as those he spent serving the American people.

NATIONAL JAYCEE WEEK

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the week of January 18 was designated as National Jaycee Week. I would like to join my colleagues in honoring the Jaycees' 50th anniversary. Those 50 years have been years of service and dedication to the community; those years mark the efforts of hundreds of thousands of men to make their cities, States, and country a better place to live. These young men, leaders in their communities, are evidence that this country has a good future. I would like to add that I know through my personal experience that these men are not only leaders and community helpers, they are also just plain fine folks.

I am especially proud to say that a

young man from my district in Minnesota has been selected by the Jaycees as one of America's 10 outstanding young men for 1969. He is Russ Voorhees, of Pipestone, Minn. The following editorial from the Rock County Star Herald of Luverne, Minn., tells the story of his contribution to the Pipestone area:

PIPESTONE'S "GO" MAN DARED BE AN OPTIMIST

A young South Dakotan arrived in Pipestone in 1962, and proceeded to hang up a shingle which read Russell L. Voorhees, Attorney-At-Law.

From that date on, the name Voorhees has been synonymous with the word, "Go!"

Today, at the age of 35, he is one of 10 outstanding men in the United States, according to an evaluation made by the United States Jaycees.

He wasn't picked for the honor because of judicious legal advice he had given, nor for cases he has won in court. Sitting in his office never was to his liking.

He had in his system some of that pioneering spirit which prevailed in the settlers of Midwest America. There was work to be done, and this to him, was reason enough to set about to do it.

It wasn't easy, and he had his share of setbacks. A lot of Pipestone people predicted he was heading for a fall. But he didn't, and word spread that there was a young fellow in the Hiawatha city that was going great guns right now, but "some day he'll get his come uppance."

Today he's going stronger than ever. There are still those who think his bubble is going to burst, but the number is becoming fewer and fewer.

Voorhees is chairman of the board of Pawnee Corporation, which he founded, and which has done more to put the city of Pipestone on the map in the last eight years than anything with the possible exception of the Hiawatha pageant and National Monument.

Thanks to Voorhees, and his enterprising efforts, Pipestone has experienced civic and business vitality that is the envy of every small city in the Upper Midwest.

Voorhees' influence has been felt not only in Pipestone, but in more than 50 other towns, Luverne included, where the Pawnee Corporation now operates plants of various kinds involved in what he chooses to call agri-business.

People of Rock county join with all Minnesota in saluting Russell Voorhees for the honor that has come to him, and for the recognition he has brought not only to the City of Pipestone, but to Minnesota and the entire Upper Midwest.

His success story is one that has been written because he had courage to be an optimist, and the adventuresome spirit to take a few risks.

It just goes to prove that America is still the land of opportunity for those who take advantage of the power of positive thinking.

HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

TO SAVE THE NATION IS THE FIRST LAW—THIEU

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, February 2, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, at a time when we are about to be once again deafened by the loud cry of "priorities" from the left, it might do us all good to read thoughtfully a Saigon story filed by Scripps-Howard Writer Don Tate.

President Thieu is usually a target of the friends of Hanoi, who point out repeatedly that he is a "minority" President, and that treason is dealt with as treason in Vietnam. Overlooked in such picking is the President of the United States and the mayor of New York City, also in Mr. Thieu's 40-percent category. Ignored is the fact that Vietnam is not America, and that the war is there, not here.

I include the Tate article with my remarks:

[From the Washington Daily News, Jan. 28, 1970]

MATTER OF PRIORITIES—THIEU SAYS DEMOCRACY REQUIRES SURVIVAL

(By Don Tate)

SAIGON, January 28.—South Vietnam's fledgling democracy, often criticized as being too oppressive, has been defended by President Nguyen Van Thieu on grounds that, in a war of survival, "to save the country is the supreme law . . . the most important task."

Citing reasons for his government's tough policies, Mr. Thieu told some of those who

have felt most oppressed, members of the Vietnamese Newspaper Editors Association: "If we don't save the country, all other things do not matter. Only when we survive can we consider other problems. . . ."

He urged the editors, some of whom have had their papers shut and reopened with revolving-door regularity, to "write with justice" and to remember that "on the international scene the Communists have actively taken advantage of the freedom of the press in the free world to distort the facts and to create confusion in public opinion in many countries, including our allied countries."

WINNING IS PRIORITY

Mr. Thieu, often taken to task by Western critics for slowness to assure the freedoms associated with Western democracies, maintained that, in creating a democracy in the midst of war, democracy must come second: winning the war comes first.

"In this critical stage of the fight to defend the existence of our country," he said, "we cannot let the Communists take advantage of the freedoms in our institutions to create disturbances, to cause confusion and jeopardize our security."

Mr. Thieu, who sometimes brands his political opponents as "dogs, traitors and fools" as well as jailing them, said: "I cannot help being disturbed when I see that there are people living within our nationalist ranks who, willingly or not, have put forward lines of thought beneficial to the Communists."

"There are a number of people who seem to forget we are in wartime," Mr. Thieu added, comparing himself to a ship's pilot in a storm watching these people "drill holes in your boat and letting the water run in."

Replying to critics who have charged that his government does not represent a majority of the South Vietnamese people, Mr. Thieu said:

"There are naive people who asked why Mr. Thieu got elected with only 37 per cent of the total votes and concluded thus that the government . . . needs to broaden its base to have a more representative character."

"They . . . have forgotten that in the presidential election of 1967 there were up to 11 tickets it is difficult for one ticket to have the majority of votes on the first ballot. . . ."

URGES RUNOFF VOTE

He called for a new election law stipulating that if there is no majority on the first ballot, a second, runoff ballot between the two tickets with the most votes should be held. This would assure election of the preferred candidate and prevent a Communist minority from seizing advantage of a split in votes to take control of the government, Mr. Thieu said.

As for broadening the base of his government by bringing more political party leaders into his cabinet, Mr. Thieu said, in effect, that Vietnam's welter of political parties have for a long time been unrepresentative of the people, poorly organized and unable to agree on anything. His implication was that for now, at least, he would stick to his own power base—the million-man army, the 200,000 civil servants, the million-plus Catholics, the "yes man" cabinet.

As for the future of democracy in South Vietnam, Mr. Thieu expressed confidence. But he added:

"Democracy in wartime differs from democracy in peacetime. Old-line democracy . . . differs from newborn democracy . . . The spirit of Oriental democracy is not the same as the spirit of Occidental democracy."

"The Democratic life in Vietnam has progressed noticeably in so far as learning from the West and even learning that which the West fears, namely the state of disorder, and excessive and irresponsible freedom."

SENATE—Tuesday, February 3, 1970

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian and was called to order by the Vice President.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Let us pray, in recognition of International Clergy Week.

Almighty God, who in every age has called men to serve Thee in the ministry of word and sacrament, for the ordering of souls in righteousness, and the teaching of Thy truth, we give Thee thanks for the memories which gather about this day. We thank Thee especially for Thy servants on the transport *Dorchester* who, amid the perils of war and on the frigid waters of the north, in saving others, gave themselves. As we remember American youth joined heart and hand in wartime prayer, so may the people of this land be united for the making of a better world.

Guide by Thy spirit the leaders of all religions who by word and life represent Thee. Give to all pastors, priests, prophets, and chaplains the fullness of Thy grace. Especially be with those who minister in the Armed Forces, that putting on "the whole armor of God and having their feet shod with the preparation of the gospel of peace" they may lead us toward that kingdom whose builder and maker is God. Nourish the people of this land in pure religion and lofty

patriotism for the healing of the nations and the establishment of peace on earth.

In the name of the Prince of Peace we pray. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

AERONAUTICS AND SPACE REPORT OF THE PRESIDENT—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT (H.R. DOC. 91-219)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying report, was referred to the Committee on Aeronautical and Space Sciences:

To the Congress of the United States:

The year 1969 was truly a turning point in the story of space exploration—the most significant of any year in that still brief history. I am pleased to transmit to the Congress this report on the space and aeronautics activities of our government in the past twelve months. As I do so, I again salute the thousands of men and women whose devotion and

skill over many years have made our recent successes possible.

This report tells the remarkable and now familiar story of man's first and second landings on the Moon. It recounts, too, the exciting Mariner voyage which took the first close-up photographs of the planet Mars. But it also discusses the space triumphs of 1969 which were less well-publicized, successes which also have great significance. It tells, for example, of progress made in our communications satellite, weather satellite and earth resources satellite programs. It discusses the scientific and military implications of all our recent advances. It details the progress we have made toward achieving greater international participation in our space adventures. And it reports, too, on our advances in aeronautical technology.

In 1969 we achieved the most prominent of our goals in space—one which had long been a focus for our energies. As we enter a new decade, we must now set new goals which make sense for the Seventies. The space budget that I am submitting to Congress reflects my view of a balanced space program, one which will build on the progress we have already made.

Our space and aeronautics program has benefited this Nation in many ways. It has contributed to our national security, to our educational, transporta-