

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TWO YOUNG TEXANS PARTICIPATE
IN BOYS' NATION; AMERICAN
LEGION SPONSORS YEARLY
EVENT

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, every year two representatives from each of the 50 States travel to Washington, D.C., to participate in Boys' Nation. These young men have generally been involved earlier in the summer in Boys' State activities in their respective home States. The 1970 delegates from Texas are Mr. Rudy F. Gonzales from Corpus Christi, and Mr. Terry D. Guthrie of Amarillo. Mr. Gonzales held the office of governor of Boys' State in Texas, while Mr. Guthrie served as party chairman at the Texas Boys' State held in Austin this June.

These two outstanding young Texans will have a rare opportunity to gain an insight into the operation of the National Government during the week of activities planned here in the Nation's Capital. The schedule of seminars, tours of national monuments, the organization of a Senate, and the deliberative process of conducting their own legislative session should prove to be of lasting benefit to these young men. Such experiences are likely to stimulate a constructive involvement in our country's democratic processes in an age when apathy and cynicism are often rampant among our citizenry. These two young men are on the verge of becoming members of the electorate as a result of the recent lowering of the voting age to 18. I feel confident that their participation in Boys' Nation will insure that these delegates return to Texas with a better foundation from which to exercise their rights as voting citizens.

I commend them for their concern and active interest in becoming involved in government as responsible citizens, and I congratulate the American Legion for sponsoring this worthwhile program.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that a statement released by American Legion Headquarters on July 8, 1970, be printed in its entirety in the Extension of Remarks.

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

STATEMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION

WASHINGTON, D.C.—One hundred of the nation's outstanding high school seniors will assemble at American University on July 17th for week long activities in connection with the 25th annual Boys Nation of The American Legion.

Th young delegates, designated junior "Senators", will undertake a comprehensive exercise in high level government, designed to provide an insight into the operation of the Federal government.

For purposes of the exercise, the boys will

be divided into two mock political parties, the Nationalist and the Federalist. They will hold formal party conventions to nominate candidates for President and Vice President, and an election to select the candidates who will carry the titles "Boys Nation President" and "Boys Nation Vice President" through the coming year.

Instruction in the intricacies of government is provided by a staff of volunteer American Legionnaires who are experts in legislative matters and have many years of experience in youth work.

The boys are selected for attendance at Boys Nation based on all around ability, including their scholastic and personal achievements. At their selection, they will have survived one of 50 "Boys State" elections conducted earlier by The American Legion in 49 states and the District of Columbia, in which they will have been elected to high office by other outstanding youths. All of the delegates are high school seniors or recent graduates.

A touch of realism in the training received in the nation's capital will be added by visits with the boys' home state Senators, briefings by high officials at the State Department, the Defense Department, the FBI, the Civil Service Commission and a personal welcome from Supreme Court Chief Justice Burger. They will also visit sessions of Congress, lunching with home state Senators, and will culminate the trip with a visit to the White House where they hope to meet President Nixon.

Sponsored by The American Legion's Americanism Commission, the Boys Nation program was started in 1946. The program has as its aim the fostering of a better appreciation and understanding of the American democratic form of government.

A NOVEL PLAN FOR RESTRUCTURING
U.S. DEFENSE PROCUREMENT
PRACTICES

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, the current issue of the Armed Forces Journal contains a feature article written by Frank Gard Jameson, president of Teledyne Ryan Aeronautical Co., proposing a major restructuring of our Nation's aerospace industry and its interrelation with U.S. defense procurement practices.

I believe his interesting and thought-provoking proposal, which represents a somewhat drastic departure from present industry and DOD practices, deserves the widest possible circulation, particularly among those of us in both the legislative and executive branches who bear any responsibility for the decisions on how our defense dollars shall be spent.

Jameson's approach is based on the proposition that the aerospace industry should alter its stance from what is now essentially a "contracting business," which is subject to costly wasteful stops and starts with attendant widely vacillating employment levels, to that of a "manufacturing business" where conti-

nunity of production, systematic planning and relatively stable employment levels would result in major savings to the companies and to the taxpayers.

In my own district on eastern Long Island, we have all too often experienced the feast or famine cycle in defense-related employment with all the personal tragedies which accompany sudden mass layoffs and the attendant economic shock waves which roll through the entire community.

My colleagues will certainly agree that any proposal which holds promise of relief from this all too common economic upheaval whether we agree with it or not deserves careful consideration. The full text of Mr. Jameson's article follows:

A CASE FOR CONTINUITY IN THE WEAPONS
WAR

America is losing the weapons war to Russia.

Why? Why are the Russians surpassing us in weapons technology? What is paralyzing the American military industry complex while the Soviets continue to build their military might?

We are losing the weapons war with Russia because of our methods of procurement of military hardware. Time, money, talent, and technological advance are wasted because of the spasmodic, inefficient, feast-or-famine way we do business in the buying and selling of military goods.

Immediate remedial action is required. U.S. defense procurement practices must be restructured to more adequately respond to this direct Communist threat to our national security.

Some will term my solution radical. But I believe it is a direct and simple idea that merits serious consideration. I have discussed the basic outline of my proposal with our nation's leading thinkers in defense systems in the active military, in the Congress, in the Department of Defense, and in the aerospace industry. They agree in principle.

The labor of weapons manufacture should be organized something like this:

The Air Force, for example, wanted a new bomber aircraft. From among several bidders, three companies were selected and eventually the contract was awarded to North American Rockwell. I propose that a short competition should be held within the next year in which another company—one which is fully qualified to design and build a new bomber—should be awarded a new contract to design a follow-on, a second prototype Air Force bomber. This new bomber should be looking ahead at least four years in design, in technology, in threat analysis, and so forth. It should anticipate and incorporate technological advances that will be achieved in the next four years.

Likewise, another aircraft manufacturer should be selected now to build a follow-on to the Grumman/Navy F-14 fighter, while still another company should begin now to design a successor to the McDonnell-Douglas Air Force F-15 fighter.

In other words, Company A, which won the first production contract, would be going operational with its system about the time that the follow-on designs would be ready for a prototype competition. Meanwhile, Company A would be building improvements into its system. Thus, a follow-on design would always be ready to go into production while current production models would receive incremental improvements as long as they were cost effective.

In every case, the lion's share of the market would go to the best designer. And more importantly, we would have continuity of production. We would not be faced with a long period when our aircraft became obsolescent without suitable replacements available. And, if by chance, a production model turned out to be a lemon, we wouldn't have to continue production because there was nothing else on the horizon.

What we need, I believe, is a new program of military procurement that has continuity built into it. Technological advances should not be allowed to become a "horse race" with competing firms experiencing the costly inefficiencies of beginning from a dead start. Instead, technological advances should be allowed to come in the manner of "leap frog," with each company competing to overtake the other with a better weapons system.

Individual firms would settle into a price-output position fairly satisfactory to all from the viewpoint of profit or "new capital." DOD would administer and adjudicate to ensure that the best national interest continued to be served. Production would continue as long as demand continues to exist, which in the Nuclear Age means as long as the United States and its allies are faced with the threat of Communist aggression.

Each firm would make improvements in each model as weapons systems technologies advance. We would not wait until our inventory aircraft were completely outdated to start mission requirements. Operational forces would be serviced continuously with updated, reliable weapons systems.

Similar long-term manufacturing programs could be established for military VTOL and V/STOL aircraft; Army vehicles and tanks; missiles, rockets and bombs of all types; even major ship systems. I believe this approach can find application to any major military supplier, to any prime military contractor.

WHAT WOULD BE GAINED?

Achieved through this approach will be the following benefits:

- (1) America's national security will be better defended and protected.
- (2) Weapons technology will be continuously updated and improved.
- (3) The defense industry will become stabilized, with steadier production flows and levels of employment. Continuity of production and employment is one of the principal goals of my proposal.
- (4) The value of independent research and development—the "lifeline" of growth and productivity—will be recognized and rewarded. R&D can be pursued with the knowledge that goals are firmly established and future markets fairly well assured.
- (5) Although not "pure competition" in a sense, this system retains a strong element of free competition among companies for new business and follow-on business.
- (6) Most importantly, the balance of weapons strength among the world's nuclear powers will be more likely to shift to America's favor once again. The Russians and the Red Chinese will be less likely to take that final step that risks world annihilation.

How does this procurement system differ from outright nationalization of the defense industry? Nationalization means the surrender of ownership of industrial firms to the national government. It also can mean the investment of control of industry in the national government.

In regard to the latter definition, we already have a form of nationalization of the defense industry. The national government already tells the defense contractor what he can build, how much he can build, what cost accounting formula he can use, how much profit he will be allowed, and so forth. In effect, the national government already controls the defense industry. The government controls both the demand for the product, as sole customer, and the supply of the prod-

uct, as creator of the requirement. In fact, it is precisely because of the depth of this control that so many defense firms are being pushed toward diversification, toward the formation of conglomerates, and even toward stepping out of the defense business altogether.

My proposal offers a means to codify the limits of existing governmental control, and places this control within a manageable, mutually responsible, mutually beneficial relationship between government and industry. In no way does my proposal indicate nationalization of the ownership of industry. Ownership of industry would remain in the hands of company stockholders.

Under my proposal, the defense industry would have to be restructured. I see the new structure along lines similar to the automobile industry. Production should be established on a continuing assembly line basis, on-going, year after year. Right now the defense industry should be manufacturing the 1970 models of defense equipment and hardware. In the back shop we should be tooling up and scheduling for the 1971 and 1972 models. We should be ready so that on Friday when the 1970 production run is completed, we can start the 1971 model production on Monday, without missing a day and without experiencing a costly layoff.

At the same time, we should have designs in work of the 1975 models. We should be talking to our customers about improvements of the 1973 models. And in our "think tanks," our advanced systems specialists should be using their computers and creative talents to dream up the weapons systems of 1980 and 1990. At the least, we ought to be working and planning five years ahead. Many auto manufacturers are drawing designs and building mockups of automobiles that will roll off the Detroit production lines ten years from now, in 1980.

CONTRACTORS, NOT MANUFACTURERS

People think of the U.S. defense business as a manufacturing business. And it was for a brief time during World War II. Several contractors built the same weapons systems to the same design during that time of national mobilization. But during peacetime, the development and procurement of weapons systems bears no similarity whatsoever to the manufacturing business.

In truth, we are not in the "manufacturing business." We do not manufacture products in the sense of an organized, systematic program of planning, designing, tooling, producing and marketing a specific weapons system for a long-term business cycle.

Instead, we are in the "contracting business." We are in a business full of costly, wasteful stops and starts, a business based more on short-term expediency than on long-term productivity. Dependent on annual budget renewals, we face a yearly battle for continued survival.

Being in the contracting business, the defense industry is really more similar to the housing industry than it is to the automobile industry.

The housing contractor hires his architect and before the first board is cut, unless he has another development down the road, the contractor has to let the architect go. The same thing follows with the carpenters, electricians, plumbers and roofers.

In the aerospace contracting business, a hard drive is made for a defense program. Some preliminary design is accomplished, some computer modeling, some independent R&D. Usually a large engineering team is amassed to demonstrate to the military buyers that the company has the capability "in being" to do the job. If contract award is delayed, as is too often the case, this high-cost team stands virtually idle for months. Costs to the company and to the government are astronomical.

The winner negotiates his schedule and

costs, tools up and starts prototype assembly and production. Payments may be made incrementally, however, and rate of return on investment risk capital may be slow. Because of this, as milestones are passed, contractors cannot afford to maintain their engineering talent pools. The old program hangs fire while the new programs keep getting pushed further out of reach. Even the "winners" can lose because valuable skill strengths often must be sacrificed.

As for the losers, unless they have the resources to pursue another program, they suffer heavy layoffs. Thousands of men go home to tell their wives, "Darling, I just lost my job. We've got two weeks to relocate." Who wants to be in this kind of industry? At least in the military services, if a man pulls a less-than-desirable duty assignment, he knows he will move on in two years to another assignment that is likely to be better. Aerospace engineers shuttle around the country every few years, victims of short-sighted procurement policies. Time and dollars are wasted in retraining, travel reimbursement, dislocation allowances, recruitment and other costs associated with the hire and lay-off of this so-called contract labor.

Actually, it is my estimation that with implementation of my proposal defense contractors will find they are able to conduct the same production jobs with thirty percent fewer people than they employ now. Again, continuity of production and employment is the key.

In recent years, the element of risk in military programs has increased tremendously. Traditionally, the net profit of the aerospace industry has averaged 3½ to 4 percent on sales before taxes. This was adequate when prime interest rates were low. In the past fifteen years, however, the prime rate has spiraled from 3 percent to 8½ percent. That doesn't leave the contractor much to grow on. The risks are becoming too great. Take the case of C-5A, Lockheed Aircraft with a total net worth of about \$350-million, was asked to assume an effective risk exposure of around \$800-million, according to Lockheed Senior Vice President Dudley E. Browne.

Aerospace firms are being forced to seek financial backing from banks and large financial institutions. This backing is needed even to make a bid on a new program. Even the largest companies among DoD contractors are forced by this system to hold tight during periods of drought, and then risk the entire corporation on winning a single new program. Many a giant has been backed to the wall; some have fallen.

TWO-HEADED PARAGON

With restriction on the Defense dollar, we see the four services compete for funding. The two-headed paragon of cost and effectiveness is applied to each weapons system desired by a service branch; contractors, in turn, are forced to offer the most optimistic estimates to propose a "responsive" bid. Coupled with the virtual elimination of prototype hardware, this approach has resulted in program stretchouts, skyrocketing costs and overruns averaging more than 200 percent in the past fifteen years. The practice of annual contract renegotiation also mitigates against the contractor, leveling off profit peaks, but ignoring profit downcycles.

Much has also been said about the need to distinguish between development contracts and production contracts—the so-called "known unknowns." Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research and Development Dr. Robert Frosch has acknowledged that at best we can only estimate the costs of what we know and never the costs of what we do not know. Our present procurement system, however, demands that contractors put a dollar figure on development program unknowns in advance. This kind of procurement system must be changed.

My proposal will serve to rectify these im-

balances. Risk will be more commensurate with return on sales. Development programs will be clearly identified. Prototype hardware will be tested and proven in an orderly fashion before production hardware is introduced into operational use. Engineering talent will be retained. Employment will be better stabilized. Continuity in production will be realized.

In conclusion, Americans are suddenly faced with the hard fact that this nation's technological edge in weapons superiority has been lost.

Corrective action is required urgently. Our recent thrust into Cambodia notwithstanding, the present trend toward unilateral disarmament by the United States is compounding the problem. The Soviet Union and Red China are continuing to increase their military capabilities. The Russians and the Red Chinese may be name-calling and bickering over national boundaries, but they are united in the goal of eventually destroying capitalism and the free democratic system. Make no mistake about it. They differ only in the method to cut us to pieces.

Representative L. Mendel Rivers, Chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, recently made a statement in which I am in complete agreement. "If we are weak and have inferior weapons, we will have war," Mr. Rivers said. "If we are strong, there will be no war." "I am for peace" he added, "and strength."

Our military strength must be maintained. Our weapons procurement practices must be restructured, or we shall surely fall into second position behind the military might of the Soviet Union.

COMBINATION UTILITIES CRITICIZED

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, on June 23 I introduced S. 4013, which would require divestiture of combination electric-gas utilities. At that time I presented my arguments for this separation of two energy sources which should be competing, to the common advantage of the companies and the consuming public. I also inserted into the RECORD the statement in support of divestiture of Mr. Robert H. Willis, president of Connecticut Natural Gas Corp.

Mr. President, I believe the remarks of Mr. W. J. Crowley, executive vice president of the Northern Illinois Gas Co., to the New York Society of Security Analysts in 1968 will also be of interest to my colleagues. Mr. Crowley discusses both the pros and cons of combined management, but stresses the long-range detrimental effects of combination utilities.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Crowley's comments be printed in the RECORD.

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

COMBINATION VERSUS SEPARATE OPERATION (Remarks by W. J. Crowley)

There are undoubtedly some "built-in" advantages that combination gas and electric companies realize. First of all, there are the cost and economy advantages, which are both short term and long term. Here are some ex-

amples of the cost savings that fall into this area.

- (1) Fewer administrative jobs and positions;
- (2) One accounting department;
- (3) One service department;
- (4) Combined use of headquarters, buildings, etc.;
- (5) Economies in meter reading (one man needed to read the meters);
- (6) Economies in billing and collecting (one bill covers gas and electric service charges).

There is a second set of advantages of combination operation. These are short and medium term advantages and relate to the insurance and possibly even to financial safety in controlling both the gas and electric operations, and hence the degree of competition between the two. Control of the orderly development of both energy sources undoubtedly has an advantage from the viewpoint of the company and its stockholders, but very possibly not so much from the viewpoint of the customers and the public.

Many years ago (actually in the early years of the big depression when utilities faced heavy troubles), a group of combination companies under the leadership of Herman Russell of Rochester Gas and Electric Company made an in-depth study to find out "once and for all" whether they were better off as combination companies—or whether they could look for better opportunities and earnings via separate operations. These studies, when completed, showed quite conclusively that financial results would be better under combination operation. The results of these studies, in my opinion, did mold the opinions of a generation of top executives now retired.

But these studies that I have mentioned were made in a period of slow growth, or even negative growth. They were, in my opinion, heavily weighted by influences related to what might be called an analysis and division of then existing costs, facilities and revenues, with very little imaginative effect given to the future. And that future really came through with results that even a utility "Jules Verne" would not have dared to dream about in the 1930's.

You can take almost any combination company today and make a good case, cost and revenue-wise, for retaining the status quo. That is, if you think in terms of the short and medium term interests of stockholders and if you are trying to avoid shaking up or disturbing the existing employee family. And I will admit that today there are some pretty good combination companies, with good management.

But there are some factors involved in combination operation that are signalling medium and long term problems to such combination company operations, and medium term that I refer to is tending to shorten as growth patterns in the energy business continue to speed up. These factors to which I refer can, in the long run, be disadvantageous to the entire gas industry and proportionately to the captive gas units of combination companies.

This can result if the gas industry fails to unite and compete strongly with every element of the industry helping. Unfortunately, there are many units of the gas industry under the control of combination companies that are not carrying their share of the burden.

Today, there are about 53 million electric utility customers in the United States, and about 39 million gas utility customers. Of the gas utility customers, about 26½ million are served by true gas utilities, and about 12½ million are in combination companies. Hence, about one-third of the gas utility customers in the United States are served by companies that must compromise their decisions between electric and gas operations.

In our overall picture there are some cases that are glaring examples of over-dominance of a relatively small captive gas business by its much larger electric partner.

Regulatory bodies are beginning to feel negative about such combinations. As one straw in the wind: in granting approval to Commonwealth Edison Company to combine with Central Illinois Electric and Gas Co., the FPC (on December 2, 1966) ordered Commonwealth Edison Co. "to show cause why it shall continue to own and operate such properties," (i.e., the gas distribution facilities of Central Illinois Electric and Gas Co.). In effect, this meant taking steps to dispose of the small gas properties within a relatively short time, or defend the retention.

Incidentally, C.E. Co. at present has 2-450,000 electric customers and only 93,000 gas customers. (This temporary commitment by no stretch of the imagination can place C.E. Co. in the category of being a friend of the gas utility business in Illinois.)

Other cases of this kind add up to a sizeable total number of customers whose companies do not actively participate in building and strengthening the future of the gas utility business.

We have some combination companies of this kind who pay dues to, and actively support the Edison Electric Institute, but do not do the same with respect to A.G.A. This unfair attitude does not help to strengthen the gas utility industry.

Even where we have a pretty good combination company with coextensive electric and gas service areas, many operate under administrative climates that are not helpful to the gas utility industry. These are the "neutral" operators. They set their gas and electric rates in effect, on a "cost plus" basis. They tend to maintain that they give the customer both sides of the picture (and in some cases try sincerely to do so), and then let him make his choice. They have the safe and secure feeling that regardless of whether the customer chooses heads or tails, the combination company will come out a winner.

But even these operators are heading for trouble in the medium and long term. As I mentioned, they tend to set electric and gas rates on a "cost plus basis" and don't care what service the customer chooses.

But where do you find real competitive pricing—real promotional pricing, and use of real marginal cost pricing? Only where there is real competition between electric and gas.

The "separate" utility atmosphere is the one where your sales department must learn to sell, rather than make dignified presentations of the merits of both services.

One example—NI-Gas sells total energy systems. We now have more than 30 on-site generation systems connected to our mains and 10 more under construction (all these in addition to the Company's installations in its own buildings). In addition, we have over 70 customers using gas engines for production of shaft horsepower.

A couple of years ago a new building was started in one of the large towns in Illinois in the service area of one of the pretty good combination companies. The builder liked the "total energy" idea and asked for gas service for his installation. The utility refused to sell gas for such a system—maintaining that it could do a better job serving the building in the conventional way, part electric and part gas, under its regular rates. The customer countered by switching his turbines to oil and the utility company lost the entire load. It now gives lip service to "total energy," but it doesn't really sell it.

Generally, only in the area of separate utility operations where real competition exists will you find groups of companies joining to take on cooperative research and

promotional activities for the long term benefit of the gas energy business. I am speaking of such activities as the gas utility cooperation with Pratt and Whitney to speed up the commercial development of the fuel cell.

You might ask yourself, how many utilities in a combination set-up have intensive gas research programs? How many contribute to the Institute of Gas Technology, and so on? It's answers to questions of this kind that really tell whether a gas utility unit is working for the long term expansion and development of its business.

In conclusion, it is my feeling that while there are short term cost analysis advantages to management and stockholders in favor of retention of some existing combination operations, we should not overlook the fact that we can overcome many of these by judicious realignment of properties and economical combinations of gas properties as well as electric properties. And, in the long run, you will have better management, tougher management, more economical operations, lower prices, better service to customers and longer term profitable operations if you let your managers give up the complications and artificialities of combination operation and allow them to get down to realistic, hard-hitting, competitive, single-utility operation.

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS ON U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

HON. NEAL SMITH

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. SMITH of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, a number of my constituents have requested copies of the summary report of the Select Committee on U.S. Involvement in Southeast Asia and my supplemental views. So that they may be available for them and anyone who cares to see them at the libraries or wherever the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is kept, I ask that they be set forth in the Extensions of Remarks of the RECORD.

They are as follows:

INTRODUCTION

On June 8, the U.S. House of Representatives adopted House Resolution 976. The resolution authorized the Speaker "to appoint a select committee of the House to study first-hand the recent developments in Southeast Asia and then report its findings to the House of Representatives within forty-five days of its adoption."

Pursuant to the resolution, the Speaker on June 15th, appointed the following members to the Committee:

G. V. Montgomery, Chairman; Neal Smith, Augustus F. Hawkins, William R. Anderson, Lee H. Hamilton, Robert H. Mollohan.

E. Ross Adair, Howard W. Robison, Hastings Keith, Donald D. Clancy, Albert W. Watson, and Orval Hansen.

In preparation for its assignment, the Committee heard from persons, both in government and in private life, representing different points of view, who could from their experience and knowledge recommend subjects to be examined and people to see in Southeast Asia relative to the Committee's objectives.

On June 20th, the committee left Washington for Saigon, which served as its base of operations during the two weeks it spent

in Southeast Asia. Given the broad mandate of the House and the limited time available, it was decided that more could be accomplished if the committee divided into groups which were given specific missions. By so doing, the committee was able to maximize its effectiveness and gather substantially more information than would normally be possible.

To collect the information that forms the basis for this report, the committee, either as a complete group, working in teams, or as individuals, traveled thousands of miles. They moved extensively throughout all of South Vietnam. Some went to Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, Indonesia, and Singapore.

The committee talked not only with U.S. military and civilian personnel of most ranks and specialties and Asian officials and legislators of the countries they visited, but also with South Vietnamese, Korean, and Thai military personnel, South Vietnamese civilians in all walks of life, provincial, district and village representatives, religious and student leaders, missionaries, captured enemy soldiers and defectors, American and foreign newsmen, businessmen and others who it was thought could contribute to the committee's objectives. Earlier the committee had cabled the North Vietnamese Government requesting permission to visit Hanoi to see U.S. prisoners of war being held there. Having received no response to this or another message, three members met with a Third Secretary of the North Vietnamese Embassy in Vientiane, Laos, in an effort to discuss the status of U.S. prisoners of war in North Vietnam.

This report represents a consensus of the views of the committee. In some instances where individual members may differ or may have made an individual study of a particular subject, supplemental views may be presented.

G. V. MONTGOMERY,

Chairman, Select Committee on Southeast Asia.

THE ECONOMY OF SOUTH VIETNAM

The weakest link in South Vietnam's chain is its economy. Inflation is the most serious problem facing the country. The need for effective action to stabilize the economy is urgent. Failure to solve the major problems on the economic front will seriously and perhaps fatally weaken the pacification and Vietnamization programs. It will surely undermine efforts to develop viable democratic political institutions and processes. In short, a strong and stable economy must be developed as the foundation on which the nation's future progress will be built.

Controlling inflation is highest on the list of priority economic objectives. Inflation has been steadily eroding the value of the piaster and prices continue to rise at a rate of between one and two percent a week, according to some estimates. Among the hardest hit by inflation are members of the military and civil service, whose pay is notoriously low. Sharply rising living costs are a deterrent to investment, and make any kind of meaningful long-range economic planning almost impossible.

To come to grips with the economic ills that afflict the country, the Government should begin a series of specific reforms without delay. Many of the measures needed will not be politically popular, but the consequences of failure to act could create even greater political difficulties.

The present official exchange rate is totally unrealistic. The official rate is 118 piasters to the dollar. The black market rate of 350 to 400 or more piasters to the dollar more nearly reflects the true value of the currency of South Vietnam.

Failure to devalue the piaster has helped to stimulate a flourishing black market in the currency. U.S. aid furnished at the official rate results in an indirect subsidy of the

Government of South Vietnam. Likewise, it penalizes American military and civilian personnel who must exchange at the official rate and are thereby forced to subsidize the Government.

The war has greatly distorted the economy of South Vietnam, which is characterized by a huge trade imbalance. The country imports far more than it exports. This imbalance is further aggravated by the unrealistic official exchange rate, which is a powerful incentive to imports and a deterrent to exports.

Unrealistically low interest rates discourage the savings and investment that the country must develop to build a stable and expanding economy. Coupled with effective anti-inflation measures, interest rates should be raised to reasonable levels. This would help to attract the investment capital needed to provide enough jobs and productive capacity to sustain the country as it shifts from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

Tax reform is also high on the list of national priorities. Most of the taxes are not collected. This deprives the Government of needed revenue and is discriminatory in its effect on those who must pay taxes, such as government employees. The need to develop a fair system of taxation and to administer the tax laws effectively is urgent.

South Vietnam also suffers from the lack of a workable system of commercial law governing sales, credit and other commercial transactions. Attention should be given to the development of commercial law as an essential step in the creation of a healthy investment climate, and to otherwise stimulate expanded trade and commerce.

In the long run, South Vietnam must achieve near parity in its volume of exports and imports. This will require the building of a substantial export trade where virtually none exists today. The agricultural industry offers hope for the production of commodities for export. Recent progress that has been made in pacification in the Mekong Delta gives rise to prospects that the country will soon be able to produce rice in an amount surplus to the country's needs. As the goal of self-sufficiency in rice is reached, however, to the extent that there is no export market for this surplus rice, land should be shifted into the production of other products for which export markets can be developed.

The country is also blessed with vast timber resources that are one of the most promising means of earning foreign exchange.

The United States has built for South Vietnam some economic assets of substantial value. An example is the ship-repair facility at Saigon, which is now being turned over to the South Vietnamese. They are developing the skills essential to its operation. Because of relatively low labor costs, it is likely that Saigon will be able to compete effectively with Hong Kong and Singapore in repairing ships from other countries. This will produce foreign exchange that is badly needed by South Vietnam.

The United States has also provided the country with a good system of roads and bridges, mostly built by units of the U.S. Army Engineers. The roads, most of which are built to U.S. standards, have not only been a tremendous aid to the pacification program but have been a strong stimulus to economic growth in the rural areas. Improved transportation and communication links between all parts of the country have resulted in building new hamlets and in the cultivation of land which had been idle. A good system of farm-to-market roads has caused the rapid expansion of trade between the rural areas and the major population centers.

South Vietnam is rich in resources and potential for a strong and growing economy. Much of its land is fertile and highly productive. Its people are intelligent and resourceful.

To achieve its potential, however, will require a major self-help effort by the people and Government of South Vietnam and a fairly high level of outside economic assistance for several years. As long as South Vietnam must maintain a military establishment at or near the present level, it must have outside help to survive. Most of the economic assistance during the next few years will undoubtedly have to come from the United States. However, other industrial nations, particularly Japan, should be given every possible encouragement to share this burden. Japan has reaped substantial economic benefits through the sale of motorized vehicles, electronics and other goods to South Vietnam. It will be a prime beneficiary of the future economic growth of the country and of the successful efforts to stem the tide of Communist aggression in Southeast Asia. However, the level of economic assistance Japan has hitherto furnished to South Vietnam has been disappointing.

U.S. assistance should be furnished on terms that will provide effective incentives for the Government of South Vietnam to institute the reforms and to otherwise take the actions that are essential to success. Our help can be justified only if there is a clearly demonstrated willingness by the South Vietnamese to help themselves.

The road to economic health for South Vietnam is a rocky one and uphill all the way. But it can make it.

PACIFICATION

To most of the committee, especially those who have been in South Vietnam on previous occasions, significant surface gains seem to have been made in the all-important pacification program. Village and hamlet security was better than most of us had expected, as also was the security of travel by road throughout much of the countryside, at least in the daytime.

As best evidence of this, committee members traveled by highway singly and in groups—and much of the time without military escort—in nearly every area of South Vietnam, and moved at will into numerous villages and hamlets where the residents seemed to be living fairly normal lives.

The key to this capability—which is undoubtedly still restricted in too many areas at night—lies in the rapid build-up of the Regional and Popular Forces (RF and PF), as well as the People's Self Defense Force (PSDF). Regional Forces operate within a province and are roughly comparable to our National Guard. Popular Forces operate within a relatively small district and are similar to a trained local militia. Both forces are paid, armed with M-16 rifles, and fairly well-trained. Total strength of the RF and PF is 509,500. Upon the continued and vigorous promotion of this program in large part rests South Vietnam's future chances of reducing its army (ARVN) strength from some 1 million men to a size that a nation of 17.8 million people could reasonably be expected to support.

The People's Self Defense Force, on the other hand, is a people's militia—the concept of a "nation-in-arms"—composed largely of those men and women not of prime military age, partially trained and armed, but not paid. Two years or so ago it would have seemed unthinkable to give weapons to the populace for fear they would end up in the hands of the VC—or that some of them might even possibly be used against the Government itself.

Beginning in late 1968, however, the Government of South Vietnam, showing some new degree of confidence at having survived the Communists' all-out Tet offensive of February of that year, has been making a strong effort in this direction. The result now is a "combat PSDF" force of over a million persons, sharing some 350,000 miscellaneous arms among them and engaged in the defense

of their communities and families. There is also an additional indefinite figure of "support PSDF"—women, children and older citizens.

U.S. military personnel have assisted in training all these paramilitary forces. On their constant vigilance and combined capacity to contain VC terrorist assaults at the village and hamlet level depends the possibility of freeing ARVN for its more appropriate role of combat with larger, regular enemy units still operating in South Vietnam and of conducting border patrol. But an even more important mission of these forces is to restore security to the countryside, thereby enabling the people to return to their homes, their rice paddies, farms, and villages from which so many have fled, either because of constant VC harassment or the devastations of war.

Whether or not these programs can achieve lasting success is not yet clear, but representatives of the Civil Operations and Rural Development Support (CORDS) with whom we talked are optimistic that it can, and there is some reason for their optimism.

CORDS, a combined military and civilian operation that seems to be functioning smoothly, maintains a Hamlet Evaluation System (HES) administered by the Military Assistance Command Vietnam (MACV). The HES system attempts to measure progress in the pacification program by monitoring trends in security of the villages and hamlets. The HES ratings have been criticized in the past for presenting an over-optimistic picture of developments. The ratings were revised earlier this year in an effort to make HES a more realistic guide.

In the judgment of the committee, HES ratings are still by no means either foolproof or a measure of permanent improvement. A hamlet rated at 90 percent on the HES scale could drop drastically overnight if the VC successfully conducted a full-scale and concentrated terrorist attack. An example would be the VC massacre of 75 civilians on June 10, at the Ba Ren Bridge near Da Nang, the site of which was visited by committee members.

The committee feels, instead, that the best measure of pacification progress is the willingness of the people to return to the countryside. Although the statistics on this are far from firm and can be misleading as well (since some "returnees" may now work their rice paddies by day but return to refuge at night), members of the committee visited and observed numerous areas where such resettlement trends were evident.

There are several important reasons why it is essential to develop and maintain such a trend. Only in such a fashion can the costly and frustrating refugee problem be solved, and only in such a fashion can South Vietnam's urban problems be solved. Its major cities are now overwhelmed by persons displaced by the war. In addition, a successful pacification and re-settlement program is vital to South Vietnam's economy. Until the major agricultural areas, especially such populous areas as the Mekong River Delta, are secure, the nation's economy will continue to waver under the overburdening deficit in its balance of payments. Even though South Vietnam can potentially produce enough rice for its own needs, as well as a surplus for possible export purposes, it is now importing rice. Its production of rubber and other products, which its rich natural resources can also provide, has likewise dropped sharply because of the war. These economic deficiencies are a direct result of the past insecurity of the countryside.

A "returnee" who may well find his home destroyed, his fields overgrown and local essential services lacking, now receives by way of assistance to rebuild his life an allowance of 7,500 piasters (\$63.56), 10 sheets of metal roofing, and a 6-month supply of rice.

Brief mention should also be made of cer-

tain other aspects of pacification. A civilian National Police Force has been built up with a strength of some 95,000 men and women located all the way from the most remote Delta hamlet to metropolitan Saigon. The true capabilities of this partly trained force have yet to be tested, but its existence is a necessary element in the hoped-for gradual shift in South Vietnam away from a military oligarchy and toward a republican form of government supported by competent civil service.

Alongside this program, and supported by it, is the so-called Chieu Hoi, or Open Arms Program aimed at first identifying and then persuading VC to "rally" to the government. This effort has shown some encouraging numerical results. The total VC thus converted were 18,171 in 1968, 47,023 in 1969, and 13,923, as of May 21, 1970. The trend shows a slight upturn of late, perhaps as a possible side benefit from the Cambodian operations. Any evaluation of these results must note the low rate of defection by officers and soldiers from the North Vietnamese Army, although there have been a few. On balance the Chieu Hoi program can be judged as showing substantial, if imperfect, success.

Next, there is the Phoenix program aimed at neutralizing the Viet Cong's carefully constructed infrastructure. This can be described as an "internal security" program. Despite some years in operation success of the program can only be described as mixed. For whatever it is worth, committee members were given to understand that the government is aware of the shortcomings of Phoenix, and of the domestic and external criticism of the program. Attempts are supposedly being made to improve its operation.

Last, but by no means least, is the "self-development" part of the pacification program—an effort substantially supported by the United States. The program is the beginning of an attempt to meet the educational, health and municipal needs, as well as encouraging local initiative.

A new approach to this was undertaken in 1969 when a fund for "village self-development" was created with 1 million piasters (about \$8,500) being allocated to each village with an elected council. The use of the fund was required to be discussed in an open public meeting with the final selection of projects to be determined by the council. For 1970, allocations are being based on population, and the total funds amount to about 2.7 billion piasters (\$23 million).

The range of projects being selected run the gamut from new schools to bridges, to farm machinery purchased on a cooperative basis, and to pig raising. To encourage greater local participation and initiative, the current program also requires local matching funds, except in instances where the hamlet or village is deemed too poor. With the election now of province councils, a comparable province development fund has also been cranked into the program for more regional planning purposes.

The committee has commented on this overall program at this length because, for the strong majority of the members, pacification is the key to South Vietnam's future.

As the withdrawal of the U.S. presence in the country proceeds, and as our large military effort upon which South Vietnam's economy has become so dependent is scaled down, only a secure and productive countryside can maintain in South Vietnam a society economically viable and politically stable.

VIETNAMIZATION

The committee was told that in December, 1968, President Thieu said that he believed it was time to start an orderly withdrawal of the American military presence, and that the South Vietnamese were approaching the capability to handle the requirements for military manpower. This is now the announced

policy of the United States; therefore, the question to be resolved is how fast Vietnamization should take place.

The committee believes the process of Vietnamization of the war is progressing and that all levels of our military command are planning to meet withdrawal schedules. The Republic of Vietnam Armed Forces (RVNAF) are increasing in their capability, both in experience and materiel, although there are still measurable differences between units. Our military commanders have their withdrawal schedules from now until October 15, and are making assessments to be used in determining the speed of the withdrawal thereafter.

Today, one person out of 17 is in the South Vietnamese Armed Forces. This is the level they believe will be necessary for a protracted engagement as long as North Vietnam furnishes manpower and China and the U.S.S.R. furnish the weapons. Most of our American soldiers of all ranks who have experienced close cooperation with the South Vietnamese forces say they are a potent force and vastly improved compared to two years ago and are still improving. South Vietnamese operations in Cambodia have given the South Vietnamese soldier more self-confidence and poise than he has ever previously displayed.

The desertion and "absent without leave" rate is too high. However, 90 percent of the Vietnamese deserters end up back in the manpower pool by joining another military unit near their home.

Additional geographic areas and military functions will be turned over to the South Vietnamese, but not all areas and functions can be delegated simultaneously.

The committee believes an orderly withdrawal requires training of additional men for the South Vietnamese Air Force and some other special categories. As far as ground troops are concerned, America should continue its withdrawal program at least as fast as is now scheduled. The only exception would be additional time to solve logistics problems.

In recent months, the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong have avoided big-unit offensive operations indicative of a more or less limited conventional war. Instead, they have reverted to the "protracted war" approach of the guerrilla, as well as terrorist tactics. Some of their regular, or Main Force, regimental units apparently are being broken down into numerous "local force" units of company size or less. This is not to say they are ineffective. To the contrary, one must expect renewed and increased small-scale offensive actions against small outposts and hamlets and increased terrorist attacks in both cities and the countryside. This is in fact happening at the present time.

While all of the American and Vietnamese military officials agreed on the announced troop withdrawal schedule, some expressed concern over its being announced publicly. That concern is shared by the committee. The knowledge of specific details of our withdrawal may give an undue advantage to the enemy.

The South Vietnamese Air Force has continued to show improvement and the U.S. Seventh Air Force has recently accelerated considerably the plans to train Vietnamese pilots and Air Force support units.

The committee believes plans could also be accelerated for the training and phasing in of ground support forces, such as artillery units.

The U.S. Navy's primary mission in South Vietnam has been that of interdicting infiltration into South Vietnam by waterways. The Navy has been conducting one of the most effective Vietnamization programs that the committee observed. As evidence of this fact, only twenty percent of the patrol craft engaged in the recent Cambodian operations

were U.S. Navy (USN) craft manned by USN crews.

The USN has adopted a Vietnamization policy that is relatively simple and may well be considered by the other services where such a policy proves feasible. A typical naval patrol normally carries a crew of five. The USN added one Vietnamese crew member, selected by the South Vietnam Navy (VNN) and when he is thought to be qualified, a VNN seaman replaced another USN seaman, and so on, until only one USN advisor was left on the craft. Eventually the patrol craft is turned over to the VNN.

In the opinion of the committee, Vietnamization should continue to improve and be one of the stronger programs we have sponsored.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTAL DEVELOPMENT AND SOUTH VIETNAM'S JUNE 28, 1970, ELECTIONS

Essential to pacification in South Vietnam is not only the ability of South Vietnam's national leaders, but also of the country's leadership at the local level—the provinces, districts, villages, and hamlets. In South Vietnam, the 44 provinces generally equate to U.S. states, the districts to U.S. counties, the "villages" to U.S. townships or supervisor beats, and the hamlets to U.S. town or village communities.

For the most part, the committee was favorably impressed with the capabilities and leadership attributes of the province and district chiefs. Because of past insecurity, these men are appointed by the central Government, and are nearly all officers of the Vietnamese Armed Forces. However, the Constitution of the Republic of Vietnam provides for popular election of these officials in 1972. Those members of the committee who had toured South Vietnam in previous years found a marked improvement in the abilities of these men.

The committee feels that as individual provinces and districts become secure and the people become more knowledgeable in a competitive political system, steps should be taken to see that province and district chiefs are elected by the people they govern. We were encouraged when President Thieu assured us that this would be the case. South Vietnam will not have a truly democratic form of government until its officials at all levels of government are chosen through a process of popular self-determination. President Thieu stated his agreement with our view, and is apparently pursuing this objective with all practicable speed.

The committee would also like to pay tribute to the American military and civilian personnel who have provided invaluable assistance to the province and district chiefs in administering to the needs of the people. These dedicated Americans live at the "rice roots" and share many of the dangers, discomforts and difficulties of the South Vietnamese. We think that nationals of both countries gain from the experience.

As to elections, the committee observed firsthand the provincial voting practices and procedures on Sunday, June 28, 1970. Seventy-two percent of the eligible citizens voted in these elections. This is commendable when one remembers that this was the first such election for Provincial Councils. There were numerous candidates and unusual interest in the campaigning, which was reflected in the presence of several hundred people at a campaign speech. The balloting was simple and secret. The South Vietnamese have adopted a simple method to assist the forgetful or less informed citizen in casting his vote. Each candidate and his party had a distinctive symbol on the ballot, so as to minimize confusion and permit the illiterate voter to cast his ballot without outside assistance. While there is always the critic who questions the validity of meaningfulness of the elections, the committee detected no justification for such criticism.

LAND REFORM

There have been several South Vietnamese land reform programs in previous years which has resulted in elimination of all non-Vietnamese ownership of rice lands and have reduced maximum holdings to about 100 acres per person. A recently enacted new land reform program is designed to reduce maximum holdings to 7.4 acres per person in the rich Delta area, and a maximum of 37 acres in other parts of the country. Present landowners would be paid 20 percent of the value of the land in cash and the balance in bonds, redeemable over a period of eight years and bearing ten percent interest.

There is not unanimous agreement that the new program will in fact be as popular as some have believed. Some of the land to be divided is held by a member of a family who supports dependent relatives or common village activities. The land may be in one family member's name, while in fact other family members own part of it. This possibility is enhanced by the fact that a substantial transfer tax has been in effect in South Vietnam. Some Vietnamese have avoided paying the tax by merely failing to transfer title. In these family situations, taking land which by the legal record may appear to belong to one person will result in either great dissatisfaction on the part of the people or in paying for land to give to a "tenant" who was the owner in the first place. An additional difficulty is the lack of sufficient land records, such as are kept in the United States. In the rural areas, family records are relied on heavily to ascertain ownership.

Since the United States pressed for the new program, the cost of \$300 million to \$500 million would presumably have to be borne largely, if not entirely, by American assistance.

The committee found reason to doubt that the new land reform program will be the panacea some have claimed, and there is a possibility it could have adverse effects. While not passing final judgment on the new program, the committee believes the above facts must be taken into consideration when making an appraisal of the program.

COMMUNICATIONS AND PUBLIC INFORMATION PROGRAMS

The committee became increasingly interested in and concerned about the public information programs conducted by the South Vietnamese and U.S. governments. Two members investigated the public information programs in as much detail as time and circumstances would permit.

South Vietnam, although relatively small by U.S. geographical standards, is an incredibly disjointed nation. At one extreme is a sprawling and overpopulated Saigon, and as the other is remote villages and hamlets. Within South Vietnamese government officialdom, there are fairly good lines of communication extending to the chiefs of most remote and pacified hamlets. Despite considerable progress in establishing democratic forms of government, nearly all provisions, villages and hamlets have military officers as their chiefs. Thus, the country is tied together by a quasi-military communications network.

Outside of Saigon and the other municipalities, the man on the street is the Vietnamese farmer. He has little present knowledge of, or feeling about, the government of President Thieu. However, some evidence of increased interest was observed. The real interests of the farmer revolve around his extremely close knit family and its members—their security, how well they are nourished and housed, and the extent to which an education can be provided his children. The farmer's ancestors had had to contend for centuries with a Chinese presence. He himself had seen and felt the French presence. Now he sees and feels an overwhelming American presence. This situation has endured for centuries and

the Vietnamese farmer can only surmise that it will go on forever. These are the Vietnamese civilians who are prime targets of VC and NVA propaganda and the most frequent targets of VC recruiters and abductors.

As in the United States in the late 1940's the most intriguing new development in South Vietnam is television. Outside the large cities and the Delta area, there is not a great deal of coverage by television. There has been a recent rapid increase in the number of privately owned television sets, with some estimates running as high as 300,000. Of these U.S. AID, and DOD have furnished 3,500 mainly "community sets." Where television can be received, it is not uncommon for scores and even hundreds to watch TV during the small time of day that programs are aired. More frequently than not, reception in the countryside is limited to the U.S. Armed Forces Network. This programming is in English, and for the most part consists of American television serials and variety shows. Beside television, there are estimates that from 10 percent to 90 percent of the families in each hamlet own transistor radios.

The Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office (JUSPAO) estimates that 75 percent of South Vietnam is covered by GVN radio programs. Local citizens report, however, that Radio Hanoi was the most powerful station available on the dial, although the North Vietnamese do not broadcast television in either North or South Vietnam.

The committee is concerned over the apparent lack of effort being made by the United States and Vietnamese Governments to increase the availability and use of television messages and radio programs to help unite the nation, as has been done in Thailand, and to explain the U.S. presence as being on behalf of democracy for South Vietnam. Colonel Tran Van Doc, a defector from the North, said "The Communists are far better at telling a lie than the United States is at telling the truth." From its observations, the committee can only report that the colonel's views were not overstated.

Lt. Gen. Lee Sae Ho, Commanding General of ROK Forces, RVN, feels that civic action and psychological warfare are just as important as military action. This is a lesson in which the United States needs a cram course. One high ranking U.S. official with noticeable hesitation characterized U.S. psychological actions as "notoriously sorry." The sad fact is that our failure to learn and practice effective psychological warfare has contributed to the loss of American lives and national resources. The pitiful paradox is that we are the world's best in communications technology, but among the world's worst in using it as an instrument in helping to achieve our foreign policy goals, particularly in Southeast Asia. The committee feels it is high time for the United States and South Vietnamese to take the communications offensive.

The official policy of the Joint U.S. Public Affairs Office in Saigon appears to be "to work itself out of a job." We are furnishing some nominal technical assistance to South Vietnamese television, which is plagued with acute growing pains and a shortage of skilled manpower.

Apparently our public affairs leadership feels it is better for mass radio and television communications in South Vietnam to develop according to its own speed. One can only partially respect this point of view. The committee feels, on the contrary, that the anti-Communist stance of the South Vietnamese, the processes of pacification and Vietnamization, and thus the prospects of rapid withdrawal of American combat forces can be considerably enhanced by effective in-country communications. The committee was encouraged that President Thieu recently included stepped-up public communications as one of his high priority goals.

The committee strongly recommends that

the United States should immediately re-evaluate its public information policies in Southeast Asia, and that the communications industry in America should recognize its ability to furnish invaluable assistance. One obvious suggestion would be a program similar to ETV's "Sesame Street" aired in Vietnamese and based on Vietnam's own rich cultural heritage.

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

Of primary concern to the committee and all Americans is the plight of U.S. servicemen held as prisoners of war or listed as missing in action. Before leaving for South Vietnam, the following telegram was sent by the committee on June 19, to the North Vietnamese Foreign Ministry in Hanoi, as well as its Minister in Paris, Xuan Thuy.

Sincerely request a part or all of our group be granted a visa as private citizens to come to Hanoi for the purpose of visiting with a representative group of American prisoners of war sometime between the dates of June 22 and July 2. Our request is for humanitarian purposes. Your thoughtful consideration of our request will be gratefully appreciated. We look forward to a favorable reply at your earliest convenience.

Having had no reply, the committee sent the following follow-up telegram to the Foreign Ministry in Hanoi on June 25.

On June 24, Members of this Select Committee made a visit to and inspection of the Republic of South Vietnam prisoner of war camp at Da Nang. Our inspection of conditions at the camp and of the treatment accorded both North Vietnamese and members of Viet Cong held there as prisoners of war confirms and supports the official inspection reports of the International Red Cross that all provisions of the Geneva Convention regarding treatment to be provided prisoners of war have been and are being met. Because of this visit by members of the Select Committee and as a result of their findings, we again request that we receive an early and favorable response to our telegram of June 19, 1970, regarding approval of a visit to prisoner of war camps in North Vietnam where American and South Vietnamese prisoners of war are being held.

Unfortunately, neither of the telegrams elicited a response from Hanoi.

Three members of the committee pressed the matter further during their trip to Laos. While in Vientiane, the members met with a Third Secretary of the North Vietnamese Embassy. They made a strong plea for North Vietnam to allow the sending of an international committee of Red Cross representatives to North Vietnam to investigate the condition of our servicemen being held prisoners there. An attempt was also made to leave a petition containing 50,000 names calling for humane treatment of American POWs. The Third Secretary refused to accept the petition.

The upshot of the brief meeting was a loud denial by the North Vietnamese official that North Vietnam has any American prisoners of war. Rather, he said, the men they held were war criminals. The Third Secretary ended the meeting after 15 minutes by storming out of the room.

The committee would like to point out most strongly the seriousness of the situation involving 1,500 American POWs and MIAs. It is a known fact that many POWs are being held by North Vietnam in Hanoi. What is not general knowledge is the fact that some Americans are held prisoner by the Pathet Lao in Laos and by the Viet Cong in unknown and isolated areas of the Mekong Delta in South Vietnam.

The committee knew it would probably be a futile effort to try to go to North Vietnam. But at the same time, the members felt it imperative to take every possible step in hopes of bringing us closer to a solution to this most pressing problem. The necessity

of constantly pressing the government of North Vietnam concerning our American POWs and MIAs cannot be over emphasized. We must never cease working on behalf of these Americans and their families.

NARCOTICS AND CONTRABAND PROBLEMS

There are no certain statistics as to how many U.S. servicemen in South Vietnam use—or have tried—marijuana. Undoubtedly, the number of our troops in Vietnam who have done so is substantial. We have seen reports of studies claiming that at least 30 percent of such personnel use marijuana, at least on an occasional basis. Certainly, as committee members could discover for themselves although such sales are now illegal, a "stick" of marijuana can be purchased for pennies on almost every Saigon street corner.

In any event, U.S. Military Assistance Command Vietnam (U.S. MACV) has instituted a number of efforts at control, including an expanded educational program, and encouraging the judicial branch of the National Police of South Vietnam to form "narcotics teams" to cooperate with U.S. military police in cities with high concentrations of military personnel. Also, "raid teams," consisting of U.S. Army Criminal Investigation Division (CID) personnel and South Vietnamese narcotics policemen have been established to locate and apprehend distributors and "pushers" of both marijuana and the so-called hard drugs.

However, of equal seriousness has been the problem of narcotics smuggling out of Vietnam, an activity in which some U.S. servicemen have participated. Given the extremely high number of daily departures from South Vietnam of both servicemen and materiel of one kind or another, this has been an extremely difficult problem to control. At one point it reached such proportions as to cause host rest and recreation countries—particularly Australia and Hong Kong—serious concern.

Besides this principal problem with marijuana, the use of hard drugs by military personnel in South Vietnam is also of concern to MACV. Again, the problem is accentuated by easy access to such habituating and debilitating narcotics.

Another facet of all this has been the surge of contraband articles of all kinds, but particularly of weapons (other than qualified "war trophies") and ammunition for them, along with such items as "live" grenades, being sent or brought back to the United States. Several months ago, a test "operation-intercept" was conducted by the U.S. Customs Service at one of the major West Coast Army Post Offices. The number of such dangerous and illegal weapons, ammunition and other contraband, along with the quantity of marijuana and hashish seized, confirmed the existence of a problem requiring the immediate attention of military authorities.

Corrective measures have since been taken. A team of six experienced U.S. Customs agents was sent to South Vietnam to work with the Provost Marshal at Headquarters, MACV. With their help, over 800 military men have been recruited and trained as "Acting Customs Inspectors." These persons, under the direction of the Provost Marshal, in accordance with new and detailed procedures perform a preclearance inspection of military personnel and their personal possessions before they leave for the United States.

For the purpose of this report it is not necessary to detail such procedures, although such information is in the files of the committee. The important thing is that such procedures are working, a point verified both by the MACV Provost Marshal and by the U.S. Customs Service Commissioner.

CON SON ISLAND PRISON

In view of the fact that U.S. aid is given to South Vietnamese national penal institutions, some members of the committee visited one of these facilities on Con Son Is-

land. While there, they observed some conditions which required remedial or corrective action. These matters were called to the attention of an appropriate Vietnamese official, as well as the American Ambassador. Assurances were given the committee that our authorities would thoroughly investigate this situation.

ADDITIONAL MATTERS PERTAINING TO U.S. TROOPS IN SOUTHEAST ASIA

While the committee concentrated its efforts upon the South Vietnamese capability of assuming the military burden for the defense of their country, it also investigated the morale prevailing among the American troops deployed in Vietnam and Cambodia.

Generally, morale was found to be very good with a significant boost from the operations to destroy the enemy's sanctuaries in Cambodia. Here the consensus, both among American and ARVN forces, was that the strike in the country was an outstanding military success, and would give the United States the breathing space needed to accelerate troop withdrawals. There can be little doubt that the anticipation of this acceleration contributes materially to the high morale.

Out-of-country R. & R. (rest and recreation) is also a considerable factor in the morale of our troops.

Concern was voiced by American servicemen over the dissent in the United States which obviously has been maximized in Vietnam as well as at home. Some expressed doubts about being accepted on college campuses after completion of their tour of duty. The committee shares the concern that the amount and character of dissent adds to the already heavy burden which the individual soldier bears.

The committee also visited the U.S. military stockade at Long Binh. The prison has a capacity of 500 and had 427 inmates at the time of our visit. Of these, one-third were being held in pretrial status, another third has been tried but not sentenced, and the remaining third has been tried and sentenced but not transferred to permanent prisons.

While the charges varied on which these men were being held, a significant portion of them were the result of actions taken by servicemen seeking separation from military service. Approximately 15 percent of those incarcerated were charged with some form of drug abuse. It should be noted that most of these charges, especially simple possession and usage of marijuana, were disposed of by nonjudicial punishment at the company level.

Although there have been allegations of racial discrimination, the committee found no evidence of such charges in the administration of the stockade. It is significant in light of these charges that the commanding officer, who impressed the Committee as being most capable, is a black. The Committee found the stockade to be extraordinarily well run.

AMERICAN CIVILIANS IN SOUTH VIETNAM

The Committee noted and heard of the presence of large numbers of U.S. government-associated civilians in South Vietnam. Upon inquiry, the following breakdown of civilian personnel as of April 1, 1970, was furnished the Committee:

Embassy, USAID, JUSPAO.....	2,222
DOD direct hire.....	2,065
Contractors.....	6,738
Employees on contract to USAID and CORDS.....	719

American civilian personnel are not bound by the same regulations as military personnel, but any unacceptable activity by U.S. civilians damages our image just the same, if not more so.

The committee feels that the reduction of American civilians (including personnel of contractors) in South Vietnam should be continued and even accelerated wherever possible.

INTERVIEW WITH NVA DEFECTOR

(The following is a summary of an informal discussion between a high ranking North Vietnamese defector and a committee member.)

The use of propaganda directed toward the North Vietnamese by Hanoi is intensive. The people believe what they hear and read. Until the Tet offensive of 1968, there was no doubt in the minds of the people that the war was being won decisively. They tended to anticipate a complete victory over South Vietnam at an early date. After Tet they have become increasingly "puzzled."

Virtually all of the NVA and VC infrastructure have broadcast-band radios. About 30 percent of the civilian families in North Vietnam own receivers. There are strong prohibitions against listening to foreign broadcasts, but this is apparently directed toward the civilian populace. Most of the infrastructure listen. The most heard station is the BBC; VOA was the fourth station mentioned. The extent to which the public listens surreptitiously to foreign broadcasts cannot be estimated.

The officer's most recent assignment was as deputy commander of forces in a section of South Vietnam consisting of two provinces and part of a third. Therefore, he had no direct knowledge of the casualties resulting from U.S. bombing of the North, although he gathered that they were considerable. He did not believe the bombing caused either a decrease or an increase in the determination to fight. Rather, it "worried" the populace. The bombing and other factors contributed to a failure to meet North Vietnam's own industry development timetables.

In North Vietnamese propaganda, the United States is portrayed as a war-mongering nation which is trying to dominate South Vietnam permanently. However, the defector said the North Vietnamese did not hate Americans as persons (this may have to be taken with a grain of salt because of the Oriental quality of going out of the way to avoid hurting one's personal feelings).

Victory claims as to enemy killed, territory "liberated," and aircraft destroyed have tapered off. The more enlightened North Vietnamese privately tend to question prior claims. (If all claims were true, would not victory have come soon after Tet?)

War dissent and related incidents in the United States are played up highly. America has been portrayed as on the verge of internal collapse. More recently, however, many North Vietnamese are starting to perceive that internal dissent must not be a fatal disease in the U.S. system (otherwise, would not the predicted collapse already have occurred?). The government of North Vietnam has no desire to negotiate for peace, because its unshakable goal is to have South Vietnam.

Ideologically, North Vietnam is far more closely tied to the Soviet Union than it is to Red China. The tensions between the two latter nations "worries" the North Vietnamese very much. Direct Chinese military intervention in Southeast Asia is highly improbable, unless the war expands beyond Cambodia and Laos (presumably into Thailand and Burma).

The defector did not attach any great military significance to China's road network being built toward Thailand and Burma (he may not have been very well informed on this subject).

The officer had no direct knowledge regarding the treatment of American POW's. In his judgment he felt confident they are treated fairly well because "they want to keep them alive." When asked, "In other words, they want to milk the last ounce of propaganda and political value out of the American POWs," his answer was a firm, "Yes." The people of North Vietnam have a satisfactory amount of food, primarily due to large imports by sea.

The economy of North Vietnam has suffered because of the large percentage of personnel and other resources devoted to the war. The currency, however, is fairly stable,

and inflation is not a large problem because wages and prices are rigidly controlled.

Asked what additional steps he thought the U.S. could take to help achieve peace and stability in Southeast Asia, he replied with some feeling, "Win the war."

Asked why he chose to return to Saigon (he was born near Saigon of a peasant family), he replied that he was upset over NVA war plans for this summer. He felt that the recent US-ARVN operations in Cambodia had contributed to an alteration of those plans. (This discussion was not pursued because it would have led to classified military matters, which were beyond the purpose of the meeting).

U.S. TROOP WITHDRAWAL FROM CAMBODIA

On June 29, six members of the committee went to the sanctuary areas of Cambodia to view the withdrawal of U.S. troops. Elements of the 101st Cavalry Division were the last to return to South Vietnam. There were still some U.S. military advisors with ARVN troops on June 29, but all of them were out of Cambodia by late afternoon of June 30.

Based on personal observations and talks with American, Vietnamese and Cambodian officers and servicemen, the committee concluded that all American combat troops were out of Cambodia by June 30, 1970.

CAMBODIA

Cambodia has less than seven million inhabitants. From the end of French rule in 1953, until the spring of 1970, the dominate political figure has been Norodom Sihanouk, first as King and then as Prince. Although the country has a popularly elected legislative body, its powers were progressively diminished. Prince Sihanouk claimed to be a nationalist anxious to maintain the independence of the country, but the leaders who deposed him now say he was a "traitor."

South Vietnam and Laos are contiguous to Cambodia and much of the border area is covered by jungle. Several years ago the North Vietnamese established large sanctuaries in Cambodia from which to carry on the conflict in South Vietnam. Cambodia's present leaders say that since Sihanouk approved the sanctuaries, the country really has not been "neutral". In May of 1965, Sihanouk broke relations with the United States. Relations were re-established in 1969 when we sent a charge d'affaires to Phnom Penh.

Although the Khmers (Cambodians) comprise about 85 percent of the population, there are sizable numbers of Vietnamese and Chinese in the country, along with Chams of Moslem descent and hill tribes. Although Cambodians have been traditionally suspicious of all Vietnamese and Thais, officials in Phnom Penh said they want and need South Vietnamese aid in resisting North Vietnamese and Viet Cong aggression.

The policies of Sihanouk steadily created a growing uneasiness in the country. In late 1969, as nearly as can be determined, other leaders discussed cautiously how to cope with the situation. Sihanouk's departure for Europe this January provided the opportunity to do something about it. Demonstrations started in several Cambodian border areas against the occupation by North Vietnamese. These were followed by demonstrations in Phnom Penh, resulting in the sacking of the North Vietnamese and Chinese embassies on March 11. Resentment against Sihanouk on the part of Cambodian leaders—the Army, intellectuals, and students—ended in the displacement of the Prince as Chief of State by unanimous action of the National Assembly, and the establishment of a new government under Lt. General Lon Nol, who had already been Prime Minister. Even before that action, Prime Minister Lon Nol had issued an ultimatum demanding that North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces leave Cambodia within 72 hours. When these demands were not met, Cambodia requested

and received some direct support from the the South Vietnamese Army (ARVN). Penetration of the eastern sanctuaries has continued by the ARVN. On April 30 President Nixon announced that U.S. forces would cooperate with those of South Vietnam to "clean out" enemy sanctuaries, but that such U.S. forces would be withdrawn by June 30.

About a third of the country is now the scene of conflict with forces opposed to the new Cambodian government, nearly all of them NVA. Elsewhere these forces occupy a number of cities and towns. Most of the principal highways are interdicted by anti-government forces ranging from a few men to large units. VC, NVA and possibly some small pro-Sihanouk groups of the Communist Khmer Rouge are active in the countryside.

When military operations began, the Cambodian army numbered about 39,000. Its effectiveness was limited by inadequate training and neglected equipment. Communications, mobile equipment and air support were lacking. The present Cambodian leaders list their immediate needs as including arms and ammunition, plus communications and transportation equipment. Even if these items are made available, additional time will surely be needed to provide training of personnel. As of the date of this report, the United States has sent some 35,000 small arms, more than 10,000 other weapons, and medical supplies. Cambodia hopes that other countries will also furnish clothing, training facilities, and even perhaps volunteers. Ten thousand Cambodians have begun training in South Vietnam.

The Committee made it clear that, in its opinion, the United States would meet the pre-announced deadline for withdrawal from the Cambodian sanctuary areas, and continue a progressive reduction of U.S. combat forces in Southeast Asia. Cambodian leaders, although not happy about the prospect, are reconciled to it. They still expressed, however, the hope that the United States would continue to supply them with military hardware. Captured enemy weapons and ammunition, it is estimated, will give them a slightly greater capability for a few months. After that, additional arms and ammunition will be required. Although the army strength has increased to 180,000 through mobilization of men and women, we were told that many of these are government and office workers who do not really need arms. Estimates provided the committee were to the effect that about 70,000 or 80,000 should eventually be armed.

The conflict in Cambodia is not a civil war. Cambodians are not fighting Cambodians. Divisive internal elements are minimal in the country, although one cannot exclude the possibility that Sihanouk may be able to rally some Cambodians in the countryside. From what should be the viewpoint of other countries of Southeast Asia, this is the first opportunity for them to join together to help a beleaguered neighbor against a common enemy. The elimination of a number of key enemy sanctuaries may provide both a short breathing spell for the Cambodians to improve their own military capability and for other nations of the area to devise a common strategy.

While Cambodians understand that no U.S. troops will assist them, they remain hopeful that, if the need becomes urgent, the United States will at least provide air support. At the present time, U.S. Air Force activities in Cambodia are confined to the northeast section of the country, although the committee was told there are no restrictions upon operations by the Vietnamese Air Force in Cambodia.

Under Prince Sihanouk the defense establishment took about a third of the national budget. Presently, the military outlay has been increased five-fold. Although the war in the country has been in progress for only a few months, the economy has already been

seriously affected. Little revenue is coming into the treasury and inflationary pressures have begun.

Except for the presence of pill-boxes, barbed wire and numerous soldiers, Phnom Penh and its citizens appear to be carrying on as usual. The loss of Sihanoukville (Kompong Som) formerly Cambodia's principal seaport on the Gulf of Thailand, would deny the country its major supply point and restore its availability to the North Vietnamese as a principal supply route for much of South Vietnam. It was estimated by a number of authorities that about 85 percent of the supplies the enemy had been using against the southern part of South Vietnam have been coming through the port of Kompong Som. These were transported across Cambodia by truck to the sanctuary areas—something that has been occurring for several years.

During the committee's stay on Cambodian soil, both in the sanctuary areas bordering on South Vietnam and in the capital, members were impressed both with the evident success of the sanctuary clearing operation and with the apparent determination of the Khmer people to maintain themselves.

LAOS

The Royal Laotian Government (RLG) is perennially and seasonally menaced by Communist Pathet Lao (PL) and North Vietnamese Army (NVA) troops pushing out of mountain and jungle areas into populated Mekong River lowlands. Until recently the Laotian Government forces have been able to reclaim much of the territory so taken during the dry season.

The Communists control most of the country's terrain, but the Government most of the people. The Lao are basically a peaceful people who want to be left alone. Hundreds of thousands of them have fled either the Pathet Lao and North Vietnamese Army or U.S. Air Force and Royal Laotian Air Force (RLAF) air strikes. Fortunately, most of them have gone south toward freedom, rather than north toward Communism.

The Committee members received conflicting reports on the abilities of the Royal Laotian Army and those of the Royal Laotian Air Force. Their capabilities have improved, however.

There are relatively few U.S. governmental employees stationed in Laos—about 900 in the mission and 2,000 in all. There are very few American military men in Laos acting as advisors to the Royal Laotian Army. Other Americans work with the tribal forces, such as those led by Meo Maj. Gen. Vang Pao. Most of the other Americans in Laos are either with the Embassy or working in AID development programs.

USAF air strikes in Northern Laos are approved by the U.S. Mission. While the next year may be a difficult one militarily for Laos, United States, and RLG officials, including Prime Minister and Prince Souvanna Phouma, emphasize that they will neither make a request nor see the need for employment of U.S. ground troops in that country. However, the Prime Minister expressed the opinion that it is essential for Laos' future that the U.S. maintain some type of military support in Thailand.

The Members were told that continued American financial aid to the Laotian military is indispensable to Laos' existence. Not only does this aid provide the means for Laotian forces to deny the most heavily populated part of the country to the North Vietnamese, but their military actions also result in tying down two crack NVA divisions that could otherwise be fighting in South Vietnam.

One other important factor adding to the volatile situation in Laos is the Chinese Communists' road-building program in NVA/PL-held areas of Northern Laos. Since 1964-65 the Chinese Communists have been building roads through that area designed

to connect China and North Vietnam. Recent information indicates that the road may well be aimed at the Thai border. Once constructed, the road could be used to transport supplies in one day, where it now takes 30 days.

The long-term outlook in Laos is therefore cloudy. If the Communists choose to break more openly the 1962 Geneva accords, they could overrun Laos and imperil Thailand.

THAILAND

Thai government officials are convinced that the countries of Southeast Asia should assume greater responsibility for their own security. Especially is this true with respect to manpower. However, they stress the need for U.S. military equipment, as they do not want to become dependent for defense equipment upon any country with whom they could have a territorial dispute.

The United States has approximately 32,000 Air Force personnel with equipment at six major Thai air bases in addition to several smaller facilities. Thai officials express fear that U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam and Thailand might be carried out in such a way as to be misunderstood. They fear that the people in some nations of the area might interpret U.S. withdrawal as abandoning the goal of self-determination for Southeast Asian nations rather than a belief the South Vietnamese can handle their own manpower requirements. Such misunderstanding, they feel, could have adverse consequences in a struggle which is partly psychological.

Thai officials state that the war in South Vietnam has never been simply a "Vietnamese War" but rather than North Vietnam with Chinese backing has for many years been waging a war to dominate all of Southeast Asia. If they had not been convinced of this fact, they state they would never have sent troops into South Vietnam.

They also expressed the opinion that North Vietnamese aggression against Laos and Cambodia is nothing new, because the North Vietnamese have partially occupied these countries for years.

While Thailand is prepared to furnish troops and training to assist the Cambodians, the Thais say they cannot do so without external financial assistance. Foreign Minister Thanat Koman was obviously disturbed by reports emanating from the United States that the Thai soldiers in South Vietnam were "mercenaries", when the Thai government needs financial aid for part of their expenses. Thai officials stated that their soldiers were paid far less than prevailing civilian wage rates in Thailand.

The Royal Thai Air Force (RTAF) does not have enough trained pilots and ground crews to handle fully its need for air power, but it is training 100 pilots per year, and wants to train more. The Thais believe they have enough pilots, so that with updated planes they could handle more of the air responsibility for the region. They say it would be better psychologically to have Asians flying aircraft over targets in Southeast Asia, which would afford less opportunity for the Communists to create anti-American feelings.

Thai expenditures for defense account for 23 percent of their budget, and those for economic and social development are 14 percent of the budget. Their economic position is obviously stronger than that of most of Southeast Asian nations.

Communist guerrilla activities along the border with Malaysia are being countered through close cooperation with the Malaysian armed forces and police. Thais are concerned about North Vietnamese activities on their border with Cambodia, and about the modern fortified road which is being built from China to Thailand's northern frontier.

Thailand strongly supports an Asian devel-

opment program based upon Mekong River development. Extensive surveys and construction of two dams have already begun. Thailand would welcome North Vietnamese participation and sharing in the benefits of such development, if North Vietnam would turn to peaceful pursuits and abandon any plan to take control of much of Southeast Asia by force.

INDONESIA AND SINGAPORE

Members of the Committee visited Indonesia because half of the population and much of the resource potential of Southeast Asia lie within that nation. Indonesian diplomatic initiatives show promise that this young nation, which has achieved its own independence, sees itself as playing a leading role in the Southeast Asia region.

Indonesia would appear to be a prime mover in developing East Asian regionalism, not only at the present time but especially in the future. The future is emphasized because of Indonesia's continuing problem of creating a viable nation out of a vast archipelago. Not only do these island people have wide racial, linguistic, cultural and religious differences, but there is a problem of creating a rational economic system out of the chaos left by Sukarno. However, since the fall of Sukarno, Indonesia's new leaders have shown a willingness and ability to step forward and provide responsible international leadership. An example of this was the May 16, 1970, meeting in Djakarta at which eleven Asian nations, with a combined population of approximately 350 million people, met on their own initiative to discuss the Cambodian crisis.

Indonesia has taken a responsible and positive role in regional economic developments and, to some extent, in a parallel development of political organizations. Because the present day Indonesian leaders do not have the personal pretensions and ambitions of former leaders, they are better able to provide acceptable leadership for nations of the area.

The varied island nature of the nation provides more scope for developing individual leaders with differing backgrounds. This, together with the national spirit developed through its own achievement of independence, furnishes the impetus for its initiatives. The Members were impressed by the capability, and the depth and breadth of perspective of those Indonesians with whom they talked. The diplomatic initiatives of Foreign Minister Adam Malik—one of the several very competent and effective civilians in what has been thus far a military government—reflect the Indonesian potential for leadership. In the search for stability in the area, so as to be able to achieve real economic progress, Malik has adopted the approach that his country must take action to "buy more time" to achieve Indonesia's national development objectives.

Indonesia does not want to help in the present Cambodian situation, but has not yet found an appropriate alternative or means to implement her diplomatic initiatives.

Despite the heritage of debts and low per capita income from the Sukarno era, Indonesia is turning the corner economically but it is not climbing out fast enough to assume significant overseas commitments. They still feel that they cannot afford to furnish troops for external military action, specifically for Cambodia. Neither they nor the other Southeast Asian nations are psychologically prepared for a defense organization such as NATO; they feel they cannot afford it politically or economically. In their view they cannot support a combat role on the mainland of Southeast Asia.

Indonesia, which was so recently dominated by a foreign power, cannot be seen—either internally or by its neighbors—as again even being remotely subservient to a foreign government. Thus, Indonesia must

not only be careful about what it does, but also as to how and when it accepts foreign aid.

A number of primarily economic regional organizations have come into being with diffused leadership. Examples are: the Economic Commission on Asia and the Far East (ESCAFE), a United Nations organization; the Asian Development Bank (ADB); the Asian Parliamentarian Union (APU); and the Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Secretariat (SEAMES). These organizations hold meetings, conferences, seminars, etc., not all of which are economically productive, but they have provided a form of cement and regional consciousness among the nations of the area. Through these meetings the leaders of the various nations of the area have come to know one another both officially and personally. Barriers still exist, but progress has been encouraging.

As the countries of Southeast Asia achieve a greater degree of economic and political cooperation, more effective regional defense relationships can and hopefully will be developed. Having been exposed to Communism in its own government and overcome it, the Indonesians believe their country has a bright, though difficult future, involving friendly and fruitful relationships with countries both of the East and of the West.

The city-state island of Singapore is strategically located in the heart of Southeast Asia. It can play a significant role in the region's development through its technological, banking and investment resources. Singapore is a center of commerce with an excellent educational system which contributes to its capability to play a most significant role in Southeast Asia. However, its potential is limited by its large population inhabiting a small area. This in turn may limit its significance in Southeast Asia.

After Singapore's rude awakening to the necessity of self-defense when Great Britain withdrew from its former protective role in the Far East, Singaporeans have put 30 percent of their budget into defense. Singapore does not receive U.S. military aid and prefers to buy U.S. weapons and equipment. Its efficient government uses Israeli military advisors who help produce tough, well-trained soldiers who contribute to the island-state's national development.

The leaders of Singapore rejected Communism and now pursue a policy of nonalignment. In supporting the U.S. Vietnamization policy, they indicate explicitly that we must not cause a "crisis of confidence" in Thailand and the rest of Southeast Asia by a precipitate pull-out.

THE FUTURE OF SOUTHEAST ASIA

The increase of military conflict in Cambodia and the tenuous situation in Laos inject additional uncertainties into the already complex situation in Southeast Asia. With the planned reduction and ultimate withdrawal of U.S. combat forces from South Vietnam, external economic assistance will be a survival factor exceeded only by the ability and will of the people of this region to make their own accommodations on how best to cope with external aggression and internal strife. An acid test is coming of their ability to survive as independent states with self-determined governments.

Some leaders in the region view the expansion of the war into Cambodia as an opportunity to draw together more closely the countries of that part of the world. A common strategy, grants of military equipment, provisions for mutual combat training, and the use of neighboring countries' forces to repel invasion are a few cohesive steps that have been suggested. South Vietnam has military units in Cambodia, and is helping to train the Cambodian army. The Thais have expressed a willingness to play an active role. The big question is if the combined manpower and military capacity of each of the possible allies is sufficient to help

its neighbors to combat Communist aggression, and at the same time to fight insurgency at home. Distances are vast and terrain is rugged. Inadequate transportation systems, communications, and airpower are common weaknesses. Progressive reduction of the U.S. military presence in South Vietnam can make available much of the needed materiel. A question arises as to the extent to which the South Vietnamese themselves need this equipment to further their Vietnamization efforts, and to maintain their lengthy supply lines if they penetrate more deeply into Cambodia.

Before one becomes intrigued by the potentials for close and continued military association of the countries of Southeast Asia, it is well to recall that hostilities that run deep into history cannot easily be erased. The past trials and tribulations of NATO, comprising nations with a common long and bitter experience in war, suggest some of the problems these less sophisticated countries now face.

Thailand excepted, all have a fragile political base. A century of colonial rule did not prepare them for survival as independent governments responsive to popular rule. While popular government may exist in all countries, the gap between the governing and the governed is often wide. The dangers of aggression and subversion understandably require a greater concentration of power in the hands of those entrusted with saving the country. The thin cadre of leadership often gravitates toward the military establishment. It is no easy problem to strike a balance between military demands and procedural and popular government.

The elements that make for a cohesive and viable nation-state, such as common language, common objectives, and a common thread of history, are in short supply in most of the countries. These shortages are a result of thousands of years of turmoil with boundaries and power structures in perpetual change. Thus a greater and more pressing burden falls upon their governments to identify the interest of all citizens with the interest of the nation. To those whose land has fallen under colonial rule, occupation, and war, government means little more than taxation and military service. If the citizens' sights are to be lifted from defense of their ancestral hamlets, something they have been doing for centuries, to defense of central and remote centers of power whose motives they suspect, the government has a responsibility to develop and make known a set of meaningful values that merit defense.

Few governments in the region have mastered the technique of reaching down to their citizens and rallying them to support a common cause. Such success as North Vietnam has had in this regard has been achieved only at heavy human cost and through massive propaganda techniques. Other governments in the area have yet to devise and implement a strategy of communications with their own citizens. This information vacuum has been filled by broadcasts from Hanoi. (See section on Communications and Public Information Programs above.)

While the economy of South Vietnam has been covered in detail above, further general remarks about Southeast Asia's economy seem in order. There the potentials for development are considerable. Traditionally, the large river basins that form the southern part of Southeast Asia are the "rice bowls of Asia." A wide variety of agricultural crops, together with livestock, form the basis for the area's economy. Even in the piedmont areas, subsistence farming has been the backbone of the economy. Mechanized farming and improved agricultural techniques could vastly increase production once "pacification" is achieved.

The long period of conflict and insecurity that dates back to World War II has made

farming precarious and hazardous. Millions have become unwilling refugees divorced from their land. Manpower has been drained to fill the demands of military service. For many, exposure to the excitement and somewhat greater security of urban life has not encouraged a return to the routine of a rural society.

To meet their heavy fiscal burdens, governments have relied increasingly upon government ownership or control of business. (Thailand is the exception.) The effect has been to stifle private initiative and to multiply the problems with which government cannot cope.

The area does not lack the basic resources to embark upon industrialization. Take South Vietnam as an example. With peace and improved farming techniques, soil and climatic conditions will permit food production with a smaller percentage of the populace. There are five excellent ports. With training, many Vietnamese mechanics are as proficient as their contemporaries in the industrial nations. The Mekong Delta offers bright prospects for multi-purpose development, including power generation.

In each country, fiscal strategy more than military strategy may well be the decisive factor in national survival. Inflation is widespread and growing. Mounting military costs cannot be sustained if the economy falters. A decline in foreign exchange earnings, the import of necessary (and sometimes unnecessary) items, and a shaky tax base strain the financial resources. Our own efforts to combat inflation in the face of heavy domestic and defense expenditures are a microcosm of the problems faced by these countries. If inflation is allowed to go unchecked the governments face financial ruin.

The current instability of the area is not conducive to a major influx of private investments. Reduction of U.S. military outlays that parallel the reduction in our troop strength adds another problem.

While Communist China, either directly or through its satraps, remains a military threat to Southeast Asia, the quiet economic penetration of Japan is giving cause for some concern over the long haul. It requires no exhaustive research to become aware of Japan's role in Saigon, Bangkok, Vientiane, Djakarta, or Phnom Penh. The endless procession of wheeled vehicles, ranging from bicycles to automobiles, and a walk through the commercial centers give convincing evidence. One member expressed his concern this way, "The United States will spill the blood and spend the billions; Japan will move in and capitalize." Southeast Asians do not generally look upon Japan today as a Asian protector or mediator. Although still linked with the United States by security arrangements, they note Japan's slowly strengthening military posture and its rapidly increasing economic aggressiveness. The impending reversion of Okinawa to Japan is a further thrust southward.

What of the future role of the United States in Southeast Asia? Most officials of the various governments with whom members of the Committee spoke are reconciled to, but unhappy about, the determination to withdraw our combat forces from the area. Some seem to welcome it, provided direct economic assistance is bolstered. With varying degrees of bluntness, all urge increased military equipment, more training, the presence of advisors, and air support.

If the U.S. presence is to be low-keyed, it would be advisable to increase emphasis on international lending agencies such as the World Bank and the Asia Development Bank. Certainly, Japan is in a position to and should pick up a larger share of the burden.

Perhaps the U.S. has gone full circle in this part of the world and should direct its assistance to specific, but essential activities. Three fields that warrant immediate assist-

ance are agricultural and industrial development and public administration.

Agriculture is the basis of the economy. If it falters, these countries face serious internal problems. Industrialization offers a needed economic balance. Public administration should fill the gap in the design and operation of essential public services and provide the glue needed to hold these countries together.

After a long and costly involvement in Vietnam, the progressive reduction of U.S. forces will have a short-term adverse effect upon the Vietnamese economy. One can only guess at the number of Vietnamese who, directly or indirectly, derive all or much of their livelihood from the sale of goods and services to the United States and its personnel in that country. While Vietnamization of the military forces continues, any sudden drop in U.S. assistance will only intensify economic strains and jeopardize the financial structure. This juncture of conditions both offer opportunity and the absolute need to exert more leverage upon the Vietnamese government to address itself more vigorously to improved military capabilities, internal reforms, and to put its economic house in order. Possibly these pressures will not be well received. But such pressures are imperative if one both reads correctly the mood of the United States and observes the reaction of the South Vietnamese to the overwhelming American presence.

ADDITIONAL OR SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS OF NEAL SMITH TO THE REPORT OF THE SELECT COMMITTEE ON U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN S.E. ASIA, JULY 9, 1970

On Monday, the consensus or summary report of the Select Committee on our involvement in Southeast Asia was filed. Under the procedure agreed upon and in order to get a summary to the Members of the House of Representatives as fast as possible, Members of the Committee worked for about 20 hours on the way back from South Vietnam going through paragraph by paragraph and developing that summary report so that it could be filed as soon as possible. Additional material and more detailed summaries of our individual viewpoints were to be made soon and filed as additional or supplemental opinions and views. They are not necessarily inconsistent with the summary filed Monday but much more detailed and in some instances may be different. In some instances they portray in detail the part of the responsibility that the individual Member had a better opportunity to observe.

We broke up into teams each day—fanning out all directions so that we could cover the maximum amount of territory and see a greater number of people; therefore, obviously no one Member saw everything that is covered in the report. Obviously no one can become fully informed on Southeast Asia in either 2 weeks or 2 years, however, using the procedure we used and having full access to any and all information and areas gave twelve of us an opportunity to be exposed to more information and see more in two weeks and simultaneously than most people have seen after living there for years. Many people who have lived there several years, have still only seen one particular area of the country or had an opportunity to observe only one group or echelon of people; but they were helpful to me in forming an overall opinion.

On Monday, the 2 Members who were assigned to go to Con Son Island, Congressman Hawkins and Anderson, gave an extended account of what they saw even before the summary report had been filed, and that was quite properly the way to handle it under the procedure agreed upon. I gave several interviews concerning Cambodia with which I was more intimately acquainted. Through the summary report filed on Monday and the various additional and more detailed ac-

counts like this one filed by each Member. Members of the House should be able to secure some of the additional information we all need to vote upon matters which face this Congress this Session.

The principal information the House expected us to secure relates to withdrawal of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia. The President and Congress are agreed upon this policy but there is a dispute as to the rate of withdrawal. To my personal surprise, we found that President Thieu had in 1968 informed U.S. representatives that he wanted to start a planned withdrawal of U.S. military personnel. Since 413,000 U.S. soldiers are still in South Vietnam and an additional 40,000 in Thailand, under the resolution which sent us to Southeast Asia, our principal focus was upon questions relating to withdrawal and included questioning various military commanders why they should not withdraw at a faster rate, considering the problems raised and evaluating the answers given. We found that they had been told to answer any and all questions including the most sensitive relating to future plans and the orders under which they operate and they were also instructed to facilitate our going anywhere we requested. Thus, upon short notice or no notice, we proceeded to secure information and view the various operations.

As a result of these interviews, visiting various bases, reviewing sensitive information on enemy activity, and other information, the consensus of the committee was that the withdrawal could be faster than is now scheduled but of course, not all would necessarily arrive at the same proposed timetable.

There is great risk in going out on a limb and advancing opinions and conclusions as to a withdrawal timetable and attempting to summarize anything like the situation in South Vietnam because so much depends upon a totally unknown quantity: to wit, the extent of the input that North Vietnam and the Communist world is prepared to expend. However, with the full acknowledgment that I am no expert on Southeast Asia, and that no one can be sure such opinions will stand the test of time, I believe I should express such opinions and so, based upon what I saw and heard, for whatever they are worth, they are as follows:

(1) The security problem in the Southern half of South Vietnam, which contains 70 per cent of the people and 90 per cent of the resources of the nation, is quite different than that in the Northern mountainous part of South Vietnam and will probably remain quite different for many years in the future. It would be exceedingly difficult and costly for the North Vietnamese to try to supply troops in this area from supply lines from the North. It would take a huge number of people to do so and they could be detected and interdicted as they cross open or inhabited territory which divides the North from South. Thus almost 100 per cent of the supplies for this area have been coming through the Port of Sihanoukville and Cambodia for at least 5 years.

The fall of Sihanouk and the loss of the supply route from the Port of Sihanoukville across Cambodia together with the U.S. and the South Vietnamese capturing the arsenal located in the southern half of the sanctuary area, as it relates to the Southern half of South Vietnam resulted in at least a temporary setback for the North Vietnamese and considerably enhanced our ability to effect an orderly withdrawal of U.S. troops with safety. Whether this remains a permanent important advantage depends upon whether the North Vietnamese are able to bring down the Government of Cambodia and also re-establish a supply route from the Port of Sihanoukville across Cambodia. If they are unable to do so, it will be very difficult for them to supply a substantial offensive in the

southern half of South Vietnam. This part of the country is reasonably secure. In the big Delta (IV Corps area) we have reduced troops strength to about 23,000 and the South Vietnamese have almost all of the military responsibility.

(2) Due to the large amount of North Vietnamese supplies now in Laos and the supply lines reaching to the Port of Haiphong, I doubt that the loss of supplies in the Northern portion of the sanctuaries could be considered a permanent setback of any major proportion for the North Vietnamese as it relates to their capacity to supply their troops in the Northern part of South Vietnam. Except for some populated areas on the coast, it will be difficult to ever provide security in this relatively unpopulated wooded area. The North Vietnamese supply activity in this area from the Port of Haiphong and therefore effectively cutting supplies in this area could probably not be accomplished without closing the Port of Haiphong.

(3) Prior to the action in the sanctuaries in Cambodia, our military commanders underestimated the ability of the South Vietnamese Army, and as a matter of hindsight, I believe the South Vietnamese Army could have handled the action in the sanctuaries without our ground combat troops.

(4) For psychological reasons, some think such U.S. combat troops should be withdrawn over a period of several months, even if they are in a substantially dormant posture; but I believe the necessity for using our ground combat troops in South Vietnam for other than surveillance around our camps and in emergency situations that might develop could be and should be terminated and that, barring some much increased input by the North Vietnamese, the South Vietnamese Army can handle the situation without our combat troops in the areas containing 90 percent of the people of South Vietnam.

(5) While our commanders are preparing for withdrawal of ground combat troops, I don't believe they have yet taken seriously enough or received the indication that they should replace ground support units with all reasonably diligent speed. I believe there could be a faster withdrawal and phasing out of our personnel in the ground support units such as artillery and transportation so that most, if not all, of the balance of this type of responsibility has been transferred to the South Vietnamese within a few months.

(6) Although it would represent a reduction of about one year in the schedule widely proposed, I believe the transfer of the Air Force personnel responsibilities can be completed by October 1972. This will allow for the minimum leadtime required to train additional pilots and maintenance personnel (including teaching them English first) and turning over responsibilities and vacating facilities.

(7) Although it does not involve great risk to life and limb of our soldiers, one of the most difficult problems to solve from a time standpoint is the logistics problem. We have billions of dollars worth of equipment, hardware and facilities over there and it cannot be withdrawn prior to the withdrawal of the troops that they supply without risk to those troops. Also, the supply depots obviously could not be fully transferred until the Air Force transfer, mentioned above has been completed. Supplying the last of the Air Force personnel, awaiting arrival of the supplies now in the pipeline from San Francisco to Saigon, unloading it, putting it into inventory, mothballing the repairable used items to be returned, determining where the material will go, securing shipping for that going to Okinawa, Guam, the United States or elsewhere, and making an orderly transfer of that which is to be left in Vietnam, together with removing portions of facilities and equipment from some bases and turning over the facilities we will leave, cannot be accom-

plished in a responsible manner (or without some kind of scandal or terrible waste occurring) in anything less than 2 years and it might require a few months longer. However, the number of people necessary for this logistics operation after next year would only be a small portion of our present total force over there.

(8) In view of the above conclusions, I don't believe it is any longer necessary to send additional draftees and short-term enlistees to combat assignments in Vietnam on an involuntary basis.

(9) Korea has 50,000 very high quality troops in Vietnam. Most of them are ground troops and unless they begin a withdrawal program (which they do not now have scheduled), they may, within a few months, have more such troops in South Vietnam than the U.S. Judging from our observation of them and their reputation, these troops are of such quality that when they do return to Korea, surely the U.S. troops strength in Korea could be reduced.

(10) The Thais want to and we should program a greater reliance upon Thai pilots and personnel to replace U.S. Air Force personnel in Thailand. As stated by Foreign Minister Thanot, it would make the allies less vulnerable to North Vietnamese propaganda if Asians were doing the flying over Asia.

(11) As stated in the summary report, I think the new land reform program which is to be financed with American funds is full of problems which are almost impossible to solve and at least will require substantial time to complete in a manner that will not result in paying the wrong people and even backfiring in some instances. I don't believe land reform is nearly as important as a program to move families to some of the millions of acres of unused rich land. A few sheets of tin and a 6-months supply of rice at a total cost of less than \$100 can be a one-shot form of aid which provides permanent benefits to a family, reduces the social problems in the over-populated cities, reduces the inflationary pressure on housing costs, helps provide commodities for export and would do more good than proposals which would make a family permanently dependent for part of their cost of living.

(12) People in Vietnam who were in Japan following World War II and in Korea following that war, believe South Vietnam, with its tremendous natural resources, has a greater potential for recovery than either Japan or Korea had. The high import tax on such items as motorized bicycles, television sets and radio sets, together with the tremendous demand for them should provide an opportunity for in-country production of such articles. Foreign investment (which I understand Japanese, West German, and possible American investors are interested in) would seem to provide the best opportunity for quick employment for those who do not want to return to farming. Perhaps some of the military installations being vacated by the U.S. could be used for a combination of housing and factory facilities.

(13) Although there is surely less repression in South Vietnam than in most Asian countries, I think there is repression. Although this is a new attempt at constitutional government with individual rights in a part of the world unaccustomed to such a government, in a country where most people are not interested in any central government as long as it doesn't bother them, and the attempt to move toward less repression is being made in time of all-out war which is when most countries move toward more repression, I believe they need to give additional, immediate and constant attention to correcting repressive activities. I think this would gain more local support.

(14) With a shortage of qualified teachers and a public education system which has only been in existence a few years, education-

al television could aid greatly in teaching the young children the three R's. Many villages at least have one TV set at a central location, there are no programs on the TV station most of the day and people and children both regard watching TV as a prize attraction. At least this possibility for a cheap per child cost of basic educational enhancement should be fully considered and encouraged right away.

(15) I believe as many as 60 percent of the people of South Vietnam do not have much interest in a central government or any governmental activity above the village level. This 60 percent are people who have built their life around the family, the hamlet, and at most the village. They would not of their own free will engage in overt activity to oppose any government that provides security and leaves them alone and they have no interest in a United North and South Vietnam. The opponents of the present Thieu Government are divided into some 40 groups or parties, each of which would like to be in control but most of which do not want anyone to take Thieu's place unless it is them.

With a large second choice support and no opposing group with a large first choice support, the Thieu Government is heavily favored by most everyone in next year's election unless there is a substantial change.

I believe it will be a long time before the country of South Vietnam composed mostly of people whose governmental interest is at the village level will develop a two party system based on issues and a strong interest in a national central government.

NEAL SMITH.

HONORS CONFERRED UPON THE
SUSQUEHANNA UNIVERSITY SYM-
PHONIC BAND OF SELINGROVE,
PA.

HON. HERMAN T. SCHNEEBELI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. SCHNEEBELI. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House of Representatives of the honors recently conferred upon the Susquehanna University Symphonic Band, of Selingsrove, Pa., during a concert tour of Europe.

On July 18, 1970, the band participated in the World Music Contest Festival in Kerkrade, the Netherlands, and was awarded the first prize in the second division category. The judges for this part of the competition were from Great Britain, the Netherlands, and Czechoslovakia.

Bands from approximately 25 nations, including six from the United States, participated in the event, which is held once every 4 years. Each band was required to play a specified composition and one of its own choosing.

This competition came as the climax of a 30-day tour of Europe which included concert engagements in England, France, Switzerland, Italy, Austria, and Germany, as well as the Netherlands. During their tour the 75 members of the Susquehanna Band and the members of the university choir, who also made the tour, received a number of other honors.

City officials in both Bexhill-on-Sea, England, and Rimini, Italy, presented medals to the band and choir directors.

The programs presented by both groups included a variety of selections with par-

ticular attention being given to the playing of the national anthems of the host country and the United States.

The tour was designed to include both studying and concert activities and was arranged by the university department of music. The tour coordinator was James Steffy, chairman of the music department and director of bands at Susquehanna. Robert Summer is choir director.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my most sincere congratulations to these fine young people of Susquehanna University and their advisers on their outstanding musical accomplishments. And I am sure my colleagues share my sentiments in thanking this group for their additional meaningful services to our Nation as unofficial good will ambassadors to our European friends.

NEW COMMUNIST THREAT TO KOREA

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, in July 1949, all U.S. troops were removed from South Korea, and in January 1950, then Secretary of State Dean Acheson, announced that the Korean peninsula was outside the U.S. defensive perimeter, and that South Korea would have to provide for its own defense. Six months later, North Korean Communist forces smashed into South Korea, and for the next 3 years the United States was involved in its first "limited war."

The net result was that the North Korean Communist dictatorship, under Soviet hireling Kim Il Sung, remained intact, and 50,000 Americans were dead. Renunciation of our commitment to our South Korean allies invited the attack, and renunciation of all sound military principles by our political leaders prevented victory. Now there are indications in the media and here in Washington of a new threat to South Korea.

For the past 3 years North Korea has been stepping up its infiltration and military action. In 1968 an assassination team was sent south to kill President Chung Hee Park of South Korea. The American intelligence ship *Pueblo* was captured, and its crew held in prison and "interrogated" for almost a year. In April 1969 a U.S. reconnaissance plane was shot down, to celebrate the North Korean dictator's birthday.

Since 1968 the number of Soviet surface-to-air missiles in North Korea has more than doubled and the North Korean air force has been expanded to over 500 jet fighters and bombers. The North Koreans are stockpiling food and military supplies and have dispersed and located underground many of their key industrial facilities. Kim Il Sung has vowed to "liberate" South Korea and "unify" the whole country under his rule.

But in the Twentieth Century, as the late Whittaker Chambers—one of the most deeply perceptive of American ex-

Communists—pointed out, wars are no longer fought simply between nations, but also within nations. The Communists know that to win in Korea, as in Vietnam, it is first necessary to win in the United States by persuading us to withdraw our military forces.

So now we find the committee of returned volunteers—which, according to testimony by J. Edgar Hoover, is composed of former members of the Peace Corps who recently gave \$15,000 to the Black Panther Party—passing a resolution calling for the withdrawal of all American forces from South Korea. A group of aging "students" including fugitive Eldridge Cleaver recently traveled to North Korea to help coordinate a propaganda campaign against our position with the current anti-Vietnam struggle. Two SNCC members, returning via Cuba from training in Moscow and North Korea, were found to be carrying notes referring to the desire of North Korea to set up an organization in the United States for this purpose. As top Soviet leader, Brezhnev said at the world Communist meeting in June 1969:

It is natural that the fraternal parties now devote considerable attention to work among the young people.

On the "intellectual" front an effort is developing reminiscent of the campaign which persuaded us to let the Communists conquer mainland China, with such vast and terrible consequences for the whole history of the world. Books and articles glorifying North Korea and condemning South Korea are rolling off the press. Long-time fellow traveler, I. F. Stone, in reissuing his book "proving" that the United States started the Korean war. The *New York Times* and *Foreign Affairs* magazine have advertised Kim Il Sung's official three-volume biography. Articles in influential magazines present him as essentially a free agent concerned mainly with the welfare of his people, and at worst a "Titoist." In fact, Kim Il Sung was installed by the Soviet army in 1946 and was himself a major in that army. Even his name was "borrowed" from a prominent Korean guerrilla fighter.

It is vital that we see this propaganda offensive in its true light. We must not abandon Korea and Vietnam to the inevitable and proven horrors of Communist conquest. For those who think that Korea is so remote as not to matter to us, it is well to remember that Seoul is closer to San Francisco than is Paris. It is the Near West we are speaking of, not the Far East. And we are also speaking of human beings.

HON. JOHN KUNKEL

HON. GEORGE A. GOODLING

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, July 27, 1970

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I am deeply grieved over the passing of John Kunkel, a former Member of the House

of Representatives and a very good friend of mine.

The congressional district that Mr. Kunkel represented in the Congress was right across the river from the one I represent; hence, our interests were closely related. I feel sure, however, that John Kunkel and I would have been good friends without the close district relationship, because he was the type of person who radiated friendship and drew friends to him. During his congressional service, he had a highly cordial affiliation with all of the Members of the House of Representatives.

As he had a very fine personality, so did he have an abundance of ability. All of his colleagues recognized and respected his competence, relying upon him for his wise counsel and guidance in legislative matters. He was dedicated to his congressional service, more interested in performing than talking about his performances. He did not have much to say because he felt there was so very much to do.

John Kunkel was dedicated to the best interests of the citizens of his congressional district, and he had a passion for the progress of America and her people. He is one of those rare individuals of whom it can be said that his achievements will live in the lives of those he has served.

John Kunkel's passing is a great loss to all of us who have been privileged to know him. I wish to extend my deepest sympathy and sincerest condolences to his family.

THE NEWEST GALLUP POLL FAVORS PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. LESLIE C. ARENDS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Speaker, I should like to call to my colleagues' attention the newest Gallup poll. It is quite revealing.

The poll, taken in mid-July, shows that 61 percent of the people approve of the way the President is doing his job. Only 28 percent disapprove.

This is the highest approval mark the President has received in the last 5 months.

Some of the confirmed Presidential critics may ask themselves why. After all, they have worked pretty hard to transfer the Democrat sins of the sixties onto the Republican President of the seventies.

But I don't really think there is any mystery as to why.

The President is, above all, two things—a man of his word and a man of courage. It took courage to send American troops into Cambodia. It took a man of his word to bring them out on schedule.

Mr. Speaker, Richard Nixon has closed the credibility gap and has provided tough, courageous leadership.

No wonder the American people are showing a growing confidence in their President.

PEACE

HON. THOMAS E. MORGAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Extensions of Remarks, I wish to include a speech made by Mr. Milton Shapp before the Pennsylvania Veterans of Foreign Wars Convention which was held in Pittsburgh from July 8 to 11. The topic of Mr. Shapp's speech is "Peace." The speech follows:

PEACE

It is indeed an honor to stand among you today as a veteran and as a candidate for Governor of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. My topic is close to the hearts of all veterans. My topic is peace.

May I ask—is there an ex-airman, soldier, sailor or marine in this room who, while serving the colors of this great nation, did not pray and dream of the day when war would end and when peace would be restored and he could come home to his loved ones?

I remember vividly the day in the spring of '45 when the enemy surrendered in Italy. I invested all the money I had won in the poker game the night before in Vino, danced in the street and kissed the first Italian woman I saw. She was at least 65, short, and heavyset but, oh my, was she beautiful that day.

Three or four days later, the nazis surrendered in Germany. This was the real V-E day and we went wild again in Italy. Then came the point system and the long worry about a possible trip to the C-B-I. Was there a man in Europe anxious to make that trip? I don't know. I do know there wasn't a man in my outfit who didn't want to go home. . . Home to enjoy peace. And me—with only 68 points. I kid you not—I was really sweating it out.

That's the way it was and still is with almost all GIs. I don't think there has ever been a guy or gal who has ever served this nation who hasn't griped about something or other almost every day while in the service but who hasn't gotten together with his ex-mates after returning to civilian life and laughed about those same situations.

Yes, most of us fought when we had to but all the while we yearned for the day when peace would come and we could go home and pick up the threads of our lives in a nation and world at peace.

There is great dissension in this country today about how to bring about peace in southeast Asia. But there is growing agreement in this nation that we must have peace—and soon.

The men who have fought in this current war for the United States have, perhaps, fought the most difficult war ever waged by this nation. This is so not because the jungles of Vietnam are any hotter than those in the South Pacific in World War II; or the life of the combat soldier, more difficult than in the North Africa campaign or in Italy, France or Germany; or the enemy, any tougher than the one in Korea. This war has been harder because it has been fought without the full support of the American people.

When Tojo dropped his bombs on Pearl Harbor, when Hitler enslaved or killed millions of people in Europe we knew exactly why we were in World War II. But there are many in America who, for various reasons, feel the Viet Nam war should never have been . . . that it was sheer folly for us in the first place to have been sucked into a shooting war in the mainland of Asia, halfway

around the world . . . particularly when the war was never sanctioned by Congress . . . that is was wrong to have become so bogged down in Asia that we cannot effectively prevent the Soviet from expanding its influence in the all-important world crossroads of the middle east . . . that the needs of our own people at home are so great that we cannot afford the \$30 billion per year cost of Indo-China . . . that the inflation caused by Vietnam endangers the entire economic structure of America and threatens the livelihood of all of us.

This opposition does not detract from the courage and bravery displayed in the war by those who are in Vietnam but it does point out why many people in our Nation have voiced their opposition. And it does point out clearly the grave danger this Nation faces internally if we do not end our involvement.

For, in reality, what good would be gained if we continued in Indo-China to the point where we did help the people in Vietnam and in the other nations in South East Asia obtain a kind of stability if, in the process, we created such economic problems and other hardships for our own people and created such anger and division among our citizens that our own free society would be endangered.

Was it not for this reason—to save France itself—that DeGaulle pulled out of Algeria?

Our national VFW Commander, Raymond Gallagher, in this month's issue of VFW Magazine, puts emphasis on one very important aspect of the present plan of withdrawal from Vietnam—a point with which I am in complete agreement. The withdrawal must be conducted with maximum safety for our own men.

I am not a military expert. In fact, I stopped giving advice to my superior officers when I took off my uniform and donned civvies. But it does seem to me that our present policy of pulling out our combat troops first and leaving out support troops to be protected solely by the ARVN is fraught with danger because the fulfillment of such a withdrawal policy depends squarely upon the success of the present program of Vietnamization. And who knows for sure how well Vietnamization is working.

To my mind it seems that since the national policy is for withdrawal the maximum safety of our own troops demands that we pull out all our men as quickly as possible.

My concern about the politics of this war has not, however, diminished my concern for those young men who have served and who still serve in this war. They have performed well and with maturity under these most adverse of circumstances. It has been a difficult war for them and, I fear, it will be a difficult peace as well. The problem we must all face today is helping the men who return to peace. They deserve—yes—demand our understanding and our help.

As Governor of Pennsylvania I will exercise the full weight of that office to effectuate the transition of these men to civilian life. That is our responsibility. Also, I will use all of my strength and persuasion to help effectuate national policies that will maximize benefits for our Vietnam veterans. These men—particularly those from Pennsylvania—must have our understanding and aid in returning to a full and productive civilian life.

When I returned in 1946 from Europe along with millions of fellow veterans, I came back to a country made safe from the threat of destruction. I came back to a Nation prepared to take care of its veterans. Congress enacted the GI Bill of Rights that enabled all vets who desired it to have the opportunity to continue their education—academic or technical—To become engineers, doctors, lawyers, and scientists as well as machinists and technicians.

The Veterans given first crack at new housing . . . preference in Government jobs and other real aid in making the transition from war to peace.

At the end of World War II, in Pennsylvania we passed a Veteran's bonus bill that helped many vets back on their feet financially.

I spoke out in 1966 for a Vietnam bonus bill. I did not stop, even after I was defeated in the election of that year. On November 11th, 1966, I addressed the Veteran's day luncheon in this very hotel in Pittsburgh and read a telegram I had sent the previous day to the then governor-elect, Raymond Shafer, urging that he change his views and support such a bill. I am glad he did. I am glad the Vietnam bonus became law. I am glad, too, that the citizens of this State, in the May election this year, approved an additional bond issue to continue to finance such a bonus. This is the very least we can do to show our appreciation to our returning Vietnam Veterans.

But a bonus bill today is little enough payment for those who have placed their lives on the line.

To keep our commitment to our men we must do more. In Vietnam, these young men are told that they are fighting there for freedom, equality and the opportunity for a full life for all. We must assume them—by our actions at the national, State, and local level—that what they fought for in Vietnam will in fact exist at home.

As governor, I promise to put the full force of the commonwealth of Pennsylvania behind such a program. We must create the kind of climate in which our returning Vietnam veterans can make constructive contributions to our society.

Here are some of my proposals:

1. All Veterans of service anywhere in Southeast Asia, Vietnam, Thailand, Cambodia should be afforded the same benefits.

2. Education. We should insure that our State scholarship program under the Pennsylvania Higher Education Assistance Agency takes special cognizance of those men who did not have the opportunity to go to college before serving. For instance, the criterion of how much a parent earns in determining the size of a student's scholarship should not be applied in the case of the Vietnam veteran. Also, the State should be prepared to underwrite the cost of on-the-job training in industry for Vietnam veterans.

3. Jobs—The Pennsylvania Bureau of Employment Security should set up a special job bank for Vietnam veterans. Further, these young men should be given first consideration for jobs offered by State and local governments.

4. State services—There should be a coordinator to insure that all the resources of already existing state programs are made available to the returning Vietnam veterans.

As Governor, I assure you, I will do all within my power at the State level to make peace work and I will use the office of Governor in striving to influence the administration in Washington to fulfill its obligations.

Now, I turn to you, my fellow veterans, and appeal for your help in still another important program.

There are some of you in this room who have lived through four major American wars: two world wars, the Korean conflict and Vietnam. In each and every case, we talked about going to war to fight despotism, prejudice, injustice and oppression. At the end of each war we were promised an end to discrimination, hate and bitterness.

As soldiers we shared dangers and learned to respect a man for the load he carried regardless of the color of his skin or the way he worshipped God.

As veterans we must take the lead and show the way to the end of racial strife at home.

Among other things, the war in Vietnam has taken away the last excuse of the racist who tells the black man: "You must earn your rights." So many black men have fought so long in Vietnam: so many have given their lives, that there is no question about "earning rights." The burden is now on you and me to guarantee these rights.

Our responsibility is not just to black youth but to all youth. We have told them to fight this war because we needed to preserve justice, freedom and democracy. Now the burden is on all of us to see that justice, freedom and democracy are realities for all at home.

This is an area for individual action and I know of no group of persons more capable of individual action than veterans of our armed forces. You must, as individuals, practice and speak out for fair play and defend it.

And, speaking of speaking out: Let me close on this note:

None of us can condone the use of violence here at home by any segment in our country. As Governor, I won't stand for violence in this State by any group.

But my father used to advise me: "Milt, you have two ears and one mouth. Use them in the same proportion and you'll go a lot further."

We of the past war generations must use our ears and listen to what many of our young people are telling us. It takes two to tango and two to bridge the generation gap. We may object to some of their ways but I learned in the army that you can't kid the troops. Nor can you kid the young people of today. Under their long hair, many of them have good ideas . . . ideas that more often than not parallel our own.

They want a world at peace in which they can raise their families . . .

They want a world at peace in which all people are judged on their merits.

They want a world at peace which can devote its full efforts to eliminating hunger, curing disease and eradicating poverty for all people.

In short, they strive to achieve the same goals we did when we were their age.

I have outlined for you some of the burdens of peace.

With the Vietnam war winding down, our major task becomes insuring peace at home. We veterans have a major role to play in achieving this goal. I'm sure we are equal to this task.

NATIONAL WATER WELL ASSOCIATION

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, 1969 proved to be an unprecedented year for disasters. Every category last year far surpassed all previous records. The number of declared disasters was an alltime high of 29, compared to the average of 18. The number of States involved was also above the average; 23 for 1969 compared to an average of 16. The cost of relief programs set a high of an estimated \$300 million compared to the average of \$59.4 million. Property damage totaled \$2 billion, and 300 deaths were recorded.

The Government's disaster experience during the past year has broadened and deepened the Federal disaster assistance program that is now pending before Congress. The program includes advance planning, preparedness, pre-

vention, warning, crises assistance, relief, and recovery and long-range rebuilding. The program is increasingly concerned with the needs of individuals and groups, as well as the public sector.

The Disaster Assistance Act of 1970 includes provisions for economic development assistance, disaster loans, unemployment compensation, local government revenue maintenance, permanent repair, housing, debris removal, and planning assistance. However, legislative changes are not the only improvements required in the administration's disaster assistance program. Changes in the administrative procedures can be equally important in providing a more effective program.

To improve coordination President Nixon has established by Executive order a National Council on Federal Disaster Assistance. Stricken communities frequently lack trained personnel who can make the best possible use of the aid available to them from many sources. Federal assistance teams will help the communities coordinate the overall assistance effort.

It is in conjunction with the assistance teams, and the facility repair provision of the Disaster Assistance Act that I would like to direct attention.

An effort is currently underway by the National Water Well Association to establish a disaster committee to create a working system of communications, contractors, and equipment, ready to answer the call for water emergencies in the event of disaster. The association, operating privately and without Federal funds, is investigating how they can best lend a hand when an emergency strikes. They are compiling a complete listing in several States, of available men and equipment ready to answer a disaster call, to develop a 50-gallon per minute ground water supply in 24 hours.

The National Water Well Association's Disaster Committee has outlined its basic emergency plan: notification from the disaster area, committee on-site inspections, recommendations for rehabilitation of the water supply, deployment of equipment and personnel to the site and a committee report to the NWWA board.

The NWWA's new disaster committee has contacted and offered its services to the Red Cross, the Corps of Engineers, Civil Defense, and several Governor emergency councils.

Hurricane Camille, and the disastrous tornadoes that hit the Midwest and South last year, revealed the need to quickly establish a reliable source of clean water. The urgent need for water was great in the aftermath of Camille along the gulf coast and in Virginia. Water was everywhere, but there was none to drink. When the water receded, the established water sources had become contaminated, necessitating trucking water from distant areas. Such measures are never enough. Individual needs, even hospital requirements, are beyond the capacity of a few hastily requisitioned trucks. A community should be able to turn for help to those knowledgeable in water equipment needs and systems.

Man's most basic need is water. An

organization dedicated to making its resources available for alleviating both national and local disasters affecting water supplies, and helping to insure the quick availability of water, is to be commended and encouraged in its efforts.

A BILL TO EXEMPT DRAFTEES FROM DUTY IN HOSTILE FIRE AREAS

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing legislation under which draftees inducted after January 1, 1971, could not involuntarily be assigned to Vietnam or other areas in which the United States is engaged in armed hostilities, except as expressly authorized by the Congress.

I am satisfied that there is no necessity for requiring members of our Armed Forces involuntarily forced into service after January 1, 1971, to in turn be required to involuntarily serve in hostile fire or combat areas.

This legislative proposal should receive prompt and deliberate consideration. It is totally consistent with my advocacy of an all-volunteer military service at the earliest practical moment.

If we are to phase out the meeting of our military needs by conscription, a good way to start is to phase out the meeting of our combat military needs by draftees.

Philosophically, my proposal is right; pragmatically, it can be implemented.

Enactment of my legislation would force the Congress and all others who have criticized the draft, and conscription of those of our youth who cannot avoid it, to immediately and sincerely consider taking those steps necessary to provide incentives not only to serve in the military but to serve in combat areas.

Although I have not talked with President Nixon about my proposal, I am sure he will recognize it as an attempt to mandate the committees of the Congress into serious consideration of a phased elimination of the draft; a thing he has already advocated.

To the extent that incentives must be provided to prompt voluntary service in combat areas by both enlistees and inductees, their cost should be shared by all. It should not be borne by only those few unfortunate sons, husbands, fathers, and brothers who did not fit into one of the many categories for avoidance of service.

My mail, my constituent cases, my everyday contact with the problems of military service, have convinced me that unwillingness to serve in Vietnam or any other potential combat area is the greatest cause of distress, unrest, and apprehension today among not only our young men, but also their families and friends.

Since it appears the committees of both the House and the Senate will soon be pressured into holding hearings on revisions in the Selective Service Act, I want to make sure this proposal is be-

fore them. While these committees deliberate overall draft reform, adoption of my proposal would provide the interim relief to which the inductee is entitled. At the same time, it would permit and require limited experimentation with the effectiveness of incentives.

Although more than 80 proposals for revision of our selective service law have been introduced, ranging from repeal of the Selective Service Act to only limited reforms therein, no such proposal has attacked the real issue of conscription head-on as does my legislation.

At the same time, the thrust of my legislation is not new. Our 1940 Selective Service Act initially restricted assignment of inductees to the limits of the Western Hemisphere except in the territories or possessions of the United States, including the Philippine Islands.

Canada initially also limited the assignment of personnel drafted into military service under its National Resources Mobilization Act of 1940. Although subsequently repealed in 1942, that act originally provided:

The powers conferred . . . may not be exercised for the purpose of requiring persons to serve in the military, naval, or air forces outside of Canada and the territorial waters thereof.

I may be criticized for "forcing the issue" with the Commander in Chief and the Pentagon.

But before one criticizes my proposal, he should reflect upon the fact that under today's law, the President and the Pentagon have absolutely no justification for treating inductees and enlistees other than on a totally equal basis. Any attempt by the President or the Pentagon to show partiality or favoritism toward either in assignment of combat duty or to a combat area could be criticized as rank discrimination. My legislation would give the President and the Pentagon a lawful right to make such distinction.

And, sometimes we lose sight of the real significance of the draft in meeting our military needs. Its relative importance as a direct source of manpower is appropriately minimized when we consider the fact that fewer than 500,000 of our more than 3,000,000 military personnel are inductees; and, fewer than one out of four draftees are in Vietnam.

Especially in view of the reduction in personnel in Vietnam, I am confident the Pentagon can work within this limitation on combat service. I am sure the lead time provided and the gradual impact of my legislation will permit our military authorities to find ways and means to shift such service to volunteers attracted by the incentive of combat pay, special treatment, and benefits. And, most of all, I am sure my proposal will quicken the steps of those who have been guilty of "foot-dragging" in the Congress.

For the convenience of our colleagues the new paragraph which my bill would add at the end of section 4(a) of the Military Selective Service Act of 1967 reads as follows:

Except as hereafter expressly authorized by the Congress no individual inducted after January 1, 1971 for training and service in

the Armed Forces under this title may be assigned, without his prior written consent, to serve in any area not under the jurisdiction of the United States in which an Armed Force of the United States is engaged in armed hostilities.

COMMENTS TO UNDERScore THE IMPORTANCE OF ESTABLISHING NATIONAL VOLUNTEER FIREMEN'S WEEK

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, on April 29, 1970, the House gave justified recognition to the thousands of volunteer firemen throughout our Nation who provide protection to hundreds of our communities and their citizens. A joint resolution introduced by my colleague, the Honorable JOHN P. SAYLOR, one of the real outstanding authorities in the Congress on community development, and cosponsored by me and 19 others, was unanimously endorsed by our membership.

By the terms of this resolution, now under consideration by the Senate, the President is authorized to proclaim National Volunteer Firemen's Week from September 19, 1970, to September 26, 1970.

I sincerely urge the Senate to pass this resolution and encourage national appreciation and awareness of the tremendous contributions being made by our volunteer firemen. Their's is in the finest traditions of good citizenship. Their willingness to serve for the public good is a part of a proud heritage that goes back to the first days of our Republic.

It is a privilege to submit for consideration by our Senate colleagues the following communications which I have received from volunteer fire companies in my own State. Maryland has long benefited from the services of such organizations. These comments from officers of our fire companies will underscore the importance of establishing National Volunteer Firemen's Week:

ABINGDON FIRE CO., INC.,
Abingdon, Md., July 25, 1970.

Congressman J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEALL: Please be advised that the Abingdon Fire Company members are in complete support of Joint Resolution 1176 authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim the week of September 19 to 26 as National Volunteer Firemen's week.

Thank you for giving recognition to the many men who give freely of their time to serve their communities.

Sincerely,

CHARLES E. SCOTT,
Secretary.

ANTIETAM FIRE CO.,
Hagerstown, Md., July 24, 1970.

Re H.J. Res. 1176, National Volunteer Firemen's Week

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEALL, JR.: Thank you for remembering our volunteer firemen! I firmly believe these dedicated, hard-working

men, more than any other group, are representative of "Mister Average American". Their consistent, often heroic, efforts have gone unheralded for entirely too long.

As President of the Antietam Fire Company, Hagerstown, Md.—and as a citizen—I fully support your resolution as a worthwhile effort to put all volunteer firemen in the national spotlight.

Very truly yours,

C. I. EYLER, Sr.,
President.

AVALON SHORES VOLUNTEER
FIRE DEPARTMENT,

Shady Side, Md., July 22, 1970.

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEALL: Please be assured that this department wholeheartedly supports H.J. Res. 1176, a Joint Resolution authorizing the President of the United States to proclaim "National Volunteer Firemen's Week" from September 19, 1970 to September 26, 1970. It is gratifying to know that someone wishes to so recognize the many hours of faithful, and unpaid, service performed by the able, skilled volunteer firemen of our country. As volunteer firemen, we feel that we are a special breed of patriotic, community conscious individuals.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM F. BATEMAN,
Secretary.

ALBERT L. TONIOLI,
President.

FRANCIS H. BARBER FUNERAL HOME,
Laytonsville, Md., July 28, 1970.

Mr. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEALL: Thank you for mailing me a copy of the Resolution to designate a National Volunteer Firemen's Week.

I have read this resolution sponsored by you; and having been a member of a volunteer fire company for over fifteen years, as well as serving as its President, I feel this would be a great honor to our service organization. It would certainly give our volunteer firemen more incentive to carry on and serve others with even greater determination; many times risking their own lives for others.

Therefore, I strongly support your resolution and want to thank you for your interest and support.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS H. BARBER.

BEL ALTON VOLUNTEER FIRE
DEPARTMENT, INC.,

Bel Alton, Md., July 24, 1970.

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR CONGRESSMAN: I wholeheartedly support the resolution designating a National Volunteer Firemen's Week. It is time the volunteer firemen throughout the state and nation are recognized for their untiring efforts and services rendered the people of the United States.

Recognition is something firemen think little of when there is a life to save, a home at stake or many of the jobs they are called upon to perform. Nevertheless, I believe a gesture such as the resolution you have cosponsored would be most gratifying to the firemen of our country.

Thank you for allowing me to support this resolution.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN E. FRERE,
President.

**THE VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT,
Brandywine, Md., July 27, 1970.**

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEALL: In reference to your letter of July 17, 1970, and the enclosure the Volunteer Fire Department of Brandywine, Inc. (Company 40) Prince Georges County, Maryland, wishes to go on record as supporting the Joint Resolution H.J. Res. 1176. We feel this is a step forward in the right direction. It will, we hope, enlighten all of our citizens to the wonderful work being accomplished by the Volunteers, as well as making it known to them that their efforts are appreciated very much.

Sincerely yours,

FRANCIS CARROLL,
President.

CHAPEL OAKS VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT,

Washington, D.C., July 22, 1970.

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States, House of
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEALL: The Chapel Oaks Volunteer Fire Department whole-heartedly endorses Resolution No. 1176, authorizing the President to proclaim National Volunteer Firemen's Week from September 19, 1970 to September 26, 1970.

It is gratifying to know we have the interest and support of you and your fellow Congressmen. Your combined efforts to honor the volunteer firemen throughout our state and nation, and to create an awareness of their diligent efforts and devotion to duty, is greatly appreciated.

This letter will serve as endorsement of the Resolution, by the Chapel Oaks Volunteer Fire Department, one-hundred per cent.

Sincerely yours,

CLARENCE NORTON,
President.

**CHILLUM-ADELPHI VOLUNTEER
FIRE DEPARTMENT, INC.,
Adelphi, Md., July 23, 1970.**

J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Member of Congress, Congress of the United
States, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEALL: We members of the Chillum Adelphi Volunteer Fire Department of Adelphi, Maryland would like to offer our support of Resolution H.J. Res. 1176 to proclaim, "National Volunteer Firemen's Week from September 19, 1970 to September 26, 1970.

This date would follow by only a few weeks the anniversary, August 9, 1969, the date two Volunteer members of the Chillum Adelphi Volunteer Fire Department, Charles R. Hobstetter and Robert J. Harmon, Jr. gave their lives in a rescue attempt in our area.

Both of these men are typical of the type of dedicated persons throughout the United States who make up the Volunteer Fire Department systems, large and small, who daily risk their lives "That Others May Live".

Very truly yours,

VERN C. PRENTICE,
President.

**CLEAR SPRING VOLUNTEER FIRE CO.,
Clear Spring, Md., July 23, 1970.**

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEALL: On behalf of the Clear Spring Volunteer Fire Department, Inc. I assure you of our endorsement of H.J. Res. 1176 authorizing the President to proclaim National Volunteer Firemen's Week from September 19, 1970 to September 26, 1970.

Volunteers spend many hours of personal time training for the prevention of fires, re-

ceiving instructions in firefighting procedures, techniques, and in actual practice.

Fighting fires; protecting the property of others not only is hazardous but also involves dedication of the men and the understanding of their families. Day or night the routine pleasant and important home life may be interrupted by the alarm.

We, of the Clear Spring Fire Department, appreciate the recognition afforded us by the House of Representatives, and by you, to remind the Nation that the Volunteer Firemen are dedicated to the protection of the health and welfare of their communities.

Very truly yours,

THOMAS F. ALTMAN,
President.

**COTTAGE CITY FIRE CO.,
Cottage City, Md., July 27, 1970.**

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is in response to your letter dated July 17, 1970.

This department desires to go on record as supporting H.J. Res. 1176 which is to honor the nation's volunteer firemen during the week of September 19 through September 26. We also urge the Senate of the United States to approve the joint resolution without delay.

The Cottage City Fire Company extends its appreciation and gratitude to you and others who had a hand in drafting the referenced resolution.

Sincerely,

PAUL L. BARTIN,
Secretary.

**DAMASCUS VOLUNTEER
FIRE DEPARTMENT, INC.,
Damascus, Md., July 25, 1970.**

J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

HONORABLE J. GLENN BEALL: The members of the Damascus Volunteer Fire Department, Inc., at their regular meeting voted to endorse the resolution of a National Volunteer Firemen's Week, September 19 to September 26, 1970.

Thank you for your interest in and concern for Volunteer Firemen.

Sincerely yours,

RODNEY H. DUVALL,
Corresponding Secretary.

**DISTRICT HEIGHTS VOLUNTEER
FIRE DEPARTMENT, INC.,
District Heights, Md., July 23, 1970.**

J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEALL: At the regular meeting of the District Heights Volunteer Fire Department the membership has authorized me to send you our endorsement of the Resolution H.J. Res. 1176 (National Volunteer Firemen's Week).

The thought by the originators of this resolution is very much appreciated.

Sincerely,

J. J. THORNE,
Secretary.

**GUARDIAN HOSE CO., INC.,
Thurmont, Md., July 23, 1970.**

MR. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEALL: This letter acknowledging your note endorsing copy of H.J. Res. 1176 in the House of Representatives, April 16, 1970 of the 2d Session, 91st Congress authorizing the President to proclaim National Volunteer Firemen's Week from September 19, 1970, to September 26, 1970.

As President of our Volunteer Fire Department I concur with this resolution and give it my support.

Sincerely,

D. S. WEYBRIGHT,
President.

**INDEPENDENT HOSE CO., MARYLAND
STATE FIREMEN'S ASSOCIATION,
Frederick, Md., July 25, 1970.**

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEALL: On behalf of the Officers, Directors and Members of the Independent Hose Company No. 1 of Frederick, Maryland, I wish to advise our sincere appreciation and support of Resolution 1176.

Our volunteers give of themselves without thought of reward or personal gain in all their assignments. Recognition of their efforts will help to encourage them in their duties and maintain the volunteer concept of fire and rescue service vital to communities throughout our nation.

Respectfully,

WILLARD M. HORINE,
President.

**KENSINGTON VOLUNTEER
FIRE DEPARTMENT, INC.,
Kensington, Md., July 23, 1970.**

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States, House of
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

SIR: Thank you for your letter of July 17, 1970.

This letter, to become part of the official Congressional Record, indicates the full support of the Kensington Volunteer Fire Department, Inc. for the Joint Resolution (H.J. Res. 1176) introduced in the House of Representatives in the Second Session of the Ninety-first Congress on April 16, 1970, authorizing the President to proclaim National Volunteer Firemen's Week from September 19, 1970 to September 26, 1970.

Very truly yours,

DONALD M. PHILLIPS, President.

**LA PLATA VOLUNTEER
FIRE DEPARTMENT, INC.,
Charles County, Md., July 24, 1970.**

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEALL: I am writing on behalf of the La Plata Volunteer Fire Department to express our support of House Joint Resolution #116, regarding National Volunteer Firemen's Week, September 19 to 26, 1970.

Thank you for your consideration in this regard.

Very truly yours,

EDWARD L. SANDERS, JR.,
Secretary.

**OCEAN CITY, MD.,
July 28, 1970.**

J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
Congress of the United States, House of
Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. BEALL: Re your letter of 7-17-70 regarding H.J. Res. 1176 on behalf of the Ocean City Volunteer Fire Department. I heartily support the proposed resolution co-sponsored by you. Thank you. I am,

Yours truly,

GEORGE M. HURLEY, President.

**OXON HILL VOLUNTEER FIRE CO.
AND RESCUE SQUAD,
Oxon Hill, Md., July 22, 1970.**

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: Referring to your letter of July 17, 1970, I am pleased to support your resolution designating a National Volunteer Firemen's Week.

Thanking you for your interest in our efforts.

Respectfully,
 JAMES M. BARNARD, Sr.,
 Vice President.

POTOMAC FIRE CO., No. 2, INC.,
 Westernport, Md., July 23, 1970.

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, Jr.,
 Member of Congress, 6th District of Maryland,
 House of Representatives, Washington,
 D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEALL: The officers and members of the Potomac Fire Company No. 2 of Westernport, Allegany County, Maryland are very much appreciative of the efforts of yourself and other members of the 91st Congress in introducing a joint resolution to proclaim the week from September 19, 1970, to September 26, 1970, as National Volunteer Firemen's Week. We support this Resolution and feel that it is long overdue for men who give so much of their time and sometimes their life for their fellow Americans.

Again, we thank you and hope that this resolution passes the Senate.

Sincerely,
 ROBERT H. SHIMER,
 Chairman, Board of Directors.

ROCK HALL VOLUNTEER FIRE CO.,
 Rock Hall, Md., July 23, 1970.

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, Jr.,
 Congress of the United States,
 House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEALL: Due to the timely arrival of your letter of July 17 with reference to H.J. Res. 1176, it was read to the Officers and members of the Rock Hall Volunteer Fire Co. at our meeting of July 21.

The members present at this meeting (approx. 30) all expressed their thanks and appreciation to you and your colleagues for your thoughts and deeds in sponsoring this resolution.

All too often the volunteer firemen are over-looked or taken for granted in the part they have in protecting their communities and the lives of the people therein.

Therefore, the Officers and members of The Rock Hall Volunteer Fire Co. wholeheartedly approve and endorse H.J. Res. 1176, and again thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
 P. JAY ELBOURN, President.

VOLUNTEER FIRE DEPARTMENT, INC.,
 W. Lanham Hills, Md., July 24, 1970.

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, Jr.,
 House of Representatives,
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BEALL: We heartily support H.J. Res. 1176, which authorizes the President to proclaim National Volunteer Firemen's Week, from September 19, 1970 to September 26, 1970.

We who serve in volunteer fire companies throughout the nation, gladly give of our time and ask for no compensation in return, except the chance to serve our communities.

In addition to our normal duties of fire suppression, we actively support fire prevention programs in our respective communities. We also require that our members complete fire fighting courses and first aid courses, usually given by a local university and the American Red Cross, as well as attendance at weekly drills. We do this in order to provide efficient and scientific fire fighting services to the communities that we serve.

We, like all human beings, feel a certain amount of gratification from a simple pat on the back and a statement of a job well done. We feel that H.J. Res. 1176 will accomplish this and give added incentive to the volunteer firemen of the nation by letting them know that they are wanted and appreciated.

The members of this fire department join with those throughout the nation, in expressing our thanks to the sponsors of this resolution.

Yours very truly,
 LEROY J. KOCH,
 President.

LETTERS WITH PERCEPTIVE COMMENTS ON THE PRESENT STATUS OF THE AEROSPACE INDUSTRY IN SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I would like to include two letters received from Mr. Thomas Albright of Santa Ana, Calif., with some perceptive comments on the present status of the aerospace industry in southern California. The letters follow:

JULY 1, 1970.

DEAR JOHN: My wife, Katie, and I wish to express our pleasure with your election to Congress.

Since a significant number of aerospace engineers are in your district, I would like to submit some comments on the situation to you. In whatever light Aerospace or the defense industry may be considered, it is a part of the Nation's needs for survival.

I feel that the accumulated events of the past 15 years have resulted in a breach of national faith to the engineers. But more important is the future danger. There is probably less than 5% of the engineers who would presently recommend the investment of the mind of his son in the defense industry. This condition is principally due to the temporary nature of the industry as well as the national trend which is being forced by the vocal crowd. The handle of a name can seemingly do wonders or harm. F.D.R. put the same industry in a favorable light by calling it "the Arsenal of Democracy."

Notwithstanding several cases of history being on the side of the Democrats, I consider the following some irresponsible contributions by them in which they made political hay:

Post Sputnik Charge: The U.S. has a booster gap.

Fact: The U.S. had developed an "advanced" bomb of lower weight (hence, was ahead) and didn't need the huge boosters for ICBM purposes as Russia did. Space was not then a national objective. However, we quickly recouped in space.

1958 Charge: The population of our technical community is getting behind, citing Russia's educational methods and national emphasis.

Fact: In those years as many as 20 companies were fighting tooth and nail for any significant contract.

1960 Campaign Charge: A missile gap exists.

Fact: Later refuted.

Early 1961 Event: Bay of Pigs fiasco following decision not to use the military.

Counter Event: Apollo race-to-the-moon program by 1970.

Total Result—As a result of the false charges and ill-advised events, money was dumped out mostly for the spending in the Space area. Every Podunk University was set up with the latest in lab. facilities, given research contracts (many of which industry couldn't get), scholarships granted, and government and university facilities were erected throughout the country. Production of Minuteman was apparently accelerated.

The sum total was a huge outpouring of college graduates (many of whom would have entered other fields) for Aerospace employment. These events, together with today's vocal objections, have created the present Aerospace employment picture—A breach of faith.

Other contributing factors by the Democrats:

1. Viet Nam War and its escalation with no intent to win

2. Inflation should have been attacked in 1968

3. A 1% productivity increase versus an inflation increase of 6% has created the focal problem in the real-world economic sense.

Yet, it appears that Russia has the Arms Race momentum and China is building a threat.

The same vocal crowd will be yelling two years from now that we are behind and the go-ahead switch will be thrown again. This off-again, on-again practice is wasteful to the national interests, is risky toward security, and is disruptive to many lives.

The Engineer—In addition to the uncertainty of work, another characteristic of the aerospace engineer in the industry is the working agreement he must fulfill as a condition of employment. This could be interpreted as the companies "owning the minds" or mental servitude—certainly enough to question the rights of the individual in an atmosphere of free enterprise.

History has recorded two phases of physical servitude in this country. First, physical bondage resulted in the Civil War. Second, physical servitude in an economic sense (sweat shops) resulted in the unions. When a company owns any idea an engineer may conceive on his own time and from prior experience, even though they are not currently in that business but might plan to be in the future; that seems to be mental servitude.

During the evening of your recent testimonial dinner, in response to your question, I mentioned that I came within 1 hour of receiving a layoff notice even though I had individually saved the government \$21 million of which my employer received \$4 million as net profit (\$2.1 million received to date). During the first week in June, I actually received a layoff notice. However, it was cancelled a day later.

I solely bird-dogged a belief for two years until I received study funds. Then, I individually developed a solution to eliminate the need for equipment which led to the aforementioned Value Savings to the government and Corporate profit.

This Corp. net profit was many times greater than that which they would have received from future equipment deliveries. Moreover, the profit was delivered to my employer during a period of tight money.

Problems cannot be solved unless exposure is made to the right people. However, in this case, I made my own exposure and assignment to the problem. In truth, I feel that my best assets toward the achievement came from my rural heritage and resourcefulness developed from previous employment. Yet, mental servitude is at work wherein the Corp. gets all and the individual gets nothing.

I did receive an Air Force certificate award which compares favorably with three certificates my boys received from the public schools. My only reward from my employer has been the two layoff episodes although my achievement was performed two years ago. I cannot believe that any fair-minded individual in public or private life would approve these events I have just related.

Certainly these practices raise many questions as to motivation or incentives to prompt an individual to perform beyond the call of duty. Today's climate would seem to influence any engineer to save any significant idea to prove himself later in case he has to shop for a new job. These practices

do not seem to be in keeping with President Nixon's correct call for increased productivity to match inflation.

It has been said that unions enter in areas only where and when significant abuses exist. Engineers do not want to belong to unions. Yet it is happening and the pace appears to be quickening. It seems a shame that this is the only solution in the American way of life. However, the layoff practices and the designation of those immune from layoff seem to be an open invitation for the unions.

Irrespective of your committee assignments in the Congress, I am sure you will work foremost in the interests of the nation including free enterprise and, while representing the people in your district, you will remember all elements including the aerospace engineer.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS B. ALBRIGHT.

JULY 23, 1970.

DEAR JOHN: Thank you for your letter of July 15th. Since writing you on July 1st, I have come across some interesting items relative to technology, the engineer, and the Aerospace industry.

I read an article "The Legal Rights of Employed Inventors" by Mr. Theodore H. Lassagne which appeared in the Sept. 1965 issue of the American Bar Association Journal. The article explains why the present system results in the U.S. ranking only 7th in the number of new inventions. The only exception to his article seems to be that employees no longer have the "security of a pay check" for their compensation.

In the correspondence section of a July technical magazine, comments were made relative to a bill, H.R. 15512 introduced by Congressman John E. Moss of Calif. This is "A bill to create a comprehensive Federal System for determining the ownership of and amount of compensation to be paid for inventions and proposals for technical improvement made by employed persons." From the scant information, this bill appears to correspond to the spirit of the trend in Mr. Lassagne's article.

An article in this publication—T.E.E.E. Spectrum—"Science in the Seventies—the policy issues" generally poses questions and says that a national policy is needed. A partial quote states: "There is general agreement that technological innovation is a component of economic growth—some economists believe it is the primary factor. Yet, there is certainly no general agreement that the assurance of technological innovation is the responsibility of the federal government. I believe it may come, however." This article was written by Hubert Heffner, Office of Science and Technology, Executive Office of the President.

Irrespective of the present-day views commonly voiced, I feel that, considering the challenges and the results, the defense effort or Department is head and shoulders above any other Dept. in the federal government. However, technology can be added to the economic sector if government will remove the shackles to innovation. From what I can tell, the passage of H.R. 15512 would be a step in the right direction. Government should not fund that which can be economically attractive.

As a means of conducting joint business, some impasse would be broken between invention ownership if the inventor got some compensation. The usual question is "who gets it—the aerospace company or the government?"

In addition, these companies usually follow a policy of "least hurt". They weigh the cost of obtaining a patent versus the possible pain or loss in not getting it. As a result, some inventions may be "tabled" and

are not released to the inventor even if he asks for it. It is highly likely that, if employed inventors are given some compensation, further technology will pour out to the economic sector, rather than remaining on the company shelves.

Relative to government not funding that which is economically attractive, I think the oceanographic pursuit may be an interesting point. Much was made about all the riches in the oceans. Having worked 5 years on the Gulf of Mexico, I would tend to agree. However, I suspect that this pursuit would have been much further developed by the petroleum and mineral companies—had not the aerospace companies rushed in to wait for government funding.

Thank you for your indulgence in reading my lengthy letters.

Respectfully yours,

THOMAS B. ALBRIGHT.

OPPOSITION TO THE SECTION 235 SUBSIDY PROGRAM CONTAINED IN THE EMERGENCY HOUSING ACT

HON. DAVE MARTIN

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I insert a letter received from a constituent in Grand Island, Nebr., in regard to the 235 subsidy program contained in the recently passed Emergency Housing Act.

I opposed this legislation because of this subsidy involved in sections 235 and 236 on the purchase of a home and on the rental of a home.

Programs such as 235 make for a crutch on which the housing industry leans and will result eventually in the construction of practically all homes in the country under this program, in which the taxpayers pay most of the interest on the loan for the next 4 years.

I am in complete agreement with the thoughts expressed by my constituent's letter which follows:

JULY 26, 1970.

DEAR SIR: We want to express our extreme disgust with the FHA 235 program. In our opinion it is definitely a socialistic program designed, along with our Country's extensive welfare programs, to destroy personal incentive and individualism.

As a family we worked and saved for 10 years to buy a \$15,000 house. We bought our house at \$140 a month, and a year later approximately 30 of the same houses were built across the street from ours for so called "low income" families which includes school teachers & similar middle class workers. They pay \$100 a month for the same house as ours & then can afford their color TV's, chain link fences, YMCA memberships, etc.

It seems to me we're penalized for hustling around for a little better job and not having a house full of children. If we were a little lazy in mind & spirit, we would be better off to take a lesser job & have a few more children and live off the government as seems to be the trend these days.

As far as I'm concerned, what's good for one should be good for all. I'm all for improving the Country and if that includes providing everyone with a nice house—fine! But—for those who have a little incentive to improve themselves, they should also be given a government allowance or low interest loan instead of being penalized for their ambition, and I could go on and on.

FIGURES TO KEEP IN MIND WHEN THE FARM BILL COMES TO THE FLOOR.

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, because the Minnesota Sixth Congressional District is one of the most agricultural districts in the entire United States, it is not surprising that our newspapers devote a great deal of editorial space to the problems of agriculture.

Some of these editors are conducting educational campaigns, through their editorials, pointing out to their readers that the price paid for food across the supermarket counter does not reflect the price the farmer is receiving for his product.

The Canby News, a State and national award winner for newspaper excellence, printed one such editorial in its issue of July 23.

Editor Richard Olson chose a list of 20 items showing their selling price and the price the producer received for these items.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to keep these figures in mind when the farm bill comes to the floor.

Our family farmers today are living on depression-level prices while the rest of our economy is enjoying booming affluence. I urge that this farm economy gap be closed, that our farmers be given greater equality in our economic structure.

With your permission, and for the enlightenment of my colleagues, I herewith insert Richard Olson's editorial in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COST OF FOOD

We all know that it costs money to process food, but sometimes we wonder why it has to cost so much. The grocery stores operate on the thinnest margin possible and the farmers have long said that they don't get a fair share of what they produce.

But to give you an idea of the amount the processors get after food leaves the farm, here are some figures:

Food item	Purchase price	Farmers share
10 lbs. of sugar.....	\$1.29	\$0.53
1 loaf of white bread.....	.35	.05
1 loaf of wheat bread.....	.35	.04
10 lbs. of potatoes.....	1.08	.34
1/2 gallon of milk.....	.47	.23
2 lbs. of American cheese.....	1.59	.93
1 package of corn flakes.....	.43	.04
5 lbs. of white flour.....	.59	.20
2 cans of peaches.....	.74	.13
2 cans of beets.....	.35	.02
2 cans of corn.....	.54	.07
2 cans of peas.....	.50	.08
2 cans of spaghetti.....	.48	.06
Jar of peanut butter.....	.89	.31
5 lbs. of apples.....	1.48	.40
1 bottle of cooking oil.....	1.09	.23
1 package of cookies.....	.49	.04
1/2 gallon of ice cream.....	.99	.34
1 choice beef roast.....	3.52	2.18
1 choice pork roast.....	2.12	1.27
Total.....	19.34	7.49

Note: Based on national averages as taken from USDA Marketing and Transportation Situation, November 1969.

FORMER CONGRESSMAN SCRIVNER'S REMARKS ON REVENUE SHARING AND EDUCATION

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, in doing research for the bill I introduced on revenue sharing, H.R. 13983, I came across remarks by former Congressman Errett P. Scrivner of Kansas, delivered in the House of Representatives on Tuesday, February 22, 1955. Congressman Scrivner was an outstanding Member of Congress, and one of the first Congressmen to propose revenue sharing. I think these remarks made in 1955 are worthy of note, and I want to take this opportunity to include them in the RECORD for your review.

I am extremely proud that Congressman Scrivner is a resident of my district, the Fifth Congressional District of Florida.

The remarks follow:

SIMPLE, DIRECT, FEDERAL AID FOR EDUCATION
(By Hon. Errett P. Scrivner)

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Speaker, if you are looking for a simple, direct program for aid to education, free from Government controls, without costly administration, and devoid of any "share-the-wealth" attributes, the joint resolution I am introducing today deserves your consideration and support.

Although most State treasuries are in better shape financially than is the Federal Treasury, there is no doubt but that in many States the demands, especially for education, call for more finances than the States are able to raise to provide needed buildings, maintenance, improved equipment, increases in teachers' salaries, and other items. The combined debt of the 48 States is about \$20 billion. Uncle Sam owes over \$275 billion.

With the enormous increase in Federal expenditures over the past 25 years the Federal Government has tapped every practical possible source of tax revenue, with little consideration for the tax needs of State and municipal governments. The States are now dependent almost entirely upon direct taxes on real estate and personal property, duplicated income tax and sales taxes which fall heavily on persons of low income. In seeking new revenue the States find available sources already drained by Federal taxation—income taxes, admission taxes, beverage taxes, luxury taxes, transportation taxes, tobacco taxes, excise taxes, to name but a few. Enormous sums, billions of dollars annually, are siphoned out of the States in individual and corporate income taxes. The remaining revenue available to the States is inadequate to meet rising local costs of government and provide adequately for growing educational needs.

It is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums from the States and then have a portion of these funds trickle back under any of the proposed bureaucratic-administered programs of aid to education. If any of the presently proposed and pending programs are adopted, a large overhead for administration is unavoidable, and in some instances the only thing offered the State is an opportunity, lured on by Federal dollars in matching funds, to go into debt, and even this is prohibited by law in some States.

Under the best-intentioned Federal administration, there remains the well-founded ob-

jection that the compulsory requirement that each State meet conditions imposed by law and regulations of the administering bureau must be complied with to qualify for benefits. Furthermore, there is a deep-seated fear—also well founded—that with Government intervention in education programs, opportunity might well be found for channeling propaganda into our schools, along with Federal controls which naturally follow Federal dollars flowing from Washington.

With a modest beginning, these programs, with almost no exception, follow a pattern of growing and growing, until it is possible that the training of our youth throughout the Nation could some day be directed from one central Federal bureau, and that bureau would be headed by someone appointed, not elected, and thus not directly responsible to the taxpayers whose funds he was spending.

The prime responsibility for education programs is in the local community and the State. Conditions now existing are not emergency short-time situations, and can be expected to continue for the long indefinite future, as more children are born.

To easily, simply, cheaply, and efficiently provide the States with some financial aid for meeting their needs for the improvement of their respective educational programs, without increasing their debt, without building up a huge Federal bureaucracy, without fear of Federal controls, dictation, or propaganda, without the slightest element of distribution of wealth, I am proposing, by a joint resolution which I am today introducing, a simple, direct, unrestricted plan for aid to the States and the Territories to help them meet the educational demands within their respective borders:

"House Joint Resolution —

"Whereas the Government of the United States, through taxes, is siphoning a great part of the wealth of our Nation out of the several States and Territories into the Federal Treasury; and

"Whereas the Government of the United States is collecting taxes from nearly all sources of revenue, including taxes on individual and corporate incomes, admissions, beverages, communications, gifts, luxuries, transportation, and from excises and other taxes, leaving to the States little but real and personal property and consumer sales as sources of tax revenue; and

"Whereas at rates approaching confiscation of property, States are still not able to raise revenue sufficient to carry the rising costs of State and local governments, and especially not to meet the demands for needed improvements and higher salaries for the training of our youth; and

"Whereas it has been proposed that the Federal Government grant aid to the States for educational purposes; and

"Whereas it is neither economical nor efficient to withdraw huge sums out of the States and Territories and redistribute funds under bureaucratic regulation from the Federal Treasury, and

"Whereas it is desirable that such aid be accomplished by a simple, easy, direct, and efficient method, not hampered with bureaucratic restrictions, directions, or dictation: Therefore be it

"Resolved, etc., That 1 percent of all income taxes collected on individual and corporate incomes under Federal statutes shall be deemed to be revenue for the State or Territory within which it is collected, for use, for educational purposes only, without any Federal direction, control, or interference.

"Sec. 2. District directors of internal revenue are hereby authorized and directed to transfer to the treasurer, or corresponding official, of the State or Territory within which their respective internal revenue districts are situated, at the end of each quarter, an

amount equal to 1 percent of the taxes from individual and corporate incomes collected within such State or Territory during said quarter.

"Sec. 3. For purposes of information only, district directors of internal revenue shall report the amounts transferred to State treasurers, or corresponding officials, as authorized, in section 2, to the Department of the Treasury, accompanying such report with receipts from the proper State officials verifying the amounts received by said State official."

Under this plan the handling of funds through Washington and back will be eliminated; the amounts available to each State will be determined annually by individual and corporate incomes within that State. The money will remain in the several States where it was collected. The total amount to be thus collected through Federal facilities for the States each year will be automatically geared to the national income for that year. There will be no danger or possibility of Federal control or dictation, and no opportunity for channeled propaganda. It will provide many States with a larger amount than would be available under many other plans which have been proposed. There would be no need for a growing bureaucratic horde with an insatiable hunger for power ready to consume ever-increasing amounts of taxes.

For example, in fiscal 1954 the district director for internal revenue for Kansas collected in individual and corporate income taxes approximately \$407,343,360. On this basis there would have gone to the State of Kansas under this plan, for the fiscal year 1954, \$4,073,433 every cent of which would be available for use within the State.

This is not a new proposal. I first presented it in 1949—H.R. 1582—at which time several various proposals were pending.

In the 80th Congress—1946—the Senate passed S. 472. Under that measure, the only direct aid to education bill to pass in either House of the Congress, the estimated initial contribution Kansas would have been required to make to the Federal Treasury would have been \$2,552,000. From the benefits authorized by S. 472, Kansas could have received back as aid to education a total of \$1,960,000—a net loss of \$600,000. The other proposals so far advanced would operate to take out of most States more to support the proposed program than would be returned in benefits, and on the whole would provide less in effective aid than is offered by my proposal.

Certainly under the plan I propose, the States, generally, by having this 1 percent of the individual and corporate Federal income taxes paid by its citizens withheld for use within each of the respective States for educational purposes, would be much better able to cope directly, as they deemed best, with their educational problems than they would under any program directed from a Washington bureau.

This proposal will be a step toward retaining our constitutional Republic and a move away from centralized government.

Such legislation will be in keeping with suggestions made by the then Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower, by keeping the control and responsibility local. He said:

"When financing of schools is turned over to the Federal Government you get bureaucracy, and this the approach to statism."

Every advocate of aid to education to whom I have talked insists he wants no Federal control, no bureaucracy. This resolution will meet that desire, for it need not add a single person to the Federal payroll and will certainly eliminate all possibility of Federal controls—even those found in most other proposals before the Congress.

From the table below based on tax collec-

tions for the fiscal year 1954—approximately—you can see the benefits for your own State. The logical appeal and the elimination of the danger of Federal bureaucratic controls under this plan would enable your State to provide more adequately and more efficiently for the needed enlargement of educational facilities and the necessary increase in salaries of teachers.

This direct use of income taxes is possible. It can be done. Precedent is established by Public Law 630 of the 81st Congress, where it is provided that all of the taxes of incomes earned by American citizens in Guam, while resident there, including stateside Americans, both civilians and military, should be turned over to the Government of Guam. Not just 1 percent, but all of the income tax collected from Americans there—and Guam is merely an unincorporated Territory.

TABLE 1

	Income tax collections fiscal year 1954 (including tax for old-age insurance)	1 percent of tax collected
Alabama.....	\$359,904,000	\$3,599,040
Arizona.....	153,119,000	1,531,190
Arkansas.....	148,110,000	1,481,100
California.....	4,671,633,000	46,716,330
Colorado.....	553,265,000	5,532,650
Connecticut.....	1,168,589,000	11,685,890
Delaware.....	869,525,000	8,695,250
Florida.....	599,990,000	5,999,900
Georgia.....	581,573,000	5,815,730
Idaho.....	100,902,000	1,009,020
Illinois.....	4,926,633,000	49,266,330
Indiana.....	1,205,079,000	12,050,790
Iowa.....	494,575,000	4,945,750
Kansas.....	437,870,000	4,378,700
Kentucky.....	441,333,000	4,413,330
Louisiana.....	459,357,000	4,593,570
Maine.....	159,030,000	1,590,300
Maryland.....	851,777,000	8,517,770
Massachusetts.....	1,708,884,000	17,088,840
Michigan.....	4,857,146,000	48,571,460
Minnesota.....	917,256,000	9,172,560
Mississippi.....	129,336,000	1,293,360
Missouri.....	1,472,722,000	14,727,220
Montana.....	109,285,000	1,092,850
Nebraska.....	320,620,000	3,206,200
Nevada.....	70,308,000	703,080
New Hampshire.....	118,150,000	1,181,500
New Jersey.....	1,745,232,000	17,452,320
New Mexico.....	99,351,000	993,510
New York.....	11,626,091,000	116,260,910
North Carolina.....	673,436,000	6,734,360
North Dakota.....	60,929,000	609,290
Ohio.....	4,147,301,000	41,473,010
Oklahoma.....	504,416,000	5,044,160
Oregon.....	403,821,000	4,038,210
Pennsylvania.....	4,531,795,000	45,317,950
Rhode Island.....	271,653,000	2,716,530
South Carolina.....	239,806,000	2,398,060
South Dakota.....	67,056,000	670,560
Tennessee.....	463,856,000	4,638,560
Texas.....	1,969,318,000	19,693,180
Utah.....	135,324,000	1,353,240
Vermont.....	70,790,000	707,900
Virginia.....	641,430,000	6,414,300
Washington.....	711,456,000	7,114,560
West Virginia.....	270,198,000	2,701,980
Wisconsin.....	1,121,973,000	11,219,730
Wyoming.....	51,764,000	517,640
Alaska.....	45,843,000	458,430
District of Columbia.....	707,455,000	7,074,550
Hawaii.....	126,170,000	1,261,700
Puerto Rico.....	(9,571,000)	(95,710)
Total.....	58,578,533,000	585,785,330

Note: Because collections for old-age insurance are not shown separately in internal revenue reports, actual benefits would be somewhat less than shown here when adjustment made for that factor—an average of about 7.2 percent.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

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

"How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive or dead?"

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

How long?

CON SON—SMALL ASPECT OF SOUTHEAST ASIA CONFLICT

HON. AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

July 7, 13, 14, and 30, 1970

Mr. HAWKINS. Mr. Speaker, much publicity has resulted from our recent exposure of the horrible conditions at Con Son Prison in South Vietnam. But Con Son constituted only one small aspect of the many findings we reported which while less dramatic were even more significant.

Some forces, more concerned with continuing the war than achieving peace, have used the wide publicity given Con Son to imply that we were interested in humiliating America and conversely not concerned with barbaric actions of other countries.

In order to lay to rest such baseless "mongering," I have compiled a few of the various statements and articles on this subject inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Let me, however, at this time make even more clear, if necessary, these points:

I condemn torture and atrocities committed by either side of the present conflict in Southeast Asia. In demanding better treatment for American prisoners in Communist hands, we cannot, at the same time, make the mistake of covering up and excusing torture committed by our own allies in Southeast Asia. Humanitarianism, not revenge, should govern both sides.

Likewise, our criticism of the Government of South Vietnam has apparently irritated certain persons who claim we are embarrassing our country by telling the truth. The embarrassment results not from what I have said but from the United States' association as an ally with the corrupt and unpopular regime in South Vietnam, a government which is in power only because of United States dollars and military power.

Apparently there are some people who do not want the truth to be told. They are willing to condemn our enemy—and justly—for many faults, but then, with hypocrisy, they want us to whitewash our own sins.

Lastly, it should be reported those who would suppress the facts and continue an absurd war have resorted to personal attacks as their means of defense. To these misguided souls I can only say in the words of a black artist, Bernie Casey:

In little ways,

On certain days,

They will ask you

To be a man.

In bigger ways,

On other days,

They will stop you

If they can.

MIDEAST TENSION AND ARMS FOR ISRAEL

HON. GRAHAM PURCELL

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. PURCELL. Mr. Speaker, recently the Texas Department of the American Legion held its 52d annual State Legion convention in the city of Fort Worth, Tex. I am certain that virtually every American is aware of the outstanding work which Legion posts throughout the county have done. This organization has made unparalleled contributions to the cause of Americanism for several decades.

There are many of us in this Chamber and in the Senate, Mr. Speaker, who are members of the American Legion and who support the principles and philosophy for which this organization stands. The American Legion represents a wide range of men from every segment of our society. The members share only two common characteristics: they have served the United States in the Armed Forces and they have a deep felt desire to make this a better world in which to live and work.

It is the custom of the Texas department to study carefully at its annual convention the important problems of American foreign policy and to recommend to the Congress, the President, and the people the most rational course of action possible. The recent convention was, of course, no exception. I think that we should all listen very closely when this group, after serious study and reasoned debate, suggests a course of national action. In this spirit, the Texas Department has spoken out on the impending crisis in the Middle East. I therefore insert Resolution No. 87 of the National Security Committee of the annual convention in the RECORD. Their suggestions I feel deserve our immediate and close examination.

The resolution follows:

RESOLUTION NO. 87 OF THE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF TEXAS

Whereas, While world attention is focused on the struggle for freedom in Southeast Asia, the threat to peace, freedom, and representative government in the Middle East is growing into alarming proportions; and

Whereas, The United States is firmly committed to the maintenance of a balance of military power in that region, so necessary in the absence of a negotiated peace settlement, to insure the existence of Israel as an independent and viable nation; and

Whereas, The State of Israel is a bastion of democracy in the Middle East and has purchased and fully paid for military material procured from the United States; and

Whereas, The continued existence of a free and democratic Israel is in the national interests of the United States; and

Whereas, The Soviet Union has recently acted to deepen and broaden the Middle East crisis and jeopardize Israel's existence by introducing very large amounts of new war-making material, including sophisticated surface to air missiles, and military personnel into the United Arab Republic in support of the latter's express purpose of destroying the Israeli nation; and

Whereas, The Soviet Union has further inflamed the existing tension there by employ-

ing Soviet pilots in U.A.R. military aircraft thereby introducing a dangerous new dimension—highly trained manpower—into the conflict; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the American Legion, Department of Texas, in regular annual convention assembled at Ft. Worth, Texas, July 24-26, 1970, that it condemn the Soviet Union for increasing tension in the Middle East by its most recent actions and reiterates its firm support for Israel, for a peace negotiated by face-to-face discussions between Israel and its enemies; and be it further

Resolved, that The American Legion reaffirm the intent of Resolution 427, adopted at the National Convention in Atlanta on August 27-28, 1969, calling for the supply to Israel of sufficient arms and other material to permit it to maintain a balance of power in the Middle East against its enemies, by urging the Government of the United States to allow Israel to obtain F-4 Phantom jet fighter aircraft, Skyhawk fighter-bombers, and other sophisticated equipment it has requested or may need in order to insure its own defense.

AN END TO SMUT MAILING

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I know that many Members of Congress share my belief that strong action is needed to curb smut mailing in our country. I am pleased that a bill, H.R. 11032, has recently been reported out favorably by the full Judiciary Committee.

As amended in committee, this bill prohibits the use of the mail or the transport in interstate commerce of "an unsolicited advertisement that is salacious." A salacious advertisement is objectively defined, enumerating with specificity that which is proscribed. The penalties proposed would amend existing law and provide for a maximum fine of \$50,000 or 5 years imprisonment, or both, for the first offense. For each subsequent offense, the measure proposes fines up to \$100,000 and 10 years imprisonment.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, I strongly support this effort to halt unsolicited, salacious advertising entering the American home.

Enactment of this legislation would substantially cut down the flood of unwanted pornography being mailed or otherwise transported.

The text of the bill, as amended, follows:

A bill to prohibit the use of interstate facilities, including the mails, for the transportation of salacious advertising

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 71 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding a new section 1466 as follows:

"§ 1466. Transportation of Salacious advertising

"No person shall knowingly deposit in the mail, or transport in interstate or foreign commerce, an unsolicited advertisement that is salacious. An advertisement is salacious within the meaning of this section if it depicts, in actual or simulated form, or explicitly describes, in a predominantly sexual context, human genitalia, any act of natural or unnatural sexual intercourse or masturba-

tion or any act of sadism or masochism. An advertisement otherwise within the definition of this section shall be deemed not to constitute a salacious advertisement if it constitutes only a small and insignificant part of the whole of a single catalogue, book, periodical, or other work the remainder of which is not primarily devoted to sexual matters.

"Whoever violates this section shall be fined not more than \$50,000, or imprisoned not more than five years, or both, for the first offense, and shall be fined not more than \$100,000, or imprisoned for not more than ten years, or both, for a subsequent offense.

"When any person is convicted of a violation of this section, the court may, in addition to the penalty prescribed, order the destruction of all copies of the salacious advertisement seized from the possession or custody of such person or anyone acting on his behalf, at the time of his arrest."

SEC. 2. The table of contents preceding chapter 71 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by adding at the end thereof the following:

"1466. Transportation of salacious advertising."

SOUTH FLORIDA ESSAY WINNERS "SPEAK UP FOR AMERICA"

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, this afternoon it was my pleasure to meet in my office Gloria Davis and Debbie Renault, two of the five winners in the "Speak Up for America" essay contest sponsored by the Certified Plumbers of South Florida. I was deeply impressed by their sincerity, intelligence, and the high regard for the institutions of this country that perpetuate the democracy they cherish.

I would like for them to speak for themselves, as I am sure they speak for the majority of our Nation's youth. Their winning essays, along with those of Richard Lee Grimm, Joan Ziegler, and Paul Bockting, the other three winners, are a fitting testimony to the great majority of our young people who are still willing to "Speak up for America."

I take this opportunity to bring their prize-winning essays to the attention of my colleagues:

SPEAK UP FOR AMERICA

(By Gloria Davis)

I adopted this marvelous Uncle called America when I was only seven, but I knew exactly what I was doing. My decision was made with the raw logic of a child who learns too soon how to bargain for life.

In a hungry place, where no one had taught me to read, I had learned the essential values. I didn't know how to count my fingers, but I learned to know the laugh of a child who has eaten well and has nothing to fear. I knew how it was to be unclaimed, and then to sense that someone wanted me, that I might have a worth of my own.

Of course, it didn't take much intellect to enjoy the hamburgers and a crunchy new delight called potato chips! I sat on a carpet, softer than any bed I had known, and stuffed my mouth while I stared at television. It was natural that I would decide to make this a permanent arrangement.

Every moment of the naturalization ceremony was real and meaningful to me. I was proud that I could do the flag salute (almost) in English; and it was far from a shameful thing to stand in the bright sunshine on the Post Office steps, waving my own small flag.

Few Americans of my age have had a better opportunity than I to get acquainted with this land. It was indeed a charming giant Uncle to me in the early days. Out West, I stood transfixed before Nature: The Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, the Grand Tetons, Glacier, Zion, Yosemite. The majestic Redwood Forests. In the East, I worshipped at the shrines of history. I took off my shoes at Valley Forge, wept at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and made a vow in the awesome presence of Abraham Lincoln.

Then, even as I suppose my new parents had discovered flaws in me, I began to notice weaknesses in the character of my adopted land. I saw bitter poverty in the shadow of affluent waste. I cringed with Blacks, Indians, Puerto Ricans and Mexican-Americans before cruel bigotry and injustice. I heard empty, sentimental words when I longed to see action. I was angry in the knowledge of futile, bloody war. I saw the nature I loved abused and mocked by greedy exploitation and heedless pollution of the environment.

I began to feel cheated and to blame others. I would protest against hypocrisy! I would submit a list of grievances. I would demand action. Perhaps the "American" idea was merely a set of sentimental words, after all: A deceitful, rosy shadow, like a little girl waving a flag.

Suddenly I comprehended the real glory of America. Laugh and cry for the irony and the beauty of it!

Who am I to make demands? Small refuge on the Post Office steps. Yet only a little later, with barely a tentative beginning in experience and judgment, I make demands. I feel free to express my opinions, and even suggest them to others.

An unclaimed wisp of starving humanity 10 years ago, now I am a person, and I dare to criticize the people who gave me life and identity! Instead, I should do my share to correct the wrongs.

Perhaps the most pervading and consistent trait of America is this: It tends to believe more in people than in systems. Somehow, inevitably, it also gives its people confidence to believe in themselves. This is a place where nobody accepts for very long the idea that he is worthless or that his cause is futile.

Every generation has believed that it could do something those before it had not done, or set right the wrongs or neglects of others. Some dared to believe that a new and different nation could be built from almost nothing against all opposition. Some dared to think that they could cross vast unknown deserts and mountains, with no promise of trails, food or water. Some dared to believe that all children are capable of learning, and that communities should create better citizens through a unique system of public schools.

In their headlong, and not always wise, rush for material gains and to accomplish untried feats, every generation has also created new problems and sometimes left old ones unsolved. I cannot expect that there would be no challenge left for me.

This nation has given me some burdens but it has also given me important assets with which to face the future and accomplish the tasks which have been thrust upon me. I feel that I am myself, a person with definite rights and abilities. I am not afraid to ask questions, make suggestions, take action.

These assets I am constricted to use in the interest of the American people for I never would have had them if I had not adopted Uncle Sam.

AMERICA

(By Debbie Renault)

What does the word "America" really mean? I tried to find the answer in books but there was no definition that satisfied me, so I decided to write my own.

"A" stands for allegiance. It symbolizes the unity between the states. An allegiance is made and adhered to only with great determination and courage. When we find it so hard to form even a simple bond between two countries today, just imagine all the trials endured by the early Americans who brought the states together. But we accomplished it, and this is something of which we can be proud.

"M" signifies merit. In our country a man almost always can get a position on his merit and skills rather than his prestige, race or creed. There still are, of course, prejudices to be overcome but we are continuing to work to overcome them.

The letter "E" definitely stands for equality. It's true that all men are not completely equal, but things are getting better. Little more than 100 years ago, Negroes were still slaves. Fifteen years ago the Negro in some areas couldn't even ride the city bus. Now he's driving it. Ten years ago a Negro couldn't get certain jobs. Now Negroes hold some of the highest positions in our country.

It's true that Negroes and the underprivileged are not yet completely free, but with God's help and a little understanding on everyone's part, they soon will be.

The letter "R" symbolizes all the red blood shed to keep our country free. All through our history, courageous men have fought for the independence and freedom of the people in this great land. Starting with the Revolutionary war and going through much bloodshed all the way to the Vietnam war of the present day, there have been patriotic men willing to fight to save our freedom, our country, and our heritage. Even today, while there are many draft-evaders, we still have men who are ready to stand up and defend their country to the death.

The letter "I" stands for America's initiative. It takes a really great country like America to come up with the scientific breakthrough of the century—putting a man on the moon. America also sponsors such worthwhile projects as trying to convert salt water into fresh, to find a cure for cancer and to solve the ever-growing problems of air pollution. All these examples point to the great initiative of our country and the huge amount of spirit and determination that is America.

The "C" stands for courage. Whether I look back into history or at the American people today, the first thing I note is their great bravery. We have withstood many things—war, depression, poverty and starvation. Looking around now, I see the misery of families living in poverty, the sorrow of wives and children who have lost husbands and fathers in Vietnam and the depression of the suppressed Negro. Through it all, one thing sticks out: Courage.

The final letter in America, "A" stands for ability. America is the land of the free and the bountiful and we have the ability to do many things. We help other peoples acquire the freedom and independence to which we are so accustomed as well as some of the economic advancements that rise from our abilities.

Now, let's put all the letters together and spell A-M-E-R-I-C-A, a great, wonderful and free land!

AMERICA

(By Paul Bocking)

Legend has it that Fisher Ames, soon to be a congressman from Massachusetts in the 1700's, provided a popular description of America when it was a new democracy.

"Monarchy," he said, "is like a full rigged ship, trim and beautiful, with all hands at their stations and the captain at the helm. It executes its maneuvers sharply and operates with the greatest efficiency. But if it hits a rock, the frail hull is crushed and the vessel sinks.

"Democracy, on the other hand, is like a raft—hard to navigate, impossible to keep on course and distressingly slow. But if it runs onto a rock, it simply careens off and takes a new course."

Ames added that, with the virtue of always staying afloat, America had disadvantages, too. "Damn it," he said, "your feet are wet all the time."

I feel America is more right today because she is facing up to what is wrong and doing something about it. People are more open-minded. We have free enterprise in industry. We are free to do or say what we want unless it infringes on the rights of others. If you say something against the government, you don't have to worry about waking up the next morning on your way to prison, sentenced without a trial. This is what they do in Russia and China.

One of the most important wrongs that we are trying to right is the plight of the Negro. His whole history is one of man's inhumanity to man. He never did get a fair deal as he went from slavery to segregation, and the majority of Negroes found they could not choose a decent place to live or get a good job.

When that tired Negro woman on the Atlanta bus refused to give up her seat and move to the rear, she started a whole new outlook for America—on the move in the 20th century with the Supreme Court back of her. Even though the raft of Democracy is moving distressingly slow, we are trying to right a wrong where the Negro is concerned.

One of the things that is right with America is our balance of power. Because we took in "the tired, the poor and the huddled masses yearning to breathe free," we have developed a remarkable balance of power. There are so many different races and nationalities with different outlooks, customs and opinions that no group ever seems to get large enough or violent enough to become a danger to democracy. Still, it could happen.

One of the things I like about America is its history. We do try to learn from our mistakes. A good example of this was the 18th Amendment—prohibition—which turned out to be an utter failure as a social experiment.

Another "right" with America is that we are living up to our ideals as Americans more today than ever before. The Cuban refugees are good examples. In colonial days immigrants were needed. Today we are overpopulated but we still live up to the lines on the Statue of Liberty—"Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me, I lift my lamp beside the golden door!"

America is doing right for her youth in giving them the best in education. She has always believed in educating the masses. Now we are trying to give everyone who graduates from high school a college education as well, if he wants it. Our government feels that we must find the best minds in this country, and God was not a snob when he handed out the brains. They are found in the most unexpected places.

I am glad we have a court system that gives us the right of trial by jury. In many countries they don't do this. People are guilty until proven innocent.

Now I want to discuss the slums of America and what we could do about them. Because of the housing shortage many people still live in slums, and urban renewal will be very slow. With no relief in sight, the first thing slum-dwellers could do is make their surroundings more interesting or picturesque.

The slums would be a good challenge for the interior decorators of America. How do you make a place habitable when you have four children, three rooms and no money?

Perhaps the Japanese could help us on that score. After all they are crowded too, but they have privacy with their screens, space with their mats that can be rolled up and put away, and beauty with their rock gardens that can be created in a little space. Also, there should be some form of protection for the young in the slums so they won't be hurt by those who are bad. So many mothers are gone at work so much of the time.

Our greatest problem today is our role as a world power in the struggle for the cause of freedom. We are up against a smart enemy. In trying to help countries that want to keep their freedom, we are in a bind. We know if we move out too soon, the Communists will take over. We also know that once a country is lost to the Communists, it is very seldom free again.

Americans should have a healthy suspicion about many of the radical groups pressing for change. We should ask: Is this a Communist front? We must not be carried away by their clever tactics to break down the structure of the American way of life. Remember what Khrushchev said: "We will bury you."

As high school students, our responsibilities as future voters of America as many. Pollution of the water and air by free enterprise is one of our main worries in America. Every man, woman and child, as well as business should be made conscious of tidying up their environment.

As a student who enjoys history, I doubt if we can ever have total peace. All we can do is try, for there always will be somebody crazy enough to start another war. We've had wars from the beginning of time and we always will have them. Some politicians say "disarm" but I say "No." We must be able to protect ourselves.

With all of America's problems today—more so than ever before—I hope she will always be a strong raft of Democracy and will always stay afloat.

SPEAK UP FOR AMERICA

(By Joan Ziegler)

Among my earliest recollections of school life are learning the Pledge of Allegiance and singing songs such as "The Star Spangled Banner," "God Bless America," "America the Beautiful." Nurtured by so much spoon-fed patriotism, I sped through elementary and junior high grades a typically "good" American, properly indoctrinated with the belief that ours was the only fair, just, workable system of government in the world.

It wasn't until my entrance into senior high that I began to question many things I had previously accepted as fact. While not a voracious reader, I did begin researching not only for assigned classwork but to satisfy my own inquisitiveness. I read books, newspapers and magazines. In particular, I was fascinated by the history of the USSR and the development of communism in Russia.

Because of my studies and research, I feel qualified to make an adult-type judgment of our country and its institutions—concentrating mainly on our system of democratic government. I'm going to use the device of comparing American Democracy with Russian Communism.

Being of Jewish parentage, I feel impelled to make my first comparison in the area of freedom of religion. In America, I am free to attend any synagogue and observe religious holidays to the fullest without fear of persecution. My Soviet counterparts are severely restricted in the practice of their religious rites. For example, last April, during the Passover holiday, they were not permitted to buy or prepare the special bread (Matzoth) which is used exclusively on that holiday. A small thing? Perhaps. But to one

personally involved, this can represent a major calamity.

The opportunities presented by our Capitalistic structure offer the average American a future consistent with his desire to succeed, the degree of his preparation and his willingness to pay the price of success. "Rags to riches" stories abound in our society. The Soviet child, surrounded by attitudes which do not tend to encourage individualism, cannot aspire to the same goals as readily.

Our American heritage is rich with tales of pioneers who forged new frontiers, despite unbelievable difficulties which would have discouraged less hardy individuals. This trait is evidenced today by our eagerness to explore the Universe. We have already sent men to the moon and are planning on a Mars landing by 1980. True, the Russians are scientifically-inclined and did place the first Sputnik into orbit. Nevertheless I find it significant that America has surpassed them despite their initial advantage. This is a tribute to American ingenuity and determination.

On the global scale, American intentions have been exhibited by the tremendous outpouring of foreign aid to underprivileged nations. Significantly, although we are the most powerful nation in the world, we have never maintained, on a permanent basis, any territory acquired through war. The Soviets invest their funds only where they feel they can make immediate or short-term gains. Further, the Soviet record of territorial acquisition through wars or through political manipulation is an unenviable one.

Americans are an enigma, in one respect. A mixture of many different races, religions and philosophies, they have managed to live together in relative peace. This instinctive feeling for their fellow countryman is doubtless the reason for their concern for the dignity of all people of the world. We have fought in two World Wars, the Spanish-American War, the Korean conflict and are presently embroiled in the Vietnam war. Criticisms flow at us from all directions because of our involvement in Vietnam, but I believe any clear-thinking student of history will know that our concern for these people is heartfelt. It can be argued that our entrance into Vietnam was ill-advised. It can be further argued that our presence there is extremely costly to our country's economy and painful when viewed from the standpoint of our loss of young men. I do not believe it can be argued that our continued presence is anything less than humanitarian, considering the tremendous blood-bath that is anticipated if we should make an abrupt departure.

The world must be aware of the mounting anti-war feelings in the United States and the pressures which have been placed on our elected leaders to bring our forces home. Can the world be blind to the unselfish manner in which we are Vietnamizing the conflict and slowly withdrawing our troops?

I have touched briefly on many facets of the American profile, highlighting our democratic concepts of freedom, opportunity, self-reliance and sense of responsibility not only here but around the world. An essay which neglected to display an awareness of a weak point would be unrealistic. I am referring, of course, to our problems stemming from the struggle to provide equal treatment for the Black community in our country.

At this writing, school systems throughout the nation are working late to meet the Supreme Court's deadline for total integration. Civil rights legislation over the past 15 years has caused a tremendous difference in the life of the Black man in America. Today, he is on the threshold of realizing equality for the first time since he was brought here from Africa centuries ago. There is still much more to be done but no intelligent observer can deny that progress has been

made and that total equality is predictable in the near future.

"America the Beautiful" is getting a face-lift. She will be that much more beautiful when the job is done.

SPEAK UP FOR AMERICA

(By Richard Grimm)

America has many voices. This is guaranteed in the first amendment to the Constitution. There are the voices of the stout-hearted men from Patrick Henry to Martin Luther King. There are the voices of tyranny from Benedict Arnold to Rap Brown. There are small voices crying in the wilderness from the starving colonists at Jamestown to the starving thousands in our ghettos. There are the great masses of apathetic people who have no voices and we label them "The Silent Majority." They speak only when their own economic toes are stepped on; otherwise they are self-involved and uncaring. The administration has been appealing to this great sleeping giant who has the potential to fulfill our national ideal. The pursuit of happiness. All these voices know that this happiness can never be obtained until we break down some class and income barriers and unite in a greater fulfillment of brotherhood.

Voices lose their meaning if there are no ears to hear. This past decade, despite the infamous labels that have been put upon it, gave us the opportunity to communicate. Voices of students on campus rose to a shout and the administrators heard. Voices of the black man became angry and politicians were forced to listen. There were those who called this tyranny, but history will reveal that a new birth of social justice began developing when the voices began to be heard. At last the "Silent majority" is listening because the air waves and the press give us the news as it really is. Freedom of the press has also been a part of our national heritage. From Peter Zenger to Spiro Agnew, our communications have been open so that all men may listen to the good, the bad, and the ugly. As a result, the stout-hearted men are hearing the cries in the wilderness; the voices of tyranny are cooling down; and there is an awareness we have never seen in this country before.

Involvement does not mean putting a bumper sticker on one's car: America—love it or leave it. Such a slogan builds a wall; not a democracy. The man who says, "My country—right or wrong" will never help correct the ills that keep festering into boiling pots of discontent. To keep still; to mind our own business; to become an isolationist in the center of tatters and tumult, is to do an injustice to our generation and to those who come after us. Let us never forget that American tradition means something that points forward as well as backward.

As yet, we do not have all the answers; but we do know the causes and we recognize them. Silence, in the face of the black man's unrest has caused a polarization that has dug deeper and deeper into those hollow pits of misunderstanding. Each little group has been pushing its own fragmented, separated truth, each so certain that its truth is absolutely right. As a result we tremble when we hear words like "Black power" or "White supremacy." Revolution is not the answer. The American people both black and white, are beginning to realize this.

The black man is tired of seeing his home and business burned; the looting; the killing among his own people. We need some "cement" to hold these fragile pieces together. We can find it in social justice and brotherhood: the traditional ideals of democracy. Small, faltering footsteps are being made. Despite the blundering, slow pace of indecision, the black man is on a march never even dreamed of twenty years ago. He has gained recognition through the ballot with a negro sitting on the Supreme Court; another in the President's Cabinet; and

black sheriffs and mayors in southern cities. Several areas, where tensions have been the greatest, have experimented with retreats where the bigots of both races met with a leader. Through talking and listening, through healthy arguments, swapping identities, and closer human relationships, these people came to a better understanding of each other's problems. Let us hope that the red blood, the red fires, the red shots in the night that identified the sixties will resolve into the red, white and blue of a United America in the next decade.

The "Silent majority" sat bolt upright when they saw the college students protest a system they called antiquated. "Tyranny", they called it. Some of it was; but some of it was a cry from the heart for more identity, more equality, and less hypocrisy. The students have gone back to classes now and education is taking a long view of itself. There is still much to be done. We are beginning to realize that we must first know the student; then we can teach him. Human dignity is the term. We can be proud that we are a nation whose college attendance is at least double that of any other nation. Another good sign of progress is the decreasing number of school drop-outs. Educational leaders are revamping a system where vocational training will be supplemented for academic subjects for those students whose talents lie in that direction. When we change our educational policies to meet the needs of all the people, we will cease to worry so much about crime, drug-addiction or poverty.

At last our ears are open to the voices of the poor. They have been crying in the wilderness too long. Recent history is the first time we have reached the consciousness of the American people so that we feel we can eliminate poverty from our midst. Much of this trend can be credited to the intellectuals on campus, many of them that same longhaired group we called "tyrants" such a short time ago. We watch them become the "Good Samaritan" who helps the injured traveler in a society that is too big and too busy to offer aid on a personal basis. Whereas poverty was "No man's Land" for such a long time, it is now becoming a camping ground for VISTA workers; for followers of the Economic Opportunity Program; for lawyers of the Legal Assistance Foundation; for concerned counselors and for Seminary students who teach love of God through love for man.

Scientific achievement alone should make us stand up and recognize this great American capacity for creativeness. The space program and the breakthroughs have been tremendous. Yet, with man's ever-expanding intellectual and scientific data—there comes a problem attached to it like an ugly parasite.

Insecticides have been a boon to farmers and growers; yet, by ridding the great outdoors of injurious insects, we find that we have been subjecting ourselves to poisons that create problems in the human anatomy. Whereas, oral contraceptives have been good news to the American housewife, it has ricocheted into a festering debate. Cigarettes and cyclamates have also been a controversial issue to protect man from himself. We, as Americans, should be proud that we have national standards set for the health and welfare of our citizens. Freedom of the press and freedom of speech have also made this possible.

Fastened to the affluency of our society is the thorn of drug addiction. Statistics prove that drugs are the main cause of crime in our country. We shall never completely wipe out alcoholism or drug addiction, but we can take steps to stop its growth. It will take money, but all the policing in the world will not be effective if we accept man's inhumanity to man. We need more rehabilitation centers; more clinics; more counseling; more drug assemblies at grammar school

level; more literature sent into the homes; and more direct communication between the addict and one who has been rehabilitated. Concerned communities; big business and voices of the stout-hearted men can accomplish this. There is a great majority of people who look upon the addicts or the hippies as a symbol of the prodigal son who squandered his inheritance. Yet, these people are like the snobbish older brother. Their attitude toward the outcasts of society show that they fail to see man's need for love and help. It is the man who pads his fat pockets with money from the sale of narcotics who needs to be punished. Faster trials, more judges and elimination of bail bonds could be a step in the right direction.

America the beautiful! America the land of God-given abundance! Yet, the abundance of people is leaving an abundance of garbage. We call it pollution. The administration is making ecology its prime objective for the betterment of society as a whole. Man's indifference to his environment in the past should tell us how important it is to face today's problems today. A silent majority dumping garbage into the streets; spraying poisons over the fields; government spilling sewage into streams; people polluting the air with exhaust from millions of automobiles; big business poisoning the seas with sludge and oil from heat; politicians and pompous people lobbying for the almighty dollar—has put a mirror up for all of us to see the awful truth. It must boil down to this; we are in this together. If we don't produce a good life for all, we'll end up with a good life for none. Big business can look to left and right and conclude that without people who can breathe fresh air as well as free air, their efforts are in vain. If it means more money in the bank, but poison in the people; if it means beautiful buildings, but sewage in the drinking water—then big business, too, must take a stand. The little voices in the wilderness must be heard too: the fisherman, the farmer, the coal miner and the conservationist. To save man from himself, government will need to put up restrictions. Scientific endeavor can come to our rescue before it is too late: packaging that will disintegrate; machines to compact piles of waste into small packages; by-products from sewage; engines that will not spew poison exhausts: creating useful means of utilizing old machinery and automobiles. Some of these discoveries are already on the market. The voices of the stout-hearted men can ask for grants and challenges and offer them to those who are willing to give their time and efforts to secure this for the human race.

America has many voices. Each of these voices deserves to be heard. If we listen carefully enough we will hear a change of life-style creeping over a country that has lived through a decade of dissent and discontent. This life-style is swinging from a product-oriented society to a service-oriented one. Neither is it too much to expect that in the near future we may have international law and order based more on consent and less on guns.

"My country—right or wrong," says the slogan. There are so many things right about it; and the wrongs can be corrected if we reach out for a faith we once had as a nation: Faith in God. "In God we trust" is written upon the coin. Let us indeed trust Him and make this a God-centered country instead of a man-centered one. Freedom of religion does not mean freedom from religion. We need to get this silent majority down on its knees in thankfulness; we need to get the voices in the wilderness on the road to the Promised Land where equality means equality in housing; in schools; and in business. We need those dedicated stout-hearted men to lend their voices to the great chorus of Freedom's Challenge. We need to listen to the problems of those who cry out

in tyranny. We are looking forward to the greatest decade of humanitarian effort this country has ever known. It won't all be perfect; there will be hills to climb and currents to be challenged; but from this social upheaval will come a new national commitment. To love America is to love all its people; to think otherwise is hypocrisy. To love America is to see its faults as well as its goodness. To think otherwise is a Pollyanna fallacy. To love America is to believe in the worth of the individual so that all men may some day stand tall and say, "I speak up for America."

LUCY'S LETTER

HON. TIM LEE CARTER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, a news article by Mrs. Lucy Albright of Fountain Run, Ky., in the Glasgow Republican truly portrays the manner in which the vast majority of people of the fifth congressional district celebrated the Fourth of July.

In this district, the citizens are God-fearing, church-going, patriotic citizens and would not permit the flag of the United States of America to be despoiled or desecrated in their presence.

I enclose this article for the persual of the Members:

LUCY'S LETTER

(By Lucy Albright)

July 4, 1970 has come and gone, but it has left a most indelible imprint on the American people. Patriotism in truth, spirit, and demonstration reached its peak. And as Independence Day was observed in flag waving, speech making, parade showing, in some type of demonstration or praise and honor, from hamlet to metropolis, from the individual to the Honor America program at the capital, hearts were lifted, faith was strengthened, and there was a reevaluation of all this great country stands for and has stood for during these almost two hundred years. I do not recall ever having seen so many flags being displayed. Ours was flying at our home, and as it rippled in the breeze, it seemed to reflect the words, "God Bless America."

In the strictest sense I am neither a leftist nor a rightist, in the strictest sense I am neither a conservative nor a liberal. But in the strictest sense I am an American, proud to be called an American, and proud to be a citizen of this great and wonderful country. And I love the flag for to me it symbolizes the great principles of democracy of our nation which were founded on the principles of the Bible. I love to look on the red stripes of the flag, with humble gratitude, and meditate on the blood that has been shed through the years, that the privileges of freedom might be mine. Not only the shed blood of battles, but intermingled with this was the blood from the shoeless feet of George Washington's army during the winter at Valley Forge, when they would not give up but endured hunger and pain that this nation might be born. The white of the flag is for purity. May we never be reticent to say the word pure, for it is the basis of all that is good whether in the virtue of the soul, the food of the mind or body. When anything is impure, it desecrates, it pollutes, it poisons. The blue of the field for the stars stands for true—true to our God, true to our own self—true

to our fellow man, true to our country, without deceit, without trickery, without shame, straight forward in our relationship both at home and with others, for upon these principles of integrity, there is no law.

If our founding fathers, who had a vision of a great nation, and established it thusly, could have looked down from above, upon the hundreds of Honor America manifestations as demonstrated on Independence Day, would they not have said, "You've come a long way, Americans. Continue to hold fast to that which is good, and press on in faith in your country, under God, indivisible with liberty and justice for all. And never, never, never give up."

BISHOP JOSEPH F. DONNELLY

HON. EMILIO Q. DADDARIO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. DADDARIO. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House is pleased that 26 grape growers representing 35 percent of the industry in California have signed contracts with the United Farm Workers Organizing Committee, to settle a nagging and persistent dispute which has damaged the economy of the west coast and wrought hardship on people and families who depend on this occupation.

My comments today wish to single out the efforts of Bishop Joseph F. Donnelly of Hartford, Conn., chairman of the Bishops' Committee on Farm Labor, in seeking to mediate the argument. Bishop Donnelly, for many years active on the Connecticut Board of Mediation and Arbitration and the Diocesan Labor Institute, following the initiative of Most Rev. Maurice McAuliffe in setting up this means of ameliorating frictions in social areas, has been a prime mover in the national Catholic Welfare Conference effort to seek labor peace. As such, he has been travelling frequently between New Haven and California since November, when he became chairman of the Bishops Committee, logging in eight trips since February.

I think Bishop Donnelly should be commended for the part he has played in helping to seek a solution of this difficult situation and I offer for the RECORD a brief biography of his career.

Few clergymen in the United States and none in his home State of Connecticut have been longer or more closely involved in the resolution of labor-management problems than Hartford's Auxiliary Bishop Joseph F. Donnelly.

He has been involved in this work virtually from his ordination to the priesthood 36 years ago. As a young curate in 1942 at St. Thomas parish in Waterbury, one of Connecticut's leading industrial centers, he was chosen by the Most Reverend Maurice F. McAuliffe, then Bishop of Hartford, as first director of the newly established Diocesan Labor Institute. One of his first tasks was to establish schools to teach industrial workers the principles of social justice, parliamentary procedure, and public speaking to make them more active and effective in union affairs. Within a year of his appointment, Father Donnelly had

established the schools in a dozen of the State's principal cities. With the subsequent expansion of labor-management courses in the State's colleges and other educational facilities, the schools were discontinued.

Bishop Donnelly headed the Diocesan Labor Institute in its task of promoting labor-management understanding until 1964. Under his direction, the institute established the annual McAuliffe Medal Awards, given each year to representatives of labor and management for promoting industrial harmony.

He was a member of the Connecticut State Board of Mediation and Arbitration for 21 years. Originally named to the board by Gov. Raymond E. Baldwin in 1943, he was reappointed by succeeding Governors. He was named chairman of the board in 1949 and served in this capacity until he resigned in 1964, when he was made a bishop.

He participated in efforts to resolve more than 2,000 labor-management disputes as mediator or arbitrator. When he was reappointed chairman of the board by Governor (now U.S. Senator) ABRAHAM RIBICOFF, the latter said of him:

I doubt that any other State in the Nation is blessed with so capable and understanding a man in a post of this importance.

He was a hearing officer for the National War Labor Board, Region 1, in World War II and has been an arbitrator of the American Arbitration Association and a member of the National Academy of Arbitrators.

Throughout his busy career, Bishop Donnelly has found the time to serve in a number of other State, national and diocesan posts. He was pastor of St. John the Baptist Parish, New Haven, for 10 years and has served as chairman of the Archdiocesan Commission on Ecumenical Affairs, archdiocesan director of cemeteries, diocesan consultor, member of the archdiocesan board of education, and member of the executive committee of the archbishop's Committee on Human Rights. He is also vicar general of the Hartford archdiocese.

He was a member of the original board of directors of the National Catholic Social Action Conference and is a past president of the National Catholic Cemetery Conference. He is Episcopal moderator of the cemetery conference and chairman of the Subcommittee on Urban Life of the Department of Social Development, U.S. Catholic Conference.

Among the honors he has received are: the Peter McGuire Memorial Award of the American Federation of Labor, the distinguished service award of the Connecticut Federation of Teachers, the Outstanding Citizen Award of the Connecticut Grand Lodge, Sons of Italy, and an honorary doctor of laws degree from Fairfield University.

A native of Norwich, Conn., the 61-year-old bishop was ordained June 29, 1934. Pope Pius XII named him a papal chamberlain in 1954 and a domestic prelate in 1957.

He was appointed titular bishop of Nabala and auxiliary to the archbishop of Hartford on November 9, 1964. He was consecrated in St. Joseph Cathedral, Hartford, January 28, 1965.

"AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL—LOVE IT, OR LEAVE IT!"

HON. BURT L. TALCOTT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. TALCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Steve Doolittle, the valedictorian of the 1970 graduating class of Washington Union School, Corral de Tierra, in Monterey County, Calif., expressed the views and attitudes of many American young persons in his valedictory speech.

Although only 14 years of age, he has obviously done considerable listening, thinking, and evaluating. I believe he speaks for most boys and girls of his age. He is sensitive and concerned; he is proud of his family, his community and his Nation; he is grateful for the opportunities he has had; he is willing to stand up and to contribute to the preservation and improvement of his country.

Too often we must listen to the whining, ungrateful, ill-mannered selfish adolescent. Steve Doolittle expresses the views of the grateful, proud, selfless, yet determined majority of young people who will contribute to the steady betterment of life on this planet.

Because Steve's remarks were so moving and meaningful, I ask unanimous consent that his valedictory address be included in the Record at this point:

"AMERICA THE BEAUTIFUL—LOVE IT OR LEAVE IT!"

(By Steve Doolittle)

"Oh beautiful for spacious skies, for amber waves of grain, for purple mountain majesties, above the fruited plain."

This is my America. My own private piece of America. My school, my home, my family, and my friends. A beautiful little place called San Benancio Canyon where blue skies and oak studded hills have been a part of my life since I was 8 months old. I was lucky enough to start my first day of kindergarten here at Washington Union School, and tomorrow on June 3rd, in the year 1970, at 3:30 in the afternoon, I will sadly bid "Goodbye" to my principal, and my teachers, and my school. A school that I have loved for nine happy years.

Yes—I will bid "Goodbye" to nine years filled with memories: of bus rides with my friends, of homework filled with challenge, music lessons with Mr. Brown, concerts and playdays, and winning football teams. These memories, I know, I shall carry in my heart through a life that should be better because of the wonderful start I was given here in this beautiful, peaceful spot—far away from the turmoils of the world. For all this happiness, and for all these memories, I thank you.

For here in our sunshine canyon, we do lead a life of contentment. We don't see the hunger and poverty and filth of the ghetto. But we know that it exists. We see it in the newspapers and through the television screen, and we know that it is there. And sometimes we wonder how this great country of ours can spend billions of dollars going to the moon and leave our own underprivileged "earth people" here to suffer and to starve. Sometimes the thinking of our leaders is hard for us to understand, and we wonder why they don't use their money to buy a new pair of shoes, or a fresh clean bed for a miserable little boy who lives in a hovel on the wrong side of town.

So, of course, there are things we might criticize about the United States of America, but it is still the greatest, most wonderful, most peaceful country in all the world. And the great leadership of our fine Presidents has kept it this way. Kept it peaceful and strong and secure. So peaceful and secure that when I fall asleep at night while talking to my brother, I know in my heart that when I wake up in the morning, my brother will still be there, my room will still be there, my home and my family will still be there—and my heart fills with sadness when I think of other boys in other lands. Lands which have been invaded and overrun by Communist War Lords. Boys who fall asleep at night wondering if when they wake up in the morning their brothers and their families and their homes will still be there.

There was a time not too long ago, when all the other countries—far and near—looked up to us with hope. Looked up to us as their great salvation. But now—though we still try to do what we feel is right—because of Communistic propaganda and hate, the people of other lands are burning our flag and denouncing us as imperialistic aggressors.

The pictures they see of violence and rioting—such as the killings at Kent State—do nothing to help the image of our great land. How horrible to see pictures of rioting students being beaten down by officers in gas masks—or being shot down by National Guardsmen with rifles. We know that it is only a small minority of students and citizens who so violently disrupt the peace, but a shocking picture on the front page of a newspaper in Russia makes it look to the world as if our whole country has degenerated into the evil hands of hatred and violence.

This is all the more reason to love and protect and to praise the good in America which so much overshadows the bad.

How does one learn to love and protect America? How does one develop a feeling of patriotism, loyalty, and national pride? Dwight David Eisenhower once said, "It is probably a pity that every citizen of each state cannot visit all the others, to see the differences, to learn what we have in common, and to come back with a richer, fuller understanding of America—in all its beauty, in all its dignity, in all its strength."

I believe that Dwight David Eisenhower was right. For how can we fully appreciate this wonderful country of ours if we have never seen it?

I realize that I have been extremely fortunate, for I have traveled across the United States by car from coast to coast. I have seen its natural wonders: Niagara Falls, the Grand Canyon, Yellowstone, Old Faithful, Yosemite, Mt. Rushmore and its great stone faces, the Rockies. From "sea to shining sea" I have absorbed the beauty of America. I have stood on the steps of the Capitol in Washington, D.C. and toured its hallowed halls, where all the great leaders down through the ages have met and decided the fate of our great land. I have seen the Memorials to the greatest leaders of all time, Washington, Jefferson, Lincoln. How very small and humble one feels standing at Lincoln's feet in the giant Lincoln Memorial as his eyes look down in kindness from that great stone face.

I have boarded a Ferry on New York's Hudson River and felt a thrill as I saw Miss Liberty's torch rise out of the fog. The Statue of Liberty—and all she has meant down through the ages to thousands of homeless immigrants who have stood at the ship's rail and strained their eyes for the very first glimpse of freedom and hope and opportunity. I have read the inscription on a tablet at her feet. "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breathe free. The wretched refuse of your teeming shores. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tossed to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

"America the Beautiful."

The greatest country in all the world.
The golden door of opportunity.
The golden door of peace.

And yet it seems so fashionable to criticize these days. To criticize our President, to criticize our schools, to criticize our government, to criticize our youth.

Let those who find it so easy to criticize, look elsewhere to find something better. And if they can't find something to love about our country, then let them leave. We don't need those who criticize. We do need those who praise.

Surely someone can find something nice to say about America! Doesn't anyone ever notice that the vast majority of us live peacefully together? That the vast majority of us have most everything we need? Good homes, good food, good clothes, good education, good jobs, good churches—good friends. Doesn't anyone ever notice?

"Oh beautiful for patriot dream that sees beyond the years, thine alabaster cities gleam, undimmed by human tears."

America the beautiful.
Love it?—Forever!
America—My homeland.
Leave it?—Never.

"REMEMBER OLD GLORY"

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article entitled "Hello, Remember Me?" written by Mr. A. B. J. Hammett, publisher of the Victoria Mirror, Victoria, Tex. The Victoria Mirror in which this article appeared on July 16, 1970, is one of the oldest weekly newspapers in the State of Texas, and has been carrying on for some time promotion of our American flag and endeavoring to instill a feeling of patriotism in our people. I am proud to be able to insert the article in the RECORD and commend its reading to all in this Chamber:

HELLO, REMEMBER ME?

Some people call me Old Glory, others call me The Star Spangled Banner, but whatever they call me, I am your flag, the flag of the United States of America . . . something has been bothering me, so I thought I might talk it over with you . . . because you see it is about you and me.

I remember some time ago people lined up on both sides of the street to watch the parade and naturally I was leading every parade, proudly waving in the breeze. When your Daddy saw me coming, he immediately removed his hat and placed it against his left shoulder so that his hand was directly over his heart . . . remember?

And you, I remember you. Standing there straight as a soldier. You didn't have a hat, but you were giving the right salute. Remember little sister? Not to be outdone, she was saluting the same as you with her right hand over her heart . . . remember?

What happened? I'm still the same old flag. Oh, I have a few more stars since you were a boy. A lot more blood has been shed since those parades of long ago.

But now I don't feel as proud as I used

to. When I come down your street you just stand there with your hands in your pockets and I may get a small glance and then you look away. Then I see the children running around and shouting . . . they don't seem to know who I am . . . I saw one man take his hat off then look around. He didn't see anybody else with theirs off so he quickly put his back on.

And what about that night at the baseball game. When they played the Star Spangled Banner and I waved so proudly in the breeze. Nobody bothered to sing. They stood up all right as a sort of mild patriotic gesture but then they talked among themselves about the game, about the weather. But they didn't sing. I felt hurt.

Is it a sin to be patriotic anymore? Have you forgotten what I stand for and where I've been? . . . Anzio, Guadalcanal, Korea and now Viet Nam. Take a look at the memorial honor rolls sometime, of those who never came back to keep this Republic free . . . One Nation Under God . . . When you salute me, you are actually saluting them.

I may not be coming down your street for a long time. It seems that patriotic parades are a thing of the past. But when I do . . . won't you do me a favor? Stand up straight, place your right hand over your heart . . . and if they play the Star Spangled Banner, sing out loud and clear . . . and I'll salute you by waving back . . . Show me that you remember.

EDWARD C. MASSA

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Edward C. Massa, a realtor-insurer and civic leader in my district, has recently been appointed to the board of regents of Saint Mary's College, our mutual alma mater. This distinction follows many years of service to the college and the community.

In addition to founding and developing Edward C. Massa, Inc. and Massa Properties, Inc., Ed takes an active role in Hayward area business organizations, most notably the Hayward Chamber of Commerce, which he served as vice president. He has chaired local drives of the United Crusade and other worthwhile programs; is at the helm of various Portuguese organizations in the area; and is a director of the Hanna Center—Boys Town of the West—and a member of the executive committee of Serra Center for Girls.

A native and long-time resident of Maywood, Mr. Massa went on to earn a law degree from Notre Dame University after graduating from Saint Mary's. He has held the national presidency of the Saint Mary's College Alumni Association, and the Northern California Director's post of the Notre Dame Alumni group.

I wish to congratulate Mr. Massa on his appointment to the board of regents at Saint Mary's, and to commend him on his outstanding record of civic achievement in my area.

MASS TRANSIT: A LITTLE LATE

HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, as this Congress moves to adequately fund necessary programs in health, education, and urban renewal, we must also turn our urgent attention to the problems of mass transit.

We have read of the dangerous levels of air pollution over New York City and in the District of Columbia. The high levels of pollution result from a combination of automobile emission, and industrial production, and the lack of air movement.

The primary cause of air pollution is auto emissions. The problem is further complicated by the number of cars being used and the fact that they only transport one or two people. Any rational assessment of this situation dictates a renewed commitment to funding for mass transit.

A recent article discusses some recent developments on this issue. I recommend it to my colleagues:

MASS TRANSIT: A LITTLE LATE IN ARRIVING

(By Albert R. Karr)

WASHINGTON.—"Urban mass transportation in the United States is in the early stages of a vast transformation, a transformation that will rival the rags-to-riches changes visited upon a fairy tale Cinderella."

That's the optimistic assessment of Thomas E. Lisco, chief economist for the Chicago Area Transportation Study, a planning group for highway and mass transit agencies in the Chicago region. And there are some good reasons for seeing things Mr. Lisco's way.

More and more drivers seem to be convinced that mass transit is the only rational alternative to mounting highway congestion. The Nixon Administration wants to spend more for transit; Congress wants to spend more; some states and many cities want to spend more. Mass transit, then, appears to be one of those ideas whose time has come.

Except . . .

Except that voters in some cities have rejected transit bond issues lately. Except that highway supporters are still very powerful in Congress, the highway bureaucracy is big and entrenched and the highway program itself has generated a momentum of its own. Except, in short, that the problems of transforming transit into a modern, popular mode of travel from a decrepit, fading mode remain immense.

A DRAMATIC TRANSFORMATION

If the transformation that Mr. Lisco and others expect actually materializes, it would be dramatic. For patronage of most transit systems has plunged over the years. (Public transportation now accounts for only 4% of all individual trips in the Minneapolis-St. Paul area, for example.) Few large cities have rail transit systems, and smaller cities' bus companies regularly fold. Even where transit service is available, its quality and quantity are often declining.

Mr. Lisco and other transit supporters list a variety of reasons why transit should soon be making a dramatic turnaround. Their main argument: Transit will succeed because it has to succeed. Declares Mr. Lisco: "Because mass transportation performs a vital func-

tion, not only for the individuals who use it, but also for the very form and efficiency of the city, it must be made to succeed."

It now seems clear to most city officials—if not necessarily to a majority of city voters—that heavy reliance upon the car and the highway has meant air pollution, disruption of homes and jobs, and roads that often detract from business growth, rather than enhance it. Even in car-conscious Los Angeles—whose voters rejected a \$2.5 billion rapid-transit bond system in 1968—Mayor Sam Yorty declares: "Our need still exists and becomes more urgent as congestion mounts." Cleveland Mayor Carl B. Stokes calls the transit need an "overwhelming problem." Alderman Richard T. Curtin talks of Minneapolis freeways filled to capacity at peak hours. "Obviously," he says, "we have only one alternative, and that is to develop mass transit systems. . . ."

There are many signs that this development is on its way. Some rail commuter lines, as they become the only outlet for congested roads, have begun to show an increase in passengers. New transit systems in Cleveland and New Jersey have attracted generous patronage. The new 75-mile Bay Area Rapid Transit district (BART) system in San Francisco, scheduled for operation in 1972, raises the hopes of transitmen for a showcase to spur other major projects.

Everyone agrees the Federal Government is the only source of the kind of money public transportation requires. And in Washington, support is building for increased spending, both to improve old systems and build new ones.

The Senate already has approved, in a smashing 84-4 vote, an Administration proposal to make available \$3.1 billion for new transit equipment over the next five years; the House seems well on its way to increasing this to \$5 billion. Either sum would be a dramatic increase over past levels. Since the Government started doling out money for transit assistance in 1962, it has spent an average of only \$104 million annually.

One sign of growing fervor for transit was the ability of Rep. Edward Koch (D., N.Y.) to line up more than 100 House co-sponsors for his bill proposing to spend \$10 billion in four years. The bill called for a transit trust fund, fueled by existing auto excise taxes—a proposition that foundered (because it was viewed as fiscally and politically unwise) when separately proposed to the White House by Transportation Secretary John Volpe. Rep. Koch's bill wasn't enacted, but it did generate support outside Congress. David I. Margolis, president of Colt Industries, a diversified New York concern, wrote executives of 600 large corporations seeking support for the bill; 225 executives replied, and most of these favored it.

An impressive lobbying effort for transit has been mounted by the Transportation Department, the National League of Cities, State and Local Officials, other transit-interested groups, and some members of Congress like Mr. Koch. Transit operators, union officials, industry men from transit equipment-makers to road builders, and others are bending the ears of Senators and Congressmen.

"This is the first time we've even encountered one force moving in one direction," says a House transit expert. "It even had conservative Republicans who never thought much of mass transit before scratching their heads and saying there must be something to this."

The urban transportation program, says Donald E. Weeden, chairman of Weeden & Co., New York investment bankers, is "visible and noncontroversial." He says bankers around the country, for example, are concerned that deterioration of transit systems threatens "the life blood of the urban economy."

USE THE TRUST FUND?

Highway advocates in Congress, long given to fighting transit proposals as a possible threat to road funds, are now proposing that the mammoth highway trust fund be used in part to help bus transit programs. The House Public Works Committee even wants to take over jurisdiction of bus transit from the House Banking Committee, which handles all transit matters now.

Rep. Joe D. Waggoner Jr. (D., La.), a leader of Southern conservatives in the House, says he favors the transit legislation partly out of recognition of transit-company needs in cities like his district's Shreveport. He adds that if small-city people back transit aid, they may be able to count on a quid pro quo for small-town highways from "(big) city boys."

Mr. Volpe and others at the Federal level are beginning to suggest a broad transportation trust fund that would make some money, earmarked so far only for highways, available for transit systems. More states are urging that Federal highway funds be cut loose for transit or other purposes, as the states see fit.

Meanwhile, Maryland, Virginia and Illinois have authorized use of some state highway user taxes to support transit, and similar moves are being considered by Massachusetts, California, Colorado, Hawaii and Ohio. In May, holders of New York's Triborough Bridge and Tunnel Authority approved use of surplus bridge and tunnel tolls for subsidizing the city transit authority, clearing the way for payment of the first check for \$74 million.

But despite all these favorable signs, it's still a long haul for transit. Powerful highway supporters adamantly oppose giving up much of their trust fund monies. Rail transit, at least, ought to find its own support, they say. Even \$1 billion a year in Federal money would be paltry against the \$5 billion annual Federal outlay for roads (butressed by earmarked gas taxes). The Government finances 90% of the interstate highway program, while it pays for only two-thirds of transit equipment. The Federal Highway Administration employs more than 5,000; the Urban Mass Transportation Administration 55.

Because of the lucrative Federal aid for interstate roads, cities and states have been lured—if not forced—into emphasizing highways over transit. Availability of "90-10" money "has led many states to a complete loss of perspective in the development and preservation of our cities," says Michael S. Dukakis, Massachusetts state representative.

Too, the Nixon measure falls far short of the needs of cities over the next decade, transit advocates insist. They estimate those requirements at \$20 billion to \$35 billion. Many transit operators say Federal financing of new equipment isn't enough—that eventually the Government will have to subsidize transit operating costs, too, because local authorities can't afford to do so.

Despite the unhappiness of the populace over choked roads and poor transit, voters generally have been unwilling to help pay for better transit—at least without a sizable Federal funding program. Transit bond issues have been rejected in recent elections in Atlanta, Los Angeles, Kansas City and Seattle—a second turnaround coming in Seattle just a few weeks ago.

CONGRESS HOLDING BACK

To some extent Congress is holding back until it sees how imminent projects work out. If the BART system falls well short of predicted patronage, revenues and earnings, as some pessimists fear it might, the commitment of Congress to mass transit will undoubtedly shrink, some transit promoters

say. And they worry that the still-undernourished transit operation suffers from lack of good management—from local companies and public authorities to, some members of Congress say, the Federal Government's mass transit program itself.

Nevertheless, transit backers are still convinced that things are looking up. Mr. Lisco of the Chicago-area study says that commuters can be enticed from their cars by well-managed transit operations. Transit riding is usually cheaper than driving, he says, and it can offer the commuter more comfort and more speed as well.

Opportunities for promoting and improving mass transit are substantial. In Montreal and Toronto—and already in San Francisco—the potential of the transit line as a focus for revenue-producing residential and commercial complexes has become obvious. Automatic operation of rail transit vehicles is a little-developed field, automation of ticket sales and processing holds great promise, more sophisticated crime-combatting surveillance is possible, and transit stations and equipment can be made aesthetically attractive, Mr. Lisco argues.

And he fully expects all this to happen. "As transit puts on her fancy clothes, she will become a princess," he declares.

SOVIET IMPERIALISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as we note continuing diplomatic activity in the Middle East and hope for a long term solution to the problems there, we must of necessity recognize the motivation of the Soviet Union in its Middle East aggression.

A very effective and timely commentary which I believe merits wide spread attention appeared in the American Zionist of June 1970 written by Eugen LoebI and I include the article at this point:

SOVIET IMPERIALISM AND ANTI-SEMITISM

(By Eugen LoebI)

Some time ago I received a polemical letter without address and with an unreadable signature posted in Washington, D.C. Parts of it are worth quoting as an illustration of a fairly common misconception concerning the origin of Soviet involvement in the Middle East:

It was well-known that Nasser's threats were vapid as he did not have any equipment. But Israel attacked the Arab states in June anyway, and this gave the Soviet Union the exact excuse it wanted for moving into the Middle East. Had Israel not been so impetuous and so stubborn, Russia would not today have the influence she has in the Middle East.

Therefore, it was Israel that brought about the contradictions that now exist in that part of the world. Were Israel not there at all, would Russia have extended her power? Of course not. Does our security depend on whether Israel is there or not? Isn't Israel in fact more a threat to the United States than a help? All the fighting she can possibly do could not deter the Soviet power. Only the USA can do that.

Israel will not be content until she draws our country into that war regardless of total

annihilation to the world. She has become a monster—killing and bombing, while pointing a finger of shame at Germany—and indeed at the world—25 years ago. You can readily see from their actions today what would have happened had they been the majority in Germany instead of a minority.

Naturally, it makes no sense to speculate over what the situation in the Middle East would be if there were no Israel. But we do know that the Soviet Union has extended its power in many parts of the world where no Israel exists.

What is going on in the Middle East and all the dangers involved there cannot be understood without taking into account Soviet policy as a whole. To blame Israel or even to blame Nasser is in any case a dangerous oversimplification. A situation has been created where even Nasser has no freedom of action because he became the victim of his own policy, which is tied to the success of Soviet imperialism.

In any attempt at interpreting this Soviet policy, one must differentiate between the ideal and the reality. The ideal of socialism creating a just society that would by its example alone exert an ideological influence on the rest of the world never had a mass basis and was accepted only by the Soviet intelligentsia. What became typical for Soviet political life was the policy based on power as introduced by Stalin.

Soviet power politics was from the beginning rooted in the interests of the Communist party apparatus. Theoretically, the party, being the vanguard of the proletariat, had to carry out the policy of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The party was led by its Central Committee, and the Central Committee by its Politburo. Thus, for all practical purposes all power was concentrated in the hands of a few leading figures, and mainly in the hands of Stalin. The interest of the party was always predominant. The interest of the party was simply identified with the interests of the proletariat, the nation, and socialism. But the interest of the party was in fact identified with the interest of the Politburo and its apparatus.

The consequence of this development was that the creation of a new and better society was not emphasized. It was sufficient to embody some ideas of socialism in the constitution, to speak of socialism, to declare socialism to have been achieved, but to care only for the power of the party. The Soviet Union is not a socialist state—as a matter of fact, it has not had anything in common with socialism for decades. The absolute concentration of power by the party leadership in all fields of activity has no parallel in history. Even Hitler's power was limited when compared with the power of Stalin, since Stalin was also in full control of the economy.

If we speak therefore of the Soviet government and Soviet policy, if we try to find out what state interest is expressed by its policy, or if we try to deduce from the interest of the state and socialism the probable trend of Soviet policy, we must fail. Policy is formulated in the Politburo; it represents the inner logic of the party mechanism, the factions, the inner conflicts between members of the leadership and groupings, different views on how to achieve the same or similar aims. That is why practically all the predictions even of highly sophisticated experts in the West were and are usually wrong.

Despite the fact that there seems always to be a monolithic Soviet party leadership, the monolithic image is an illusion. Apart from many different smaller issues there is a basic issue which is always latent and came into the open at the 20th Party Congress in 1956. This conflict is between those who would have the party concentrate on the problems of creating a real socialist system and those who want the party to continue to base its existence on power.

Under Stalin there was no question that power and expansion of power should be the only leading principle. In order to have this principle work, all opposition had to be liquidated. This opposition was a socialist opposition in the sense that it was interested in creating a socialist country. Naturally this opposition was represented by the intelligentsia of the party. And it is well known that a great number of the leading intellectuals were Jews. Thus, anti-Semitism became a political issue in the Soviet Union. Although the Bolshevik party fought against Czarist anti-Semitism, and the Jews in the Soviet Union did not represent a class opposed to socialism, although the founder of Socialism was a Jew, anti-Semitism became a state policy in the Soviet Union. It was a new type of anti-Semitism not based on religious prejudice, racist theory, social conflicts, or national motives such as had characterized classical anti-Semitism. The main and decisive motive was anti-intellectualism. The purges in the thirties were not directed only against Jews, but through anti-Semitic persecution a great number of extremely able and influential intellectuals were liquidated and it became at the same time an instrument for discrediting all intellectuals by making them fearful lest their cooperation with Jewish intellectuals bring their ruin. An anti-intellectual tendency became typical of Soviet political life in the thirties.

We cannot neglect the parallel with the development in Germany. Hitler saw in the German intelligentsia his main danger. He had to liquidate this social stratum. His first blow was against the Jews, who played a great role in German intellectual life. He had to go so far as to declare a Jew everybody whose grandmother was Jewish in order to persecute a really great part of German intelligentsia. In the process of liquidating German Jewry and its intelligentsia, Hitler was able to break the resistance of the German intelligentsia.

I think it is important to see and emphasize this point. In modern history, anti-humanistic, anti-democratic movements both in the East and West were based on anti-intellectualism, as it is the intelligentsia that is the only social stratum which basically objects to dictatorship since dictatorship limits intellectual activities (I am speaking of the intelligentsia as a social stratum and not of all the intellectuals, as some of them will be always willing to serve any dictatorship). The events in Hungary, Poland, Czechoslovakia and also in the Soviet Union are ample proof of this. Stalin was right to see in the intelligentsia the great danger for his dictatorship. Anti-intellectualism is very much related to any reactionary movement which always has a tendency to express its anti-intellectualism in anti-Semitic terminology and actions.

The final step of Stalin's drive for party power was the Stalin-Hitler pact. It would lead us too far afield to explain all relevant elements of the background of this pact. I spoke with the wartime Soviet ambassador (Majsky) to Britain. He insisted that the Stalin-Hitler pact was just a defensive pact and that occupied territories would be freed. He declared that the occupation of the Baltic states, of Poland, the war against Finland were all directed against Hitler. The nations of the Baltic states and that part of Poland the Soviets had occupied (it was half of Poland) had been saved from the fate of German-occupied countries. As a matter of fact, these nations had to suffer under Nazi occupation because of the retreat of the Red Army, but this discussion took place after the Nazis had been driven out of these countries. Majsky declared with absolute certainty that after Hitler's defeat these nations would have absolute freedom of action. As we see, not only did all territories remain occupied, but immediately after the war the Soviet

Union also occupied Bessarabia, a part of Finland, and the eastern part of Czechoslovakia. At this moment Soviet troops are occupying Hungary, Poland, Eastern Germany and Czechoslovakia, and they are threatening Rumania. The expansive, imperialist policy became a characteristic feature of Soviet policy and the author of this policy was Stalin. The Stalin-Hitler pact in 1939 should be seen in this context: a policy of dividing the world between the great powers, thus fulfilling the dream of imperialistic Russian Czars.

The turning point in Soviet policy came in 1956 some years after Stalin's death. Stalin and his policy was condemned; a solemn promise to respect the sovereign rights of all socialist countries was made along with the announcement of a policy of friendly co-existence. Of equal significance was the promise of a rising standard of living.

It seemed in 1956 that the emphasis would not be put on power politics but on creating a successful society and an effective economy able to eliminate the poverty of the great majority of the Soviet people. Then, two elements brought about a change in this policy. The upheaval in Hungary and Poland showed that the Soviet Union had lost its ideological influence even in the socialist countries. It could not rely on its economic influence either, and the only way to maintain any influence was through power exercised by direct intervention of the Red Army. Thus a very peculiar situation arose. Socialist countries had to be militarily occupied in order to follow Soviet policy. After liquidating colonialism in Africa and Asia, we got colonialism in Europe.

But there was an even more important reason for re-Stalinization. To create a modern, effective economy and to overcome the great economic problems some very drastic changes had to be accepted. The economy had to run on economic principles and not on party lines; the market had to decide and not the plan; enterprises had to become economically independent. This meant practically an "expropriation of the expropriators," which is to say, an expropriation of the party. It meant a basic change in the role of the party, and in this sense a real revolution; a revolution because the leading power would be replaced by some form of a democratic mechanism. It would have been a socialist revolution in the sense that at least some of the aims and ideals which were the ideological moving forces for the Russian Revolution would have come to realization.

Khrushchev was too smooth an "apparatchnik," too deeply influenced by the idea of the leading role of the party, and not a big enough personality to bring about all the measures that would have made impossible a re-Stalinization. His half-way measures and compromises undermined his own policy and he had to disappear from the political scene.

Thus we are in a phase of Soviet policy in which Stalin's imperialism became again typical: the military occupation of Czechoslovakia and the so-called Brezhnev Doctrine, according to which the Soviet Union claims to have the right to occupy any socialist country (why only socialist?) acting against the interest of the Kremlin.

With this background let us try to understand the Israeli policy of the Soviet Union. Soviet global policy was after the Second World War seemingly ambiguous. The Soviet Union was the only big power that increased its territory in the wake of the war. But at the same time a great number of nations in Africa and Asia became free. The end of the epoch of colonialism began with the anti-imperialistic feelings, which became an important political force. In this part of the world, Soviet policy was aimed at the support of this feeling in the hope that a political base for Soviet influence would be created. This was more than a political interest that the Soviet Union had, as the

evolution of her Middle Eastern policy proves.

It is known that in 1948 Israel had an ardent supporter in USSR. The USSR was interested in giving military support to Israel. I remember the discussion that Mr. Clementis, Secretary of State in the Czechoslovak Ministry of Foreign Affairs, had with Mr. Vishinsky, who was representing the Soviet Ministry of Foreign Affairs in 1947. Vishinsky turned down an offer by an Egyptian trade delegation that had negotiated with Czechoslovakia the purchase of a munitions factory. Vishinsky declared that it is a definite Soviet policy to give all military and economic support to Israel and under no conditions should "fascist" Egypt be strengthened. Vishinsky spoke very openly of Israel being a potential bridgehead in the Middle East and that all socialist countries should feel it a political duty to support Israel.

This attitude was based on the assumption that Israel would become an industrial power, and consequently have a strong labor movement. This labor movement, combined with a strong pro-Soviet attitude due to the heroic fight against Hitlerism, was supposed to be the basis of Israel's attitude towards the Soviet Union. Israel had to become the first "people's democracy" in the Middle East.

Egypt was declared to be a fascist country. The Communist Party was persecuted then as it is now under Nasser's regime. There was no Soviet interest in the fate and existence of Israel, but only in Israel as a bridgehead that would enable the Soviet Union to have a firm foothold in this part of the world. Only when Israel was not willing to be a tool of Soviet expansionist policy did Soviet hostility get roused to the point that Israel was denounced as an agent of Western imperialism. At the same time a change toward Egypt and the Arab states became obvious. In order to get a foothold in the Middle East, it seemed to be necessary to build on anti-Israel feelings in the Arab world and to try to persuade the Arab world that the Soviet Union and not the USA is willing and able to fulfill Arab ambitions. Apart from the economic aid (especially the Aswan High Dam) the Soviet Union helped with the reorganization of the Egyptian Army, and provided it with all necessary weapons. The Soviets not only accepted the anti-Israel policy, but picked up the Nazi theory of a Jewish plutocracy. Both in official statements and within the party organization a powerful anti-Zionist propaganda was launched.

At this stage, Soviet anti-Semitism, while maintaining its anti-intellectual character, developed new features. It had to prove that Israel is an imperialist agent, that Zionism is a movement which intends to create world power for the Jews in alliance with the West, especially with the USA. The State of Israel had its imperialistic mission in the Middle East, and consequently the aim to annihilate this state was a most legitimate and progressive policy. This anti-Zionist policy had to prove at the same time that Soviet Russia was an honest friend of the Arabs and that the United States is their enemy.

Unhappily, my information on these matters is derived from first-hand experience. As far back as 1949 I had been imprisoned in Prague and interrogated by Soviet interrogation officers. The two interrogators who were in charge of the Czechoslovak State Security Ministry were very high officials and close aides to the powerful Soviet Minister of Interior and member of the Politburo of the Soviet Communist Party, Lavrenti P. Beria. After Stalin's death, these interrogation officers were sentenced to death and executed together with Beria.

It was more than a shock for me to hear a terminology from the highest Soviet officials that was to me very well known from the Nazi era. They accused me of being an agent of Israel, a supporter of world Zionism, which aims at world domination by first ruining the socialist part of the world. "Jew" was just a

synonym for traitor and imperialist agent. The official accusation was "Zionist," but during the interrogation only the word "Jew" was used.

My "discussion" with the Soviet interrogators lasted many hours, and I also discussed this problem with their Czechoslovak aides. I denied having been connected with the Zionist movement—as I have as a matter of fact never been—and I tried to disprove their accusation of Zionism as absolutely not valid. At that time I was convinced that my imprisonment was based on an error and that this would be found out any day. Consequently, I thought that arguments might have some value. The Soviet interrogators knew better. They were at that time convinced that I would be sentenced to death and had no reason not to speak to me very openly, aiming to break my resistance.

Already in November, 1949, when all this took place, they spoke to me of an annihilation of Israel, of Arab states becoming socialist, of the USA being driven out of this sphere and of breaking once and for all the Jewish power: They blamed Hitler for not having exterminated all the Jews, and declared that the Soviet Union won't tolerate this backbone of world imperialism.

In 1952 among 14 defendants in the so-called Slansky trial, there were 11 Jews. None of us was a Zionist, but all of us were accused of being Zionists. We were accused of aiming at world domination by the Jews, of having tried to destroy socialism and developing political and economic ties to the West in order to make of Czechoslovakia an American colony. All defendants in this trial, as in trials in Moscow, confessed. None of them was able to withstand the endless tortures, and finally all gave in. All that the interrogators were interested in was confession. They did not even bother checking whether any verifiable basic facts of the confession were right. The whole thing was part of a propaganda campaign, and they needed only words.

For instance, I confessed that in my capacity as the First Deputy Minister of Foreign Trade I made an agreement with Israel that was detrimental to the Czechoslovak economy. As a matter of fact, I learned of the existence of this treaty only after more than a year of my imprisonment. The treaty was signed some months after I had been imprisoned. The treaty had been arranged by the non-Jewish Minister of Foreign Trade, Mr. Gregor, who signed it, and it was approved by the government on his recommendation. I also confessed to having approved for export to Israel certain machines that were vital to the Czechoslovak economy, whereas I had given written instructions that this export not take place and it actually did not take place. That was the only way that a defendant could let at least the informed people know to what extent his trial was based on fabrications and vicious lies.

This was the biggest anti-Semitic trial in modern history. The anti-Semitic tone was to serve several functions: create a scapegoat for the ineffectiveness of the planned economy; appeal to anti-Semitic feelings; discredit Zionist and prove that the USSR was the real friend of the Arabs and the enemy of Israel.

Although Beria was executed and all of us were rehabilitated (eleven posthumously) the policy toward Israel did not change nor did anti-Semitism disappear. In the first hours of Czechoslovakia's occupation in 1968, Dubcek, the First Secretary of the Party, Cernik the Prime Minister, Sarkovsky, the head of the Parliament, and Kriegel, the representative of the National Front, were beaten up, handcuffed and brought to prisons in the Soviet Union.

As the Soviet expectation to create a pro-Soviet government proved illusory, the Soviet leadership had to negotiate with these prisoners. When, in the course of these negotiations, Kriegel made the remark that the Czechoslovak representatives must take into consideration the interests of the

Czechoslovak people, Kosygin, who is regarded in America as a relative liberal, shouted at Kriegel: "You are not supposed to speak in the name of the Czechoslovak people, you are a bloody Galician Jew." The Soviet leadership was finally willing to free Dubcek, Cernik and Sarkovsky, but insisted that Kriegel should remain in a Soviet prison. Only the solidarity of Dubcek and the others saved Kriegel—at least temporarily.

Even so, re-Stalinization became a reality.

I would like to add some remarks on the Israel-Arab war of 1967. In the Soviet bloc there is a rather poor health service and there are no private physicians. The party apparatus therefore has a special structure for medical care. There is also a state sanatorium for the party officials. After the rehabilitation of the innocent victims, it was decided that all whose health suffered in prison should be treated in the state sanatorium. This decision also applied to me, owing to my heart attack. Thus, in this sanatorium were treated party officials and some of their victims. As it happened, I was hospitalized for some weeks and during this time the Six-Day War took place. Thus, I had ample opportunity to speak with leading party officials and their visitors. There were basically two views expressed by them.

Some of those who later joined Dubcek thought that the Soviet Union had an opportunity to win the sympathy of the whole world by launching a progressive policy, because its influence was strong enough to bring about a peaceful solution of the Egyptian-Israeli confrontation. If the USSR were to guarantee Israel's frontiers, Egypt would have to accept this guarantee and Israel would in turn have to recognize Egyptian interests. A settlement would be in the interests of both the Arab states and Israel. It was argued that Israel as a highly developed country could contribute to the development of the underdeveloped Arab countries and since there was enough living space for all concerned there was no reason to foster hostilities. But most of my fellow patients were "realists." They spoke of spheres of influence. They openly declared that according to their information the Israeli army could not check the superiority of the Arab states, that nothing can save Israel. The threat to annihilate Israel so openly expressed by all Arab leaders including Nasser was regarded as a most realistic threat.

I spoke with one of these "realists" a few weeks later. I reminded him of his prognosis, and asked him how he could explain that the USSR was so poorly informed and permitted such a defeat of Egypt and indirectly of the Soviet Union. My informant, who must remain unnamed, confided what he was given to understand by Bilak, a party Secretary who in 1968 succeeded Dubcek as First Secretary of the Slovak Communist Party. Bilak is the most intimate friend of the Soviet Consul General in Bratislava, has permanent contact with Soviet political circles, and is the main promoter of Soviet policy in Czechoslovakia. Bilak was invited to the office of the Soviet Consul General for a most official discussion, in which he got an authoritative explanation of Soviet policy with regard to Israel. The Soviet representative declared that the Soviet government desired party officials to have a clear picture of the events in the Middle East. Soviet strategy, he pointed out, is to dominate the Middle East and the whole Mediterranean area. This requires that the whole Arab world be convinced that the Soviet Union is their only friend, and that they consequently ask the Soviets to intervene massively and provide military aid, including army advisers. Thus the Soviets will develop direct contact with Arab military groups and win a real stronghold. It is necessary that the Arab armies recognize that without Soviet help they could not be powerful. Soviet intelligence had very good information

JIM HARVEY'S 10TH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE

concerning Israel's military potential. They were unpleasantly surprised when Egypt lost the war within a few days instead of a few weeks, but Egypt's defeat was no surprise. It was, on the contrary, an important part of the Soviet plans. Only an Arab defeat could create conditions for stronger Soviet influence. The Soviets were not at all interested in Israel's defeat. The Egyptian army is not too happy to be bossed around by the Soviet military. If Israel would have been defeated and practically eliminated, the Arab states would not need Soviet assistance; they would have freedom of action and might be tempted to develop closer relations with the West, which is in a position to offer them far greater economic aid than the Soviet Union. As long as the Soviets have no decisive control of the Arab policy, the existence of Israel is in the interest of the Soviet Union.

If ever it is no longer in their interest to make use of Israel's existence, the Soviets will not hesitate to contribute to its annihilation, or they may hope to force Israel to capitulate, give up those territories occupied after the Six-Day War and be at the mercy of the Soviet Union. This would be the second alternative. According to the information of the Soviet Consul General, the Soviets want to avoid a direct conflict with USA and consequently will maneuver in order to achieve their aim without risking a direct confrontation with the United States.

All that has happened since 1967 proves that the information of the Soviet Consul General was correct. We must view the policy of the Soviet Union as a typical imperialist policy, in which the fate of nations, be it Czechoslovakia, Egypt or Israel is just the fate of a figure in a chess game.

However endangered the existence of Israel is, I think it is important to see that in the Middle East it is not only the fate of Israel that is at stake. The Middle East is one of the most important strategic aims of the Soviet Union, because from there it could command the whole African continent and basically change any balance of power. A Soviet victory in the Middle East would weaken the political influence of the USA all over the world to such a degree that the Soviet Union would be in a position to play the primary role throughout the world.

TENTH ANNUAL QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure for me to bring to the attention of our colleagues the results of the 10th annual questionnaire which I have conducted in Michigan's eighth congressional district. I am certain that many Members will be surprised by a few of the tabulated results of the nearly 20,000 people who responded.

I would also like to publicly express my appreciation for the fine cooperation of most of our district newspapers who published the questionnaire ballot as a public service. This helped tremendously in stirring greater interest and in assuring that all families had more than just one means of participating.

I would mention that some 140,000 questionnaires were mailed to each mail patron in the five-county eighth district. Results continue to come in. The questionnaire results follow:

Do you favor:

	Yes		No	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
1. President Nixon's policy of troop withdrawal from Vietnam and the Vietnamization of the war?	14,676	82.1	3,202	17.9
2. The United States gradually expanding its diplomatic and trade relations with Red China?	7,873	44.1	10,005	55.9
3. The use of wage and price controls to fight inflation?	11,693	65.4	6,185	34.6
4. A volunteer Army in place of the draft although it would cost more?	9,249	52.3	8,629	47.7
5. Undergraduate college students being given temporary draft deferments?	8,993	50.1	8,885	49.9
6. Enlargement of the Safeguard anti-ballistic missile system which was authorized in 1969?	9,078	50.8	8,800	49.2
7. The administration's multi-billion-dollar program to combat pollution of our environment?	14,482	81.0	3,396	19.0
8. A farm program that provided for less Government participation and subsidies than at the present?	12,550	79.2	3,880	20.8
Please check if you are in farming	1,055	72.8	393	27.2
9. Lowering the voting age?	6,580	36.8	11,298	63.2
What is the single most important problem in the country today? Pick one:				
(a) Air and water pollution	2,326	13.0		
(b) Crime and violence	7,536	42.1		
(c) The Vietnam war	3,374	18.9		
(d) Inflation (rise in the cost of living)	3,301	18.5		
No response	1,341	7.5		

RESTRICTIVE TRADE BILL

HON. PHILLIP BURTON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. BURTON of California. Mr. Speaker, on July 28 Mrs. Virginia H. Knauer, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, issued the following statement which I would like to call to the attention of the House:

STATEMENT BY VIRGINIA H. KNAUER

I am alarmed over the disregard of the American consumer evidenced by the restrictive trade bill presently before the House Ways & Means Committee. The President has registered strong objections to the measure, and I would hope his reservations will be taken into consideration by the Committee.

In many ways, this bill is the most significant "anti-consumer" legislation now in the Congress. The imposition of import quotas will hurt virtually every consumer in the United States, particularly lower income consumers.

Higher prices, fewer product choices, reduced competition, and a limited supply of imported products are the probable result of the proposed import quota legislation. Quotas of the type provided for by the bill will also raise the prices of imported commodities.

It is possible under the bill that some inexpensive foreign imported goods might not be available at all, and our lower income consumers may well find themselves unable to afford certain products.

The interests of consumers can best be protected by moving toward freer trade. The bill in the House of Representatives does the reverse: it reduces the flexibility of the President to lessen trade barriers, it preserves by law oil quotas which prevents the President from shifting to a tariff system, it mandates new quotas in certain industries, and it encourages other special interest groups to obtain quotas on their products—all of this at the expense of the American consumer.

I do appreciate that certain industries now face serious competition from imported goods, and I suggest that the appropriate relief for these manufacturers is through liberalization of adjustment assistance procedures.

If, as many economic experts believe, a trade war results and other nations do retaliate, there will be an even greater reduction in the supply of goods and price com-

petition, and the effect on the consumer will be devastating.

Congress should put the welfare of the nation's consumers before the welfare of a few individual industries.

WHAT ROLE FOR THE LEGISLATOR?

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, in the June 1970 newsletter which I mailed to my constituents, I included my thoughts on the role of the elected official in representing the views of his constituents:

As your representative in Congress, let me assure you that I do listen to your opinions. And I fully recognize that those who disapprove of my positions have the right—indeed the obligation—to work to defeat me. That is the basis of our system of government. But to ask me to alter a position based on principle or conviction in order to suit one group of my constituents is to ask me to betray not only my own conscience, but the trust of those who support me because of the positions I have taken. No elected representative can be all things to all people; and I do not believe it is the proper function of a Congressman to violate his own convictions in an attempt to do so.

Abraham Lincoln once said, and I take the same position:

"I do the very best I know how—the very best I can; and I mean to keep doing so until the end. If the end brings me out all right, what is said against me won't amount to anything. If the end brings me out wrong, ten angels swearing I was right would make no difference."

In the July 30 issue of Roll Call, the distinguished young columnist, Allan C. Brownfeld, addresses himself to the same question. I believe that Mr. Brownfeld's comments are worthy of the thoughtful attention of my colleagues, and of all readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Therefore, I include his column in the RECORD at this point:

WHAT ROLE FOR THE LEGISLATOR?

(By Allan C. Brownfeld)

One of the dilemmas of democracy in an egalitarian age is the question of what our

representatives are to do, and what their role is to be. The way we answer such a question determines the quality of government, the extent of freedom, and the existence of virtue in our public life.

One view is that a Senator or Congressman should at all times express views which are harmonious with those of the majority of his constituents. An extension of this approach holds that a representative should vote only for the interests of those who helped him to get elected.

The late Senator Kerr of Oklahoma, for example, was an advocate of this view. He stated: "I represent the financial institutions of Oklahoma, I am interested in them, and that is the reason they elect me. They wouldn't want to send a man here who has no community of interest with them, because he wouldn't be worth a nickel to them."

The more traditional view of the Anglo-Saxon legal tradition was that held by Edmund Burke who noted that "Your representative owes you not his industry only, but his judgment; and he betrays instead of serving you, if he sacrifices it to your opinion."

Commenting upon the view that a representative's opinion should always be consistent with the views held by 51% of those registered and voting in his district, columnist William F. Buckley, Jr., said that "If the latter were truly desirable, we could have running democracy without any difficulty at all by simply plugging in Dr. Gallup to a big IBM machine and turning the dial. Do you prefer Johnson or Nixon? If the answer on Monday is Nixon 51, Johnson 49, we could simply flash the helicopter to jettison Lyndon and pop up to New York to fetch Nixon . . . and so for all the Senators. . . . Why have any elected officials at all? Why not just constantly submit questions about everything to the voters, and let them decide directly?"

This, of course, is the age-old question faced by political representatives. Is their function to represent the transitory opinions of their constituents, or their interests as determined by the best judgment of the man chosen to assume a position of leadership?

In the 1830s, for example, a citizen of Massachusetts suggested to John Quincy Adams that his job as Congressman was to register exactly their views on public matters. The ex-President replied that for such a job clerks were available, and that his idea of representative government was that the man sent to Washington was to represent not the transitory views of his constituents but was to exercise the judgment in which such constituents had shown confidence by electing him. If the constituents disagreed, he argued, they could turn him out of office at the next election.

And what of the broader view of representatives? Is a representative merely the spokesman for those registered and above the minimum age in his district, or is he representative of a broader constituency?

In his important volume, *Orthodoxy*, G. K. Chesterton discussed what he called "the democracy of the dead." "If we attach great importance to the opinion of the ordinary men in great unanimity when we are dealing with daily matters, there is no reason why we should disregard it when we are dealing with history. . . . Tradition may be defined as an extension of the franchise. Tradition means giving votes to the most obscure of all classes, our ancestors. It is the democracy of the dead. Tradition refuses to submit to the small and arrogant oligarchy of those who merely happen to be walking around."

Americans have traditionally believed in the kind of representative government in which legislators sought to be statesmen, and not mere reflectors of the popular will. It was Edmund Burke who noted that in making a decision such a statesman must take into consideration not only the views of the current majority, but the views of all those who have come before and all those who are yet to come. To do otherwise would

be to enshrine neither democracy nor freedom, but the rule of the mob and the passions of the moment.

It appears that the "Age of Heroes" discussed by Thomas Carlyle is rapidly dying. We no longer revere our leaders, and part of the reason is that we no longer think of ourselves as being a little lower than the angels. We conceive of man more in terms of the behavioralists, and if his creature comforts somehow can be provided for, then happiness will ensue.

The men who wrote our Constitution in 1789 believed that truth was a discoverable phenomenon, and not simply a relative value judgment. Jefferson would hardly have accepted the idea that certain men would prosper under tyranny, while others' needs would best be served by liberty. Today it is often said that the men and women of the underdeveloped nations of Asia, Africa, and Latin America need totalitarian forms of government to help them to enter the modern world. According to this view, man is not a being endowed with certain inalienable rights, the view enunciated in our Declaration of Independence, but is simply a creature of time and circumstances. Some are meant to be free, and some slaves.

Many today believe that all truth is of modern vintage, and that we have little to learn from the life of Jesus, the orations of Pericles, the musings of Plato. In fact, all truth may be determined at the next election by majority vote. What all of this means, says Dr. Elton Trueblood, the distinguished Quaker philosopher, is "that we cut ourselves off from the wisdom of the ages, including that of the Bible. It means that, if this is taken seriously, we are really an orphan generation . . . that takes itself far too seriously, that is too much impressed with changes that may be only superficial." And of course, if this is true of our generation, there is no reason why it will not be true of another generation. Therefore, whatever we gain would naturally be rejected by our descendants. No civilization is possible this way. Contemporaneity, when it is a disease, is a very damaging disease, because it destroys the continuity of culture.

It is our modern concept of man, of truth, and of the nature of society which leads us to our current conclusion about the function of our representatives. If truth is whatever 51% of us decide it is at any given moment, we obviously do not want any representative of ours to support its opposite, which would be falsehood. Our belief in equality, of course, eliminates the possibility that some men know more about some things than other men. "Leadership," if such a term may be used any longer, simply means giving expression to the majority will.

This is by no means the concept of equality which was written into our life and our law in an age when equality meant not that all men were the same but that all men, despite their diversity in talents and abilities, were equal in the sight of God and before the bar of justice. Such a view permitted for leadership, for it accepted the truth that men do differ, and that all of us cannot be Lincolns, Washingtons, and Jeffersons. It also permitted such leaders to exercise authority and not be mere handmaidens of the passions of the moment.

When we ask ourselves why the level of political leadership has declined, the answer is clear. We no longer seek leadership; we seek men who are so devoid of judgments and opinions of their own that merely expressing what we tell them to express will be no hardship.

We seem to think so little of ourselves that we reject the idea that man is capable of visions and dreams. Some, however, maintain a view of man much more ennobling than the one which predominates today, and it is this vision which must be restored before leadership will once again be exercised in the interest of freedom and justice rather than of popularity and praise.

A time such as ours cannot survive pedestrian representation. The problems of crime and violence, of war and domestic disorders, of the generation gap and the need to accommodate to a rapidly changing technology all point to the need for the best men to exercise the most superior judgment we can call upon. Those who conceive of their function as personal enrichment and serving the interests of the conflicting lobbies and pressure groups must spend at least a portion of their time re-thinking their role. What does it profit a man, after all, if he gain the whole world and lose his own soul?

SMOG

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, one can hope that this afternoon's heavy rainfall will wash away the blanket of smog that has enveloped the Nation's capital for the past few days.

But the rain, at best, will bring only temporary relief. It will not solve the problem, or eliminate its primary cause—the more than 105 million cars, trucks, and buses that now clog our highways.

Last month, the House made what appears in retrospect a desultory attempt to do something about air pollution, through approval of H.R. 17255, the Clean Air Amendments of 1970.

Several amendments were offered, to strengthen the sections of the bill for dealing with motor vehicle emissions. These proposals would have forced auto manufacturers to improve the shaky performance of their emission control devices, and one of the amendments even contemplated the phasing out of that primary scourge of pure air enthusiasts, the internal combustion engine.

But the amendments were all shouted down, perhaps because the air over Washington was relatively clean that day. The California State Senate, a legislative body not noted for its radicalism, of course felt differently last year, when it voted 26 to 5 to bar these engines beginning with 1975 models.

Maybe it was because our California Senators have had longer and more lugubrious experience with smog than most national legislators.

In any event, now that we are all getting a chance to sense this problem firsthand, as it were, our national Senate may be emboldened to take the decisive and bold steps necessary to really come to grips with this menace.

Under unanimous consent, I will include at this point a relevant editorial from this morning's *Washington Post*:

A CLOUD NO BIGGER THAN THE EASTERN SEABOARD

The dangerous cesspool of air that now hangs over this city and the eastern seaboard is a shock but not really a surprise. The bread we threw out on the water now returns to us. It is true that abnormal weather in the form of a mess of warm air that won't move on is a major weave in the blanket of pollution now covering us. But we cannot blame the fickleness of nature for this mess; it is manmade, largely by the exhaust fumes from automobiles and buses, according to local officials.

This raises the immediate question of

whether the public can wait the 10 years the automobile industry has said it needs to produce clean cars. Has an independent group thoroughly looked into this time-table to see if 10 years really is needed? Or is it a comfortable pace the industry has set for itself? These are honest questions and there is an urgent need for answers; the air around us argues that anything less than a crash program to get clean air is basically a no-win effort.

A world-wide survey by the UPI reveals that we are not alone in our filth. Wallowing also in smog are places like Japan, Mexico City and Singapore. The ongoing series of articles on world pollution by Claire Sterling on this page has been detailing the theme that we are all in this problem together; action by one country and not by another will not do. And neither will it do to wait until things get worse.

A recent book called "The Vanishing Air" by John Esposito ends with a chapter called "Pollution and Palliatives." What he and his researchers tried to do, says Mr. Esposito, and in many people's opinion *did*, was "illustrate how the public's hope for clean air has been frustrated by corporate deceit and collusion, by the exercise of undue influence with government officials, by secrecy and the suppression of technology, by the use of dilatory legal maneuvers, by special government concessions, by high-powered lobbying in Congress and administrative agencies . . ."

In saying where the blame lies, Mr. Esposito also implies where the remedy lies: in positive and immediate action by corporations, governments and citizens, not just in Washington or in the United States, but in every part of this blanketed planet.

The trouble is that as long as the menace remains invisible, by and large, we may fool ourselves into thinking that there is no urgency in the developing crisis of our environment, which suggests a silver lining in the great dirty cloud that has enveloped, not just a city, but an entire area of the United States the past few days. For what this has done has been to make the menace all too frighteningly visible, as a regional thing, which is only a step away from a continental, and ultimately, a planetary thing.

It is often said that the crisis of pollution and environment will fade away, like other fads, a victim of our short attention span, as the media turn to new trinkets or inserts to play with. But it won't, in our view, because it won't remain invisible. When the old and sick are in danger of dying along a whole seaboard, when officials in Washington and New York are ready to block roads to keep cars from being used, when the menace is inescapably there for all to see and breathe, it is not a fad which can fade away. A blind eye can be turned on the ghettos or the war but no one who ventured outdoors the last few days could avoid seeing what we are doing to ourselves. It would be nice to think that we could take sensible warning from a cloud no bigger than the eastern seaboard.

FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY

HON. ROBERT TAFT, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, this week the budget deficit for fiscal 1970 was announced officially at \$2.9 billion.

Our friends, the Democrats, I am sure, will again ignore their own lack of fiscal responsibility to chide the administration for the deficit.

But I believe we should look at the facts.

First, this administration lived within its budget. The deficit came not from

overspending, but from an income shortfall.

The reason for that is simple.

When you set out to control a galloping inflation, brought on by 8 years of Democratic fiscal mismanagement, you have to take stringent measures.

Mr. Speaker, the President has taken those measures. In doing so he has kept the deficit minuscule and is bringing about a return to fiscal sanity and economic stability.

The entire Nation is the beneficiary.

LETTER TO THE PRESIDENT

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the August-September 1970 National Wildlife magazine contains an open letter to President Nixon criticizing our national priorities and pointing out that although the proposed budget for fiscal year 1972 calls for \$73.5 billion for national defense, only \$1 billion is earmarked for improving the quality of our environment. This thought-provoking letter follows:

AN OPEN LETTER TO PRESIDENT NIXON

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: What awesome responsibility! You, the most powerful man by far, in the most powerful nation on earth—you alone, must finally recommend how to spend \$200 billion. One thousand dollars for each man, woman and child in the United States—of our money.

A stroke of your pen decides whether it is spent for guns or butter. . . . for supersonic jets or to clean up our environment. Your decision can send a man to the moon or rebuild our cities. (See our lead article, page 4). You decide whether we build big dams, fight air pollution, or rescue starving kids abroad.

These are all agonizing decisions, because few of them are black-or-white, yes-or-no, right-or-wrong decisions. They are a matter of goals, conscience and priority.

But, Mr. President, now that you are putting together your budget for fiscal 1972, we respectfully ask:

"Are you spending enough to repair the damage done to the environment—to safeguard our natural resources?"

Our first EQ Index of Environmental Quality was dismal, and our 1970 EQ Index, to be published in the October-November issue of NATIONAL WILDLIFE, may look worse.

You have said:

"I have become convinced that the 1970s absolutely must be the years when America pays its debt to the past by reclaiming the purity of its air, its water, and our living environment. It is literally now or never."

The people also recognize this urgency. In a recent NBC poll, "Pollution" ranked alongside "Vietnam War" as of "most concern" to the American people. This confirms the results of two polls sponsored by our National Wildlife Federation: Our Gallup survey showed 85 percent of all Americans are "concerned about the environment." A national follow-up study showed 97 percent favoring reallocation of Federal spending to provide more money for environmental cleanup and protection.

A careful reevaluation of our national priorities is in order. After all, only a handful of our 210 million citizens will ever ride on a supersonic jet but everyone must breathe. What does it matter if there is life on Mars but none on Earth?

If you are right, if the people are right, and if we are right in saying that a healthful environment is the key to our survival, then we must conclude the present budget, dramatized in these drawings, is somewhat preposterous.

Natural Resources ranks 13th and dead last on your ladder of spending priorities, getting only \$2.5 billion of our tax revenues. We will spend 30 times more for military . . . 20 times more for income security . . . nearly twice as much for highways. And to what avail if the freedoms we seek to defend, the income insurance we purchase, and the homes we build all turn to ashes because our environment falls us?

The \$2.5 billion of tax money set aside in your current budget for "Natural Resources" is pitifully inadequate, even when you add another \$2 billion which comes from such things as leasing mineral rights and timber sales. Because, ironically, a major share of this money will be spent for dams, levees and utility company projects—a far cry from environmental improvement programs which really gets only a little over \$1 billion.

Do we need the additional noise pollution from a supersonic jet transport which will cost over \$4 billion to develop—when noise pollution now costs U.S. industry over \$4 billion annually in damages?

Is it wise to spend \$375 million one one moon shot, but only \$104 million per year for air pollution control?

Which is more important—the \$7.4 billion spent on military research, or the \$6 billion it would take to build and repair sewers in all American cities?

Is it in the public interest to spend \$220 million to refurbish an outmoded aircraft carrier but only \$300 million for the nation's entire outdoor recreation program?

Should we give away \$3.6 billion in foreign aid? Or use it to build industrial waste treatment facilities to meet existing water standards?

You said in your budget message: "Primary responsibility to reduce pollution appropriately rests with state and local governments and the private sector. However, the Federal government must exert leadership and provide assistance to attack these problems now!"

We heartily agree! For, if we fail to respond to the EQ challenge of the '70s, we may belatedly discover that we have been our own worst enemy. We may have ignored our internal defense and weakened ourselves in the real fight for survival because we were overly concerned with enemies from outside.

You said, Mr. President, in your telegram to the delegates of the 34th National Wildlife Federation Annual Meeting this year that "This is a battle which involves all of us. Working together. I know we can conserve and restore the quality of our total environment."

We're ready to work with you, Mr. President. Isn't it time we really got started?

THOMAS L. KIMBALL,
Executive Director,
National Wildlife Federation.

HOW LONG, MR. PRESIDENT, BEFORE YOU REPLY?

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

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

Nowhere has this administration's at-

titude toward black Americans been more apparently calloused than in their vacillation over school desegregation policy. Determining what the policy is at the moment has been a matter of "who do you believe"—a game of trying to keep up with the various administration spokesmen and their varying and conflicting remarks on school desegregation policy.

Since Nixon assumed office, school desegregation has been the orphan for whom no one wanted responsibility. The Supreme Court has been made out to be the "illegitimate father" of a law to which this administration has yet only given lipservice.

The responsibility and opportunity for leading the country, for inspiring the citizenry to work for a policy which is recognized as both morally and legally right—has been overlooked. President Nixon has instead, sent emissaries forth with statements to placate all interests and groups while he sits back and watches the confusion and controversy. School desegregation policy under Nixon has been subject to a supreme exercise in "buck-passing" and a prime contributor to the alienation of many black citizens.

For the interest of my colleagues, I am submitting the following material which is indicative of the backsliding and sidestepping which now accompanies the feeble movement of this Nation toward a realization of desegregated schools.

It is important to point out that the words and deeds related in the following articles, reports, and comments—have occurred 16 years after the Supreme Court first set school desegregation as the "law of the land."

The material follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Mar. 19, 1970]

DESEGREGATION

(By Louis Harris)

An examination of public attitudes toward the United States Supreme court order to end school segregation without further delays reveals that most persons support the ruling.

The latest findings on the court order show:

By 58 to 28 percent, a majority of the American people agree that "integration of schools has been the law since 1954 and it was about time to enforce the law."

By an almost identical 57 to 27 percent, a majority also agree that "desegregation of schools just will not take place until some higher authorities order it."

"The United States Supreme Court decision was a great step forward for racial justice in the United States" is a view shared by a majority of 54 to 29 percent of the public.

These results add up to a substantial majority opinion in the country which senses that integration of schools is an "inevitability" and that failure to abolish education systems which provide for dual, segregated schools not only is "moral hypocrisy" but a "violation of the law" as well.

To be sure, there are strong demurs to the Supreme court order. These center on a reluctance to "force" the issue:

By 50 to 42 percent people agree that "the Supreme Court was pushing things too fast, before people were ready for it."

At first glance, the two sets of results would appear to be contradictory. How can rather convincing majorities hold to the view that enforcement of the 1954 court decision on school segregation is "overdue" and at

the same time 50 percent feel that the court is now "pushing too fast"?

One answer is that these latest findings point up once again the basic ambivalence of white America in facing the dilemma of race: As a people we know that segregation and discrimination are wrong, but at the same time we are reluctant and even unwilling to support compulsory measures, such as busing, which would eliminate segregation in the schools.

[From the Baltimore Afro-America,
Mar. 17, 1970]

HEW SHOWS SOUTHERN PUPILS BUSED MANY MILES TO MAINTAIN SEGREGATION

WASHINGTON.—Many southern school districts have been busing children long distances for many years simply to maintain segregated school systems, according to figures compiled by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

The figures were compiled at the request of Sen. Clifford P. Case, R-N.J., who said in a speech on the Senate floor last week:

"The facts show that there has been more busing of pupils in the South to maintain segregated schools than there has been to desegregate them."

Southerners have been complaining in recent months that it is unfair to bus children away from their neighborhoods to end segregation.

Recently, Louisiana Gov. John J. McKeithen has placed full-page ads. in several northern newspapers decrying the fact that "court-approved plans have required the busing of children 20 to 30 miles from their homes, when neighborhood schools are within walking distance."

However, the HEW statistics reveal that in many parishes of McKeithen's state, large percentages of students were bused. For example, in Ascension Parish, about 92 per cent are bused; in West Baton Rouge, 99 per cent; in West Feliciana, 98 per cent, and so on.

The HEW figures were compiled for 300 areas in the Deep South for which the department has helped draft desegregation plans in the last year.

The report shows that in the 1968-69 school year, when these counties were still running segregated schools, up to 100 per cent of the children were bused daily in some areas.

In one suburb of Atlanta, black children were bused 75 miles round trip every day to attend segregated schools.

Black children in Oktibbeha County, Miss., were bused from their home town of Sturges—where there was an all-white school—some 46 miles every morning to attend a segregated school. They had to ride the buses the same 46 miles to get home again in the evening.

"In order to maintain its segregated schools," Case said, "Neshoba County, Miss., bused all of its pupils to their classrooms."

Case noted that many other rural Mississippi counties bused almost all of their children—Franklin County, 97 per cent; Marion, 96; North Pike, 94; Lauderdale, 99; and Kemper, 95.

According to HEW, busing is still being used to maintain segregated schools in at least a dozen rural Mississippi counties.

In Newport News, Va., students are bused some 25 miles daily to maintain its so-called "freedom-of-choice" plan.

Expanding on the figures, Lloyd Henderson, education chief in HEW's Office of Civil Rights, told newsmen last week that of 300 areas, many bused solely to maintain segregation, while others bused children longer distances than necessary in order to preserve segregated schools.

Henderson added that only seven of the 300 areas would have to increase their busing if they desegregated. The others would have the same or less busing after desegregation.

He said that "in many cases the neighborhood school will become a reality for the first

time" as a result of desegregation because it would no longer be necessary to bus children great distances to segregated schools.

A similar statement was made by Case, who said, "I think it is obvious and logical that if we bus children on the basis of geography rather than on the basis of color we will have less busing."

WEEKLY COLUMN OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAM L. CLAY

Last week, the President made a special statement on school desegregation. History will note that it was an unprecedented happening, that the President of the United States should have to write a special statement to tell the Nation he will obey the law.

Nixon said he had to make the statement on school desegregation to clarify confusion—confusion which began when this country saw the President behaving as though the law of the land could be ignored.

The President's message reminded me of a tax lawyer explaining all the technicalities and loopholes that his client might use to circumvent the law. In detail, the President explained just how much of the law he could bend. To the extent that he can relax the impact of school desegregation law and mandate, he will do so. To the extent that by his own office he could expedite the law, he has and he will continue to refuse action.

It is a national disgrace to hear a President go before the public and try to convince himself that black citizens shall have certain rights. But it is a national tragedy to hear a President go before the public to rationalize the limits of those rights.

The President stated, "On the one hand . . . we are not backing away. On the other hand . . . certain changes are needed in the nation's approach to school desegregation." In this way and with a dozen significant "buts" and "however's"—the President went characteristically about the task of making himself "perfectly clear."

The President proclaimed that "environment"—not race, not teachers, not school facilities nor equipment—is the most important educational factor. If this comes as a revelation to the President, why does he refuse to fund programs such as OEO which seeks to improve the "environment" which traps the poor and the uneducated into poverty.

The emphasis on the "environment" factor is also a key to understanding the President. We need only turn it around and point it at the President to understand why he has no sense of equal rights or equal opportunity. He has controlled his own environment in a way which insulates him from any learning experiences which might contribute to his racial I.Q. By surrounding himself with Mitchell, Thurmond, and Agnew, he has guaranteed that his environment will not adversely affect the racist atmosphere within which he functions.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 8, 1970]

SCHOOL DESEGREGATION

(By Jonathan Spivak)

The Nixon Administration's latest attempt to clarify its school desegregation policies leaves most of the key issues as fuzzy as ever.

In yesterday's clarification effort, Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Finch insisted that President Nixon's civil rights statement of last month, which seemed clearly to signal a go-slow approach, hadn't changed anything as far as the HEW department is concerned. HEW, which has the legal authority to cut off Federal funds from school districts that discriminate racially, is still seeking to accelerate school integration dramatically, Mr. Finch maintained. Next fall, he predicted, there will be at least another doubling of the number of Negro students in integrated schools in the South.

And HEW's new civil rights director, J.

Stanley Pottinger, a 31-year-old San Francisco lawyer, echoed the Secretary's stand. "No change," insisted Mr. Pottinger, who replaced another liberal, young California lawyer, Leon Panetta, in one of HEW's hottest spots. Mr. Panetta was forced to resign by Congressional opposition—mainly from Southerners—to HEW's handling of school integration.

Messrs. Finch and Pottinger and other HEW education experts held their first full-dress news conference on civil rights but provided little new insight as to where the department is really heading in school desegregation, at what speed and why.

On the plus side for those who favor more aggressive action, particularly in the South, was the announcement that HEW would monitor the progress of court-ordered desegregation plans. These plans cover most of the major Southern cities, such as Atlanta, Houston, Dallas and New Orleans, and involve large numbers of pupils.

Three previous HEW civil rights directors had tried without success to negotiate such an agreement with the Justice Department, which has the basic Federal responsibility in such cases. Now, HEW officials say the Justice department wants their help in identifying slow-to-desegregate districts, so court decrees can be tightened up. If this is done, substantial integration gains would result.

But much of what Secretary Finch said was either obscure or ambiguous, and the tenor of his remarks suggested, as did the President's, that there were limits to how much controversy the country could stand over desegregating its schools. "If we are going to preserve public education in this country, you have got to have community support," Mr. Finch insisted.

HEW's civil rights enforcement efforts in Southern cities will distinguish between legally enforced school segregation (de jure) and school segregation arising from residential living patterns (de facto), its officials said. But Mr. Finch didn't give any indication of the standards for drawing this line or how tough his department would be in resisting Southern appeals to permit the continued existence of all-Negro schools in all-Negro neighborhoods. In the past, HEW enforcers have taken the line that all school districts that once had legally separate white and Negro systems must be eradicated. How much of a departure Mr. Pottinger will permit remains to be seen.

The big unsettled issue in HEW's Southern school picture remains the extent to which the department will be able to compel desegregation in such cities as Columbia, S.C.; Raleigh, N.C.; Palm Beach, Fla., and Austin, Texas, which aren't currently under court orders. HEW is negotiating plans or proposing fund cutoffs in about 200 districts with a final desegregation deadline.

But at the same time the Justice Department is talking about bringing statewide school suits in Arkansas, Florida, Mississippi, North Carolina and South Carolina that would cover most of these 200 districts and have the effect of insulating them from HEW's cutoff authority. Whether the Justice agency actually will bring such suits and particularly how stringent its proposed desegregation remedies will be wasn't discussed at the Finch press conference and remains a major unknown. A statewide suit the Justice Department won in Georgia has left considerable leeway for perpetuating all Negro schools, some civil rights experts contend.

As far as Northern school desegregation is concerned, the HEW press conference gave little guidance. The President's stress on remedying only legally enforced school segregation suggested that HEW will soft-pedal its efforts outside the South. But the department had been gearing up for a significant effort to apply its fund-cutoff powers under the 1964 Civil Rights Act to segregated Northern schools, which stem mainly from

living patterns. Its approach was that deliberate discrimination in housing that produces segregated neighborhoods is sufficient legal justification to seek the segregation of schools serving these areas.

Secretary Finch seemed to lean more heavily on the carrot of the additional \$1.5 billion in Federal funds to handle the Northern school problem. He also emphasized the educational virtues of the neighborhood school and the evils—hardships on students and waste of financial resources—of forced school busing, as in the plan ordered by the courts in Los Angeles. But whether HEW's Northern strategy will be pursued or simply go by the boards—as seems more likely—was left uncertain.

Gov. Claude Kirk of Florida has placed himself in danger of a contempt citation by following a path blazed earlier by other Southern governors, notably George Wallace of Alabama. Kirk has personally assumed the management of a county school system and ordered its pupils to ignore an integration plan approved by the U.S. Supreme Court.

The school system's problems are real and difficult. The transfers involve 2,600 pupils, and it's only nine weeks to the end of the present term. School officials, unable to obtain enough additional buses, had scheduled staggered starting times at the elementary schools. Perhaps the courts could better have postponed the transfers.

But it has been 16 years since the Supreme Court declared segregated schooling unconstitutional—long enough, it would seem for desegregation to have been accomplished. Yet Florida, like other states, is still struggling and resisting. And a court order remains a court order—the law of the land.

The present Florida brand of defiance, like its predecessors, is likely to fail, and it makes a mockery of pleas for law and order among the generality of the people. If elected leaders defy the courts, what is the ordinary citizen, or the school child, to do or believe?

The governor's attitude also makes the task of the school officials more difficult. They had made their plans for compliance but his order has now added chaos to difficulty. The school superintendent said "the confusion caused by this is going to be tremendous," and he was resisting Kirk's maneuver.

And so the children suffer, as usual, while their elders play their childish games.

[From the Washington Post, July 17, 1970]
U.S. WILL SEND 100 TO SOUTH TO ENFORCE
DESEGREGATION

(By Ken W. Clawson)

Attorney General John N. Mitchell disclosed yesterday that a federal task force of more than 100 will be assigned to the South next month to assure complete desegregation of public schools.

"The Supreme Court has ruled that schools must be desegregated now," Mitchell said in an interview. "Without fervor, without passion, we will enforce the law."

Mitchell said he did not anticipate trouble, "but you never can tell. Much depends on how firmly state and local officials uphold the law."

To protect Justice Department lawyers working in the field, a deputy U.S. Marshall will be assigned to each as a personal escort.

Southern schools, many of which are under voluntary or compulsory orders to desegregate, start opening Aug. 17 and continue through the day after Labor Day.

Before the first school opens, a force of more than 100 federal officials, equally divided between the Departments of Justice and Health, Education and Welfare, will have set up five temporary regional offices.

One office will serve North and South Carolina; others Georgia and Florida; Alabama; Mississippi-Louisiana-Arkansas, and Texas. The three-state regional center will be in

Jackson, Miss., with the others to be chosen later.

Jerris Leonard, assistant attorney general for civil rights said Justice Department lawyers, accompanied by deputy marshals, will be scattered throughout each region.

"We are going to publicize the telephone numbers and addresses of each regional center," Leonard said, "A person with a complaint will contact the regional center and it will be assigned to the nearest field lawyer to make a personal investigation."

Leonard said that if the Justice Department lawyer felt the complaint was justified he would call for an immediate FBI investigation, the results of which would be presented in a U.S. District Court for a remedy.

Nearly 100 hardcore Southern school districts were recently sued by the Justice Department to desegregate this fall. Another 500 of the 2,700 districts are under voluntary or court-ordered plans to desegregate.

Mitchell said that desegregation of the Southern schools will be completed this fall. "This will show even our critics on the Mondale committee that we mean what we say," he said.

Earlier this week, Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D-Minn.) accused the Nixon administration of turning its back on "integrated quality education" and settling instead for "the narrow legal question of compliance with what the courts require."

Leonard, who was the object of Mondale's criticism, said the courts have rejected racial balance that requires increased busing.

Yesterday, Leonard said of the desegregation effort, "When this job is done, there will be a smaller percentage of black children in all-black schools in Mobile, Ala., than in Minneapolis-St. Paul or Indianapolis, Ind."

Mitchell said there would continue to be criticism from civil rights groups because "some have Democratic constituencies and just can't admit that what we're doing is right."

The Attorney General acknowledged that vigorous federal desegregation action this fall might damage Southern Republican efforts in the November elections but he added that the "climate is right for desegregation under the law" and he predicted it would have no lasting political effect.

Mitchell said the gubernatorial primary victory in George Wallace in Alabama was not a factor in moderating the administration's stance on civil rights.

"I believe Wallace's popularity will tail off more and more as time goes on," Mitchell said. "His win in Alabama was so close, I doubt if he can get many votes outside the state now."

He denied that he has been under intense pressure from Southern senators and congressmen over the pending desegregation action. Some politicians, as well as Southern school officials, have been covertly aiding Justice and HEW in formulating desegregation plans, he added.

Mitchell said he did not witness a contrary performance Tuesday night when Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) upbraided White House aide William Timmons at a reception for Southern Republican State Chairmen.

Thurmond reportedly took Timmons to task over the recent Nixon administration policy to end tax exemptions for segregated private schools. One person who witnessed the argument said that Thurmond was cooling off in a seat later when he spotted Mitchell, jumped to his feet, and started the debate all over again.

[From Christian Science Monitor, July 24, 1970]

SCHOOL ISSUE COULD SPLIT THURMOND AND NIXON

(By Richard L. Strout)

WASHINGTON.—Some think Sen. Strom Thurmond (R) of South Carolina made

Richard M. Nixon President. Certainly he helped at the Miami convention and he kept Southern states away from George C. Wallace in the election—both actions which were of critical importance.

Now, however, the big push to get school desegregation this September in the South threatens to divide the two. It is part of the fallout from a momentous educational battle.

On the Senate floor Mr. Thurmond flatly asserted July 17 that Mr. Nixon had promised to give tax exemption to the new so-called segregation academies springing up over the South.

The Senator condemned the Internal Revenue Service for its decision to remove the private schools' tax-exempt status. And he attacked the Justice Department for its plans to send what he called 100 "carpet-bagging" lawyers to the South to assist in desegregation of schools.

Mr. Nixon replied in soothing words at his July 20 press conference.

WARNING GIVEN ON '72

Senator Thurmond said later that he has not broken with Mr. Nixon, but warned again that the President may lose the South in 1972. He declined to name so-called "liberal and ultraliberal advisers" allegedly close to Mr. Nixon but said he was "not happy that Finch [Robert H. Finch, White House aide] has the President's ear."

Speculation grows that school segregation is the watershed issue for relations between Mr. Nixon and the South, and that it may decide the 1972 election.

Another man in the drama has given hints, but has not yet spoken plainly. This is Randolph Thrower, Commissioner of Internal Revenue. Some feel a compromise formula may be found that will let the new private academies operate.

And Sen. Walter F. Mondale (D) of Minnesota is watching closely. He has been holding hearings on the new segregation issue. He may summon Mr. Thrower as witness.

WALLACE VICTORY NOTED

It all seems to stem from the run-off election victory of Wallace in Alabama. To some this indicated that Mr. Nixon couldn't write Mr. Wallace off in 1972.

By coincidence or design the Nixon administration moved a bit to the left after the Wallace victory on desegregation matters: Suits were brought against recalcitrant school districts and the Treasury decided that private academies that practiced segregation would lose tax exemption.

On the Senate floor Mr. Thurmond declared:

"As recently as Feb. 19, 1970, the President assured me positively that he supported the continuance of the tax-exempt status of private schools. The people of the South were counting upon the President's word."

At his press conference here Monday Mr. Nixon spoke conciliatingly: "We finally have in this country what the South has always wanted and what the South deserves, a one-nation policy—not a Southern strategy and not a Northern strategy but a one-nation strategy."

He said Supreme Court rulings on school desegregation would be enforced.

The question is what formula will be applied.

The Southern Association of Republican State Chairmen has just held a conference here. Senator Thurmond first showed angry signs of denouncing the administration. Kevin Phillips, former Justice Department aide and author of "The Emerging Republican Majority," who is now writing a syndicated column, was on hand to advise them.

SOUTH WARNED

Clark Reed, chairman of the Mississippi Republican Party and chairman of the State Party Executives in the South, went home

to warn the state of the forthcoming school suits. But he was quoted as saying that the suits should not cause alarm because they were "strictly administrative in nature."

He hinted that the suits would take desegregation out of the control of the Health, Education, and Welfare Department and place it with the Justice Department, under the more sympathetic John Mitchell.

Not long after Commissioner Thrower had announced the end of tax exemptions Mr. Reed told the Florida Republican State Committee in Orlando that Mr. Thrower's announcement had a loophole. Mr. Thrower would accept as evidence of nondiscrimination "published statements of policy" that the schools would be desegregated, he said. According to Mr. Reed, Mr. Thrower stated that the Internal Revenue Service would not go beyond that requirement.

TAX STATUS DEBATED

"If Thrower sticks to his word," he is quoted as saying, "and is sincere in taking action only to offset more extreme court action, no private school in Mississippi—or anywhere else I know of—will be without tax-exempt status for a single day."

Mr. Thrower gives a reply that does not seem to settle the issue.

"We, of course, expect the institution to adhere in good faith to an announced admissions policy, and through our regular examination procedures we expect to verify this . . ." he said.

This leaves Mr. Nixon's relations with Senator Thurmond, and the administration's policy to the private schools, still unsettled. Much will depend on the vigor with which enforcement is carried out.

Senator Mondale is also watching closely and may ask Mr. Thrower to come before his committee to be interrogated.

[From the Washington Post, July 20, 1970]

FINCH ANSWERS THURMOND BLAST

(By A. D. Horne)

Sen. Strom Thurmond's attack on Nixon administration school desegregation policies Friday was based on "erroneous" information, White House counselor Robert H. Finch said yesterday.

"We are not sending any large augmentation of people into the South" to enforce desegregation, the former Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare said on "Issues and Answers" (ABC-WMAL).

Thurmond (R-S.C.), in his Senate speech decrying "arbitrary and discriminatory actions by the executive branch," cited "the action of the Internal Revenue Service in threatening the tax exemption of private schools" and "the proposed invasion by 100 carpetbagging Justice Department lawyers for the purpose of assuring forced integration of the public schools."

The latter was a reference to articles Friday in The Washington Post and The New York Times which attributed the figure of 100 lawyers to separate interviews with Attorney General John N. Mitchell and Assistant Attorney General for Civil Rights Jerris Leonard. The Justice Department on Friday issued a statement in Mitchell's name declaring that the information was "pre-mature" and that no decision had yet been made on the number of lawyers to be used.

Finch said yesterday that he foresaw "almost a total breakup" of dual school systems this fall, "but we are trying to do it in a spirit of cooperation rather than forcing it with cadres of people as was suggested in that story."

Mitchell's position, Finch said, is that "we are going to do what has to be done in order to enforce the law with these court-ordered decisions . . . (but) that does not necessarily mean that you are going to save to send cordons of attorneys or troops or anything else."

On other topics, Finch said:

The possibility of Thurmond bolting the GOP to join George Wallace on a third-party ticket in 1972 is "totally out of the question," and Wallace's party is going to "go downhill" as past third-party movements did.

He had decided to leave the Cabinet because at HEW he couldn't find time to "sit down to talk to the President," and "that is where the decisions are made."

The House-passed education appropriations bill, boosted about \$450 million above administration requests, "could" be vetoed by President Nixon or allowed to become law without his signature.

"Obviously there will be some disturbances" on college campuses this fall but "the students have gotten far more sophisticated about this and we are not going to see a repetition of the same kind of thing that went on last fall."

POLICY ON SCHOOLS

Q. Mr. President, are you concerned about Southern reaction to the administration's school desegregation policy, particularly since Senator Thurmond's speech the other day?

A. I am not surprised at the reaction, but I believe that as thoughtful people in the South consider not only what we have done in the past but what we do in the future they will recognize that we finally have in this country what the South has wanted and what the South deserves, a one-nation policy—not a Southern strategy and not a Northern strategy, but a one-nation strategy.

As far as the South is concerned, the statement that Senator Thurmond made partially objected to an action we have not taken and have no intention of taking, and that is of sending vigilante squads, in effect from the Justice Department, lawyers, in to coerce the Southern school districts to integrate. We have not done that; we are not going to do that.

Our approach is one of recognizing this terribly difficult problem of cooperating with the educational leaders and other leaders in the South in bringing them into compliance with the law of the land as it has been interpreted by the Supreme Court. Our policy, in other words, is cooperation rather than coercion.

Now I would say finally that I know that some people in the South would prefer a policy that was perhaps not as even-handed as this, but I believe this is the right policy insofar as carrying out the constitutional mandates are concerned. I think it also is the fair policy. I think in the long run, too, it is in the interest of the South, because when we look at this difficult school problem there cannot be instant integration, but segregation must be ended. That is the law of the land, and it is necessary for us to go forward and to end it with a transition period which will be as least difficult as possible.

That is what we are trying to work out. That is one of the reasons we are trying to, as you know, obtain \$1½ billion out of the budget for this year and next year to cushion that transition period from segregated to non-segregated education.

MITCHELL SEES RIGHTS GAINS

Attorney General John N. Mitchell said yesterday that Southern desegregation problems will be out of the way by 1972.

Mitchell made the remark to newsmen who sought his comment on a speech Friday by Sen. Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) considered one of President Nixon's leading Southern backers—scoring administration policy in the South on the school issue.

Mitchell said he would not comment on the Thurmond speech, but went on to say that the desegregation program in the South

is going on "in cooperation with responsible local people, including school officials."

Asked whether the dispute would hurt Mr. Nixon politically, Mitchell replied "as Attorney General of the United States the political repercussions are beyond my concern."

[From the St. Louis Post-Dispatch]

INTEGRATIONISTS WARY OF U.S. SCHOOL SUITS
(By Roy Reed)

JACKSON, Miss., July 17—The Nixon administration's latest actions on school desegregation in the South have aroused anger on one side and suspicion on the other.

Neither segregationists nor integrationists are pleased by the Department of Justice's law suits against the holdout segregated school districts or by the Internal Revenue Service's announcement that it would evoke the tax-exempt status of segregated private schools. The actions were announced last week in Washington.

The segregationist reaction was expressed by William J. Simmons of Jackson, administrator of the Citizens Councils of America. He condemned the tax ruling as "politics at its wickedest at the expense of school children."

"If the principle of race or religion is to become a factor in tax exemption, then every private school or church is in similar jeopardy," he said.

Black leaders and civil rights workers, who might have been expected to applaud the actions, reacted with a combination of strained optimism and skepticism as to the Government's intentions.

Some Southern black leaders suspect that the Administration plans one last well-publicized assault on school segregation and then will announce this fall that the fight is over and the job finished.

Their suspicions were heightened by a marked difference between what the Administration said in Washington and the way the words were interpreted for the south by Southern Republican spokesmen.

For example, three days before the Justice Department filed its scatterload of lawsuits to end segregation in the last recalcitrant Southern school districts, Clarke Reed, chairman of the Mississippi Republican Party and chairman of the state party executives in the South, called a press conference to warn Mississippians of the suits. He assured them that the suits should not alarm them because they were "strictly administrative in nature."

Besides, he hinted, the lawsuits would take desegregation out of the hands of the unfriendly Department of Health, Education and Welfare and place it in the more sympathetic hands of the Justice Department.

Then, within hours after Randolph Thrower, Revenue Service commissioner, had announced the end of tax exemptions for discriminatory private schools, Reed assured the Florida Republican State Committee in Orlando that Thrower's announcement was not so far-reaching as it sounded.

He noted that Thrower had said the Revenue Service would accept as evidence of non-discrimination "published statements of policy" that the schools did not discriminate.

He said Thrower had taken it on himself to see that the Revenue Service did not go beyond that requirement.

"If Thrower sticks to his word," Reed told the Florida Republicans, "and is sincere in taking action only to offset more extreme court action, no private school in Mississippi—or anywhere else I know of—will be without tax-exempt status for a single day."

Thrower, when asked to clarify his position and to comment on Reed's reassuring statement to the Florida Republicans said: "Our statement of position of July 10 makes it clear that we will continue recognition of the tax-exempt status of a private school, or rule

favorably on an application for tax exemption from a new school, only if that school is shown to have announced publicly a racially nondiscriminatory admissions policy.

"We, of course, expect the institution to adhere in good faith to an announced admissions policy, and through our regular examination procedures, we expect to verify this and withdraw the recognition where the announced policy is not followed."

Meanwhile, both of Reed's statements were publicized across the South. If they reassured segregationists, they put integrationists on guard.

The most common complaint of Southern integrationists now is that the Government is doing nothing to stop such abuses as segregated classrooms within supposedly integrated schools, the transfer of public school equipment and property to private schools, the dismissal and demotion of black teachers and administrators, the closing of black schools, destruction of black students' traditions and continued segregation of buses and cafeterias.

Melvin R. Leventhal, a white attorney here for the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, Inc., said this week that he would have preferred no new lawsuits by the Justice Department. The department no longer polices the integration decisions it wins in court, he said, "and thus in many ways worsens the situation."

"The Government is integrating schools, but it is not eliminating discrimination," he said.

Leventhal's organization, which handles many private school desegregation cases for black clients, recently sifted through reports to the federal courts in Mississippi after 33 school districts were ordered integrated in February.

They found that 14 of 28 districts that reported had significant numbers of totally segregated classrooms within school systems that were, on paper, desegregated.

Leventhal's staff found that 26 per cent of the white students in the 28 districts had left public schools after the integration order. Half a dozen districts lost almost all of their white students.

Civil rights lawyers believe that if the Internal Revenue Service enforces its tax ruling, the private schools could be severely hampered in raising money to build and operate schools.

The ruling would require not only that the discriminatory schools pay Social Security and federal excise taxes, but also that contributors to the schools pay federal income taxes on the money they contribute.

**VIETNAM WAR VETERANS
HONORED**

HON. JOHN O. MARSH, JR.

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. MARSH. Mr. Speaker, this past Fourth of July was observed in many different ways by Americans in communities across our Nation.

I should like to call to your attention and to the attention of my colleagues what one county in my congressional district did during the Fourth of July observances. Under a program which was sponsored by the Culpeper Jaycee Chapter in cooperation with the local post of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Culpeper County and the town of Culpeper paid tribute to its young men who have served in Vietnam by presenting them with certificates of gratitude. To honor those men who gave their lives in

Vietnam, memorium certificates were presented to their families.

I commend both the Jaycees and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, as well as the citizens of Culpeper, and I would like to honor these men by placing their names in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Since there is no official list that specifically sets out those American servicemen who have served in Vietnam, the following names have had to be compiled from several different public sources and, therefore, it may not be complete:

THOSE WHO GAVE THEIR LIVES IN VIETNAM

Floyd B. Coates, Henry Thomas Curtis, William Edward Fincham, Calvin M. Minor, Edward Odell Spencer, Thomas Leake Stanley, Michael Edward Stewart, and John Vrabel.

RETURNING VETERANS FROM SOUTH VIETNAM

Jerry W. Alexander, Marshall W. Baber, George E. Bailey, Jr., James R. Bailey, James H. Banks, George A. Bannar, George R. Beard, Don Allen Berry, Jerry Howard Brown, and Richard C. Burke.

Jesse M. Christensen, Carroll C. Chumley, Jerry Clatterbuck, Carroll T. Coffey, Granville W. Colvin, Alan Bernard Cropp, Jr., Charles Penton Cropp, Otis Clyde Deal, Jr., Terry F. Dillon, and Douglas D. Dodson.

William N. Dodson, Teddy L. Elliott, John R. Franklin, David C. Ganskopp, Homer Lee Garrison, Jr., James E. Gaskins, William E. Gillison, John William Glascoe, Taylor Roberts Griffin, III, and Paul Allen Harry.

Jacob Reason Haight, Robert Lynn Hawkins, William Edgar Huff, George Thomas Hoffman, Richard Lee Hoffman, Velton Lawrence Hunt, Harrison Randolph Hunter, William Edward Jameson, John Kyle Jasper, and Daniel R. Jenkins.

Douglas William Jenkins, Henry Lee Jenkins, George Anthony Johnson, Jack Way Jones, Leroy Jones, Robert Lee Keyser, Joseph Nokely Korte, Robert Frank Lutz, James Herbert McFarland, and Lee Roy McPeak.

James Henry Mack, James Thomas Martin, Robert Alton Martin, Albert William Mills, Gary Douglas Nair, Thomas Alvin O'Halloran, Jr., Floyd Ruben Orange, Charles William Osborne, Henry Apperson Pollard, George Eugene Poulson, Jr., and Russell W. Price.

Arthur Benjamin Puller, George Raymond Puller, George Howard Raub, Frederick Gordon Rixey, Norman Presley Rixey, John Meade Rutherford, Charles Carroll Sanders, Jr., Gary Wayne Sarkozi, Eugene Carl Scroggins, and Charles Ashby Settle.

Alan James Shotwell, Benjamin Franklin Smith, Jr., Isiah Eugene Smoot, James Russell Smoot, Robert F. Stanley, John Alin Stein, Stuart Langdon Strickland, Garrett Matthews Taliaferro, O'Neil Barry Taylor, and Thomas Westley Terrell.

John Charles Thomas, Irving Andrew Walker, Jr., William Henry Washington, Jr., Floyd Edward Weakley, Floyd Edwin Whetzel, Roy Clarence Whitlock, Norborne Randolph Winn, Frank Wayne Wood, Robert Dudley Wood, Wallace Mawger Woodward, and Benny Lester Yowell, Jr.

THE WINES ARE FINE IN NEW YORK STATE

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, with all due respect for my colleagues from the State of California, which I have heard claim credit from time to time as

a wine-producing region, I should like to call attention to a recent article in the Washington Post.

The article, written by Ruth Ellen Church, quite correctly points to New York State's Finger Lakes district as one of the finest wine-making areas in the Nation.

I am both pleased and proud to note that this area is part of my district. As the article states, "business is booming" in New York's grape country, attesting not only to the good taste of the people but to the product as well. I should like to share this vintage information with my colleagues and include the article in the RECORD at this point:

[From the Washington Post, July 23, 1970]

THE FINGER LAKES: NEW YORK'S GRAPE COUNTRY

(By Ruth Ellen Church)

According to the legends of the Iroquois Indians, the 4,000 square miles of New York's Finger Lakes district are an enormous turtle, the lakes being pools between the ridges of the turtle's mammoth shell.

Early white settlers said that the Creator laid His hand in benediction upon this beautiful land, thus shaping the long, finger-like lakes.

In truth, the formation of these lovely valleys, hills, lakes, trees and vineyards has more to do with drumlins and eskers than turtles and benedictions. During the ice age glaciers scooped out deep long valleys that became the lakes—six big ones, and numerous small ones. Canadagua and Keuka Lakes are the important vineyard areas, but Gold Seal Vineyards has just purchased 250 acres along the shores of Seneca Lake, which will be planted next spring, extending the wine-growing district of the Finger Lakes.

Drumlins and eskers? Drumlins are oval-shaped hills left by glacial drift. Eskers, according to my desk dictionary, are winding ridges of sand or gravel "probably deposited by a stream flowing in or under glacial ice." This kind of geographical formation is favorable for grape growing, and the vines don't have to push their roots too deeply to find water. Therefore, long dry spells are not particularly damaging to the vines.

Sturdy American roots are growing more than labrusca and hybrid grapes nowadays. Most New York state wineries now are growing some vinifera vines, grafted on sturdy, pest resistant labrusca roots, and making wines from these, if only to modify and improve the taste of their regular wines. It still is expensive and tedious work to grow the fine wine varieties such as pinot chardonnay, Johannisberg riesling, cabernet sauvignon and pinot noir in the east. Yet, more and more, it is being done.

I have just concluded a 10-day tour of eastern vineyards, and I want to say that anybody who puts down New York State wines these days doesn't know what is happening—it is happening in scattered areas all over the east, but especially in the Finger Lakes region. Fine wines are being made where once it was said to be impossible. Most of the action is in French-American hybrids, the vines that adapt particularly well to the soil and climate of New York state.

Business is booming. All of the wineries have building programs, and none of them can keep up with the need for more space, especially for aging and storing wines. Widmer's Wine Cellars at Naples, N.Y., has a new warehouse that holds 100,000 cases of wine. But it is not enough.

At the Taylor Wine Co., the public relations department complains that every time spacious new quarters are planned for them and for a hospitality center, that space is preempted for warehouse space or a new bottling line. Taylor and the Pleasant Valley

Wine Co. (Great Western) keep building new buildings and quickly outgrowing them.

The almost explosive demand for wines comes largely from young people. The hard liquor industry and even brewers are worried enough to point their advertising toward this new and growing market.

Garry Miller, the young advertising manager of Pleasant Valley, told me that young people like wines first because they are a natural beverage. He also mentioned another reason for wine's favor among the young—a sizable portion of today's youth believes that pot and wine are perfect companions.

I would rather they'd believe that cheese and wine are the most congenial partners. I do think that one big appeal to youth is the same appeal that wine has for all of us; it is ever changing, it has nuances of flavor and character, it is a living thing! And it is all tied up with history and people.

Speaking of people, the crowds that tour wineries every summer (and to some extent the year around) have forced most wineries to plan special programs and often to construct attractive tasting rooms. This is good business.

Finger Lakes wineries now have wine shops for tourists to buy the wines they have seen made and tasted. This development is the result of public demand. People want to be able to put a few bottles in the back of the car after a tasting.

At Taylor and Great Western tourists get to sample hors d'oeuvres with their wines. Taylor offers a mini-tour—movie and a quick look at some of the processes—for those who haven't time to take an extended trip through the winery. At Gold Seal, a tasting of five different wines is offered.

Entire families visit the wineries. Youngsters may drink grape juice when tasting time comes. Great Western's expanded facilities (there are seven tour guides) can take care of 1700 people a day in August, the big month for tours.

The last two weeks in July are commonly vacation time for wineries, but otherwise tour groups are welcomed at most Finger Lakes establishments between 9 and 4 o'clock, except on Sundays. It is illegal in New York to serve or sell wines on Sunday before 1 p.m., so Sunday tours are not scheduled.

Because of the difficulty of obtaining root stock needed, Greyton Taylor, chief of Pleasant Valley Wine Co. and a director of the corporation that owns both Taylor and Pleasant Valley (Great Western), and Walter Taylor, his son, are growing their own nursery stock. Certain varieties of vines will get a head start in the spring by being planted at Hilton Head, N.C., where the Greyton Taylors live in the winter and own property. From there the vines will be transplanted to the shores of Lake Keuka, where the Taylors have purchased more acreage. The new property is adjacent to the famous vineyards of Dr. Konstantin Frank, who has been successfully growing vinifera vines and making remarkable wines from them for a number of years. The Taylors also will go into vinifera plantings.

The Taylors, father and son, are estate bottling red and white wines at Bully Hill Vineyards, where Walter Taylor's great-grandfather's home still stands.

FOR SOUTHFIELD VILLAGE, A SECOND CHANCE

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, the following is an article taken from the July-August edition of IBM's Think maga-

zine. It is the story of a business professional who was concerned with the social problems facing Southfield Village, a black community in Stamford. Dr. Goldmark not only spoke of his concern, but physically rolled up his sleeves to see that a second chance was given to the people in this ghetto:

FOR SOUTHFIELD VILLAGE, A SECOND CHANCE

When it was built, Connecticut's Southfield Village was an asset to Stamford—a cluster of pleasant apartment buildings, complete with open balconies. Three years later, Southfield was a festering slum—and remained so until one businessman galvanized into action a community that cared, with dramatic results.

Two years ago Peter Goldmark, president of CBS Laboratories, attended an unforgettable meeting. It was a community gripe session—the first of its kind—of the poorest of the poor living in Stamford, Connecticut, a patch of suburbia 40 miles north of Manhattan.

One by one, the poor—mostly blacks—stood and told Goldmark, and members of the Urban Coalition, what life was like in their ghetto. It was an ugly portrait they painted, and it shocked many of the middle class whites there. But none was as deeply affected as Peter Goldmark. He came away determined to do something important about poverty.

Fifteen years before, leading Stamford citizens had caravaned to Southfield Village in the city's southern sector to celebrate the cornerstone-laying for a quartet of 8-story low-income apartment buildings. The mayor and his aides felt good about the project, and why not? The bill, more than \$1,000,000, was to be paid by the Federal Government. The poor, especially the numerous blacks and Puerto Ricans filtering into the city, would finally have a decent place to live. In fact, the architect proudly proclaimed that these were to be the first multistory dwellings in New England with open balconies running the entire length of the building.

A year later the buildings were ready for occupancy, and three years later, in keeping with the dismal federal housing pictures throughout urban America, the "decent place to live" had festered into a snakepit of crime, deterioration and hopelessness. Rats and vermin infested the apartments; muggings were a frequent occurrence in the streets; filth littered the hallways and sidewalks, and the stench and noise often grew to intolerable proportions. Except for contributing the screaming siren of an ambulance or an occasional police car, the city of Stamford and its services to public housing seemed invisible to the 2,000 inhabitants. Plumbing was seldom fixed; removal of snow was not heard of; and according to residents, a street cleaner had not been seen in years. After all, many a tenant complained bitterly, the ghetto was far removed from the city's major interest, which lay in the affluent taxpaying citizenry along the edge of the Sound or north of the Merritt Parkway. As for the Washington solons, who keep an eye on what their money hath wrought, the Village was another tired statistic in a long list of the nation's deteriorating housing projects.

For over a decade this situation hardly changed—despite investigations, charitable intervention and ugly publicity. And then a year and a half ago the unexpected happened—a metamorphosis occurred in the life of Southfield Village that has had a number of people from Hartford to Washington taking notice. On the physical front, the unsightly rubble and beer cans began to disappear from the streets; the hulks of stripped and abandoned cars in the parking lot behind the high-risers gave way to playground equipment and basketball hoops; numerous buildings wore fresh coats of paint, window screens really screened out bugs, and sym-

bolically the old seldom-used garbage cans in the yards were cleaned up, painted yellow, and converted into containers for basketballs. More importantly, the crime rate suddenly dipped, and many Villagers started to greet one another in the streets and in the basement laundry rooms with a new feeling of community pride. Last year, Washington ordered a committee of experts to investigate what some journalists call the "second-chance miracle" of Southfield, and an official of George Romney's Housing and Urban Development department suggests that the Southfield experience might make a model of what can be accomplished through internal dynamics in other depressed areas of the country.

What makes this transformation of one ghetto area in one part of New York's suburbia uniquely exciting today is that it was accomplished at little cost not by an expensive delegation from a do-good country or by great federal funding (in fact, these approaches have failed when tried) but by the inspiration of a single businessman. In the electronic phase of his colorful career the 63-year-old electronics expert Goldmark is noted for having devised such cultural blessings as the long-playing record, the first practical color TV, and home electronic video recording. Less well known are his personal efforts to bring technology and the rigorous thinking of science to bear directly on the needs and problems of the people.

"In the case of Southfield Village," Goldmark says thoughtfully, "it was a mix of systems engineering, good business practice, the right communications with the people and, of course, the efforts of individual tenants who wanted to pitch in and help."

Goldmark admits that it wasn't easy to put this mixture together. He had to battle private and public apathy, mismanagement and misdirection. Fellow businessmen offered lip service—"of course," they insisted, "we want to fight poverty"—but they failed to come through with help at critical moments. City officialdom often threw up its collective hands at the complexity of the problem of the black poor. Even the tenants were hostile at first—they didn't believe a white businessman from the Establishment on the other side of the thruway would do anything meaningful and long-lasting for them. And the more philosophic objectors pointed out that the culture or subculture of poverty was so encrusted in community life no technique or dedication could root it out.

The story of how Goldmark overcame these obstacles and put together his mix began in 1967 at the time when government and business set up the Urban Coalition because they were shocked and fearful at what the explosive race riots had done in Watts, Harlem and in other urban areas. As a prominent community figure, Goldmark was invited to join the Stamford arm of the Coalition.

Goldmark had already joined the antipoverty fight by serving as chairman of the board of CTE—the Committee for Training and Employment of the Office of Economic Opportunity—and he had helped develop programs for training the hard-core unemployed and for finding them jobs. He wasn't sure what else was expected of him, but one thing he knew—if he was to become more deeply involved, he had to see what it was all about firsthand. An energetic Hungarian, used to quick action, he got hold of a Negro policeman named Henry Crawford, who was a fellow member of CTE, and asked him to show him around the poor sections of Stamford.

"That Saturday afternoon I couldn't believe my eyes," Goldmark recalls. "Here I was in the second wealthiest county in the United States and I saw for the first time that many of our black citizens were living in a virtual hell—crowded together in small apartments, wallowing in filth and despair. I was appalled."

Goldmark buttonholed people standing on street corners, loitering in doorways, and playing pool in dark poolrooms. He talked to adults and youth, to men and women. He poked everywhere. The sight that really stirred him into activity was the community recreation center. "It was called Sunrise Center," he remembers, "but there was little sun in it. No equipment, no means for organized play. The two floors in the dilapidated building where the youngsters played were actually in danger of collapsing. I almost fell through a hole in the floor."

But Goldmark saw some good things, too. He discovered that one teenager was supplying sodas for the small fry out of the pennies he was earning as a delivery boy. He taught the smaller boys how to play billiards on an old makeshift table with wobbly legs. "If this kind of spirit could exist in such surroundings," Goldmark said, "I had to do something to fan it and keep it alive."

What Goldmark did was to phone business friends about the center. From one he teased a new table; another contributed chairs; still another gave some money toward purchase of sporting equipment. CBS Laboratories contributed a PA system. "In no time at all, we had a kitty of \$2,400. It was amazing how much could be done with so little money and so little involvement. I compared it with the way the Federal Government was dropping billions through a bottomless pit and realized that what was wrong with Washington was that they did not have the proper approach to the real needs of the poor people."

For Goldmark this was the beginning of a new dimension in his life. But his chance to do something of wider scope—beyond saving a recreation center—didn't arise until a later meeting with the Urban Coalition when the members were perplexed as to what direction to pursue. Perhaps, one member said finally, the missing ingredient needed to spark a program was the residents themselves. Why not hold a giant community gripe session and invite all the poor people of Stamford to tell it as it really is?

Everyone agreed. That was why, on April 25, 1968, several hundred people showed up at CTE headquarters on Main Street. From the dais the members of the Urban Coalition made their statements. Chairman Bruno Giordano, so proud of those washing machines, we almost had a christening party for them," a tenant recalls.

Youngsters earn from \$1.25 to \$2.00 an hour, depending on age. When they're not learning a trade, they're improving their education in such subjects as elementary math and reading. Three nuns, themselves graduate teachers and guidance counselors, have come from Notre Dame congregation in nearby Ridgfield to live in the Village and spend full time tutoring anyone who wants special education. The nuns have been at it over a year now, and report that some 250 youngsters and 25 adults, mostly women, have attended classes. "Our first pupil," says Sister Geraldine Hacker, "was a 60-year-old woman who wanted to learn geometry. What she'll do with it she doesn't know, but she feels it's important."

On occasion, Goldmark has had to exercise ingenuity when it comes to obtaining even elementary services for Southfield. "One job I thought was important was to blacktop the playground areas, which looked like a dustbowl. It was the city's responsibility to do it, but I got no action from the officials. So when the United Fund came around for their usual contribution, I said I would withhold \$6,000, the cost of the blacktop, from the total donation unless the city did something about the playground."

The United Fund representative argued that the Fund had no control over the city. The Mayor himself phoned and promised to take care of the blacktop. One day, several

weeks later, Len Rivers telephoned Goldmark in great excitement.

Another tenant—Ray Monaco—adds that Southfield is teaching some youngsters the value of a dollar, but that a lot remains to be done. "You have to get to the parents," he says, "to see they have better income."

Everyone instinctively knows that the Southfield renaissance has only scratched the surface of the problem of the poor. "Poverty is still a way of life here," says Len Rivers. "People feel trapped. Even if they come up in the world financially, there is no place for Negroes to go. There is just no housing. They have to pay higher rent to the Housing Authority whenever they make more money—rent is pegged at 25 percent of income—so many of them feel like they're in a prison with no hope of parole."

The biggest obstacle to progress is still the structure of American society, which limits opportunity for blacks, even for skilled blacks. As one youngster put it in one of the basement classes: "It's fun to study this plumbing. But, man, what do you do with it when you finish the course?" Goldmark, anticipating this question, has made promising strides with the unions of Stamford, one of which—the Carpenters Union—has set a precedent in absorbing blacks into the trade.

Goldmark too has deeper visions for the future of the black community than merely making poverty more tolerable. He is fundamentally opposed to low cost housing as now handled—"it becomes a slum," he says—and he has taken a firm position against the so-called urban renewal projects, a form of residential genocide, he believes, which demolishes homes without providing suitable interim housing for the displaced tenants. "Rehabilitation is more important," Goldmark says. "I remember seeing a Swiss village near Lucerne. It, too, was impoverished, but the residents lived there in cleanliness and dignity. Of course," he adds, "the people there do have opportunity, and that is what we have to provide here in carving out a new community. Bring in private enterprise for the blacks. Give them more opportunity to build their own town."

"And hopefully start with the kids, so the gains can be transmitted to the next generation. Businessmen and other civic leaders could do this in every community where it is needed. Transfer the hope. That, I think, is the best way to break the chain of hopelessness that created Southfield and every public housing ghetto in America."

EXCESS WAR PROFITS TAXES FOR HOUSING

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing an excess war profits tax bill. I do so in the belief that the extreme burdens of the war in Indochina should be borne by the corporations of America as well as the youth of America. Further, I believe that such a tax would help curb inflation without increasing unemployment and would thereby stabilize our economy without placing an undue burden on the poor.

The proceeds from such a tax should not be permitted to be used simply for increased military expenditures. My bill prevents this contingency by earmarking all extra revenues received for housing—our most critical domestic need. In this regard, my bill draws upon a measure

drafted by faculty and students of the Tax Department of New York University Law School, who deserve particular credit for their work.

The aim of this bill is to impose an additional levy on corporate profits that result directly from the effects of the Indochinese war on the American economy. The proposed bill imposes on all corporations a tax of 37 percent on the amount of their taxable income which exceeds their normal nonwartime taxable income. This 37 percent tax will be added to the normal 48 percent corporate tax rate.

There is precedent for enacting this legislation, both in declared and undeclared wars. In both World Wars, excess profits taxes were enacted to make possible a more complete mobilization of the Nation's productive capacity. In 1950, Congress passed an equally strong excess profits tax within 6 months of the beginning of hostilities in Korea. The same step should have been taken long ago in the Vietnam war.

My bill differs from excess profits measures passed by previous Congresses or introduced in this Congress in two main respects: First, the emergency period—the period during which the tax would be in effect—is defined to begin on January 1, 1970, and to continue so long as the American troop commitment in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia totals 50,000 or more, including offshore naval operations. A second novel feature of the bill is the earmarking of all moneys collected from the imposition of the excess war profits tax for housing, a critical domestic need which has long suffered from a lack of adequate funding. This represents a step in the direction of a more rational ordering of national priorities.

BOSTON UNIVERSITY LAW REVIEW
REVIEWS KENT STATE AND CAMBODIAN ISSUES

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, as one who has consistently urged and endeavored to stimulate responsible and creative public dialog on the Indochina question, I have been greatly encouraged by the conscientious efforts, such as that undertaken by the Boston University Law Review, to contribute to meaningful public discussion.

Their statement announcing the publication of a special supplementary issue, including the works of a number of noted legal scholars, which is devoted wholly to the various legal issues which have arisen in response to the U.S. involvement in Cambodia and the tragedy that occurred recently at Kent State University, portends an outstanding document. In terms of the contribution it can make in bringing rational thought and scholarly analysis to bear on these issues, it will, I am sure, bear careful reading.

I include the statement here for the

attention of my colleagues, and look forward to its publication:

JULY 29, 1970.

In response to American entrance into Cambodia and the recent incident at Kent State, the Boston University Law Review has undertaken the publication of a special supplementary issue devoted to some of the legal issues arising from these events. We are publishing articles by legal scholars as well as a number of student works. Included in the volume are articles by the following authors: Professor Henry Monaghan of Boston University School of Law, Professor William Barnes of the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy at Tufts University, Professor Joseph Goldstein of the Yale Law School, Mr. John Bender of New York University Center for International Studies, Professor Banks McDowell of Boston University School of Law, Mr. Albert Brien formerly of the Rhode Island National Guard, and Mr. Fred P. Graham of The New York Times.

It is the hope of all connected with this project that hard, scholarly analysis will surface above the emotional harangues, and that this volume will make a meaningful contribution toward that end.

BARTLEY F. FISHER,

Editor in Chief, Boston University Law Review.

CHANGE IN OUTLOOK TOWARD
CRIME CONTROL

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, when the second session of the 91st Congress finally adjourns, there is no question in my mind that passage of the District of Columbia crime bill will be adjudged one of its most creditable achievements. Even more important than the changes it will bring in dealing with the criminal, is the change in outlook toward control of crime. I would hope that the passage of this bill indicates the beginning of the end of the old era of permissiveness which characterized the previous administration, and which led America into the worst crime wave in its history.

The symbol of this permissiveness was, of course, the previous U.S. Attorney General Ramsey Clark who continues to demonstrate on television that he has learned nothing since he left office. The subject is dealt with fairly and honestly in an editorial in the current issue of the Republican Congressional Committee's weekly Newsletter, which I submit for publication in the RECORD:

RAMSEY GO HOME?

Ramsey Clark, former U.S. Attorney General, has the true "Texas look" about him. He is tall, lean and rangy. Also, his drawl is authentic Texan.

If one went by how he said something—rather than the import of his words—it would not be difficult to visualize him as a tough marshal of the Frontier West—spurring Old Faithful to full gallop and unlimbering the trusty Winchester while chasing the bad guys into the sunset.

Such an image would be sadly inaccurate. To his credit, Clark is passionately dedicated to civil rights. Also to his credit is the good work he has done toward racial peace through the Urban League. We wish he could have exhibited similar zeal toward plain, common-sense enforcement of Federal law, to the benefit of all races.

Crime soared throughout the Nation during his tenure as Attorney General. Ramsey Clark certainly did not cause the crime wave. But his approach toward coping with it was so negative and inconsistent that we wonder how much the rate might have been abated by a tougher stance on his part.

Amazingly, now in July, 1970, he appears again on TV news shows, selling the same old line: The D.C. crime bill that is finally clearing Congress—a bill aimed mostly at repeat offenders and loaded with safeguards for them—will increase crime rather than reduce it, in his opinion.

As Attorney General, Clark particularly disliked wiretapping. His strong views against it were unusual in that his predecessor, Robert F. Kennedy, used it extensively. And the spelled-out, strictly circumscribed authority Congress provided in the big crime act of 1968, over his objections, went unused.

Asked on "Meet the Press" earlier this year to explain his refusal to use wiretaps, Clark replied: "Because crime can't be controlled by wiretapping. It undermines the confidence of the people in their Government. It demeans human dignity in the long run. It escalates the levels of violence in America. . . ."

Purer poppycock than that statement would be difficult to imagine.

In the first place, the syndicate gamblers and narcotics peddlers who rely on the telephone are not violence-prone where violence can be avoided. What they like is to have things nice and quiet. In the second place, a virtual guarantee of clear, unmonitored communication is generally regarded as a major contributor to the expansion of organized crime in recent years.

Thankfully, that attitude was cleared out of the Justice Department in January, 1969.

Ramsey Clark also has pooh-poohed the importance of the Attorney General's office in the war against crime. Crime, he emphasizes, is essentially a local problem, to be solved by local resources.

Crime is, indeed, a local problem. Where his reasoning falls apart is in his indicated belief that it is only a local problem. If it were merely local, and not national, why did Congress find it necessary, even before he left office, to subsidize State and local law enforcement to the tune of hundreds of millions of dollars? Why does Pennsylvania Avenue have a gaping block-square excavation where enlarged facilities for the FBI will soon rise? When crime is both national and rampant, it must be met by power and resources such as only the Federal Government can command.

Although it is tempting to suggest, "Ramsey go home," on second thought, should we?

Clark was and is a Democrat—one who held a major Cabinet office. And he was, and remains to a large extent, the symbol of the era of permissiveness that characterized law enforcement in this Nation before the Nixon Administration came to power.

Ramsey go home? No! He should stay in Washington and keep talking. He could be the GOP's secret weapon of 1970 and '72.

BRYAN H. JACQUES

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, the able staff director of the House Select Committee on Small Business, Bryan H. Jacques, has retired after many years of dedicated and outstanding public service.

I can personally attest to the fine work Bryan has done. Sitting in the ranking

minority spot on the committee, I have witnessed Bryan in action. I think his record is something that all of us on the committee, and in this body, can look upon with pride.

Bryan graduated from the University of Kansas and the University of Chicago School of Law. He served as counsel with the Federal Trade Commission and when appointed staff director of the Small Business Committee was serving as Director of the Bureau of Industry Guidance at the FTC.

Bryan's service to the Nation's 5 million businessmen will not be forgotten. The spirit with which he tackled his job on the committee will be remembered by all of us.

Mr. Speaker, I think we all owe a debt of gratitude to this outstanding public servant—Bryan H. Jacques.

SGT. GARY LEE SCHNEIDER

HON. M. G. (GENE) SNYDER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. SNYDER. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, July 14, Sgt. Gary Lee Schneider, 20, was killed in action in Vietnam.

There is very little a man can say to a family that has given its son in a war. I rise here today to pay tribute to Gary Schneider. I rise on behalf of the American people for whom Gary made the highest sacrifice.

He gave his life upholding his patriotic beliefs and it must be our hope and prayer that Gary Lee Schneider died so that others could live—and remain free. I know I speak for the people of the Fourth District of Kentucky—and for all Americans—when I convey my deep sense of loss and sympathy to the Schneider family.

The front-page story reporting the loss of Sergeant Schneider, which appeared in the Kentucky Post follows:

[From the Kentucky Post, July 21, 1970]

KILLED IN PATROL ACTION IN VIETNAM

(By Donna McKeown)

Army Sgt. Gary Lee Schneider, 20, a handsome Newport Catholic High School graduate, was killed in action July 14 in Vietnam.

The Defense Department notified his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Edward Schneider, 432 W. 10th street, Newport, he died under hostile fire during night patrol action.

No further information was available, said his mother.

Sgt. Schneider is the 145th northern Kentucky son to lose his life in the Indochina War; 30th from Campbell County.

Mrs. Schneider said her son "never complained."

"He always wrote nice letters.

"He was contented as anyone could be over there," she said.

Sgt. Schneider graduated from NCHS in 1967 and entered the Army in April, 1969.

In Vietnam since last September, he was due home September of this year.

In addition to his parents, Sgt. Schneider is survived by three brothers, Edward Jr., who has just returned from Army service in Germany; David and Kenneth, and a sister, Robin, all at home.

Radel Funeral Home, Newport, is in charge of arrangements.

THE CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD
AND AIR FARES

HON. JOHN E. MOSS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. MOSS. Mr. Speaker, on July 29, 1970, 31 of my colleagues and I filed in the U.S. Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit a response to a motion by the Civil Aeronautics Board asking the court to issue a partial stay of its mandate in a case which we have brought against the Board.

Our response follows:

[In the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia Circuit, No. 23,627]

JOHN E. MOSS, GLENN M. ANDERSON, THOMAS L. ASHLEY, WALTER S. BARING, GEORGE E. BROWN, JR., PHILLIP BURTON, DANIEL E. BUTTON, JEFFERY COHELAN, JAMES C. CORMAN, JOHN D. DINGELL, DON EDWARDS, RICHARD T. HANNA, AUGUSTUS F. HAWKINS, CHET HOLIFIELD, HAROLD T. JOHNSON, ROBERT L. LEGGETT, JOSEPH McDADE, JOHN McFALL, SPARK M. MATSUNAGA, GEORGE P. MILLER, JOSEPH G. MINISH, PATSY T. MINK, JERRY L. PETTIS, THOMAS M. REES, PETER W. RODINO, JR., EDWARD R. ROYBAL, BERNIE SISK, CHARLES M. TEAGUE, JOHN TUNNEY, LIONEL VAN DEERLIN, JEROME R. WALDIE, CHARLES H. WILSON, PETITIONERS, v. CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD, RESPONDENT

RESPONSE OF PETITIONS TO MOTION FOR
PARTIAL STAY OF MANDATE

Petitioners object to the partial stay of mandate requested by the Civil Aeronautics Board. However, if such a stay is granted, it should be conditioned upon appropriate measures designed for the protection of the traveling public. Today's CAB order, No. 70-7-128, appears adequately to protect the interests of carriers. Yet, if the decision of this Court in the present case means anything at all, it means that the time has come to pay some heed to the interests of fare-payers.

I

The fares now in effect are unlawful for several different reasons:

First, as the Board admits, they are based on the Board's illegal order of September 12 and therefore unlawful under the decision of this Court.

Second, they are excessive, unjust, and unreasonable for all of the reasons stated by petitioners in previous submissions to the Board and this Court. There is still not a scintilla of evidence that they meet the substantive standards of sections 1002(e) and 102 of the Federal Aviation Act.

Third, as petitioners made clear in a filing with the Board on July 28, 1970, (which filing is attached to this response), the Board's decision of June 19, 1970, to permit a "rounding up" of fares—which decision resulted in the specific tariffs now on file—was illegal for the same reasons stated in the decision of this Court with respect to the Board's order of September 12, 1969. Indeed, the Board's decision of June 19 was even more objectionable, because the Board acted on the basis of private communications from the carriers, never issued an order but only a press release, and admittedly gave the public no opportunity to lodge objections.

It is thus a highly tainted group of fares that the Board now proposes to maintain in effect for a further 90 days pursuant to an order of this Court.

II

Petitioners are doubtful that under present circumstances there can be carrier-made rates which meet the requirements of the Federal Aviation Act. The Board's attempt to cure its prior illegal ratemaking activities by simply declaring that the carriers are now "free" to file tariffs does not deal with the realities of the situation.

In the first place, the effect of the procedure ordered by the Board is to preserve the existing tainted fares for an additional 90 days. It is extremely unclear why the status quo which the Court has already declared to be unlawful should be maintained for that period. Secondly, the influence of the Board's detailed September 12 order is so pervasive as to raise serious questions about the notion that the carriers are "free" to make rates.

Petitioners do not believe that the Court should force the representatives of the public or the carriers to play the Board's game of charade. We believe that the Court should issue its mandate along with an order to the Board to determine rates according to the substantive criteria of sections 1002(e) and 102 of the Federal Aviation Act.

The Court's opinion gave the Board ample notice that it is prepared to interpret the Act flexibly to allow the most summary type of hearing on an emergency basis to allow the Board to act legally under section 1002(d).¹ We think it is high time that the Board act as the responsible regulator of the airline industry which the statute requires it to be.

III

In the event that the Court determines to stay its mandate, petitioners request that the Court condition such stay upon appropriate measures to protect the traveling public during the interim between the date on which the Court's mandate was to issue (July 30, 1970) and the date on which lawful fares are re-established. Petitioners believe that such conditions are imperative to mitigate the unfairness of calling upon the public to pay the present unlawful fares for any further length of time.

Petitioners would suggest that the following conditions may be appropriate:

1. The Board should conduct proceedings to determine the amount by which the present unlawful fares exceed lawful fares. It may well be that this amount is equal to the 6.35 per cent fare increase granted on September 12, plus the additional fare increase attributable to "rounding up" each fare to the nearest full dollar.

2. An equitable means should be determined during those proceedings for refunding the unlawful overcharge to members of the public. The carriers should be ordered either to collect sufficient information from passengers to permit eventual refunding or to post appropriate notices in sales offices and ticket counters informing members of the public that the fares they are paying are of disputed lawfulness and that ticket stubs should be retained for the purpose of securing refunds. Alternatively, a fund or reserve should be established for the purpose of being subsequently applied against future rate determinations.²

¹ In a filing with the Board on July 24, 1970, (attached to this response), petitioners suggested that the Board itself should determine lawful fares for the future and that pending such a rate determination the fares prevailing prior to October 1, 1969—which had never been challenged and therefore may be presumed to establish a lawful structure—could be instituted after the most summary 1002(d) proceedings.

² Compare *Bebchick v. Public Utilities Comm'n*, 115 App. D.C. 216, 232-33, 318 F.2d 187, 203-04 (en banc), cert. denied, 373 U.S. 913 (1963). The legal authorities for such

Respectfully submitted,
 STANFORD G. ROSS,
 RONALD B. LEWIS,
Of Counsel.
 H. DAVID ROSENBLUM,
 CAPLIN & DRYSDALE,
Attorneys for Petitioners.

July 29, 1970.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that I have this day served the foregoing Response of Petitioners to Motion for Partial Stay of Mandate by causing a copy thereof to be mailed, first class postage prepaid, to the following persons:

Honorable Richard W. McLaren, Assistant Attorney General, and Howard E. Shapiro, Esq., Attorney, United States Department of Justice, Washington, D.C., and

Warren L. Sharfman, Esq., Associate General Counsel, Civil Aeronautics Board, 1825 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20428.

I have also served copies of the foregoing document by causing copies thereof to be mailed, first class postage prepaid, to counsel for: Continental Air Lines, Inc.; American Airlines, Inc.; Eastern Air Lines, Inc.; Trans World Airlines, Inc.; North Central Airlines, Inc.; Mohawk Airlines, Inc.; Braniff Airways, Inc.; and Northwest Airlines, Inc.

H. DAVID ROSENBLUM,
Attorney for Petitioners.

July 29, 1970.

SHAW PREPARATORY SCHOOL

HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. PHILBIN, Mr. Speaker, I was honored to participate in and deliver the principal address at the impressive graduation exercises conducted by the Shaw Preparatory School of Boston, Mass., at the Sheraton Plaza Hotel on June 13, 1970.

The affair was well attended by the families and friends of the young graduates, and it was a great pleasure for me to have the chance to talk, not only with these boys and girls, but also with the

interim action have already been presented to this Court in the present case, particularly in the papers filed in the response to the Court's order of January 9, 1970.

As the Board notes in today's order, No. 70-7-128, petitioners have filed with the Board a request that the Board institute a hearing to determine the amount of the overcharge during the period beginning October 1, 1969, and to decide on the relief to be afforded the public. (See petitioners' filing of July 24 with the Board.) Since this question is before the Board, we are asking the Court only, by way of condition to a stay of its mandate, to accord similar relief for the period beginning with July 30, 1970. We note that statements appearing on the first page of the Board's order appear to prejudice the question of whether such relief is appropriate for the period beginning October 1, 1969. Petitioners recognize, however, that that question is still before the Board and that they retain the opportunity, upon issuance of a final Board decision on this point, to seek from this Court a ruling as to whether such a decision would be in accordance with its mandate.

outstanding Shaw faculty and some of the families attending the exercises.

I was particularly impressed, Mr. Speaker, that the graduates of Shaw Preparatory School represent every economic level in our society and come from local and distant communities.

The school is fulfilling a most important educational role in these times of student unrest in that it is primarily geared to meet the educational needs of young men and women whose secondary education has been interrupted for one reason or another, or who are in need of specialized individual help in meeting the college entrance requirements.

I include in the RECORD the text of my address at the graduation exercises:

ADDRESS OF HON. PHILIP J. PHILBIN

Distinguished guests, members of the Faculty, Mr. Avery, members of the Graduating Class, Parents and Friends:

This is a memorable day of fulfillment, of vital tasks successfully finished, a day mingled with the joys of achievement and the sorrow of parting and I am greatly honored to be with you.

First, let me congratulate each and every one of you upon your graduation.

It marks a long important step in your personal advancement—an accomplishment of which you can justly be proud.

If you had not worked sincerely and intelligently you would not have been able to reach the cherished goal which we so joyously celebrate in these impressive exercises and which bring to this happy ending your preparatory school careers.

But actually it is just the beginning.

The wide world opens before you.

Boundless opportunities of a promising, successful future await the impact of your aspiration, energy, ability and courage.

You are the beneficiaries of a noble transition, blessed by Providence with the favored destiny of being raised and educated in this great, free country of ours—the most powerful, the freest, the richest, the most advanced, most prosperous, and most successful democracy the sun has ever shone upon.

You have been fortunate enough to live in an atmosphere of tolerance, where men and women are judged for what they are, what they achieve, what they strive for, and not for the circumstances of their birth, their religion or their national origin.

Time forbids that I should recite in full the merits, the virtues, and the brilliant achievements of this noted school and its dedicated teachers.

The vital thing to recall today is the wonderful atmosphere of freedom, opportunity, tolerance, pride in accomplishment, incentive and inspiration which has been engendered here, and in which you have been so fortunate to work under the guidance and direction of these gifted, educational leaders and advisers.

Let me repeat:

You have been fortunate in the extreme in having this fine school and its teachers, and I know that as you meet with them officially for the last time your hearts are filled with regret of parting but with deepest gratitude for what they have done for you. You will miss them and your class-mates. Future years, let me assure you will serve to bring into clearer focus as an inspiring force in your lives the many advantages and benefits you have enjoyed under the leadership of your teachers, and which will inspire you throughout your lives.

There is another group today to whom you owe an indefinable debt for your present

success, and that is your loving parents. As a parent myself, I know full well the immeasurable quality of the love, devotion and loyal support they have given you so gladly, so proudly, so eagerly, seeking no reward or commendation save your continued goodness of character, renewed devotion to duty, and future contributions on your part in the form of constructive interest by the graduates in behalf of your families, communities, the nation, and compassionate regard, concern and assistance for those in our society, who may need your help in so many different ways.

Parents do not expect miracles, but they like to think that in whatever you undertake, you will give your best, recognize your responsibilities to yourselves, your families, to the people as a whole, and to the country, which has given you the freedoms and the opportunity to advance yourselves to an extent not possible in any other country.

They ask only that you strive as good, industrious, self-respecting Americans contributing in every way you can to the building of good citizenship, wholesome family life, loyal friendships and the building of a better, modernized, up-to-date, and socially, economically and spiritually just and righteous nation that will be adapted and functionalized to serve, pray God, the jet-space-nuclear age of peace, prosperity and social justice, into which we are already entered.

For parents today there is very special pride in you and happiness for your success.

After all—parents are long-suffering. Parents know the joys and sorrows of life—the trials, adversities and problems, because they have come your way some time ago.

They have experienced the obstacles, the pit-falls, the difficulties you will have to face, indeed you may have already experienced some of them.

If parents were to close their eyes today, they would see the bright, flower-decked fields of other years. They would see before them the smiling faces of dear loved ones, no longer here, who made their own progress possible. They would perhaps feel again the affectionate touch of their hand upon their shoulder, the wise words of counsel, advice and encouragement in their own golden days.

But this is the world of the present. It will not wait. It will move on. Opportunity is beckoning you, each and every one. It knocks on your door. It may knock often, or it may knock only once. It is up to you to remember your fine heritage, to treasure your own high ideals, and let nothing swerve you from them.

The generation gap is somewhat of an illusion. A generation moves faster than you think. Today is yours. Make the most of it. Do not let it pass you by.

You have recorded a significant accomplishment in preparatory school work. By training and character, you are well equipped for future advancement. If you have the will, ambition and determination you will go on to finer achievements, and that is what I proudly wish for every one of you.

Be interested in the civic and political affairs of community, state and nation. Do your part to make the community and country a better place for all our citizens with peace and real happiness.

Remember this—that Democracy and freedom can be destroyed by the indifference and non-participation of the ordinary citizen, and the unbridled activities of minority pressure groups seeking to take over, and to recast this nation into a monolithic, totalitarian, police state that would convert citizens into subjects and slaves, and steal away their liberties.

The nation and the world are faced by many grave problems. Peace in our time is

the greatest, and there are others of major priority to serve and help the people. All these challenging problems, the outcome of which could well determine the destiny of free men and women here and everywhere, cannot be solved in their entirety without your active, dedicated help.

You and those who work with you are the brightest and most promising generation this nation has ever known. You will have to solve these great problems as they come before the country in your day and that is near at hand, in fact, it is tomorrow.

I will not elaborate the acute problems we face, but who does not see the hand of subversion in the events transpiring in this country must be uninformed, living in a world of his own, or sympathetic with those who are pledged to cripple, destroy and take over this government.

Ours is the duty in these perilous days to lead the national effort to insure and promote stability, self-respect, sense of identification of those, young and old, who are alienated and frustrated by things in our society. The overwhelming majority in this country, who believe in the free principles of the Constitution and the country, are determined to protect and preserve this nation at all costs.

Everyone must come to understand that the democratic process, under the rule of law, not force and violence, is the way by which necessary changes in the government and the economy can and will be made under our system of government.

Some people are sadly deluding themselves if they think they can start a revolution by violence in this country, or intimidate the American people and their elected representatives.

Lawful dissent and full individual rights are recognized by law in this country.

But the only lawful revolution recognized by our Constitution and laws is the revolution of the ballot. The overthrow of this government by force and violence, or advocating such overthrow, is against the law of this country, and will never be tolerated by the people.

I have unbounded confidence in this country, the flexibility of our government, pursuant to the popular will, to make any and all necessary changes in our system.

I also have great confidence in the future greatness, growth, progress, prosperity and well-being of the nation and the American people in this generation, and in countless others to follow.

This is in truth the greatest country ever conceived and developed in this world. Like all governments from time to time, it must be adapted to modern conditions.

I repeat:

This government can and will be adapted by the will of the people to meet every need. No one can ever destroy this country by force and violence, so long as we remain strong, the people remain concerned, loyal, and intent upon protecting and preserving it as they are bound to do, and will do.

Let all of us regardless of race, class or creed unite to solve all our problems, and to bring understanding, social justice, full civil rights, and enduring peace and the rule of law for this country and the world and withdrawal from Vietnam at the earliest possible time.

And now let me thank you for the high privilege of being with you on your great day, and let you in on a little, advance information from Washington.

Next week in the House, it will be my great pleasure to vote for the bill granting the vote to 18 years olds. You deserve it.

Good luck and God love you. And let me warmly thank your great Mr. Avery, your gifted leader for his kindness in inviting me to this truly memorable graduation.

THE CONSUMER AND THE TRADE BILL

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, the Ways and Means Committee is currently considering far-reaching amendments to the laws governing America's trade policies.

I have objected strongly to the anticonsumer turn which this legislation has taken in the Ways and Means Committee, of which I am a member.

Because of the importance of this legislation, the implications it has for American consumers, our relations with our trading partners, and the health of the world economy, I would like to include in the RECORD at this point the comments which Mrs. Virginia H. Knauer, Special Assistant to the President for Consumer Affairs, made July 28. Her statement summarizes some of the major deficiencies in the legislation as it presently stands.

The statement follows:

STATEMENT OF MRS. VIRGINIA KNAUER

I am alarmed over the disregard of the American consumer evidenced by the restrictive trade bill presently before the House Ways and Means Committee. The President has registered strong objections to the measure, and I would hope his reservations will be taken into consideration by the Committee.

In many ways, this bill is the most significant "anti-consumer" legislation now in the Congress. The imposition of import quotas will hurt virtually every consumer in the United States, particularly lower income consumers.

Higher prices, fewer product choices, reduced competition, and a limited supply of imported products are the probable result of the proposed import quota legislation. Quotas of the type provided for by the bill will also raise the prices of imported commodities.

It is possible under the bill that some inexpensive foreign imported goods might not be available at all, and our lower income consumers may well find themselves unable to afford certain products.

The interests of consumers can best be protected by moving toward freer trade. The bill in the House of Representatives does the reverse: it reduces the flexibility of the President to lessen trade barriers, it preserves by law oil quotas which prevents the President from shifting to a tariff system, it mandates new quotas in certain industries, and it encourages other special interest groups to obtain quotas on their products—all of this at the expense of the American consumer.

I do appreciate that certain industries now face serious competition from imported goods, and I suggest that the appropriate relief for these manufacturers is through liberalization of adjustment assistance procedures.

If, as many economic experts believe, a trade war results and other nations do retaliate, there will be an even greater reduction in the supply of goods and price competition, and the effect on the consumer will be devastating.

Congress should put the welfare of the nation's consumers before the welfare of a few individual industries.

RESTRICTIVE TRADE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon acted wisely in announcing his intention to veto any trade measure which went beyond the very limited relief he proposed for the textile industry. The blanket quotas which the House Ways and Means Committee has proposed for textiles, shoes, and other imports, as well as other restrictive trade measures, promise little relief, much domestic inflation, and hold the potential for disaster to international trade and the monetary system.

Clarence K. Streit, who reported for the New York Times during the period when Smoot-Hawley tariffs led to the monetary crash of 1929 and the Great Depression of the 1930's, has commented wisely on this new trend toward protectionism and isolationism. In the June 1970 issue of Freedom and Union, Mr. Streit draws the parallel between these times and those of 40 years ago, and expresses his hope—a hope we all should share—that Congress will not make the same mistake and permit history once again to repeat itself.

I also want to include in the RECORD a piece by the French economist Frederick Bastiat, satirizing arguments which still, strangely, find some acceptance by those who favor restrictive trade practices today.

WHY QUOTAS AGAIN—THE LSD THAT BROUGHT HITLER AND WAR?

(By Clarence K. Streit)

History, someone said, repeats itself only when its lessons are ignored. That has dire implications now for the already falling U.S. and world markets and economies. All too clearly the many leaders in American industry and in Congress who are seeking import quotas as protection against the current recession deepening into another world depression ignore the lesson given when that remedy got a full trial 40 years ago. And now the Administration has reluctantly given in as regards textile quotas—deemed to bring the quickest political rewards.

I would not question the sincerity of its reluctance to approve them—but this indicates it has some awareness that the quota drug does not cure but, like heroin or LSD, gives delusions—as Herblock brings out so vividly on our cover—that cost dearly. The reluctance of the Administration's consent will not, in the circumstances, mitigate its responsibility when the consequences of its having opened the door to the waiting horde of other quota-seekers come home to plague it.

The reasoning that leads to import quotas resembles that which leads to currency devaluation: The expected benefits depend on the example not being followed by others. That expectation, experience shows, is naive indeed. It is the more so now, because 1970 is an election year. The only hope that quotas will not spread to "protect" other producers in the United States—and therefore abroad—is that reconsideration will bring the Administration and Congress to a much higher level of courage, with the help of those who eye-witnessed what quotas did to deepen the 1929 Wall Street crash into the World De-

pression in 1931. As one who covered the international monetary-economic chain reactions in that period as N.Y. Times correspondent assigned to the League of Nations, International Labor Office and World Bank, perhaps I can help.

WHAT, WHY AND WHEN OF QUOTAS

Quotas let in only a fixed amount of a commodity, usually small. They curb trade more than tariff duties, because exporters may get past the latter by cutting costs, getting subsidies, etc., but when a quota is filled, nothing more can get in. Quotas were rarely used before the world monetary crash in September 1931. The protectionist device that led trade toward that disaster was the tariff. Nine months after the 1929 Wall Street crash, the U.S. passed the Smoot-Hawley tariff. To cite Geneva's *World Economic Survey, 1931*:

"The great tariff event of 1930 was the Hawley-Smoot tariff . . . additional duties were imposed on more than 900 items. The heavier duties were upon manufactured articles . . . exports of European countries, particularly Germany . . . were most affected. The U.S. tariff was the precursor of many others, and by the end of 1930 there was serious restriction of international trade."

When this led to the world monetary crash, many nations took more and more tariff "marijuana" and began adding the LSD of quotas. The 1932-33 *Survey* noted:

"Prohibitions, quotas, licensing systems and clearing agreements" had "never been used before as a general method of trade regulation, except in the altogether abnormal circumstances of war and immediate post-war years." This "new protectionism," it said, "effectively completed" the "restrictive effects" of the older way.

QUOTAS SPED DEPRESSION

"Speed" is a nickname of LSD—a further reason to liken quotas to that drug. They speed not the escape from trouble the users expect, but ever worse depression. Here are figures from the 1932-33 *Survey* on what happened to the imports and exports of 45 nations doing 90 percent of world trade:

In January 1929, their total imports and exports were, respectively, \$2,836 and \$2,516-million. The Wall Street crash left these at \$2,605 and \$2,252-million in January 1930. Then came the higher tariffs the U.S. spawned in many nations; the totals fell more than four times the 1929 decline—to \$1,743 and \$1,516-million by January 1931. That year quotas were added. Whereas high tariffs had cut world trade 34 percent in 1930, quotas cut the remainder by 47 percent in 1931; imports shrinking to \$1,141 and exports to \$994-million.

QUOTAS HELPED SPEED HITLER TO POWER

In the 1928 German election, Hitler won but 12 seats. A year after Wall Street's crash he got 107. On July 31, 1932—10 months after the monetary crash and resort to quotas—he got 230. Five months later he was in power, hellbent for World War II. As for the U.S., 17 months after quotas, the one nation without a bank open inaugurated FDR.

OUTLOOK MUCH DARKER NOW

What does all this add up to now? Consider three contrasts with 1930 when the U.S. led the world the protectionist way: 1) That came after Wall Street's crash; now only a slump brings it. 2) The quota remedy spread then after the world monetary crash; now the quota clamor comes before such disaster, and is strongest in the U.S., which shunned this LSD even after the 1931 crash. Hobart Rowan, *The Washington Post's* astute business editor, reports that "some 70 industries are already lined up, hat in hand, trying to get on the quota bandwagon" started by Administration approval of the Mills textile

quota bill. 3) Whereas it took a long depression to bring on Hitler, we already face a more formidable dictatorship, whose dogma thrives almost everywhere on economic misery. The basic Soviet strategy is, I believe—for reasons often given here—to increase strain on the dollar wherever it can (as in Southeast Asia and the Mideast now) so as to wreck this world currency and by the ensuing depression win without nuclear war.

This may suffice to show how much worse than 40 years ago is the folly and the danger now.

THE LAST BEST HOPE

Disaster can still be averted, I believe, by President Nixon promptly bringing about the proposed convention to explore the Atlantic Union answer, which he urged Congress to approve in 1966. He has let secondary things divert him from it since he entered the White House. The perils facing him and us all have grown only worse. May he remember that time is slipping by far faster now than 40 years ago.

THE LITTLE DOG LAUGHED

(By Frederick Bastiat)

(Petition of the Manufacturers of Candles, Wax Lights, Lamps, Candlesticks, Street Lamps, Snuffers, Extinguishers, and of the Producers of Oil, Tallow, Resin, Alcohol, and Generally, of Everything Connected with Lighting, to Messieurs the Members of the Chamber of Deputies.)

Gentlemen, you are on the right road. You reject abstract theories, and have little consideration for cheapness and plenty. Your chief care is the interest of the producer. You desire to protect him from foreign competition, and reserve the national market for national industry.

We are suffering from the intolerable competition of a foreign rival, placed, it would seem, in a condition so far superior to ours for the production of light that he absolutely inundates our national market with it at a price fabulously reduced. This rival is no other than the sun.

What we pray for is, that it may please you to pass a law ordering the shutting up of all windows, sky-lights, dormer-windows, outside and inside shutters, curtains, blinds, bull's eyes; in a word, of all openings, holes, chinks, clefts, and fissures, by or through which the light of the sun has been in use to enter houses, to the prejudice of the meritorious manufactures with which we have accommodated our country.

We trust, Gentlemen, that you will not regard this our request as a satire, or refuse it without at least previously hearing the reasons which we have to urge in its support.

And, first, if you shut up as much as possible all access to natural light, and create a demand for artificial light, which of our French manufactures will not be encouraged by it?

If more tallow is consumed, then there must be more oxen and sheep; and, consequently, we shall behold the multiplication of meadows, meat, wool, hides, and, above all, manure, which is the basis and foundation of all agricultural wealth.

If more oil is consumed, then we shall have an extended cultivation of the poppy, of the olive, and of grape. These rich and exhausting plants will come at the right time to enable us to avail ourselves of the increased fertility which the rearing of additional cattle will impart to our lands. No branch of agriculture but will then exhibit a cheering development.

The same remark applies to navigation. Thousands of vessels will proceed to the whale fishery; and, in a short time, we shall possess a navy able to maintain France's honor.

Only have the goodness to reflect, Gentle-

men, and you will be convinced that there is, perhaps, no Frenchman, from the wealthy coalmaster to the humblest vendor of matches, whose lot will not be ameliorated by the success of this petition.

You will tell us that, if we gain by the protection which we seek, the country will lose by it, because the consumer must bear the loss. We answer:

You have ceased to have any right to invoke the interest of the consumer; for, whenever his interest is found opposed to that of the producer, you sacrifice the former. You have done so for the purpose of encouraging labor and increasing employment. For the same reason you should do so again.

You have yourselves obviated this objection. When you are told that the consumer is interested in the free importation of iron, coal, corn, textile fabrics—yes, you reply, but the producer is interested in their exclusion. Well, be it so; if consumers are interested in the free admission of natural light, the producers of artificial light are equally interested in its prohibition.

But, again, you may say that the producer and consumer are identical. If the manufacturer gain by protection, he will make the agriculturist also a gainer; and if agriculture prospers, it will open a vent to manufactures. Very well; if you confer upon us the monopoly of furnishing light during the day, first of all we shall purchase quantities of tallow, coals, oils, resinous substances, wax, alcohol—besides silver, iron, bronze, crystal—to carry on our manufactures; and then we, and those who furnish us with such commodities, having become rich, will consume a great deal, and impart prosperity to all the other branches of our national industry.

If you urge that the light of the sun is a gratuitous gift of nature, and that to reject such gifts is to reject wealth itself under pretence of encouraging the means of acquiring it, we would caution you against giving a death-blow to your own policy. Remember that hitherto you have always repelled foreign products, because they approximate more nearly than home products to the character of gratuitous gifts.

If a Lisbon orange sells for half the price of a Paris orange, it is because natural, and consequently gratuitous, heat does for the one what artificial, and therefore expensive, heat must do for the other.

When an orange comes to us from Portugal, we may conclude that it is furnished in part gratuitously, in part for an onerous consideration; in other words, it comes to us at half-price as compared with those of Paris.

Now, it is precisely the gratuitous half which we contend should be excluded. If this half, being gratuitous, determines you to exclude competition, how should the whole, being gratuitous, induce you to admit competition? If you were consistent, you would, while excluding as hurtful to native industry what is half gratuitous, exclude *a fortiori* and with double zeal, that which is altogether gratuitous.

Once more, when products such as coal, iron, corn, or textile fabrics are sent us from abroad, and we can acquire them with less labor than if we made them ourselves, the difference is a free gift conferred upon us. It is as perfect and complete as it can be, when the donor (like the sun in furnishing us with light) asks us for nothing.

The question, and we ask it formally, is this: Do you desire for our country the benefit of gratuitous consumption, or the pretended advantages of onerous production? Make your choice, but be logical; for as long as you exclude, as you do, coal, iron, corn, foreign fabrics, in proportion as their price approximates to zero, what inconsistency it would be to admit the light of the sun, the price of which is already at zero during the entire day!

POSTAL REFORM AGREEMENT
REACHED BY CONFEREES

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is a landmark occasion in the history of our committee and the time-honored U.S. mail service.

As chairman of the House-Senate conference committee on postal reform, I am proud to announce completion of action on shaping historic postal reform legislation.

This has been a long, hard route for me personally. I look back to November 1968 when I first asked my staff to begin drafting reform legislation that would give postal management the authority and finances to do the job it has been assigned.

This meant giving the postal management fiscal flexibility, transportation options, and practical leeway on new postal facilities and equipment. In seven words: Cutting the Gordian knot with the past.

STARTED WITH H.R. 4

My staff—and it is a good staff—worked hard with me and came up with H.R. 4 which I introduced on the opening day of the 91st Congress last year.

Now, nearly 21 months later, a House-Senate conference committee has signed a report which wraps up one of the most important legislative packages of this Congress: Comprehensive postal reform.

Over the past 21 months—particularly the past 18 months since the new administration took over the executive branch—there have been doubts whether we ever could come up with reform legislation. The controversies were often bitter and usually frustrating.

But today we have a postal reform bill.

I am proud to be the father of this legislation. It differs from my original concept, but that is the legislative process.

THIS IS POSTAL REFORM

My aim from the outset has been to accomplish postal reform. This bill is postal reform.

I think it can be said reasonably that while the bill will not make any one completely happy, it does satisfy everyone.

It has been a long row. I met objections when I sought to start hearings in April last year. But I persisted even to the extent of being my own first witness.

I met constant frustrations in our almost endless executive sessions to shape up a bill. The record will show that I held the line—I kept the committee plodding. Finally we produced a bill, only to have rightfully impatient postal workers stage a partial strike last March which opened up a whole new set of circumstances.

In all these 18 months—including these past 3 weeks of conference sessions over which I have presided—the one thing I have tried to display is patience. I let everyone have his say and if he had the votes that was that.

ALL HAD THEIR SAY

I exercised this patience when the bill came to the House floor. No one was cut off. Some wanted me to postpone final action over the weekend, but I insisted that we stay in session because I knew we could finish the job—even if we missed supper. I am indebted to the House leadership for respecting my conviction.

The last 3 weeks of conferences have been time-consuming—some of my colleagues were irritated at the protracted debate—but we stayed on the job.

I want to pay high tribute at this time to my loyal and devoted staff which has labored with us through these trying months.

Their patience and conscientious attention to the many technical and administrative details have been of the highest order.

And I want to recognize, too, the sincere cooperation of the Senate committee staff.

WORK OF CHARLES JOHNSON

As for my own committee staff, my right-hand man in this long legislative drive is the committee's staff director and the chief counsel, Charles Johnson.

As many of you know, Charlie has decided to retire from Government service at the end of this year. To my mind, he could leave behind no finer monument in law than H.R. 17070, the postal reform bill before us today.

Charlie put together the language of H.R. 4 for me and it is a good bill. It is true that H.R. 4, as such, has fallen by the wayside, but it is not forgotten. It was the forerunner of all postal reform legislation, and I am proud to be its father, just as I am proud to be the father of H.R. 17070.

As I said earlier, the bill that results from this conference report will not make anyone happy, but it will satisfy everyone.

My policy from the outset of the conference, when I was named chairman, was to withhold any official announcements of action until all were final. Of course, the decisions along the way have been no secret, as the telephone calls to me and my staff have made clear.

RESULTS OF CONFERENCE

Now, as to the result of the conference:

As with all legislation sent to conference, the only issues which are considered are those on which there are specific differences between the respective bills passed by the House and the Senate.

Therefore, many important parts of H.R. 17070 already are locked into the legislation. I would point particularly to the sections dealing with the postal pay increase and the provision for compression of pay schedules, also the most important section on finances which will give the new postal service the financial flexibility which it has needed for so long.

As a result of the conference on the House and Senate versions, a compromise measure is now ready to be sent to the House and Senate for final congressional action. Since the House asked for

the conference, the Senate will act first on the conference report.

HEADED BY 11-MAN BOARD

As for organization of the new U.S. postal service, it will be headed by an 11-man Board of Governors. This includes nine Presidential appointees who will name a Postmaster General. The 10 then will name a Deputy Postmaster General.

The Senate provisions for appointment and function of the Advisory Council were adopted.

An important feature of the new postal system is the creation of a completely independent Postal Rate Commission composed of five Presidential appointees for 6-year terms. Their appointments will not be subject to Senate confirmation.

The conference agreed that only the Postal Service should initiate changes in postage rates, but the Rate Commission may recommend new mail classifications either on its own initiative or at the request of the Postal Service.

CHANGES IN RATES, CLASSES

Commission decisions on rates and classifications are subject to judicial review and to return by the Governors for reconsideration. But when the Commission submits its new decision, it may be modified only by unanimous written action of the Governors.

When the Commission fails to act on rate or classification changes within 90 days, the postal service can initiate temporary rates, and so forth. No temporary increase may exceed one-third of the present rate.

The House had instructed the House conferees to insist on its ban on a union shop and it was adopted.

Also adopted were the strict House prohibitions on political and other undue influence in appointments and promotions. An amendment clarifies that statements may be submitted with respect to character and residence of applicants.

COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The conference adopted the House language on collective bargaining units, leaving determination of appropriate units to the National Labor Relations Board when the postal service is organized. During the transitional period bargaining will be only with labor organizations holding "national exclusive" recognition.

House provisions on "dues checkoff" were adopted.

As for supervisors, the conference-approved compromise language gives supervisory organizations the right to consult directly in planning and development of policies and programs. However, these organizations will have neither collective bargaining rights nor the right of veto.

Compromise language was adopted on free and reduced rate mail, with the rates to be fixed by the Rate Commission. However, at the end of 10 years, the special rates may not exceed the actual cost of handling.

Public service appropriations are continued for 8 years at 10 percent, then reduced annually by 1 percent for 5 years when the postal service shall decide about future need.

MAIL TRANSPORT FLEXIBILITY

The new postal service is given greater flexibility in selection of modes of mail transportation than the Department now has. This is a vital improvement in the light of the changes in surface transportation which have occurred in recent years.

The conference adopted the Senate amendment on "sexually oriented advertisements." The section is part of a separate bill previously passed by the House. It permits any postal patron to advise the postal service of his desire not to receive such advertisements and requires the mailer of any such advertisement to place on the envelope his name and address and such mark as the postal service prescribes.

The foregoing, of course, is only a brief summary of this most comprehensive legislation, but I believe that it deals with the items of principal interest.

AIR POLLUTION

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the eastern seaboard has been threatened for the past several days by unusually high air pollution levels. The problem has been caused by atmospheric conditions which have trapped warm air over the East, preventing the polluted mass from being swept away. This is not a permanent problem and we should be able to breathe comfortably in a few days.

The reassurance that this discomfort is not permanent is in itself a danger, however. If we were faced with a choice of taking steps to clean up our air or not being able to breathe, I think all would choose a healthier life-giving atmosphere. As it is, we too often tend to shrug our shoulders and endure a few days of unpleasant weather with the attitude that the problem is temporary and will soon go away.

We can no longer ignore the evidence, however, that if we continue to live as we do without working to develop a non-polluting internal combustion engine, or implementing workable plans for a usable mass system of transportation in populous corridors along our east and west coasts, then we will not be able to live in a very comfortable manner on this planet for much longer. We should all work now for better air to breathe, because the fact is that a failure to do less will, according to the experts, allow the destruction of the atmosphere to the extent that we will not have breathable air.

In New Hampshire, there is some of the cleanest air in the Nation. It is my fervent hope that we can take the necessary steps to see that the atmosphere over the rest of the Nation may be as clean and fresh. With this goal in mind, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an editorial appearing in the Washington Evening Star of Wednesday, July 29.

The editorial follows:

CXVI—1682—Part 20

REHEARSAL FOR DISASTER

The stagnant bubble of pollution that hangs over the Eastern United States from New York to Atlanta is, we are assured, no cause for alarm in the Washington area. The problem will end when a tide of cool air arrives to shoulder the polluted air mass out over the Atlantic. In the meantime, it will sting the eyes and irritate the lungs. But it is, according to the official assessment, just a bother and nothing more.

It is—or it should be—a great deal more. It should be taken as a reminder that nature cannot always be counted on to cart away man's airborne garbage. It should be accepted as persuasive evidence that mankind is indeed charting a course to environmental disaster. It should be seized upon as an opportunity to develop and to test the escape mechanisms before that disaster materializes.

The weather phenomenon that laid the damp blanket over Atlanta, Washington, Baltimore, Philadelphia and New York is nothing really new. Every now and again, infinitely complex mechanism that produces the weather creates a vast dome of stable air, massive enough to resist the pressures that normally move weather patterns in a west-east parabola. The mass comes to rest. Winds, both lateral and vertical are at a virtual standstill.

When this mass settles down over an industrial area, the pollutant byproducts of civilization are pumped into the stagnant pond of air. There they are altered and strengthened by the photochemical actions of the sun on the tainted air trapped beneath the dome of the atmospheric greenhouse. It has happened before. It will happen again. And every time it happens, man's industrial progress has moved the threat of areawide disaster several steps closer to fulfillment.

Washington will, assuming the predictions of relief are accurate, escape a killer smog such as those that have, in the recent past, claimed hundreds of lives in London. Washington will be spared the white horror that, until today, enveloped the major cities of Japan, and produced 9,000 serious illnesses. The most that is anticipated is an area alert that will trigger some voluntary antipollution steps.

But there must be no assumption that an emergency can't happen here. It can, and it will. And the present minor emergency could have been utilized for a full-dress rehearsal for disaster. It would have been possible to put the contingency plans for a real emergency to the test, curtailing the area's limited industry and halting all non-essential auto and bus travel. Then it could have been seen if the limited measures that have been planned are really enough to reduce the levels of poison in a body of stagnant air.

The Washington Council of Governments should determine now that such a test will be made the next time nature sets the stage for a disaster drill. And the rest of us should hope that the next time is not the real thing.

A CLOUD OF WARNING

HON. HAMILTON FISH, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, for 7 days a pool of stagnant air has covered our eastern seaboard. This bubble of trapped, still air has caught and held the filth generated by our great cities, to a point that warnings have been issued in some areas for residents, if possible, to remain

indoors, and serious thought given to the banning of automotive traffic from the streets of the major cities caught under this blanket should conditions worsen.

Fortunately, this polluted air, although disagreeable, so far has not proven disastrous. But this is through no fault of our own. Rather it was due to our not yet quite possessing the ability to fully contaminate such a large mass of air.

But what of the future? Inversion systems have happened before. They are bound to happen again. The only difference between such a stable mass of air today and 50 years ago is our ability to inject poison into it. So although we escaped disaster this time, what of the next inversion mass, or the next, or the one after that: as our ability to spew poisons increases, and few steps are taken to control these poison emissions? This past week's mass of stagnant air should point a warning for us all of what can, and surely will happen if we do not act, and act quickly.

Mr. Speaker, I feel this danger is well and forcefully covered in an editorial appearing in today's Washington Post. I include the entire editorial in the RECORD, for its timeliness and for my colleagues who may have missed it:

[From the Washington Post, July 30, 1970]

A CLOUD NO BIGGER THAN THE EASTERN SEABOARD

The dangerous cesspool of air that now hangs over this city and the eastern seaboard is a shock but not really a surprise. The bread we threw out on the water now returns to us. It is true that abnormal weather in the form of a mass of warm air that won't move on is a major weave in the blanket of pollution now covering us. But we cannot blame the fickleness of nature for this mess; it is manmade, largely by the exhaust fumes from automobiles and buses, according to local officials.

This raises the immediate question of whether the public can wait the 10 years the automobile industry has said it needs to produce clean cars. Has an independent group thoroughly looked into this time-table to see if 10 years really is needed? Or is it a comfortable pace the industry has set for itself? These are honest questions and there is an urgent need for answers; the air around us argues that anything less than a crash program to get clean air is basically a no-win effort.

A world-wide survey by the UPI reveals that we are not alone in our filth. Wallowing also in smog are places like Japan, Mexico City and Singapore. The ongoing series of articles on world pollution by Claire Sterling on this page has been detailing the theme that we are all in this problem together; action by one country and not by another will not do. And neither will it do to wait until things get worse.

A recent book called "The Vanishing Air" by John Esposito ends with a chapter called "Pollution and Palliatives." What he and his researchers tried to do, says Mr. Esposito, and in many people's opinion *did*, was "illustrate how the public's hope for clean air has been frustrated by corporate deceit and collusion, by the exercise of undue influence with government officials, by secrecy and the suppression of technology, by the use of dilatory legal maneuvers, by special government concessions, by high-powered lobbying in Congress and administrative agencies . . ."

In saying where the blame lies, Mr. Esposito also implies where the remedy lies: in positive and immediate action by corpora-

tions, governments and citizens, not just in Washington or in the United States, but in every part of this blanketed planet.

The trouble is that as long as the menace remains invisible, by and large, we may fool ourselves into thinking that there is no urgency in the developing crisis of our environment, which suggests a silver lining in the great dirty cloud that has enveloped, not just a city, but an entire area of the United States the past few days. For what this has done has been to make the menace all too frighteningly visible, as a regional thing, which is only a step away from a continental, and ultimately, a planetary thing.

It is often said that the crises of pollution and environment will fade away, like other fads, a victim of our short attention span, as the media turn to new trinkets or interest to play with. But it won't, in our view, because it won't remain invisible. When the old and sick are in danger of dying along a whole seaboard, when officials in Washington and New York are ready to block roads to keep cars from being used, when the menace is inescapable there for all to see and breathe, it is not a fad which can fade away. A blind eye can be turned on the ghettos or the war but no one who ventured outdoors the last few days could avoid seeing what we are doing to ourselves. It would be nice to think that we could take sensible warning from a cloud no bigger than the eastern seaboard.

THE CONTINENTAL LINE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on March 13, 1970, the West Point Society of the District of Columbia held their Founders Day Dinner at Fort Myer, Va., marking the 168th anniversary of the birth of the U.S. Military Academy. The principal speaker was the Honorable JOHN O. MARSH, JR., whose address was entitled "The Continental Line." The remarks are most appropriate to a very current subject and I commend them to this body:

THE CONTINENTAL LINE

First, I would like to thank you for having invited me to participate in this annual dinner marking the 168th year of the birth of the United States Military Academy.

I am particularly pleased to have this opportunity because it gives me a chance to thank each of you for the many years of service that you have given to the security of our nation. Our country is indebted to the Military Academy and to its graduates. Rather than criticize your association with the military, I would like to assure you of my support of your service to your country in the prosecution of its wars.

In reference to the Cadet First Captain who is here tonight representing the Corps, I might say that the student body at the United States Military Academy stands for and represents a number of things that are needed today on many campuses of America.

My topic tonight is taken from the Revolutionary War and relates to the subject of national will. National will is an intangible. It is the morale of a nation—the esprit de corps of a great people. It is a vital ingredient in national success. It is indispensable to national survival.

In just a few years, our country will observe the 200th anniversary of its birth. Born of revolution, America is the first of the emerging nations of the modern world. Ours has been the product of a determined na-

tional will. I would like to mention to you just three evidences of that will. Please do not think of them as geographic places, nor just the scenes of great historical events, but rather, think of them as elements of the national character, as parts of our heritage—as pieces from the mosaic of American life.

Each of the three places are drawn from the American Revolution. They are tributes to the Continental Line, the first Regular Army of the United States, the Army that redeemed the pledge the signers of the Declaration made when they pledged their lives and fortunes.

The first place was in the rolling hills of Pennsylvania, a short distance west of Philadelphia, not too far from the fringes of the frontier. Its name was not well known, then, even to the American settlers, but it shall forever be known in American history—Valley Forge. Let me read to you an historical description of the Continental Army moving into Valley Forge on December 19, 1777. It was an army of about 11,000 men.

"Toward this plateau the main army of the United States headed in December, as the air sharpened and powdery snow began to sift through pine and oak limbs . . . Snow thickened, became stinging sleet, softened into pelting rain. The freeze came swiftly and the wretched, boggy roads stiffened into knife-ruts that slashed at rag-bound feet. Washington said 'you might have tracked the army . . . to Valley Forge by the blood of their feet.'

"The main column reached the plateau on the afternoon of December 19, and exhausted, chilled men lurched to their camp sites and lighted fires. For rations they had only what they might scrape out of their haversacks; and soon even the fires became a menace, for all their cheerful glow. Broken boots dried too quickly, cracked and split. Foot-wrapping charred and fell away from bruised, bleeding soles. Nothing very much happened in the Valley Forge lines. Men simply set their teeth and stayed alive, and thus kept alive the army that was the active expression of their cause, quite unaware of the deep glory of what they did."

When the warmth of spring would come to the Pennsylvania countryside and the winter snows give way to the greenery of spring, 4,000 men of Washington's Army had found their home in the grassy slopes of Valley Forge. Among the men who endured the hardships of that winter and survived was a young Company grade officer in the Continental Line by the name of John Marshall, later to become Chief Justice of the United States.

The Continental Line left Valley Forge a better Army.

Valley Forge was sacrifice and suffering. It was the story of an untrained army.

The next place is a peninsula on the Chesapeake Bay—Yorktown, October, 1781.

The Continentals by now had behind them six bitter years of war. Man for man, theirs was the finest Army in the world.

Cornwallis had moved into a cul-de-sac which the Americans, together with the French, had closed. Escape by sea had been sealed by the French Fleet.

The Revolution was a war of the bayonet. On the night of October 14, a unit of the Continental Line, under cover of darkness, quietly moved into position for an assault on Redoubt Ten. In order to achieve surprise, the commanding officer of the assault force had ordered that no muskets be loaded and that the force storm the Redoubt in a coordinated and carefully timed night bayonet assault. After a fiercely-fought night attack, Redoubt Ten fell and Cornwallis had no choice but to surrender. The commander of the assault force was a Lieutenant Colonel. His name was Alexander Hamilton who later helped write the Constitution and would become the first Secretary of the Treasury.

Yorktown was the vindication of leadership and training. Yorktown means courage and victory.

The third place I would like to mention was one of great strategic importance during the Revolution. Its retention was essential to frustrate British plans to separate the colonies by penetrating the country using the Hudson River. Each of you are far more familiar than I with the scenic beauty and geography of West Point.

West Point today is the legacy of Valley Forge and Yorktown. It is a product of the Revolution. The heritage of the Continental Line which secured the blessings of liberty at such places as Saratoga, Trenton, Monmouth, Cowpens, Brandywine and Guilford's Court House is vested today in the "Long Gray Line" of the United States Military Academy.

West Point is trained leadership for the nation. It was the hope and dream of men who fought and led the Continental Army. Its patrons were Washington, Hamilton and Knox.

A protector would be President Monroe. Monroe was an officer of the Continental Line. He fought at Harlem Heights, White Plains and Trenton. Badly wounded at Trenton, he had to leave the Army. He later rejoined and fought at Brandywine, Germantown and Monmouth.

One of the reasons I have mentioned some of these officers in the Continental Army such as Marshall, Hamilton, Monroe and others is to point out that men who would later help build the infant Republic in a political sense had previously rendered a great service in positions of military leadership. However, they retained their basic belief that the power of government should be vested in civilian leaders. Still they remembered from their days of military conflict how vital it was for the nation to have a Corps of well-trained military leaders.

To them West Point would spare the young nation the agonies of the early years of the Revolution when there had been no trained leaders to build an army.

West Point had a unique mission for the infant Republic. Its far-sighted patrons saw for it a means to provide a resource of talent and military leadership as America faced west. The Mexican War would be its watershed and prove its national worth.

Its graduates would chart and explore the West. It gave the nation a resource and reputation for civil engineering. It not only helped develop our west, but would earn for American arms respect as a key part of an enlightened national policy when lessons of territorial government learned in our West were carried across the Pacific.

The very term "Long Gray Line" connotes continuity and succession. It does not say ranks or formation; it conveys the meaning of the power of one individual—of determination of one in the forefront, a leader—of a man against odds—the razor's edge. For the graduates of the Academy, there have been their Trentons and their Valley Forges. Brandywines as well as Yorktowns. Men of the Academy made the difference at Buena Vista, and rode with both armies from Bull-run to Gettysburg and Antietam to Appomattox.

They stormed San Juan Hill and pacified the Philippines.

Men of the "Long Gray Line" led the A.E.F. through the agony of the gnarled forests of the Meuse-Argonne.

They were at Corregidor and made the death march at Bataan—led America's sons as they clawed their way across the beaches of Normandy or jumped from C-47's in the pre-dawn skies over France in an assault on fortress Europe. They flew with the squadrons that struck at Ploesti and fought through the jungles of Guadalcanal. Succeeding classes stepped forward to endure the bitter winters of Korea.

Today and yesterday, and in the tomorrows to come, the muffled tramp of the Corps continues as each succeeding June week sees more of the Academy's own leave to serve the nation's cause. The sons of West Point say farewell to Cadet Gray to take their place with the United States Army in Vietnam.

The banks of the Mekong River are half a world away from the highlands of the Hudson, but the lessons of leadership learned in the "Long Gray Line" go with them to the ranks of the American army, whether in the frozen wastes of Alaska or the foothills of the Amanite Mountains.

In each of the nation's wars, sons of West Point sleep forever on the battlefields where the men they led have fought.

Today national will is being undermined. Today there is an attack on many of the things the Academy stands for. I suspect those of you associated with West Point sometimes wonder whether that institution must also bear the brunt of conflict on the battleground of public opinion as well as the battleground of combat.

Today there are those who would again have us turn to the old paths of isolation, who believe a new road to peace and world security can be found by non-involvement. This view is surprisingly like that of a "fortress America", urged upon us in the 1930's, which availed us naught when World War II crashed upon us.

It is one of the ironies of history that the times exact from each generation a special measure. As some men pay a greater price, so some nations bear a heavier burden. The "times that try men's souls" of which Thomas Paine would write in the Revolution continue to challenge us in the evolution of the American Experiment.

Each President has had to wage his own battle for the hearts and minds of his people. That battle is now joined. The terrain of public opinion is not just the rice paddies of the Mekong delta. Today the major battleground for the hearts and minds of the people is here at home. It is along our own coasts, and in the rolling foothills of the Blue Ridge, and the mountain towns of Appalachia as well as the heartland of our Midwest.

In my opinion, it is essential that the President mobilize public opinion. It is important that our people understand the geopolitical significance of Southeast Asia and the vital part it plays not only to American interests, but the cause of a free and stable world. We must build National Will. As in crises in the past, the American people are not interested in Party or politics but in principle.

To those of you who are not on the active list, I believe you have a unique opportunity to render a national service. By virtue of your distinguished careers, your experience and your training, you enjoy a special status as a spokesman on matters that relate to national security affairs. This is recognized and respected by your fellow citizens. In your communities and through organizations and associations of which you are a member, I think you can furnish leadership in programs and projects that help mold public opinion on matters that relate to national defense. Better than most, I believe you can explain to a local civic club the geo-political significance of Southeast Asia and the nature of the American commitment in South Vietnam.

There is great dissent and unrest in the land about the war in Vietnam. That men should have differences of opinion and speak out when they favor different courses of action is the history of our Republic. But in our pursuit of dissent, let us not neglect our duty to those who serve our country in the field, nor abandon those who have fallen into enemy hands.

Let us not blind ourselves to reason, nor close our eyes to fact. We must be ever mindful there are nations who believe that might does make right; nations whose weapons include assassination, kidnapping and terror; nations that have tried to mute the voices of dissent by the gas chambers of Buchenwald, by the use of armor in Czechoslovakia or by mass graves in Hue.

In the final analysis, the threat we face is the challenge the police state poses to the legacy of Philadelphia. Lenin, Mao, Che Guevara and Giap have in the 20th Century developed a doctrine of conflict for the monolithic police state not just on the military battlefield but in the other areas of human life including politics, economics and psychology.

These architects of aggression wage limited wars on unlimited battlefields. Yet, there is a paradox in warfare—the paradox of conflict which finds the sophistication and totality of weapons systems actually deescalating conflict to more classical concepts that draw on skills of the individual soldier.

To meet this threat, West Point must give to the nation the leaders who develop the doctrine and tactics on behalf of the Free World to fight on these multi-dimension battlefields.

Vietnam has given us tremendous resources of leadership and experience in new dimensions of conflict. I do not share the view that we have lost the struggle there. On the contrary, I think that we stand at the threshold of success. The American soldier coming home from South Vietnam does not come home the vanquished—rather, he comes home the victor.

I am convinced a resource of talent exists in the ranks of the American Army drawn from years of bitter lessons in South Vietnam. It is a valuable national resource which must be retained for it must continue to be a vital part of our national defense. What we have done in South Vietnam has not been lost on Moscow and Peking.

The trained leadership that exists in the American Army is a deterrent to aggression and, therefore, vital to the United States in achieving a secure peace and a free world.

As America needs today the lessons of Valley Forge and Yorktown, so we need the example of West Point. The words, Duty—Honor—Country, must become again key words in every American's vocabulary.

As a part of our legacy from Philadelphia, we frequently quote the lines from the Declaration of Independence:

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty and the pursuit of Happiness."

This is the part of the Declaration we like—"pursuit of Happiness." However, we often overlook the last line of that same Declaration:

"And for the support of this Declaration, with a firm reliance on the protection of Divine Providence, we mutually pledge to each other our Lives, our Fortunes and our Sacred Honor."

That pledge signed at Philadelphia was redeemed by the Continental Line. The "Long Gray Line" stands ready to redeem it today because to the sons of West Point, Emerson's poem on duty has a special meaning.

"So nigh is grandeur to our dust;
So near is God to man,
When Duty whispers low, Thou must,
The Youth replies, I can."

Today, as it is always done through our nation's history, the Corps responds to Duty's low whisper as with one clear voice—"I Can!"

RESOLUTION BY MICHIGAN UNITED CONSERVATION CLUBS

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, the Michigan United Conservation Clubs held its annual convention in Traverse City, Mich., June 18-20, and adopted a number of important resolutions dealing with conservation and environmental issues. I wish to insert them in the RECORD at this point so they may be brought to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED BY MICHIGAN UNITED CONSERVATION CLUBS AT 1970 CONVENTION

9(L). Whereas, all the Michigan Congressional delegation have joined in sponsoring legislation to provide for establishment of the Sleep Bar Dunes National Lakeshore; and whereas, the administration has indicated that money would be available for national recreation areas; and whereas, MUCC has consistently supported the Sleeping Bear Dunes proposal; Therefore be it resolved that MUCC reaffirm its stand and request that Congress approve and provide the necessary funding for establishment of a Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore in Michigan.

12(L). Whereas, the proposed Timber Supply Act has been amended extensively by the House Committee on Agriculture of the U.S. Congress and this version is known as the "National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act"; and whereas, provisions in this proposal (H.R. 12025) would give stress and emphasis to the commercial logging aspects; and whereas, provisions in the "National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act" would direct the U.S. Forest Service to increase allowable cuts for commercial purposes before an accelerated growth program has produced additional timber; and whereas, the Multiple Use—Sustained Yield Act of 1960 directs that all legitimate use of national forests shall be given equal consideration; and whereas, the U.S. Forest Service already has sufficient authority to carry out provisions in the proposed Act if given adequate funds; Therefore be it resolved that MUCC hereby register its opposition to the principles enumerated in the "National Forest Timber Conservation and Management Act," and invite conservationists throughout the State to join in expressing their opinions to their elected officials.

13(L). Whereas, insufficiently severe penalties have been imposed upon those involved in the criminal use of fire arms; and whereas, there is failure to strengthen local law enforcement agencies throughout the country to effect higher rates of apprehension and conviction of criminals; Therefore be it resolved that MUCC go on record as opposing any type of legislation that will cause registration and licensing of shotguns and rifles; and be it further resolved that MUCC support legislation to impose mandatory jail sentences upon individuals convicted of crimes involving firearms.

15(L). Whereas, an existing ten per cent Federal excise tax on the sale of pistols and revolvers is credited to the general fund of the U.S. Treasury; and whereas, legislative proposals currently before the Congress would credit these tax monies to the Secretary of the Interior for distribution to the States for cost-sharing of wildlife restoration programs, hunter safety training, and the construction and maintenance of public outdoor target ranges; and whereas, such a pro-

cedure would closely parallel the successful Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration program made possible through the Pittman-Robertson Act: Therefore be it resolved that MUCC hereby endorse the principle that funds accruing from Federal excise taxes on handguns should be earmarked for wildlife restoration work, for hunter safety programs, and for public target ranges.

15(L). Whereas, there are thousands of registered handguns legally owned by citizens of our State; and whereas, there are very few places such handguns may be practice fired: Therefore be it resolved that MUCC support H.R. 12475 introduced by Congressman John D. Dingell, that would apportion among the States for wildlife programs one-half of the revenues resulting from the tax on pistols and revolvers, and which permits the States to use wildlife funds apportioned to them under this Act to pay up to 50% of the costs of a hunter safety program and the construction, operation and maintenance of public outdoor target ranges, as a part of such programs; and be it further resolved to send copies of this Resolution to the Michigan Congressional delegation as an indication of MUCC's support of this proposed legislation.

19. Whereas, several catastrophic oil and chemical spills or leaks in navigable waters have occurred in recent months; and whereas, catastrophic oil and chemical spills or leaks may occur in waters beyond the jurisdiction of a coastal state; and whereas, spills may be harmful to the resources of that State or adjacent States or to those in other countries; and whereas, spills inside a State's jurisdiction may be of such magnitude and scope that they may be beyond the capabilities of a State to control; and whereas, the States have the primary responsibility and authority to prevent pollution of their waters; and whereas, one Federal agency can work more closely than several with State agencies in controlling oil and chemical spills inside territorial waters: Therefore be it resolved that MUCC urge that one Federal agency be vested with the primary authority to take command in the direction of operations to control a spill of oil, petroleum products or chemicals in international waters or to cooperate with appropriate state agencies in appropriate actions to prevent or minimize damage to fish, shellfish, wildlife, and outdoor recreational resources in State waters; and be it further resolved that the designated Federal agency should be authorized to prevent the application of oil dispersants and other chemical substances on navigable waters or adjacent beach areas until appropriate state or federal wildlife agencies have been consulted with respect to the possible effects on fish and wildlife.

25(L). Whereas, eminently qualified scientists have determined that the present world population is using oxygen faster than it is being reconverted from carbon dioxide; and whereas, this population is using natural resources faster than new resources are being discovered or recreated; and whereas, the current birth rate is exceeding the death rate by such an extent that the world's population will increase from 3½ billion to 7 billion by the year 2005; and whereas, the uncontrolled increase in population will eventually make air, land and water pollution impossible to control: Therefore be it resolved that our state and national elected legislative and executive officials form study committees to study the state, national and world population explosion and make their conclusions to these studies in the form of proposed legislation to effect the best possible corrections to these conditions to their respective legislative bodies.

30(L). Whereas, the President of the United States has announced a "now or never" top priority program for attacking the pollution of our environment; and whereas, he has signed a bill to create the Council of Environmental Quality; and whereas, a re-

port of a House Study group states, "Few national problems are handled with such a diffusion of administrative attention and responsibility"; and since present anti-pollution law enforcement is scattered through nine cabinet level agencies, some Congressmen fear the Council could be just another complication in trying to solve environmental problems: Therefore be it resolved that MUCC request the President of the United States to establish a new cabinet level position as a Department of Environment with a well-qualified director, and that all problems pertaining to pollution and the environment, now assigned to other departments, be reassigned to the new Department of Environment.

36(L). Whereas, the Great Lakes shorelines along Lakes Huron and Michigan were severely damaged by erosion in 1969; and whereas, the Federal government is controlling the level of Lake Superior by allowing excess water to flow into Lake Huron, thereby raising the water level of Lake Huron; and whereas, said damage by the high water level causes actual loss of valuable shorelines property, in some cases as much as fifty percent, fallen trees and cottage septic tanks; and whereas, property owners literally dumped anything into the water to retain their property, such as brush, stumps, rocks, cement blocks and concrete; and whereas, every foot of soil lost, and the aforementioned items, cause further pollution of the Great Lakes: Therefore be it resolved that MUCC seek and support legislation, both State and Federal, to control erosion and pollution of the Great Lakes.

40(L). Whereas MUCC believes it essential that the Federal government meet its obligations to State and local governments for cost-sharing of waste treatment plant construction for control of water pollution: Therefore be it resolved that MUCC support the full authorization of \$1¼ billion to be appropriated for fiscal 1971 and used by the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration pending approval of alternate methods of financing a massive nation-wide drive for clean water.

41(L). Whereas, the Congress of the United States has enacted legislation creating a cooperative State-Federal water quality standard and providing for a clearly defined level of Federal financial assistance to States that comply with the act; and whereas, Michigan has met the water quality standards proposals, thereby qualifying for Federally financed assistance; and whereas, Michigan voters approved a \$335 million bond issue to initiate the pollution abatement of Michigan waters; and whereas, Congress and the Federal administration have repeatedly failed to keep the financial assistance pledge in the Federal act: Therefore be it resolved that the Legislature and the Governor of the State of Michigan take all appropriate and effective action to urge all Michigan Congressmen, Senators and the President of the United States to fully fund the Clean Waters Act of 1965.

60(L). Whereas, wild geese are in relatively abundant supply on the North American continent; and whereas, Michigan hunters have limited goose hunting opportunities; and whereas, a goose refuge in the Hayward Lake area of Menominee County would do much to improve goose hunting opportunities for sportsmen; and whereas, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service indicate that the Hayward Lake area seems ideal for a goose refuge: Therefore be it resolved that MUCC urge that a comprehensive study be made and a tentative plan adopted by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; and be it further resolved that the Michigan Legislature and the Congress be contacted and encouraged to support this proposed study.

67. Whereas, it is evident that the sharp-tail

grouse populations in the Upper Peninsula are at a critically low level; and whereas, this low population level is largely due to lack of suitable habitat for this popular game bird; and whereas, the habitat will continue to decline as civilization makes more demands on wild lands: Therefore be it resolved that MUCC urge the public land management agencies, namely, the Michigan Department of Natural Resources and the U.S. Forest Service, to increase their efforts to develop and maintain suitable habitat for sharp-tail grouse and to initiate management plans which will insure increased populations of these upland game birds; and be it further resolved that MUCC send copies of this resolution to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources; Regional Forester, U.S. Forest Service, Milwaukee, Wisconsin; and to appropriate State and Federal Congressional representatives for the Upper Peninsula.

74(L). Whereas, Congressman John D. Dingell on January 3, 1969 introduced in Congress H.R. 1049 to amend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act; and whereas, the purpose of this legislation is to extend and expand the program for conservation, development and enhancement of our nation's anadromous fish and fish in the Great Lakes that ascend streams to spawn; and whereas, H.R. 1049 would amend the Anadromous Fish Conservation Act to extend the program until 1974 with appropriations over these four years of \$32 million; and whereas, the program would be broadened to authorize the Federal share of an approved program to be increased to a maximum of 60% whenever two or more states having a common interest in a basin jointly enter into a cooperative agreement with the Secretary of the Interior: Therefore be it resolved that MUCC lend its wholehearted support to H.R. 1049 as being the best means to further the interests of the anadromous fishery in Michigan.

(Item #4 New Business). Whereas, the constantly increasing population of the United States and Michigan is a major factor in the creation and worsening of many of our most pressing environmental and conservation problems; and whereas, this population growth will ultimately ease, either by operation of the basic natural laws governing all living things, or through man's conscious actions in anticipation of these laws; and whereas, many of the values cherished by members of this organization—clean water and air, abundant game, individual freedom—are constantly being eroded by expanding populations: Therefore be it resolved that MUCC urge the people of the United States and Michigan to abandon population growth as a pattern and goal, and call upon the President and Congress of the United States to provide the leadership for establishing a national population policy, with the emphasis on the quality of our lives rather than the maximum numbers we can support.

LOOK AT AMERICANS: LIFE IN A GOLDFISH BOWL

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as debate continues in the Congress over foreign policy matters, I believe that cognizance must be taken of the affect that statements made by American officials have on thinking in foreign lands.

This point is well made in a July 6 article in the Elgin, Ill., Daily Courier-News by the distinguished international correspondent of the Copley Press, Du-

mitru Danielopol, who has just returned from a factfinding tour of Europe.

The article follows:

LOOK AT AMERICANS: LIFE IN A GOLDFISH BOWL

(By Dumitru Danielopol)

PARIS.—An American traveling in Europe finds himself trying to look back at America in the European perspective.

Perhaps it is easier for me, since I was born and educated in Europe.

How oblivious are so many American public figures to the impact abroad of their words!

They forget, or perhaps they do not care that the United States literally lives in a goldfish bowl, subject to the closest scrutiny of hundreds of millions of people a big percentage of whom have little direct knowledge of the U.S.A. and no experience with our free-wheeling brand of democracy.

Europeans are often baffled and confused by the negative attitude toward the war in Vietnam of senators like Fulbright, Mansfield, Church and Kennedy. And they are even more confused by the attention they receive.

Even Europeans in high places simply cannot understand how "liberals," in Congress can ally themselves with hippies and college students against two Presidents.

Rationalizations and explanations are swept aside.

"Win the war first, then argue," they insist.

Another case in point.

President Nixon's move into Cambodia was received as a logical, intelligent and long overdue move by the majority of knowledgeable Europeans, even those who do not approve of the U.S. commitment in Vietnam. They accepted it as a strategic operation designed to save lives and permit the orderly withdrawal of American ground troops.

Even neutral Austria approved 9 to 1 in a public opinion poll.

Here it was obvious that the Cambodian operation struck a harsh psychological blow to Hanoi and the Viet Cong. Even the Red delegations at the so-called peace talks couldn't hide their dismay. They had ignored Mr. Nixon's threats. Now they had to ponder other warnings.

So imagine the surprise and shock of western Europeans to hear and read of the vitriolic attacks on the President in elements of the American press and from dove wing in Congress. What appeared to be an obvious American victory was suddenly placed in doubt not by Hanoi, but by voices in Washington.

"Why do they do it?" asks one after another.

A good question.

SPESSARD HOLLAND—A MAN OF QUALITY—STATESMAN, U.S. SENATOR

HON. DANTE B. FASCELL

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. FASCELL. Mr. Speaker, the Honorable SPASSARD L. HOLLAND, of Florida, a man whose every fiber and action denotes quality and integrity, will be leaving the Senate after 50 years of dedicated and consecrated service to his State and Nation at the end of this Congress. His distinguished reputation will always remain to inspire all Members of Congress to continue with a sincere and

courageous approach to solve the problems that confront us.

Pete Laine of the Miami Herald has captured the essence of the Senator's strength of character in his article, "Spessard Holland—A Man of Quality."

SPASSARD HOLLAND—A MAN OF QUALITY

(By Pete Laine)

WASHINGTON.—The day after the filing deadline for candidates in Florida, the United States Senate was in a drowsy session on a summer afternoon.

Only a handful of members were on the floor handling its business. The talk drained on about a complex appropriations bill.

Spessard Lindsay Holland, 78, who is hardly ever off the floor in session, sat at his front row desk, hands clasped across his chest, his white head almost nodding.

Fifty years ago, Holland put his name on a list of Florida candidates for the office of county judge in Polk County. He never did lose an election in Florida. Now the books had shut without him and an era had been ended.

The last son of a Confederate veteran left in Congress, Holland is winding up 24 years in the Senate as a widely respected leader of the old guard. He built his reputation for integrity, moreover, at a time when many, if not most, Southern politicians were compromised by sectionalism.

He peered round the Senate chamber through his heavy glasses, pulled a thick book out of the small desk, stood up and fingered the knot of the red tie he often wears with the dark suit and white shirt. He put his hands in his pocket.

Then—how many times has he said it?—"Mr. President, will the senator yield?"

Holland, with his remarkable memory, misses nothing in debate. He can be a formidable adversary. This bill pleased him as "conservative . . . and constructive" and he wanted to say so.

He liked it especially because it included funds to maintain a wildlife refuge on Sanibel Island, something he recalled helping start many years ago. In passing, he gave the Senate a little word picture of the sea and the wind and the birds and the shells there.

He gave back the floor, took off his glasses to wipe one eye, then cross the aisle and whispered something to Caleb Boggs that made the Republican stand, flushed with appreciation.

He chatted a moment with Mansfield and Scott, then walked out slowly through a side door. Only now are the years beginning to make their mark.

No, he said in his office, he'd never once thought of changing his mind and filing again because he'd be 84 "and a half" at the end of the next term. The thought of not being able to serve the state properly had worried him.

A pretty young woman came in and was introduced as his granddaughter. He said she was helping him get ready to go back to Bartow in January and they'd done nine packages already. Not at U.S. expense, he added. He had never hired a relative and isn't about to now.

There is a lot to pack. A half-century or more of U.S. history parades through 3,000 pictures. One shows a trim young man in World War I uniform in France, wearing a mustache and the single wing of an aerial observer. The old man, popping his feet on the desk, said the young man didn't keep the "little whisker" long. The record says he did bring back a Distinguished Flying Cross.

Liberals long ago despaired of Holland, but no one ever said he gave them a fast shuffle. In changing times, he has fought a rearguard action for conservatism and taken his many defeats without rancor.

Unlike many of his juniors in Congress, he works very hard, lives unpretentiously, shuns junkets, refuses to profit from his position, is open about his finances, and answers questions fairly and squarely.

Conservative or liberal, any man who possesses these vanishing qualities is going to be missed around here.

THE SST FOR THE SST'S SAKE?

HON. CHARLES H. WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON. Mr. Speaker, from time to time I include portions of the "TVASNAC 'Quotes'" publication of the Town-Village Aircraft Safety and Noise Abatement Committee of Hempstead, N.Y., in the RECORD because the editors of this worthwhile publication continually include the best and most useful articles concerning the intolerable jet noise levels in many areas of this country—including my own 31st Congressional District of California, which contains the Los Angeles International Airport.

I have long been an adversary of those who believe that the Government-subsidized development of the SST plane is in the best interests of our Nation.

It has been and continues to be incredible to me that a publicly financed project such as this, which will ultimately benefit only a very few of our Nation's jet-set, globe-hopping minority, is deemed worthy by the current administration to receive taxpayers' funds. Perhaps my colleagues will recall that such handouts were not offered to the developers of the first passenger jet planes which were, like the SST, intended for private profit and private use. Apparently, our Nation's relief rolls have since been expanded.

At any rate, perhaps a plausible rationale has now been offered by a British scientist whose remarks on the blatant boondoggle were recently excerpted for use in the aforementioned "TVASNAC 'Quotes.'" I call these excerpts to my colleagues' attention at this point in the RECORD:

SST BUILT AS USELESS TRICK TOY?

WASHINGTON.—Is the supersonic transport airplane just a slick technological trick that should be built more or less for the hell of it, flown a few times and then shelved?

A British scientist says that it is, but that Americans probably won't be "civilized" enough to quit while they are ahead, as the British and French builders of the rival Concorde may do. The records of European and American ventures in "pure technology" set the pattern for the ultra-high speed airplane, he says.

The Englishman's views are contained in an article in Technology Review, the monthly magazine of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

"Pure Technology," Daedalus says, "is the building of machines for their own sake and for the pride or pleasure of accomplishment. It is a creative art form and somewhere between art and science."

The SST, Daedalus argues, is "an indubitable masterpiece of thinly disguised pure technology." He explains:

"I need not detail here the ample demonstrations which have been given of the pointlessness and social drawbacks of this project. But given a journey of say seven hours at an average of 10 miles an hour and another six at 600 miles an hour (a fair profile of a typical trans-Atlantic air excursion) the expenditure of millions of dollars to clip a few hours off the highspeed section seems misguided to say the least."

"Balancing the insignificant gain and the tiny minority who gain it against the solid debit in expense and noise pollution inflicted on the majority, we can see how unexpectedly powerful is the drive to pure technology in our supposedly cost-conscious society—for the only really compelling reason for building the SST (and of course its rival, the Concorde) is the sheer entertainment of overcoming all the technical problems and finally flying such a thrilling machine."

"Consider the noble record of the British aerospace industry. A long series of pure-technological triumphs—among them the Princess flying boat, the Brabson super-airliner, the Blue Streak ICBM and the TSR-2 supersonic fighter bomber—were developed just to the point where the prototype was successfully flown, and were then canceled (though Blue Streak was kept on in a pure-technological capacity as a space-launcher).

"There is every reason to hope that the pattern will be repeated with Concorde. Once the prototype has been exhaustively tested, the program will be canceled to save money, and peace-loving citizens will be able to breathe freely again."

Excerpts from article Long Island Press—July 1, 1970.

REV. JOSEPH G. NOVOROLSKY

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, on July 16, St. Peter's Church of Westfield, Mass., lost its pastor of 37 years, Rev. Joseph G. Novorolsky.

Father Novorolsky served the people of St. Peter's Church and of the community with great distinction. He will long be remembered.

I would like to include in the RECORD at this time some articles on Father Novorolsky:

[From the Westfield (Mass.) News Advertiser, July 22, 1970]

FAREWELL "FATHER JOE"

The untimely death of Rev. Joseph G. Novorolsky, pastor of St. Peter's Church for the past 37 years, leaves a void which cannot be filled.

Known affectionately as "Father Joe," he was a man of great compassion, beloved by all.

Persons of all faiths and from all walks of life mourn his passing.

Farewell "Father Joe," you served God and your fellow-man well.

ST. PETER'S PASTOR: FUNERAL SERVICES HELD MONDAY FOR REV. JOSEPH G. NOVOROLSKY

The funeral of the Rev. Joseph G. Novorolsky, 63, pastor of St. Peter's Church, Westfield, for 37 years, who died Thursday, July 16, in Bridgeport, Conn., was held Monday, July 20, with a Concelebrated High Mass of Resurrection in St. Peter's Church with the Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, Bishop of the Springfield Roman Catholic Diocese, as celebrant.

Concelebrants were the Rev. Jerome Pavlik, OFM, Franciscan Friary, Easton, Pa.; the Rev. Andrew Cokovsky, St. Anthony's Church, Johnstown, N.Y.; the Rev. Joseph D. Ferenz, St. Anthony's Church, Webster; and Rev. Edmund Mochak, St. Dennis Church, East Douglas.

Also, the Rev. Paul O'Day, St. Thomas Church, West Springfield; the Rev. Vincent Puidohas, St. Casimir's Church, Westfield; the Rev. John Blazewicz, MS, Holy Trinity Church, Westfield; and the Rev. Joseph Mas-saro, CSS, Holy Family Church, Lynn.

The Deacon was the Rev. David Joyce, St. Mary's Church, Westfield. The Rev. Francis X. Sullivan, Blessed Sacrament Church, Westfield, was the Thurifer.

Acolytes were the Rev. Michael Develin, Blessed Sacrament Church, Westfield, and the Rev. John O'Donnell, St. Thomas Church, West Springfield.

The Homilist for the Bible service Sunday, July 19, was the Rev. Edmund Mochak.

The Eulogy was delivered by the Rev. Richard Portasik, OFM, the Franciscan Friary, Pittsburgh, Pa.

There was a delegation in attendance representing the City of Westfield, including Westfield Mayor John J. Palczynski, State Senator George D. Hammond, City Auditor J. Vincent Kane, City Clerk Ethel Oleksak, State Representatives Robert McGinn and James Adams.

Also Councilman Edward Andreski and former Mayors Harold Martin and Alice Burke.

Bearers were Robert Vittengl, John Kleis, Albert Bachleda, Paul Peregrin, Robert Monko, Joseph Oleksak, John Malcovsky and Frank Gryszlewicz

Fr. Novorolsky, affectionately known as "Father Joe," was a native of Reading, Pa., where he attended Saints Cyril and Methodius Parochial School. He also attended St. Charles Preparatory School, Overbrook, Pa., and graduated from St. Francis College, Loretto, Pa., in 1928.

He was ordained in 1932 in Harrisburg, Pa., and was assigned by the late Bishop O'Leary to the post of assistant priest at St. Michael's Cathedral.

On Jan. 29, 1933, he was transferred to St. Peter's Church and has been pastor for 37 years. St. Peter's is the only Slovak parish in the Springfield Diocese.

He was Whip City Knights of Columbus chaplain for many years and was recently feted by the organization.

He leaves a brother, John, of Reading.

In lieu of flowers friends were asked to make contributions to the memorial fund at Noble Hospital in Father Novorolsky's memory.

The Robert E. Cusack Funeral Home was in charge of arrangements.

[From the Catholic Observer, July 24, 1970]

TRIBUTE

In grateful memory of Father Joseph G. Novorolsky, pastor of St. Peter's, Westfield, who died July 16, 1970.

"He gave
Not counting cost
To all who looked to him
As Pastor, Counsellor and Friend . . .
Father J. G. N."
(Sister Mary Vittengl, O.Carm., Carmelite Monastery, Hudson, Wis.)

[From the Catholic Observer, July 24, 1970]

HOMILY GIVEN AT FATHER NOVOROLSKY'S FUNERAL

(NOTE.—The following homily was preached at the funeral of Father Joseph G. Novorolsky, pastor of St. Peter's Parish, Westfield. The preacher was Father Richard Portasik, O.F.M., of Holy Family Friary, Pittsburgh, Pa.)

This morning we have gathered here at

St. Peter's in Westfield to pay our final respect to Father Joe, as he was widely called, our brother priest and our spiritual father.

Of his 38 years in the priesthood, he spent 37 as pastor of St. Peter's.

Without question, he has throughout these years affected the lives of the young and the old. He will be missed.

If we would characterize the life of Father Joe in one word, we would have to say that it was one of service to the Church, the community and the People of God.

Recognizing his human deficiencies, he nevertheless conducted himself after the example of Christ, who came "not . . . to be served, but to serve" (Matt. 20:28)

Father Joe served by conscientiously administering the parish temporalities. He maintained all the parish buildings in excellent order.

The church, the house of God, was always clean and properly kept.

He served by his especial love for the sick, the poor and the elderly.

He was a very familiar sight at the local hospital, the surrounding nursing homes, the home for the blind.

Here he absolved the sinner and strengthened him with the Body and Blood of Christ.

One of his most familiar greetings was: Pochvalen Pan Jezis Kristus (Praised be Jesus Christ).

He served by preaching the Word, by announcing the good news of the Gospel in both English and Slovak.

Because of his facility in speaking and his wit, he was called upon frequently to be a toastmaster.

In his age of ecumenism, he served by openly and freely engaging in most of the ecumenical activities in the community.

I am sure that his friendliness and warmth drew Catholics and non-Catholics closer to one another.

We will all miss Father Joe, especially we, his brother priests, who have experienced his kindness, his sociableness and his friendship.

When the mother of St. Augustine was dying, she said to her son: "Son, lay this body anywhere; do not worry about the care of the body when I die; this only I ask, that you remember me at the Lord's altar wherever you may be."

Let us all remember Father Joe in our prayers not only during today's Mass, but in the future Masses we offer and attend.

May he rest in peace and attain his eternal reward for his priestly life of service.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Union, July 18, 1970]

ST. PETER'S CHURCH PASTOR DIES

WESTFIELD.—The Rev. Joseph G. Novorolsky, 63, pastor of St. Peter's Church 37 years and former assistant pastor of St. Michael's Cathedral, Springfield, died Thursday in Bridgeport, Conn.

ORDAINED IN 1928

A native of Reading, Pa., he attended Saints Cyril and Methodius Parochial School in Reading, and St. Charles Preparatory School, Overbrook, Pa., and was graduated from St. Francis College, Loretto, Pa., in 1928.

Fr. Novorolsky was ordained to the priesthood in 1932 in Harrisburg, Pa. Soon after ordination, he was assigned by the late Bishop O'Leary as assistant priest at St. Michael's Cathedral and in January 29, 1933, was assigned to St. Peter's Church.

During his 37 years as pastor, St. Peter's, the only Slovak parish in the Springfield diocese, grew steadily.

He was Whip City Knights of Columbus chaplain many years. He leaves a brother, John of Reading. Robert E. Cusack funeral home is in charge. Burial will be in St. Mary's Cemetery.

NOVOROLSKY

Westfield, July 16. Rev. Joseph G. Novorolsky, pastor of St. Peter's Church, Westfield. Concelebrated high Mass of Resurrection Monday 10 a.m. St. Peter's Church, Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon will be the celebrant. Calling hours at the rectory, 22 State St., Westfield will be Saturday 7 to 9 p.m., Sunday 2 to 4. The body will be transferred to the church Sunday at 7:30 p.m. where it will lie in state until Monday at 10 a.m. In lieu of flowers friends may make their contributions to the Memorial fund at Noble Hospital in Fr. Novorolsky's memory. Worcester, Mass papers and Reading, Pa. papers please copy.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, July 18, 1970]

ST. PETER'S CHURCH PASTOR DIES

WESTFIELD.—The funeral of the Rev. Joseph G. Novorolsky, 63, pastor for 37 years of St. Peter's Church, who died Thursday in Bridgeport, Conn., will be held Monday in St. Peter's Church.

The Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon, Bishop of the Springfield Roman Catholic Diocese, will be the celebrant.

Concelebrants will be the Rev. Jerome Pavlik, OFM, Franciscan Friary, Easton, Pa.; the Rev. Andrew Cekovsky, St. Anthony's Church, Johnstown, N.Y.; the Rev. Joseph D. Ferenz, St. Anthony's Church, Webster; the Rev. Edmund Mochak, St. Dennis Church, East Douglas; the Rev. Paul O'Day, St. Thomas Church, West Springfield; the Rev. Vincent Puidokas, St. Casimir's Church, Westfield; the Rev. John Blazewicz, MS, Holy Trinity Church, Westfield, and the Rev. Joseph Massaro, CSS, Holy Family Church, Lynn.

The Deacon will be the Rev. David Joyce, St. Mary's Church, Westfield. The Thurifer will be the Rev. Francis X. Sullivan, Blessed Sacrament Church, Westfield.

Acolytes will be the Rev. Michael Develin, Blessed Sacrament Church, Westfield, and the Rev. John O'Donnell, St. Thomas Church, West Springfield.

The Homilist for the Bible service Sunday will be the Rev. Edmund Mochak. The Eulogy Monday will be delivered by the Rev. Richard Portasik, OFM, the Franciscan Friary, Pittsburgh, Pa.

ORDAINED IN 1928

A native of Reading, Pa., he attended Saints Cyril and Methodius Parochial School in Reading, and St. Charles Preparatory School, Overbrook, Pa., and was graduated from St. Francis College, Loretto, Pa., in 1928.

Fr. Novorolsky was ordained to the priesthood in 1932 in Harrisburg, Pa. Soon after ordination, he was assigned by the late Bishop O'Leary as assistant priest at St. Michael's Cathedral and in January 29, 1933, was assigned to St. Peter's Church.

During his 37 years as pastor, St. Peter's, the only Slovak parish in the Springfield diocese, grew steadily.

He was Whip City Knights of Columbus chaplain many years. He leaves a brother, John of Reading. Robert E. Cusak funeral is in charge. Burial will be in St. Mary's Cemetery.

[From the Springfield (Mass.) Daily News, July 18, 1970]

NOVOROLSKY

Westfield, July 16. Rev. Joseph G. Novorolsky, pastor of St. Peter's Church, Westfield. Concelebrated high Mass at resurrection Monday 10 a.m., St. Peter's Church, Most Rev. Christopher J. Weldon will be the celebrant. Calling hours at the rectory, 22 State St., Westfield will be Saturday 7 to 9 p.m., Sunday 2 to 4. The body will be transferred to the church Sunday at 7:30 p.m., where it will lie in state until Monday at 10 a.m. In lieu of flowers friends may make their contributions to the memorial fund at Noble

Hospital in Fr. Novorolsky's memory. Worcester, Mass. papers and Reading, Pa. papers please copy.

[From the Catholic Observer, July 24, 1970]
FATHER NOVOROLSKY'S FUNERAL HELD—WESTFIELD PASTOR FOR 37 YEARS

WESTFIELD.—The funeral of Father Joseph G. Novorolsky, pastor of St. Peter's Parish for the past 37 years, was held on Monday, July 20, in the parish church.

Father Novorolsky died suddenly in Bridgeport, Conn., on July 16. He was 63 years of age and had been a priest for 38 years.

Bishop Christopher J. Weldon was the principal concelebrant of the funeral Mass. He also officiated at the interment in St. Mary's Cemetery.

Offering the Mass with Bishop Weldon were Father Joseph A. Ferenz of Webster; Father Andrew B. Cechovsky of Johnstown, N.Y.; Father Edmund G. Mochak of East Douglas; Father Vincent Puidokas of Westfield, Father Joseph Massaro, C.S.S., of Lynn; and Father Jerome Pavlik, O.F.M., of Philadelphia. Father Richard Portasik, O.F.M., of Pittsburg gave the homily.

Father David J. Joyce of Westfield was deacon of the Mass.

Fathers Michael H. Devlin of Westfield and John J. O'Donnell of West Springfield served as acolytes. Father Thomas F. McCarthy of Westfield was crucifer and thurifer.

Father John Blazewicz, M.S., of Westfield assisted the master of ceremonies, Father Daniel A. Doyle of the Chancery staff.

Father James P. Sears of Wilbraham, diocesan director of music, led the Priests' Choir and the congregation in the music of the Mass.

Father Novorolsky was a native of Reading, Pa. He prepared for the priesthood at St. Charles Preparatory School in Overbrook, Pa., and at St. Francis College, Loretto, Pa. He was ordained in Harrisburg, Pa., in 1932.

For a brief period after his ordination he served as an assistant in St. Michael's Cathedral Parish, Springfield. He was named pastor of St. Peter's on Jan. 29, 1933.

THE LOW COST OF FREEDOM

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, July 30, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, on December 8, 1969, Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak, USMC, gave an address at the U.S. Naval Academy, which was reprinted in condensed form in the July 1970 issue of the U.S. Naval Institute Proceedings, with the title "The Low Cost of Freedom."

General Krulak has made 54 trips to the Vietnam theater of combat, and his last command embraced all Marines serving in the Pacific Ocean area. I believe his words deserve wide attention, and I would like to include the speech at this point in the RECORD.

THE LOW COST OF FREEDOM

(Condensation of address by Lt. Gen. Victor H. Krulak)

There is in our land a growing dissatisfaction with that group of our citizens who feel that there is some short cut or bargain basement route to national security, who somehow find strength in weakness, who condemn and demean those dedicated to our defense, who indict what they call the "military/industrial complex" as being dishonorable or capricious.

Before condemning those who criticize our

security efforts, it will be well to clarify the general state of our defenses—how big they are and what they cost.

First, as to people. There are 3.5 million assorted people serving within the Department of Defense today. A half-million are deployed overseas in Vietnam, another quarter-million are deployed overseas in other critical places around the world.

To support the varied activities of these 3.5 million men—to supply, train and sustain them—the current defense budget aggregates 79 billion dollars. That is 79 stacks of thousand dollar bills, each stack as high as the Washington Monument.

About a third of this total—perhaps 26 billion—is intended to support our overseas operations.

Here is the key point right at the outset. If those who clamor for our abandonment of Vietnam were successful in causing us completely to turn our backs and quit, perhaps a third of this large sum might be diverted to other purposes. But the bulk of it—fully two-thirds—would still be needed to sustain the same forces deployed in the United States or to replenish the material reserves—ammunition, aircraft and weapons—that have been so depleted by our war in Southeast Asia.

If experience is worth anything, it must tell us also that our summary withdrawal from Southeast Asia would just fertilize trouble elsewhere; trouble that could well demand a far greater expenditure. And no matter how courageous or pusillanimous we are in Vietnam, we still have no license to repeat the post-World War II Louis Johnson era where we so weakened ourselves as to invite the Communists to launch the Korean invasion.

Another eight billion of the 79-billion-dollar budget request is intended to support our minimum essential defense against nuclear attack—our nuclear submarines, our strategic bombers, nuclear weapons, detection systems, missiles. Ultimately, the ABM will be part of this, too.

In light of what our potential enemies are doing, there is doubt as to the adequacy of this sum. A good case could be made to increase it. In today's world there can be little question as to what would result if the Soviet Union ever found us in a position where we could not retaliate decisively to their first strike nuclear attack.

Our enemies know what nuclear blackmail means. And the very day we make ourselves vulnerable to nuclear blackmail, we can expect to feel it. That was the guts of the ABM issue.

But, let's get back to our 79 billion dollars. When we take away the cost of Vietnam and nuclear defense, we still have something over \$43 billion left.

Of this we have to take three billion for obligatory payments to retired military personnel; pensions to the disabled, to the widows, to the soldiers going all the way back to the Spanish-American War. This is a legal obligation. It cannot be escaped.

Six billion more are committed to military research and development. Here is an area that is under tremendous pressure—even attack, by those grown-up flower children who contend that, if you don't develop the means to make war, you won't be found making war. It's all so simple. We hear this frequently now, from a vocal few in the Congress, from the anarchistic Students for a Democratic Society, and from an array of Marxist professors whose object seems to be the erosion of the minds of our young people.

Second to the attack on our expenditures for nuclear retaliatory power, I believe that the attack on this sum of money could be the most deadly of all.

Military research is costly. Some of it has been inefficient. Poor planning and cost overruns have eroded people's confidence—mine included.

But these inefficiencies don't diminish at

all the need for aggressive technologic research to evolve better and more efficient weapons.

Moreover, our own research is pretty much open. We know—indeed, the world knows—what we are doing.

Not so with the Soviet Union. Their research is done—to the extent that they can do it—in secret. Nobody knows what they are achieving.

We simply don't dare to underestimate them. Our survival is at stake and we need to go forward at top speed, just to be safe.

We all remember Sputnik. The Russians beat us into space by a large margin because of the secret Soviet program of research in one limited area—large rocket motors. Their superiority has since been overcome by our own successful research in other areas of space technology. But, it took us eight years to do it.

Just suppose that their secret research had not been related just to getting a peaceful object into space, but had been devoted to developing a means to detect and destroy America's nuclear weapons. And suppose they had succeeded, and were able to catch us unawares, just as they did with Sputnik.

What might have happened if research had put us at the nuclear mercy of the Soviets for eight long years? This is something we simply cannot risk. We need to maintain a clear superiority in technology for our own survival. And, that kind of superiority does not come cheap.

The Russians know the stakes involved, and they are prepared to pay for it. For the past few years the Soviets have increased their research and development spending continually while ours has grown only very slowly. In 1970, if these trends continue, the Soviet Union will for the first time be putting more money into research and development than we are.

This is no time to lag behind. But, unless there is some dramatic change in the attitudes in Congress, we are headed for second place in a scientific race where nothing but first place counts.

But, back to our arithmetic and our 79 billion. We still have something on the order of 35 billion dollars left.

Out of this we take some 15 billion for support functions—supply, maintenance, repair and modernization of valuable equipment, training of hundreds of thousands of men in the whole gamut of technical skills, military travel, hospitalization—in short, everything involved in making this whole complex mechanism work, day in and day out.

There can be some improved efficiency in this. But, basically, these support functions are going to have to be accomplished at 1970 prices. This 15 billion dollars is not just all mysterious military outgo. What price tag, for example is reasonable for all the young men to whom the military teaches a useful skill that will make them better citizens? What price tag is reasonable for the medical care given to 10 million Americans of all types and ages—the active and retired and their dependents—in some 250 hospitals? Where would they go otherwise? And how much would it cost?

What price tag is reasonable for the benefits realized by all sectors of business and industry from the day-to-day military purchases—whether it be socks or beans or ten-penny nails? There probably can be something wrung out of the budget in this area, but it just can't be much, or the basic machinery won't work.

The only area remaining is our conventional fighting forces—the fleets with their carriers, amphibious forces, ASW forces, Air Force tactical units, the Army and Marine combat forces—all of which put together, form the basis of our capability to go where American strength is needed. This sum also provides for our Reserves and the National

Guard and the other elements of our military staying power.

All told, this package is something on the order of 22 billion dollars worth, and, together, we may all simultaneously shudder to think what would happen to us if these bread-and-butter elements of our national security were to be eroded.

If this erosion were to occur, our enemies would present us with choice after bitter choice where our use of nuclear weapons would not appear justified but where some important political, military, or economic position would have to be sacrificed because we simply did not have the alternative conventional tools to do anything about it. If we want to see Western Europe or Southeast Asia or both go down the drain, weakening our conventional forces is the surest way to accomplish it.

Nevertheless, unless some Congressmen are obliged to face up to the problem, there is a major budget cut coming in this critical area because, along with all the military, large and small, it's under drumfire attack today.

This discussion has outlined what our country would do with the money originally requested to underwrite our security for next year. But really, it doesn't mean much to talk about military budgets if they exceed our ability to pay. This question has to be faced up squarely.

In this case, and in spite of the very large sums involved, there is no question whatever but that we can foot the bill. No responsible person in this country has ever declared that the United States cannot afford to defend itself. And 1970 is no exception.

This 79-billion-dollar expenditure, for example, would only be seven per cent of our gross national product. The Soviet Union, is now expending about twice as much on defense forces as we are.

We can afford it.

Last year, our Federal spending went up about six billion dollars. But only half a billion went for the military.

No, we're not over-balanced in our defense spending.

In the past five years, the Federal Government alone has put 30 billion dollars into welfare. And this is on top of all the state and county and city and private funds that have been piped into the welfare sector. The total welfare expenditure has probably exceeded 10 billion dollars a year—this is far more than we are investing in protection against the doomsday weapon in the hands of our potential enemies, the Russians and the Chinese.

Last year, we spent over four billion dollars in this country to collect garbage. We spent over three-and-a-half billion dollars on our pets.

No, we are not over-spending on defense.

Last year we spent 24 billion dollars to fix our automobiles. That's about what Vietnam costs. And then we spent 26 billion more to buy new ones. That's more than Vietnam costs.

There is no evidence to suggest that we have ever over-spent on defense. In war, it's results that count and our military forces have won every war we've ever entered—at least up to the time that the politicians took charge.

Our military forces have defended our country, they have protected our shores, they have enhanced our overseas commerce, they have fulfilled our international obligations and have earned for us vastly more respect than some of the aimless and disorganized giveaway programs that have bruised our treasury to the tune of over a third of a trillion dollars since 1945.

Critics of our national security mechanism say that our military power, on occasion, has been excessive; that we actually have been too strong. Maybe so, but these critics' freedom might be spent more profitably contem-

plating what might have happened if ever our strength had been just not quite enough.

The same critics, and others, say that our military power has been used for the wrong things. And this may also be true. But if it is true, we cannot, in all fairness, overlook the fact that the military does nothing on its own.

Wherever we go, whatever we do, military acts are invariably products of political decisions.

Our soldiers went to France in 1917 to carry out a political decision. We entered World War II only after a careful political appraisal by the Federal administration. We went to Korea as a direct result of President Truman's own political judgment.

And—let there be no doubt in anyone's mind—we sent our forces to Vietnam not because of any capricious chicanery that had to do with Tonkin Gulf, but as a result of 12 months of painful deliberation by the Federal administration.

Heaven knows, we have fought that war not as soldiers would fight it, but as political leadership of our nation has directed—even to the extent of the selection of bombing targets and the prescription of military tactics by the politicians.

Whatever they do, wherever they go in the future, their countrymen may be sure of this—our military forces will be following the dictates of our civilian leaders. This is the way it always has been. This is the way it has to be.

The current condemnation, then, of our military for being off the reservation, or irresponsible, or unjustifiably costly, is just dead wrong.

But, in a broader sense, we have to acknowledge that the condemnation is understandable in today's world climate. It's almost to be expected. Because it is just a symptom of what is wrong with America as a whole.

What is wrong with the United States of America?

It has to do with that region of our body down around the midsection—we are suffering a shortage of that four letter commodity called "guts." There is a passive unwillingness on the part of the vast bulk of our people to stand up and be counted; to fight what is wrong.

Walter Lippmann expressed this thought more elegantly when he said, "The critical weakness of our society is that, for the time being, our people do not have great purposes which they are united in wanting to achieve."

I agree. Today we see an extraordinary lack of purpose and an even greater lack of resolution in our people. While the majority of Americans remain silent, we find vocal minorities of our people exerting inordinate—and often dangerous—influence on our country's affairs.

With no visible frontiers to conquer, they grope about for emotional causes. They find satisfaction in deprecating America's progress, ignoring America's strength, attacking America's institutions, while giving undeserved respect to the philosophy and the conduct of our potential enemies. And they are being allowed to get away with it by a passive majority.

The fact is this is a great country. Our system is a good system. It's the success story of the modern age. Nowhere, in all the nooks and crannies of history, is there a record of anything better.

Certainly the system with which we are in competition around the world can't even compare with it. Karl Marx designed what he reckoned was a foolproof scheme for defeating capitalism.

It's been tried in a score of places, in a hundred ways around the world for the better part of a century. But, it has never been able to meet the challenge of freedom, where man has the opportunity to succeed and the right to fall, where there is equity in govern-

ment, participation by little people in important affairs, and where the events of the market place govern the economy.

Marxism and its totalitarian trappings have failed. Certainly the cold aggression in Budapest, where Soviet tanks confronted Hungarian flesh and blood, was not a manifestation of success.

The brutal aggression by the Soviet Army in Czechoslovakia—seen on millions of television screens—was by no means a mark of triumph.

The erection of the Berlin wall—living monument to frustration—was not an example of Communist progress.

The cold murder of thousands, perhaps millions, of Chinese, the raging of the Red Guards, the forcible seizure of peasants' crops by the People's Liberation Army are no evidence that Marxism is succeeding in China.

The ejection of the Communists from Indonesia, the largest Moslem nation in the world, was a major setback.

Nor is the propaganda drumfire regarding Vietnam that we hear coming from every

Communist source around the world—a drumfire that seeks to shake our own convictions in the ability of our nation to solve its problems—a manifestation of strength.

All of these symptoms, plain for every one of us to see and analyze on his own, sound a note which should resound from one end of our country to the other.

It is this: While the American system has made tremendous strides, our enemy is in trouble all over the world and what he is doing, by every means possible, is to try and divert our attention from his plight, to create doubts, apprehensions and cynicism in our minds so that we will not make capital of his weakness.

What is needed desperately today is for the great mass of silent America to come out of their shells—to acknowledge publicly and openly what they already know—that ours is a great, a dynamic, and successful country, that the ragings of those who condemn our system are false.

Now, above all, is no time for people whose work has brought our country to greatness to be silent or uncertain.

Over a generation ago, Calvin Coolidge said, "Doubters do not achieve, skeptics do not contribute, cynics do not create."

The 20th century is certainly a battlefield. Of this, there can be no doubt. And, to win the battle of the 20th century, our country can afford no doubters, no skeptics and no cynics.

If the American people will show the guts to face the issues as they really are and to make themselves heard over the din of those who would destroy our society, the future has to be bright. This particularly has to do with the military, with the preservation of its image, with the damping of the downward tilt of the curve of our popularity with the protection of our strength, of our right to fight, of our opportunity to defend our land.

Each of you midshipmen with the broad education that is coming your way here, certainly see the magnitude of the stakes involved in today's battle for military survival. We face shortages—shortages, of course, of money, of men, of information, of organization, of leadership, of time.

And the shortest of all is time.

SENATE—Friday, July 31, 1970

The Senate met at 11 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, our God, and our children's God, before Thee the generations pass. We thank Thee for the work of hand and speech and pen in every age by which life has been enriched and Thy kingdom advanced. We bless Thee for our place in the making of history, for the sturdy warriors of the spirit who have moved ahead, and for the vital youths in the ranks which follow. However few or many our days, we thank Thee for life, and that it is lived now when new vistas are opened, new wonders of creation revealed, and new disciplines demanded. O Lord, make us adequate for our time.

To the President, to the Congress, and to all our leaders give that higher wisdom and that nobler courage which belongs to free men under Thy protection and rulership.

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore of the Senate (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D.C., July 31, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JAMES B. ALLEN, a Senator from the State of Alabama, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ALLEN thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Berry, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 3586) to amend title VII of the Public Health Service Act to establish eligibility of new schools of medicine, dentistry, osteopathy, pharmacy, optometry, veterinary medicine, and podiatry for institutional grants under section 771 thereof, to extend and improve the program relating to training of personnel in the allied health professions, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 15733) to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a temporary 15-percent increase in annuities, to change for a temporary period the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 16915) making appropriations for the legislative branch for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1971, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1 through 22, 24 through 31, and 37 through 41 to the bill, and concurred therein; and that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 23, 32, and 35 to the bill, and concurred therein, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H.R. 18104) to amend section 15(d) of the Tennessee

Valley Authority Act of 1933 to increase the amount of bonds which may be issued by the Tennessee Valley Authority, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message further announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. ALLEN):

S. 3348. An act to amend title 38, United States Code, to increase the rates of compensation for disabled veterans, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 15733. An act to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937 to provide a temporary 15-percent increase in annuities, to change for a temporary period the method of computing interest on investments of the railroad retirement accounts, and for other purposes.

HOUSE BILL REPORTED

The bill (H.R. 18104) to amend section 15(d) of the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 to increase the amount of bonds which may be issued by the Tennessee Valley Authority, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Public Works.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, July 30, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ORDER FOR TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that, following the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG), there be a