

Edward S. Walker, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
For appointment as Foreign Service information officers of class 5, consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Harry Iceland, of the District of Columbia.
Leonard R. Sauble, of Florida.

For reappointment in the Foreign Service as a Foreign Service officer of class 6, a consular officer, and a secretary in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
John Dodson Coffman, of Pennsylvania.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 7, consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Ross E. Benson, of California.
John S. Blodgett, of Virginia.
Michael A. Boorstein, of Colorado.
James C. Cason, of the District of Columbia.

Peter R. Chaveas, of New Jersey.
Frederick R. Cook, of New York.
Dean Dizikes, of California.
Douglas A. Dworkin, of Tennessee.
Stephen W. Faber, of New Jersey.
Lawrence F. Farrar, of Minnesota.
Royce J. Fichte, of Illinois.
Miss Joan E. Garner, of Virginia.
Harold W. Geisel, of Illinois.
Michael L. Hancock, of Georgia.
Donald Vance Hester, of Illinois.
James G. Huff, of the District of Columbia.
Morris N. Hughes, Jr., of Nebraska.
Robert Leonard Jacobs, of Illinois.
Warren E. Littrel, Jr., of Illinois.
William A. Moffitt, of Texas.
Day Olin Mount, of New York.
Thomas F. Murphy, of Illinois.
Ronald E. Neumann, of California.
Robert C. Perry, of North Carolina.
Wayne Alan Roy, of Virginia.
Robert L. Scott, of Virginia.
Hugh V. Simon, Jr., of Tennessee.
Richard A. Smith, Jr., of Connecticut.
Joseph Gerard Sullivan, of Massachusetts.
Russell J. Surber, of Washington.
Frank P. Wardlaw, of Texas.
Charles Allen Weeks, of Pennsylvania.
Andrew Jan Winter, of New York.
Ira Wolf, of Virginia.

For appointment as Foreign Service information officers of class 7, consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Arthur S. Berger, of the District of Columbia.
Miss Donna Marie Blatt, of Florida.
Nelson C. Brown, of Louisiana.
John F. Coppola, of New Jersey.
William Henry Graves, of California.
Robert C. Heath, of California.
John E. Katzka, of Virginia.
Thomas F. Lonergan, of California.
Michael F. O'Brien, of California.
Miss Anne M. Sigmund, of Kansas.
John C. Thomson, of California.
John Treacy, of New York.
John C. Wicart, of Virginia.

For appointment as Foreign Service officers of class 8, consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:

Larry G. Butcher, of Oklahoma.
Richard Dunlap Heim, of New Jersey.
John Scott Monier, of Illinois.
Miss Suzanne Sekerak, of Pennsylvania.
John Stern Wolf, of Pennsylvania.
For appointment as Foreign Service information officers of class 8, consular officers, and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Michael L. Braxton, of the District of Columbia.
Frank Dietrich Buchholz, of New York.
Howard A. Cincotta, of Maryland.
David P. Good, of New York.
Andre N. Gregory, of California.
Phillip C. Harley, of New York.
Robert D. Miller, of Pennsylvania.
Robert C. Wible, of Ohio.
Foreign Service reserve officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:
William D. Carey, of Virginia.
Gerald L. Engle, of Michigan.
William A. Wolfer, of New Jersey.
Foreign Service reserve officers to be consular officers and secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Charles R. Best, of Virginia.
Brian H. Bramson, of Virginia.
Robert Clayton Brown, of Virginia.
Rodney W. Carlson, of Virginia.
Charles A. Cooper, of California.
Christopher N. Darlington, of New York.
Frank B. Dean, of Florida.
Warren L. Dean, of Nebraska.
James B. Devine, of Maryland.
C. Harlow Duffin, of Florida.

Donald G. Eckrote, of Virginia.
Warren E. Frank, of Nebraska.
John F. Gilhooly, of Connecticut.
William R. Gray, of California.
Richard D. Harrington, of Maryland.
Raul J. Hernandez, of the District of Columbia.
James M. Howley, of Maryland.
Myron M. Kline, of Minnesota.
Jonathan F. Ladd, of Ohio.
Ishmael Lara, of California.
Robert B. Leete, of Connecticut.
Larry V. Luther, of South Dakota.
Richard M. Luther, of Virginia.
Charles A. Marquez, of New Mexico.
Martin W. Moser, of Pennsylvania.
John L. Murray, of Virginia.
Ronald P. Oppen, of Florida.
Philip W. Pillsbury, Jr., of Minnesota.
Arthur J. Porn, of Wisconsin.
Rowland E. Roberts, Jr., of Pennsylvania.
Leo Sandel, of Maryland.
Henry P. Schardt, of Illinois.
André C. Simonpietri, of the District of Columbia.
Raymond J. Swider, of Virginia.
Wendell L. Wallace, of Maryland.
Foreign Service reserve officers to be secretaries in the diplomatic service of the United States of America:
Richard M. Cashin, of Maryland.
Thomas C. Niblock, of North Carolina.
Robert T. Shaw, of Arizona.
Frederick A. Turco, of Maryland.
Foreign Service staff officers to be consular officers of the United States of America:
Miss Nancy C. Abell, of Illinois.
Walter M. Berwick, of Virginia.
Andrew S. Coe, of Texas.
John M. Hall, of Florida.
George A. Hannemann, of Texas.
John A. Hollingsworth, of California.
Robert C. LaPrade, of California.
Robert N. McGovern, of California.
Joseph A. Murray, Jr., of Washington.
David P. Reimuller, of California.
William C. Wagner, Jr., of Virginia.

THE GENERATION GAP
HON. LEE METCALF
OF MONTANA
IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, there are few among us who have not given extensive consideration to the overused and, in many cases, little understood concept of the generation gap.
In very simplistic terms, one could describe this concept as an inability to effectively communicate thoughts and feelings between individuals of different ages. That this widespread inability exists should not be surprising, for the establishment of rapport is dependent upon the degree of mutual experiences. This is particularly true in the areas of political inclination and cultural appreciation.
I was privileged recently to read a September 1970, article, published by the

U.S. Information Service, written by the father of a teenage rock music group leader. As this article may be of interest to many of us who are constantly striving to bridge the generation gap, I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

ROCK AND THE FLIGHT OF PARENTS
(By Edward Devol, IPS Staff Writer)

Summary: What is the impact of rock music on an American parent whose home is used as a rehearsal hall and who must act as chauffeur to the rock group his guitarist son leads? This is the inside story by a father who knows.

Rock music—that deafening electronic blend of guitar and drums—has made its place in the American musical firmament. Musicologists laboriously analyze its structure and pronounce it interesting; critics declare it an expression of the times; famous rock performers become millionaires. It is aimed at the young and they love it.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

Rock music is their bread, their wine, their heavenly choir. A thousand-million-dollar industry has arisen to serve their desires for recordings and public performances by rock musicians.
But what of the parents of a youngster who is unfulfilled by listening to the records, or even by sitting in a meadow with thousands of his peers while Blood, Sweat and Tears or some other popular rock group assails the open air with sounds amplified by several thousand watts?
Consider the plight of a household trying to survive a 17-year-old who wants to become a professional rock guitarist. There are millions of him. Most, of course, will never make a profession of music. They will do as their fathers did, abandon such dreams for the law, or carpentry, or selling insurance.
Practicality, however, is in a future the young rarely consider. Now the 17-year-old guitarist wants nothing but rock and the house quivers from the music of the Flotilla, as his three youth rock group calls itself. Living quarters designed for sound no louder than conversation are pounded by decibels better suited to an auditorium seating hundreds.

U.S. NAVY
Vice Adm. Jackson D. Arnold, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of admiral while so serving.

Flotilla rehearses once a week. Its 17-year-old leader, the elder of two sons, is not unreasonable. He formally requests permission for the weekly rehearsal and permission is granted. If his mother plans well, she can be out of the house at the appointed time. Usually her household duties keep her at home and when Flotilla begins to play, the mother winces, the dog howls, and the younger brother leaves home, trailing behind him rude remarks about the noise. (He likes rock music, but his subordinate status in the family does not permit him to express a liking for his big brother's rendition of it.)

The father is rarely home at rehearsal time. But to him falls the privilege of transporting Flotilla to its occasional public performances.

Once they played at a church, following the business meeting of a young people's organization. Half a dozen adults were also present, and the generation gap soon appeared.

While Flotilla was making ready—tuning guitars, testing amplifiers, eyeing the girls— young and old mixed comfortably, admiring the sheen of the guitars, remarking on the size of the amplifiers.

Then the music began. The youngsters rushed forward, eager to let the sound beat against their ears from close range; the adults retreated to the farthest corner and looked at one another with raised eyebrows.

One woman spoke to the father of Flotilla's leader. He could not hear her. She spoke again, again was not heard, and finally wrote on a piece of paper: "Loud, aren't they?"

The father nodded, hoping loyalty to his son permitted a slight frown.

She wrote again on the paper: "But quite good."

He nodded, this time with a smile.

Another time Flotilla invited itself to perform on the mall of a large shopping center. The authorities consented and Flotilla was transported to the mall by the father one evening after a particularly difficult day at the office. He stood patiently beside the car while the musicians unloaded their huge supply of guitars, amplifiers, speakers, drums and little bags containing electric cords, microphones, and tools for emergency repairs.

While the boys were setting up their equipment near the fountain at the center of the long mall, the father wandered from store to store. In the bookstore near the fountain, he heard one clerk say to another: "I hope those boys don't play so loud we can't hear our customers."

Perhaps they did, for the reinforcement of Flotilla's own amplifiers and speakers by several borrowed items produced a truly noble volume of sound. The mall, lined by shops on both sides, was an efficient trap for the sound: the wall of the guitars and the throb of the drums were trapped between the shop windows. The panes of glass vibrated slightly.

Soon Flotilla was surrounded by people. They came from the shops, they came from the parking lot. Both young and old listened and smiled. The young liked the music; the old were attracted by the novelty. A small boy stationed himself 18 inches from the guitar of Flotilla's leader and the father hoped the child would not jostle the guitar and interrupt the careful fingering of the performer.

The father watched the audience enjoying his son's music and framed the reply he would give if someone asked him who the musicians were. "The leader is my son," he would say calmly, and without boastfulness. And then he would wait for the words of praise for his son's dexterity and musicianship. But no one asked.

Flotilla played on, exalted by their own music. An attractive young girl replaced the small boy near the leader's guitar. The

guitarist scarcely saw her. His music was all.

The father wanted to share the experience. He found a public telephone and called his home. When his wife answered, he said: "You ought to be here. They're playing very well."

He thought she said, "That's good," but Flotilla made it difficult to hear her.

"Listen," he said, and extended the telephone receiver in the direction of the music. "Did you hear it?"

"I heard something," she said. "It sounded like a train."

He decided that some experiences were impossible to share. But he had been there and he knew the people had liked Flotilla.

As for the future of Flotilla's leader, music was a fine profession, too. Perhaps practically should wait. The young had less need of it.

And besides, the father thought, next time Flotilla might even get paid.

AGRICULTURE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, Illinois' 20th District is a combination of cities, small towns, and rural countryside. The lives of most of my constituents are centered around agriculture—either producing crops, preparing them for market, selling them, or serving those who do.

Throughout my service in Congress, therefore, I have maintained close interest in all legislation relating to agriculture. For 6 years I served on the Agriculture Committee. Since then, as a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee, I have been able to enlarge my work on behalf of farming interests, particularly expanding foreign markets.

NEW APPROACH NEEDED

Every recent indication from farmers, farming organizations, and the public has shown a demand for a new approach in farm legislation. Unfortunately, the 91st Congress failed to respond.

A comprehensive, 5-year program of transition to strengthen market income—H.R. 9009—was my principal proposal. It was later cosponsored by 71 other Congressmen—including the late Senator Dirksen. I described my 5-year plan to the House Agriculture Committee in October 1969, as "people oriented":

Present programs are crop-oriented. (They) give income support to commodities and yield many payments of astronomical size to individual farmers, which in turn, give the big operator resources with which to get still bigger, often at the expense of the small farmer.

In their place I recommend two separate but complementary approaches: first, a general cropland adjustment program not tied to individual commodities; second, a program of personal assistance available only to farmers of low income.

In March 1970, I joined with 4 other Illinois Congressmen in this plea to President Nixon:

As Representatives of an agricultural constituency, we respectfully request that you not embrace the failures of the past, but

rather, reform and build upon those portions of the farm program which hold more promise for the development of a sound market economy for American agriculture.

By May it was clear that most farmers wanted a change from the present agricultural program. In a survey of farmers in my district, 95 percent voted for substantial change and reform. Less than 5 percent preferred no change. Of those favoring change, one-third wanted H.R. 9009. Another third wanted present programs but with payments to farmers limited to \$20,000. Surveys by other Congressmen confirmed my own findings.

The bill finally passed was, in effect, a 3-year extension of present law with costly gimmicks to the advantage of cotton growers, but distinctly to the disadvantage of midwestern farmers. I opposed it, as did all major farm organizations.

A \$20,000 PAYMENT LIMIT

When the showdown on the farm bill came, the vote on my amendment to limit payments to \$20,000 per farmer provided the test between those who wanted reform and those who favored the existing program with its big payments. For 8 years I have pressed this issue.

In May 1969, I published the names of the 425 counties in the United States which did not have a Federal food-aid program for needy people, together with the amount of Federal farm payments to wealthy farmers for not growing food in those same counties.

In May 1970, I wrote to each of the 50 Congressmen representing districts receiving the largest amount of Federal farm payments, asking them to support a responsible payment limit. I said:

As you know, big payments to farmers of substantial means—more than any other factor—have put farm programs in disrepute with almost all citizens, urban and rural alike.

I pointed out that "each of us can fully justify support for a payment limit in terms of the wishes of our own constituency," including those from the cotton South. A farm magazine survey last year in the cotton belt showed 71 percent of those farmers want a payment limit.

On July 7, Senator RALPH TYLER SMITH of Illinois accomplished an extraordinary feat by persuading the Senate to adopt a \$20,000 limit in a pending appropriations bill.

Unfortunately, on August 5, on a very close vote, the committee's \$55,000 level was chosen over the \$20,000 payment limit level which I offered. Although the limit adopted was not as low as I would have liked to see, it was a step in the right direction. I will continue my efforts to establish the ceiling at \$20,000.

AGRICULTURAL ADVANCES

Substantial progress was made in other areas. Transmissible gastroenteritis—TGE—which often wipes out entire litters of baby pigs, last year cost Illinois pork producers over \$10 million. When the Agriculture appropriations bill was before the House, I appeared before the committee and requested additional funds for research into a cure for the disease. My request was granted.

The Agriculture appropriations bill also included \$100 million in grants, I had urged for water and sewer systems in small towns. This important step will help to breathe new life into rural America. With adequate transportation, educational facilities, and municipal services, industry will bring jobs and new hope to these areas.

During this fall's corn harvest I made a detailed survey of the crop in the 13 counties of the 20th District and presented the report in a meeting to Agriculture Secretary Hardin. In it I suggested administrative changes to cut redtape when farmers hit by crop disaster seek Federal low-interest loans.

In several conferences with European trade leaders I argued against a proposed tax which would cut our export markets for soybeans. Officials of the Department of Agriculture described this "missionary work" as helpful. While the tax is not dead, it at least is not being actively considered at this time.

FOUR HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-EIGHT YEARS OF LOYALTY

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, one of the facts that has made the United States a great nation is that we are a pluralistic nation. From our earliest days, great contributions have been made to our society by the Americans whose ancestors have hailed from other lands.

Americans' pride in their own ancestry has helped make them better Americans.

It gives me great pleasure to record the words of one of my constituents, Frank Capra, commander of the Bronx County Post No. 39, Italian American War Veterans of the United States:

FOUR HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-EIGHT YEARS OF LOYALTY

We are Americans, of Italian heritage which is firmly imbedded deep in the grass roots of American History.

Italian American blood enriches the main stream of America. It has given and it continues to give strength, character and vitality to the nation. It shall always be so forever and ever.

The Italian Americans who fought and died in order to enjoy the blessings of peace, from the very beginning were prepared to defend it as well. Thus Italian American War Veterans have played an important role in the defense of American Liberty and Freedom.

To my knowledge no American of Italian descent has ever been called for an investigation by any Agency of the United States Government on matters pertaining to the security of this Government. A record of unwavering loyalty unmatched by any other group within this land. The Italian American Veteran has distinguished himself beyond the call of duty, eleven (11) have earned that highest honor that the United States Government could bestow, The Congressional Medal of Honor.

I am proud, we should be proud, all of us, to belong to the Italian American Veterans. With your cooperation, we shall unite and

do our utmost, each and every one of us, in succeeding to bring forth our heritage to the highest pinnacle.

I am in firm belief that you should devote time and effort in your Organization. Participate in all Post activities, and let our nation know that we are the same men that answered the many calls our nation had summoned. That we are in readiness to protect our shores (if and when necessary).

In time of supreme crisis during World War II our nation asked for men to defend and protect our democratic society. The Italian Americans had 2,400,000 under arms, one-sixth (1/6th) of the United States forces. Why shouldn't we be proud, and proud I am, for I am an Italian American Veteran.

PEACE, AT WHAT PRICE, IN THE MIDDLE EAST?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an uneasy peace has been negotiated in the Middle East, at least we are so told.

No one really won, but until the interpretive news analysts decide on how to best present the fiasco, one thing is for certain—we can be assured that the United States lost.

Many wonder what prompted the sudden decision of the Russians to encourage the Syrians and Egyptians to withdraw their military forces from infiltrated and invaded Jordan. We hear little these days of what our precise foreign policy in the Middle East is or how it may vary from country to country and from incident to incident. Time was when our Middle East policy consisted of neutrality except to defend territorial integrity. Now it has been redefined as maintaining a balance of power.

But, many Americans have not as yet forgotten the Jordanian episode which followed the Palestinian hijacking of aircraft. The U.S. 6th Fleet maneuvered in the Mediterranean, U.S. combat troops at bases in Germany and North Carolina were readied for combat alert and our State Department entered negotiations with the Russians to cool it.

Suddenly, we are told that the Russians are the good guys and they had applied heat at certain quarters which resulted in the involved Arab chiefs ceasing to kill each other and set up a peace-keeping commission. It is even suggested that the bad guys in the Jordanian escalation were Chinese Maoists and not Russian Communists.

What did peace in the Middle East and the saving of Hussein's kingdom cost the United States?

We are reminded that last Friday about the same time peace hit the Middle East, the Pentagon reported that the Soviet Russians were building a submarine base in Cuba. Sunday, we were notified that the United States should not take any action to remove the Russian threat but should resort to diplomacy. As usual, we are to talk while the Soviets continue to build. Nero fiddled while Rome burned. We are also told that the

United States will replenish Jordan with arms spent during the uprising.

One thing that we can be sure of—through diplomacy, the United States lost again. U.S. diplomats play by strange rules. Our diplomats enter the game, never to win but only to ask "what else do we have to give you to slow down the pace?"

SPEECH BY DR. PAUL ASHTON, PRESIDENT, CALIFORNIA PROFESSIONAL GUILD

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Paul Ashton, president, California Professional Guild, recently delivered a very interesting speech to doctors and businessmen assembled in Newport Beach, Calif. Dr. Ashton is a strong advocate of free-enterprise medicine, and is currently practicing in Santa Barbara, where he has one of the most advanced cardiac centers in the world. As an item of personal interest, he is one of the few surviving members of the Bataan "Death March." He has an excellent reputation among the medical faculty. His speech follows:

SPEECH BY DR. PAUL ASHTON

The hottest topic in medical legislation today is the creeping plague of socialized medicine. Its most recent disguise is in the form of a national health insurance program for everyone, sometimes in conjunction with a prepaid health care plan. One program that would completely restructure the present delivery of health care is the one entitled "Health Security Program" recently introduced by Senator Kennedy and Congresswoman Martha Griffith, which is the Reuther Plan and is backed by AFL-CIO. The common cry of all of these programs is "Better Health Care at Lower Cost." This is a laudable goal, and everyone should work toward it, but let's see where we're going before we jump off the cliff. The Guild has made an in-depth study of the subject and some of the flaws in the various programs being advanced are so obvious that it is hard to believe they are not being presented with tongue-in-cheek. Let's examine a few of the main weaknesses. First, who are the masterminds who are planning the future of American medicine?

HEALTHOCRATS

A new breed of experts has arrived on the scene. A highly educated group of technocrats, system analysts, economists, statisticians, social planners and administrators... a new race of healthocrats... and they are going to solve the nation's health care problems because they have had special courses and studies to equip them for this monumental task? These self-appointed guardians of our nation's health boldly say that WE (the medical profession) are too simple-minded to be entrusted with such a mission; consequently, there isn't a fumbling physician, a feeble pharmacist or a doddering dentist in the bunch. We have the experience, but they are going to save the world for us... and from us. The writing is on the wall, big and bold: "They (meaning all medical men) will no longer have a voice in the shape of the systems under which they practice." Here are a few direct quotes:

"The institutions and organizations of the medical community must respond to the

challenges of the times. If they refuse, their punishment will be to live under the judgment of less knowledgeable men than themselves. Indifference to the social issues of medicine will ultimately guarantee Governmental intervention . . . this is not a threat, but a realistic assessment of current trends." (John G. Veneman, Undersecretary of HEW, former California Assemblyman.)

"We are coming to recognize that there has to be a great deal more in-depth planning for the distribution of health care and manpower, and that this doesn't necessarily require medical knowledge." (HEW Deputy Undersecretary Frederic V. Malek, former toolmaker.)

"I cannot help feeling that a major reason doctors have not had greater influence on such matters is that they have usually not had enough educational background in the economic and social aspects of medical care to be able to grapple with this kind of issue . . . if the physician wants to be one of the molders of policy he is going to have to be equipped to do so." (Rashi Fein of the Harvard Center for Community Health and Medical Care.)

The HEALTHOCRATS say they advocate "no formal Federal takeover of hospitals, no socialization of doctors . . . nor any compulsion." *Who's kidding whom?*

BETTER HEALTH CARE

Let's examine the first part of the slogan . . . "Better Health Care at Lower Cost" . . . It is impossible to provide medical care to everyone in the country because there are simply not enough primary physicians to go around? If our medical schools would turn out more primary physicians, the natural law of competition fostered under the free enterprise system would take care of better physician distribution and better care to outlying areas. But until the experts realize this glaring deficiency in their planning, their program will just have to work with what doctors we now have.

Statistics from other countries show the patient load increases dramatically under socialized medical plans. Why can't we learn from this? In other countries, including some of the Canadian provinces that have similar health insurance programs, it has been shown that the patient load has increased tenfold; yet, interestingly enough, there has been no corresponding increase in the number of hospitalizations. This would indicate that there are no more really "sick" people—just more patients.

It's human nature for people to want something "free" whether they need it or not. So, if you are seeing around 40 patients a day now, you will be expected to see around 400 under the national health insurance program. And babies with diarrhea may have to wait weeks for an appointment because you are too busy with patients who need their band-aids changed. How can we handle such a patient load and call it "better care?" You will have to go into your waiting room and say, "All right, everyone with a headache please stand up" . . . Then you can give some group diagnosis and distribute printed sheets of do's and don'ts for back problems. Of course, if the program has enough money in it for X rays, then everyone in the group will get them . . . whether or not they are indicated. And there will be no time to help those who suffer from fear, loneliness, guilt, anxiety, or any other "illness" that is not on the fee schedule. And what about Grandma Jones who needs her gall bladder removed, but your budget is overdrawn for the year . . . will she have her cholecystectomy or will the operation be postponed until the next fiscal year when the new funds are appropriated?

(When England instituted the socialized insurance program, the standing joke was the care given to pregnant women. At the

first examination, she received a rubber stamp on her stomach which read: "When this gets big enough to read without glasses, come back for another appointment.")

When any system prevents the personal one-to-one relationship between patient and doctor, with continuity of that care by the same doctor, then it is less than the best. Nothing will ever replace the doctor sitting down with a patient in an examining room and listening to his history, complaints and problems. And it must be the same doctor, with the same patient, year after year . . . one who knows his personality, his family, his history, his peculiar foibles and anxieties. To change this personal relationship for assembly-line care would be disastrous. The only conclusion is that patient care will not be improved . . . it will deteriorate. Now what about the claim of lower costs?

LOWER COSTS

A vast new bureaucracy will administer health care to over two hundred million people with all the present Medicare services, plus preventive medicine, plus predictive medicine, plus many other benefits and it will be for everyone, regardless of age or income, with no exclusions or deductions. This is the great giveaway . . . the biggest bargain since Barnum and Bailey. Again, we say: "Who is kidding whom?" Who is going to pay for the health clinics that must be built (about 2,000 of them planned across the country, many of them duplicating present facilities)? Who is going to pay for the organization costs . . . the high salaries of the Healthocrats . . . the administrative costs . . . the crushing load of paper work? The employers are supposed to pay 35% of the bill through a payroll tax; the employees will pay 25% of the costs, and the Government is supposed to pay the remaining 40%. Of course, this 40% will be passed on to the public, making double payments by the taxpayers. Sounds like an automobile pitch! The demonstration ride is free, but who is going to make the monthly payments?

Last year 67 Billion Dollars were paid to the health industry by everyone, including the Government, private citizens and insurance companies. This is big business. Now the figures being tossed into the health hopper are that the budget will be only 37 Billion . . . a savings of 30 Billion Dollars . . . yet everything will be free to everyone. And all this will be accomplished by the magic of a medical budget. We recognize and agree with the crying need to provide medical care to the underprivileged and the poor, but the planning outlined by these social engineers will only compound the problems, and we resent the silly games they are playing with such vital issues. They cry "economics," but it makes one wonder if it isn't more political than economical? Is their goal really health to the poor, or votes at the polls? Could it also be a tool to demand the loyalty of the blue-collar worker? And even if their program was economically sound, how would it be administered?

ADMINISTRATION

The Healthocrats are going to show us how to do it. They say there will be no "formal takeover" and no "compulsion," but what do you call it when all policies and administration is set by the Government? You will be handed a pre-packaged program and will submit annual budgets for health care to be reviewed by the Healthocrats. If your costs run over your budget, then you just fill in form No. 988654709962F-aS, and in about three years you might get partial payment. You conform or you don't get paid. It's that simple. And these trained brains say the Government can streamline health care delivery into an efficient operation. Do you agree? Federal expertise in "health care" has already been proven . . . just look at the Veterans Hospitals. And as for their experience in "delivery," well, the Government operates a

unique mail delivery, so why wouldn't they do as well with health care delivery? Put the two departments together and we will have a sort of Medical Post Office.

Now, one final factor no one has bothered to consider.

GOVERNMENT CONTROLS

Nothing much has appeared in print about this aspect, but it's as important, if not more so, as any of the others. To overlook it would be catastrophic. Yet the Healthocrats don't seem to realize that a doctor is probably the most independent and complete individualist left in captivity! And how long would he continue to function . . . effectively . . . if he were reduced to the status of a Government employee? The controls and restrictions being planned would soon reduce pharmacists to stock boys, dentists to plaster specialists and physicians to puppets (but all would be experts in filling out insurance forms!).

Under proposals now being submitted, there will be peer review, set fee schedules, no direct billing, monitoring of cases, established budgets, committee control on regional, sub-regional and local levels, working conditions, control of privileges, fixed working hours, prescribed patient loads, etc. . . . and more and more and more insurance forms and paper work. You will accept whatever changes and restrictions are set down for you by the golden boys.

Well, the program might get medical men to conform . . . and keep on conforming . . . to a point, but no one is going to tell us how to practice medicine. The success of medical science is in its freedom . . . its ability to soar off and explore new frontiers. That's what attracts many men into medicine. We are a different breed and are not geared to conform. If a doctor becomes a Federal employee on a 9-5 basis, he will soon become antagonistic, lose his dedication, incentive and enthusiasm . . . the very qualities that sent him into medicine. Medical care cannot be stifled and the individual expression cannot be thwarted. It is doubtful if the heart transplant would ever have been attempted under the program being proposed, as it was not "on the fee schedule." And what about other organ transplants and all the wide open areas ahead for medicine? The research scientist will continue to need the experience of practicing physicians to keep medicine forging ahead with new discoveries and cures. Medicine is the highest type of science and demands freedom. It is burgeoning and simply cannot and must not be curtailed and regimented.

It would fill a book to critique all the flaws in the programs being packaged for us, but we have tried to look at just a few of the major ones. We must admit that it is easy to criticize and tear down, and answers to problems as complex as ours are difficult. It is not the intent of the Guild to disparage our Government. America is the greatest nation in the world and offers unparalleled benefits, opportunities, and challenges . . . and this is why we hate to see one of our most precious commodities become a political toy. America has the best medical care in the world and it comes from the free enterprise system.

The goals are good ones, but problems cannot be solved with money and insurance forms. Guidelines have to be carefully drawn and we believe this should be done by men who have had experience and practical knowledge, not by laymen. We believe medical man can come up with better solutions. We can no longer be apathetic and say, "Maybe this issue will be something for the next generation to fight, but I will be retired before it becomes a real threat." It's upon us NOW and we must grasp the opportunity to be heard before it is too late. We don't HAVE to quietly accept what we believe will be inferior health care. Maybe we won't be able to stop the trend, but at least we'll go down hollering!

PROTEIN FOR TOMORROW'S FACES OF HUNGER

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, there has come to my attention recently a paper prepared by three eminent doctors of veterinary medicine on the importance of protein in our diets. The contents of this well-documented paper should be noted in connection with our present concern with population problems.

The paper to which I have reference was prepared for the Council on Research of the American Veterinary Medicine Association by Drs. Fred D. Maurer, George C. Poppensiek, and Paul M. Newberne. This yet unpublished paper attests to the importance of veterinary medicine in maintaining our ability to provide good protein food to our ever-increasing population. As is pointed out, veterinarians in addition to protecting the health and productivity of our \$50 billion livestock industry, are caring for the Nation's 58 million pet and companion animals, shielding the human population from the many animal diseases that may affect man, and contributing to the control of human disease through cooperative research.

I must emphasize, however, that the potential of the profession of veterinary medicine is almost limitless in the areas of research and disease control so necessary to the assurance of adequate and proper food supply for the teeming population of the world today and in the years to come.

I ask that the paper, entitled "Protein for Tomorrow's Faces of Hunger," be included in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

PROTEIN FOR TOMORROW'S FACES OF HUNGER
(By Dr. Fred D. Maurer, Associate Dean, College of Veterinary Medicine, Texas A. & M. University; Dr. Paul M. Newberne, Professor of Nutritional Pathology, Dept. of Nutrition and Food Science, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, and Dr. George C. Poppensiek, Dean, N.Y. State Veterinary College—Cornell University)

INTRODUCTION

We were warned in 1798: "Population, when unchecked, increases in a geometrical ratio. Subsistence increases only in an arithmetical ratio. A slight acquaintance with numbers will show the immensity of the first power in comparison of the second."

The alarm, terrifying in its simplicity and import, came from England's famed political economist, T. R. Malthus. It was little heeded.

Only one hundred and seventy years later, physicist-writer C. P. Snow, in a lecture at Westminster College, remarked: "I have to say that I have been nearer to despair this year, 1968, than ever in my life. We may be moving—perhaps in ten years—into large-scale famine. Many millions of people are going to starve. We shall see them doing so upon our television sets."

The number of people on earth has grown with Malthusian speed. There were only 250 million people living at the time of Christ. It took all of sixteen centuries for that population to double to 500 million people. At the rate we are going now, it will take only about

25 years for our present population of 3½ billion people to double to 7 billion.

Food supplies lag far behind. The world's production of food today is not adequate—in quantity or quality—for even 3½ billion people. To feed another 3½ billion hungry mouths only 25 years from now will require enormous increases in food supplies." (1)

From a paper written by W. M. Beeson and J. L. Krider of Purdue University: "At present there are 4 million people dying from malnutrition or starvation; by the year 2000 there will be 1 billion people or more dying from starvation unless the people of the United States intervene. United States population will increase to 300 million people by 2000 A.D." (2) FAO data indicate that each single day adds 180,000 to the world's population. (3) Beeson and Krider conclude that United States scientists and farmers can increase our food production to feed 300 million United States citizens, "but how much of the world population will we need to feed? Some authorities have predicted that the United States will be feeding one-quarter to one-half the world in 10 to 20 years. The United States is not even geared today to feed 300 million people in the U.S.A. at present nutritional levels much less millions of people outside the United States." (2)

Prediction follows prediction, and world food production falls nearly 2% behind food requirements every year. The highest rate of population increase, up to 3.5% per year, occurs in the underdeveloped countries which have the lowest per capita food production. These food deficit countries which now harbor ¾ of the world's population will contain ¾ of the world's people by the year 2000. Sixty percent of the inhabitants already suffer from malnutrition. Optimistic estimates predict the effect of family planning during the next 20 years will only reduce food requirements by 20%. Mass starvation cannot be avoided without changing the trend of increasing food shortages: Fortunately new high-yielding cereals and improved agricultural technology (4) (5) have greatly increased production in several developing countries. While this so-called "green revolution" has great potential, it should be looked upon as one of several necessary steps toward satisfying man's future food requirements.

To neglect the problem now because of this advance will be to risk the spread of hunger to whole nations with the consequent loss of social, economic and political stability fostering aggression. If widespread starvation is to be prevented, all potential food resources must be developed.

With only 10 countries having a surplus of food and those countries containing only 15% of the world's population, it is evident that they will not long be able to make up the deficits. It has been estimated (6) that by 1985 the United States will be able to make up only 10% of the food shortage abroad. Since we cannot long provide the food, we must help the people in the underdeveloped countries to increase their own food production.

Contrary to old opinion, more farmers on more land do not automatically provide a surplus of food. The mere expansion of a subsistence agriculture is no longer sufficiently productive. The shift of the population to urban centers will require production for the market at a faster rate than total food production. Between 1962 and 1985, urban populations of the developing countries are expected to increase by about 160% and in Africa by 300%. (7)

There must be a surplus beyond the needs of the farmer's family which can be sold in the cities and provide farm capital, because to apply the new technology and increase the yield per acre, farmers must buy

References at end of article.

fertilizer, pesticides, seed, water, tools and machinery. The livestock man must provide better nutrition breeding, management and health control.

ADVANCING TECHNOLOGY

The key is improved technology which provides very high rates of return on the investment.

Through such investment, the farmer or rancher will make money, not only with which to produce more effectively but with his profits to buy the finished goods of industry. With an expanding market, industry will provide more jobs for more people who can and will buy more farm products and maintain farm prices in spite of increased production.

Obviously the improved technology of food production, whether plant or animal is the source of broad economic development essential to both agriculture and industry.

In other words, efficient crop and livestock production now requires as much education, adaptive research and capital as does industry, and they must complement each other in an economic structure that provides incentive to all those involved. This approach has made our modern civilization possible.

The great success of food production in the United States provides an example and a basis for further productivity. Although blessed by abundant natural resources, US Agriculture has not been left to chance. Research in agriculture has been basic to the production of food and to our national development.

Food is a major source of our economic strength, is vital to social welfare and world supplies can mean peace or war. (8)

Prior to 1850, over 80% of our people were required to produce food and fiber. Through applied agricultural research which increased the efficiency of crop and livestock production, more and more people have been freed from the land to engage in education, research, science and industry.

Although only about 6% of our people now are required to produce adequate food for the nation, interdependence with industry requires another 6% to provide supplies and equipment for the producers, and another 10% to provide the storage, processing, and marketing of food products. If we include food transport and retailing, over 25% of our people are dependent upon food for a livelihood. (9) (10) Further, the total consuming public is much concerned with food supply, quality and price. One of our greatest national assets is that only 18% of the American consumer's income is required for the purchase of food, in contrast to most countries which require more than twice that amount. (11)

The most acute food shortage at home and abroad is for protein foods especially those of animal origin.

The relative abundance of land for more intense forage production, the large volume of by-product forage from increasing grain production, and the edible waste from human food processing will feed a much larger U.S. livestock population. With parallel support for research and training to improve animal health and productivity, U.S. requirements for animal protein can be met, some proteins will be available for export and technical assistance can increase animal protein production in food deficit countries.

Currently, plants provide 70% of the world's dietary protein, animals, 30%. Both are needed and there is considerable interdependence both in their production and consumption.

PROTEIN REQUIREMENTS

During the twentieth century, much knowledge has been gained through extensive research on protein requirements. Proteins

participate in all biological processes; they are vital for all forms of life. Discussions of needs for calories, carbohydrates, fats, vitamins, and minerals are meaningless without indications of the amounts and kinds of proteins in the diet.

Eight of the 22 amino acids, essential for growth and maintenance of cellular tissue and other metabolic functions, cannot be synthesized by the human body, and must be provided by proteins in the diet. When the essential amino acid pattern of the dietary protein closely approximates the need, the protein is utilized more completely. Animal proteins supply amino acids in about the same proportions as those needed by the body, whereas individual plant proteins are always deficient in one or more of the essential sulfur amino acids. (12) (13).

An adequate diet during infancy, growth, pregnancy and lactation should include animal protein foods. In underdeveloped countries, prolonged breast feeding is of greatest importance, but the maternal diet must be adequate.

The protein deficiency disease, kwashiorkor, widely prevalent among undernourished children, can be prevented by ingestion of milk and other animal protein products. (14) (15)

It has been established that infants and children deprived of adequate protein during the prenatal and early postnatal period of life fail to achieve optimum physical size. Even more significant, however, is the convincing evidence that these children can never reach the level of intelligence enjoyed by their contemporaries supplied adequate protein during the critical, formative period of life. Since this deficit in native intelligence cannot be regained, these observations add emphasis to the critical need for adequate animal protein. (16).

SOURCES OF PROTEIN

From a nutritional standpoint, it is possible to obtain all the essential proteins for human growth and maintenance from plant sources. To do so requires the presence of the right variety of plant proteins, enough knowledge of nutrition to select them, enough capital and technology to process them into edible products for both infants and adults, and the incentive to eat them in adequate amounts.

The protein content of plants is often too low to serve as the only protein source; for example, it takes about a kilo of corn per day to provide enough protein. To obtain all of the essentials from such plant foods may be difficult for adults and impossible for children. Being complete proteins, the inclusion of minimal amounts of animal protein makes it possible for a wide variety of plant foods to complete an adequate diet.

There are economic and geographic considerations as well: Land for direct food crop production is definitely limited; only 8% of the world's land area is considered suitable for crops and only about 2% is ideal. In the late 1950's we were using only 13.5% of U.S. agricultural lands for direct-food crops; 4% for industrial crops, and 82.5% for livestock feeds. (17) Most gains are expected to come from intensified use of present acreage. Having already taken full advantage of mechanization and fertilizer and done much to develop more productive strains in the United States, the yields of cereals per acre here are less likely to increase as rapidly during the next few years as in the past.

Efficient plant production requires substantial research and development. Although high-yielding, disease-resistant plants have been developed for various environments, adaptive research is required for each different environment and optimum yields are obtained and maintained only under ideal conditions when using proper

amounts of fertilizers, water, and crop-productive chemicals, and specialized farming methods. (18)

Livestock thrive on many foods that cannot be eaten by man. Especially in the undeveloped countries very few ruminants receive feed that could be used directly by man. Some 65% of the world's land area is only suitable for grazing. R. E. Erb of Purdue reports: "Over one-half of our total land area, about one billion acres, produces forage which has little or no value unless marketed through livestock. When this forage is marketed in the form of meat and milk from cattle, it is valued at about \$8 billion annually. The value of the U.S. corn crop is in comparison, about \$5 billion." Since 85% of our corn crop is fed to livestock this crop also has much reduced value until marketed as eggs, meat and milk. (6) In fact, most U.S. grains have no other market than as livestock and poultry feeds. Large numbers of animals convert the waste products of grain production into food for man. It is estimated that, by 1980, the increase in by-products from grain production in the United States, with proper supplementation, will support four times as many dairy cattle as we now have. Such forage materials are now largely wasted. Recent experiments in the Philippines show that, with especially developed grain sorghums suitable for the tropics, one 6-ton crop of IR-8 rice can be grown per hectare. Then three cuttings of grain sorghum, yielding about 6 tons each can be grown on the same land. Such developments with improved cereals provide hope not only for more rice but for the luxury of feed-grain livestock production to supplement the rice with animal protein that has been so sorely needed in the tropics. Where grain-sorghums are now grown in parts of Mexico, the hog-raising industry has increased; and it has been suggested that Mexico's poultry industry would not have grown so spectacularly had it not been for the availability of sorghum for feed. (19)

From a production standpoint, 75% of the world's people live in regions where they are dependent upon animals for agricultural power, transport, and fertilizer, as well as for much of their protein. For many millions of these people, animals also provide a way of life with great additional dependence upon animals for shelter, clothing, and fuel.

In those countries with grain shortages, the principal contribution of domestic animals to food needs is in the conversion of pastures, rough forages, and unconventional protein sources to animal protein products. In the U.S., it has been estimated that range forage production can easily be doubled. (20) Research on range livestock nutrition and supplementation, on better utilization of range, and on grass and browse on land too rough, dry, or infertile to maintain food crops can contribute greatly to the available food supplies, not only in the United States, but also in vast areas of the world not now utilized or poorly utilized for food production. (21) (22) Many grassland areas, particularly in the tropics, are stocked to only a fraction of their capacity. (23) Other tropical resources, such as molasses, crude sugar, cassaba, and bananas, are poorly used or not used at all. The potentialities of molasses, in countries poorly equipped at present for livestock raising, are shown by the experience in Japan. Molasses was purchased at 7¢/gallon; by using it in animal feed, its value increased to 21¢/gallon on the farm, in terms of marketable protein produced in the animals fed. (24)

Not only cattle and other ruminants, but also swine and chickens efficiently convert protein from various sources into meat. The feeds value of garbage, broiler house litter, and animal manures are now being studied, as well as other unusual materials. (25) (26) (27)

The role of livestock will necessarily vary

with the natural and potential resources and economy of each country. For those with a surplus of grain like the U.S., the excess can be converted to more desirable animal protein. Of those countries which must use their grain directly for human food, some have abundant natural forage and crop wastes which only animals can convert to food for man. Some crowded countries will necessarily use their livestock primarily as scavengers but in each case, livestock is needed to play a vital role in the utilization of resources which would not otherwise contribute to man's food supply.

Synthetic protein foods from petroleum, algae, yeasts, and bacteria will, no doubt, provide food for livestock, and are even being publicized as the solution to future human food problems; while they may eventually make a contribution, much research and development will be required. Former President Johnson's world food panel warned against the false hope that some of these synthetic foods will provide an easy answer, and decried publicity which lessens effort to do more through conventional agriculture, livestock, dairy and poultry production. Further, custom plays a major role in the diets of people; and most people will consider synthetic foods more acceptable after animals have converted them to recognizable products like ham and eggs.

EFFECTS OF DISEASE

A productive livestock industry is possible only when loss from disease is controlled. That research points the way toward animal health and productivity is evidenced by the contrast between the developed and undeveloped regions of the world. While only 40% of the world's 3 billion head of livestock are in the developed countries, they produce 80% of the world's meat, milk, and eggs. In many countries, the yield per animal is tragically low. In parts of Africa, cattle are not slaughtered until they are 6 or 7 years old and the yield of beef is roughly 1/6 that of U.S. beef animals. In these regions, it also takes from 10 to 20 cattle to produce the milk of an average American dairy cow. (25) (28) Disease, breeding, malnutrition and poor management of livestock are prime contributors to poor reproduction, retarded growth and high mortality; but it is primarily in the undeveloped countries where existing technology has not been applied and where there are many health problems awaiting research. For these reasons, calving percentages in the tropics range from only 40 to 50% and of the calf crop obtained 10 to 15% are lost prior to weaning and some 6% from weaning to market. (23) With adequate disease control and good management prospects for much greater beef production in the tropics are excellent because there is a potential for abundant forage and there are several good productive breeds of cattle well adapted to the tropical environment.

In the U.S. today, diseases and parasites decrease animal productivity by an estimated 11%, but in countries where there are no veterinarians, losses frequently exceed 50%. Even this 11% represents significant wastage of animal protein.

It is in the underdeveloped countries where the major enzootic diseases persist. They not only handicap the production of native animals, but they prevent the establishment of imported breeding stock, remain a threat to clean countries, and prohibit the exportation of animal and animal products thereby limiting trade to the detriment of both agricultural and industrial countries. While improved nutrition, breeding, management and disease control are all essential, disease control is the key to self-help; for, with improved breeds and the income from trade, the capital with which to improve management and nutrition will be available. To fulfill this international need for disease control and to protect U.S. livestock, provides ample justifi-

cation for U.S. research and training in the prevention and control of such foreign diseases as foot-and-mouth disease, trypanosomiasis, babesiosis, anaplasmosis, East Coast fever, African swine fever, African horse sickness, bovine pleuropneumonia, and fowl plague.

Many of the disease control techniques are known and can be adapted to local needs while others need to be developed. Between 1870 and 1959, eight diseases were eradicated from the U.S., and in 1954, there was a joint program in Mexico of foot-and-mouth eradication which cost some \$170 million. (25)

Texas fever once cost the U.S. cattle industry \$40 million in losses per year; though it took many years of research and application to eradicate the disease, the total cost was only \$40 million, and now we save that much every year. Losses from bovine tuberculosis were \$150 million per year; but now that it is largely controlled, we are saving that much per year, plus the invaluable decrease in its hazard to man. Although livestock disease control programs are costly, they roughly save many times more than they cost. South of the Sahara, about 1/2 of the continent of Africa, capable of supporting approximately 125 million cattle, is unsuitable for cattle production because of trypanosomiasis transmitted by the tsetse fly. (25) Can the world afford this kind of cost when people are starving?

Although the U.S. has accomplished a remarkable degree of disease control, many diseases continue to take their toll. (28) (29) (30) (31) in the U.S. estimated annual losses from disease in cattle and pigs, alone, averaged \$1.2 billion in 1965. Total annual losses from diseases and parasites were estimated to be approximately \$2.8 billion, needing further research and control are reproductive problems (including mastitis), diseases of the newborn, diseases of feedlot cattle and hemoprotozoan diseases. In July 1967, a joint Federal-State Committee on research needs for agriculture recommended a 75% increase in scientific man years of research on animal diseases during the next 10 years.

The shortage of animal health services in the food-deficient regions of the world and the shift to large-scale methods of livestock production in the United States demands more emphasis on the widespread application of preventive medicine. Technological advance and mechanization has led to large specialized livestock and poultry operations which are more efficient and more profitable than small mixed farms which are fast disappearing. Now 600,000 or 20% of our 3 million farms produce 90% of the nation's food and fiber. Cattle feedlots that handle over 40,000 cattle per year are not uncommon. Intensive long-range research and the development of new preventive medical and management procedures will be the most economical way to reduce the 1 to 2% annual loss of animals now experienced in many feedlots.

The need for research and preventive medicine is equally great in the poultry industry where flocks of less than 10,000 birds are no longer profitable and many exceed 100,000. The success of modern livestock and poultry production is closely related to disease control. Recently, acute leukosis (Marek's disease) has caused serious losses in young chickens. At the time of processing, leukosis may account for 50% of the condemnation. In 1968, 271 million pounds of fryer chickens were condemned for all causes.

In 1968, average mortality for young turkeys was 9 percent but respiratory infections and transmissible enteritis may cause serious losses during the growing period. Disease conditions account for 85% of the condemnations in packing plants. In 1968, over 35 million pounds of turkeys were condemned for all causes. (32)

The diseases of wildlife are so closely involved with the epidemiology of diseases of domestic animals that both must be understood if either is to be controlled. Work to improve the health of wildlife is also justified by its recreational and potential economic value as a food resource. Some species of wild ruminants are more efficient in the conversion of rough forage into food for man than are domestic species.

The maintenance of animal health must include the control of toxic hazards as well as infectious disease. The extensive use of chemical insecticides, herbicides, fertilizers, and drugs—and the exposure of animals to industrial wastes—require continuing research for evaluation and control.

Problems of sterility and reproduction annually cost enormous amounts. Improved reproductive rate and production of healthy animals must be attained. During the past 25 years, a gain of only about one pig per litter farrowed and 10% in calves saved has been achieved. Death losses in 1967 totaled 2,514,000 of a 43,647,000 calf crop. (20) (10)

SUPPORT FOR ANIMAL DISEASE RESEARCH

Of the expenditures for agricultural research in 1968, only about 16% was allocated to animal disease and parasite problems; about 31% was spent for plant research, and the remainder for agricultural engineering, animal husbandry, entomology, and soil and water. The 1966 scientific man-year inputs on agricultural problems per billion dollars of product were 294 for crops, and 92 for livestock and poultry. (33) During the same year, total cash receipts from farm marketings were \$9.1 billion for crops and \$22.4 billion for livestock and livestock products. (33)

In view of the greater return from livestock and poultry in proportion to the research input, it would appear prudent to increase the research expenditure for livestock research.

Although total research expenditures have increased in the past 15 years, this increase merely reflects an increase in costs, not an increase in scope. (34) There must be enough research to keep animal production economically attractive to the producers.

It is of major concern that essential research to curtail serious losses from animal diseases at home and abroad is not being accomplished while there is time to do it. Neither are enough research men being trained nor gaining experience in livestock disease research for the nation to be adequately prepared for an emergency effort when the imminence of a food crisis requires more personnel for such work. Funding agencies and the various groups that will benefit from more research on and control of livestock diseases must give long-range consideration to the availability of research scientists to do this work. A long period of relatively poor support for livestock research has caused veterinarians and other scientists to be attracted to other areas of opportunity. (23) (24) (35) In addition to protecting the health and productivity of our \$50 billion livestock industry, veterinarians are caring for the nation's 58 million pet and companion animals, shielding the human population from the many animal diseases that may affect man, and contributing to the control of human disease through cooperative research.

Since profitable livestock production now requires as much education, research, and capital as industry, it appears time for the producer to take a lesson from industry to help assure his own future. Industry finds it profitable and necessary to plow back an average of 6% of gross sales into research. This is proportionately 40 times more than the state and federal governments allot to health research for livestock. The livestock industry finds it difficult to provide direct support for research to protect its great investment against loss from disease. This is

partially due to the large number of independent livestock producers and the difficulty of effecting close cooperation for this purpose among the associations of producers, processors, distributors, and food retailers. If they were to speak with one voice, and contribute a very small fraction of current sales receipts to research, they could insure higher future income. A start has been made in a few places; for instance, in Iowa in 1968, 5¢ per head for feeders, and 10¢ per head for slaughter animals was collected from the sale of hogs for research on swine problems.

Likewise, the consuming public which now obtains ample food for less than 18% of its income could avoid drastic increases in food costs by becoming alert to the facts of the situation and by investing a small percentage of current food savings into research which will help insure a plentiful supply at reasonable prices in the future. The investment of 0.1% of current food costs in research now may well avoid a 10% increase in food costs later. Through example, such interested groups and enlightened consumer associations could influence the establishment of a high priority for livestock research which would contribute greatly to the national welfare.

In "The State of Food and Agriculture 1968", FAO, has stated—"Even in developed countries the efficiency of livestock production still appears to be well below its potential level. As disease control improves, and the steadily accumulating discoveries in nutrition, breeding and management are applied, substantial increases in productivity become possible. The main lines of advance are the widespread use of complete rations to improve conversion rates, the genetic selection of efficient feed converters in all classes of livestock, and improved disease control in livestock." (18)

PROTEIN FROM FISH

Aquatic animals provide an insufficiently developed resource of protein food for both man and animals. With well-planned conservation, with the maintenance of the essential conditions of a natural environment, and the necessary culture and restocking, perpetual annual harvesting has been demonstrated and found profitable. (36) Denmark, which started trout farming in 1890, exported over 7.5 million Kg in 1961. (37) Several other European countries have similar fish farming industries which provide a vital source of food.

In 1966, some 25 million pounds of channel catfish were raised in U.S. ponds, a growth from a few thousand in 1963. (38) In 6 years, Arkansas increased its fish farming 35%, to 51,000 acres in 1968. (38) U.S. fish culture annual production now retails for about \$75 million. Yet 75% of all fish products used in this country are imported, indicating a much greater market potential for local production. (39) Shellfish and shrimp are also being raised frequently on farms in cooperation with rice culture in flooded paddies. (36) In addition, fish raised in flooded rice fields feeding on insects and plant pests have increased the yield of rice by as much as 7%.

An acre of sea can produce as much food as an acre of arable land. One acre of fresh water, which can be on otherwise unproductive land, with supplemental feeds can produce more than an acre of land. Reservoirs, salt marshes and other idle waters can be made productive. Fish provide the most efficient means of converting feed to edible meat; this they can do at the rate of 1.4 pounds of feed per pound of fish compared with 2.0 pounds of feed for 1 pound of chicken, either of which is more efficient than any domestic animal. Methods for the culture of marine fauna in estuaries and even at sea are being developed. To maintain winter temperatures compatible with fish culture in estuaries, the utilization of heat from the water used to cool atomic reactors has been considered.

When fish are free to seek an ideal environment for the species, they migrate with changing seasons and seek conditions which provide essential nutrients, an optimal temperature range, optimal oxygen, and water free of pollution with toxic or noxious substances, all vital factors for survival, growth and reproduction. By contrast, fish farming generally involves confinement and concentration of fish into environments where health problems become apparent, often revealing serious losses which require diagnosis and control. (40)

AQUATIC ANIMAL HEALTH

Crowding of aquatic fauna not only creates the same hazards of disease concentration and transmission as in animals, but also lowers resistance and contributes to pollution. Where fish farming is well-developed, problems with viral, bacterial, fungal, parasitic, and protozoan infections are prevalent. Fish pathogens represent health hazards to man and animals, as well as handicaps to fish production.

In Finland, mycotic infections tend to be more serious in polluted waters where the pH is altered and where there is a low oxygen content. Fish eggs are especially vulnerable to the mycoses, and protozoan infections are most hazardous to young fish in crowded environments. Trematodes, with fish-eating birds as intermediate hosts, are frequently a serious problem. Cestodes, numerous in pike, perch, whitefish, and bream, not only destroy the fish, but 25% of the human population of Finland is infected from eating raw fish. Nematodes cause liver destruction in some species, and parasitic crustaceans cause serious losses. Finnish veterinarians must control tapeworms, salmonellosis, botulism, *E. coli*, *Enterococci*, and *Pseudomonas* to prevent significant hazards to human health. (41)

Maintenance of fish health is considered one of the most important conditions for proper production in Poland, which has a major fish-food industry. There, 14 major fish diseases are under constant veterinary supervision and control. The Minister of Agriculture provides funds for diagnosis, research, and disease control at five fish health centers. (40) Russia has 150 veterinary research and teaching institutions which concentrate on fish disease problems. (43)

A brief review of the literature reveals that fish and other aquatic animals serve as reservoirs and transmit numerous diseases of man and animals, such as leptospirosis, trichinosis, erysipelas, erysipelothrix, listeriosis, and salmon poisoning. An eosinophilic phlegmonous enteritis caused by a parasite from herring has been reported in the Netherlands, (44) and a meningitis in Tahiti was related to fish consumption. Mollusks are frequently incriminated in poisonings because they live near shore in waters that tend to be polluted, are eaten raw, and are filter feeders. Their ingestion and transmission of radioisotopes, (45) hepatitis virus, (46) enteric bacteria, heavy metals, and phytoplankton have all caused illness in man. Mercury poisoning has been reported in cats, birds, and man following ingestion of fish with a high concentration of organic mercury in their tissues.

These largely foreign references to disease problems give ample evidence of the need for U.S. colleges of veterinary medicine to provide training in fish diseases, to apply the world's knowledge to our domestic fish production problems through adaptive research, and to do research on the many unknowns.

The obvious primary need is for a preventive approach to eliminate the unhealthy factors or etiologic agents and provide the essential elements for health and productivity. Viewed in this light, it becomes apparent that, if natural waters are to provide a productive habitat for fish, or if we are to create artificial environments for optimal fish culture, we must first learn all of

the characteristics of the ideal environment for each species, the essential nutrients, and the natural sources of its food. Since our natural water resources must also be fully utilized as supplies for our cities, for industry, irrigation, and recreation, it becomes important to learn the level of tolerance of each species of fish for alterations in its environment, and to set permissible legal limits on environmental alteration and contamination compatible with fish production in selected waters. These points are not mentioned just as an appeal for conservation, but to point up the immediate need for a team approach for research to understand the essential characteristics of the natural environment of fresh and marine waters most favorable for the desired fauna while these environments and the life they support still exist. To do otherwise will not only result in the loss of great natural food resources but, if the characteristics of the optimum environment for each species are not learned while we have a natural model, we may never be able to reconstruct it for the maintenance for productive culture of the species.

The veterinarians and other scientists must join together on the research team which will use the health and productivity of fish as barometers for control of a compatible environment. There is need for veterinarians, ecologists, nutritionists, toxicologists, geneticists, aquatic agriculturalists, water resources engineers, irrigation engineers, industrial chemists, commercial and recreational fisheries men, and legal advisors concerned with the national welfare, all working together to most wisely utilize and not destroy these resources.

SUMMARY

In summary, there must be more efficient production from all food sources if mass starvation is to be prevented.

As a humane people striving for national and international stability, we would like to prevent malnutrition or starvation anywhere any time. World production and distribution of food especially animal protein is inadequate in many regions and population growth is increasing shortages. Improved production methods attainable through research have demonstrated ability to meet former demands and have adequate potential for the future.

Domestic livestock and poultry, wild and aquatic animals each have great undeveloped potentials for making major contributions to the world's food supply. Improved animal health is a vital key to more efficient animal production. Veterinary medical research and training provide effective means of developing improved techniques and competent men to apply them at home and abroad. A national priority for the support of research and training is the key to optimal utilization of animals as a perpetual food resource.

People in government and education must urge support for research and development, and those people directly involved in the production, processing and distribution of foods of animal origin must not only unite in seeking support but provide self-help or all share responsibility for the disaster of spreading hunger.

April 15, 1970.

REFERENCES

- (1) Syntex Corporation: Syntex and the Plague, Protein Starvation. Syntex Corporation Annual Report for the fiscal year ended July 31, 1969, p. 25.
- (2) Beeson, W. M. and Krider, J. L.: Food and Man-Animal, Plant and Synthetic Resources. Talk presented at Purdue University, 1969.
- (3) Clarkson, M. R.: Livestock Health and Human Food Needs. Presented at the Public Symposium on the Use of Drugs in Animal Feeds, MRC. National Academy of Sciences, Washington, D.C., Tuesday, June 6, 1967.

(4) Boerman, A. H.: The Technological Basis for Intensified Agriculture, Agricultural Development. Proceedings of a Conference sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation, 23-25 April 1969, pp. 8-16.

(5) Wortman, Sterling: The Technological Basis for Intensified Agriculture, Agricultural Development. Proceedings of a Conference sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation, 23-25 April 1969, pp. 17-43.

(6) Revelle, R.: Population and Food Supplies: The Edge of the Knife. Nat. Acad., Sci. 56: 1966, 328.

(7) FAO Introduction in Agriculture Development: World Needs and Potentials in Agricultural Production. Proceedings of a Conference sponsored by the Rockefeller Foundation, 23-25 April 1969, pp. 3-7.

(8) Scrimshaw, N.S.: Applications of Nutritional and Food Science to Meeting World Food Needs. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. 56: 1966, p. 352.

(9) U.S. Bureau of the Census: Statistical Abstract of the United States. 1967.

(10) U.S.D.A.: Agricultural Statistics. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1968.

(11) Barton, G. T.: Our Food Abundance in Protecting Our Food. The Yearbook of Agriculture 1966, U.S. Government Printing Office, p. 16.

(12) Albanese, A. A. and Orto, L. A.: Proteins and Amino Acids in Newer Methods of Nutritional Biochemistry. A. A. Albanese, Ed., Academic Press, N.Y., 1963, p. 1.

(13) Leverton, R. M.: Proteins in Food. The Yearbook of Agriculture 1959, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C., p. 57.

(14) Kolari, O. E.: The Use of Animal Proteins for Food. J. An. Sci. 25: 1966, p. 567.

(15) The WHO Programme in Nutrition, 1948-1964-2. WHO Chronicle, 19: 1965, p. 429.

(16) Scrimshaw, N. W. and Gordon, E.: (Eds.) Malnutrition, Learning and Behavior. MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass. 1968.

(17) DeGraff, Herrell: The Importance of Animal Agriculture in Meeting Future World Food Needs. Centennial Symposium, College of Agri. U. of Illinois, October 1967.

(18) FAO: Role of Science and Technology, the State of Food and Agriculture, 1968, pp. 81 and 97.

(19) Stakman, E. C.: Genetic Potentials for Increasing Yields of Food Crops and Animals. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. 56: 1966, p. 370.

(20) Byerly, T. C.: The Role of Livestock in Food Production. J. An. Sci. 25: 1966, p. 552.

(21) Bohman, V. R. and Lesperance, A. L.: Methodology Research for Range Forage Evaluation. J. An. Sci. 26: 1967, p. 820.

(22) Cook, C. W., Harris, L. and Young, M. C.: Botanical and Nutritive Content of Diets of Cattle and Sheep Under Single and Common Use on Mountain Range. J. An. Sci. 26: 1967, p. 1169.

(23) Raun, N. S.: Professional Animal Scientists Throughout the World. J. An. Sci. 27: 1968, p. 267.

(24) Japan Bureau of Animal Industry, Statistics of Animal Hygiene, 1955, 1957, 1966; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Food Consumption Statistics, 1954-1966, Japan.

(25) Pritchard, W. R.: Increasing Protein Foods Through Improving Animal Health. Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci., 56: 1966, p. 360.

(26) Gotaas, H. B.: Composting. WHO, Geneva, 1966.

(27) Kornegay, E. T., Vander Noot, G. W., Barth, K. M., MacGrath, W. S., Welch, J. G., and Purkhiser, E. D.: Nutritive Value of Garbage as a Feed for Swine. I. Chemical Composition, Digestibility and Nitrogen Utilization of Various Types of Garbage. J. An. Sci. 24: 1965, p. 319.

(28) FAO: Production Yearbook, 18: 1964.

(29) Maurer, F. D.: Emerging Animal Diseases. Military Medicine, 128, 4: pp. 327-333.

(30) FAO: The Economic Losses Caused by

Animal Diseases. Animal Health Yearbook, United Nations, 1962, p. 284.

(31) FAO: Freedom from Hunger Campaign. Basic Study 10: 1963.

(32) Pomeroy, B. S.: Personal Communication. Professor and Head, Department of Veterinary Microbiology and Public Health, University of Minnesota.

(33) Staff, Animal Husbandry Research Division, ARS, USDA: Animal Agriculture and Food. ARS 44-208, Jan. 1969, pp. 1-18.

(34) King, N. B.: Trends in Animal Disease Research and Financing in the United States. J.A.V.M.A. 153: 1968, p. 1040.

(35) Plimpton, R. P., Jr.: New Goals in Undergraduate Teaching in Animal Products. J. An. Sci. 27: 1968, p. 893.

(36) Anderson, A. W.: Fish and the Fishing Industry. Food, The Yearbook of Agriculture, 1959, U.S.D.A., Washington, D.C. p. 353.

(37) Christensen, N. O. et al: Fish Diseases in Denmark. Bull. Off. Int. Epiz. 59: 1963, pp. 21-29.

(38) Klussman, W. G.: In Proceedings—Commercial Fish Farming Conf., Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas, 1-2 February 1967, p. 7.

(39) Bureau of Sport Fisheries and Wildlife: Warmwater Fish Farming: An Acquacultural Success Story, 83: February 1970, p. 4.

(40) Maurer, F. D.: Fish Health a Requisite of Fish Culture. J. on Am. Vet. Med. Assoc., 154, #12: pp. 1596-1599.

(41) Ojala, Olli: Fish Diseases in Finland Bull. Off. Int. Epiz., 59: 1963, pp. 89-109.

(42) Kocylowski, B.: Etat actuel des maladies des poissons. Bull. Off. Epiz., 59: 1963, pp. 89-109.

(43) Belor, E. M.: Les maladies des poissons. Bull. Off. Int. Epiz., 59: 1963, pp. 127-130.

(44) Roskam, R. T.: A Human Disease Caused by a Nematode from Herring. Int. Council. Expl. Sea. C.M., 98: 1960.

(45) Weiss, H. V. and Ship, W. H.: Biological Concentration by Miller Clams of Cobalt 60 From Radioactive Fallout. Sci., 125: 1967, p. 695.

(46) Mason, J. O. and McLean, W. R.: Infectious Hepatitis Traced to the Consumption of Raw Oysters: An Epidemiologic Study. Am. J. Hyg. 75: 1962, p. 90.

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD TAKE THIS OPPORTUNITY TO MEET IN EUROPE WITH LEADERS OF THE INTERNATIONAL RED CROSS ON BEHALF OF AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, I have wired the President proposing that a day be found during his 8-day European tour for a meeting in Geneva with leaders of the International Red Cross on behalf of Americans held prisoner in Southeast Asia.

This tour of Europe on which the President is embarked would be a marvelous opportunity to make a dramatic and unprecedented visit to the Red Cross to urge a renewed effort by that humanitarian organization on behalf of our prisoners.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that my wire to the President be printed in the RECORD with my remarks. The wire follows:

SEPTEMBER 28, 1970.

The President,
The White House,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I respectfully urge you to dedicate at least one day of your eight day European tour to a personal meeting with leaders of the International Red Cross on behalf of American Prisoners of War in Southeast Asia.

A personal visit to Red Cross Headquarters in Geneva, Switzerland would be impressive both in symbolism and in substance. It would I believe be without precedent and its significance would not be lost on the Government of North Vietnam which is very sensitive to world opinion on the prisoner issue.

This would be a singularly dramatic act on behalf of our prisoners. It would encourage other nations to take similar action on behalf of prisoners and impress North Vietnam with the strength of American determination to see our men properly treated in POW camps.

A day carved out of your schedule for a meeting with the Red Cross could produce solid results for our prisoners held in Vietnam and for their families.

Sincerely,

JOHN S. WOLD,
Member of Congress.

THE DEMOCRATS AND THE "WHITE PAPER"

HON. WILLIAM L. DICKINSON

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. DICKINSON. Mr. Speaker, the reaction of the Democratic Party to the news that the administration has succeeded in halting the rising cost of living was a sorry performance, even for a campaign year. This country has been suffering under a Democrat-made inflation for so long that one would think nobody would like to see it go on. But judging from their actions yesterday, some Democrats would not mind seeing a weak economy—at least until after November.

Somewhat like a magician, the chairman of the Senate Democratic Policy Committee reached under the table and produced a 26-page "white paper" which told us that—contrary to what appeared to be a brightening economic picture—the economy was in real trouble.

I think it is worth taking a look at the authors of that report—three economists who served under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. It was these experts who advised President Johnson that this country could afford both "guns and butter." For those who do not remember it was the "guns and butter" policy which produced a \$25 billion Federal deficit in 1968 and kicked off a gross inflationary spiral which is now being brought to an end by a Republican administration.

If the Democrats are going to persist in looking for dark clouds, they should at least find instant experts who have some credibility left. All in all, last week's "white paper" recalled the spectacle of Larry O'Brien, the onetime apologist for the war in Vietnam, criticizing President Nixon for not ending it.

DEMOCRATS RESPONSIBLE FOR WAR AND INFLATION

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, my esteemed colleague from across the aisle, the majority leader of the House, stated that he welcomed the sudden slackening of the rise in the cost of living as a relief from the inflation which has been so burdensome to consumers.

This rather surprised me. Although I was delighted to hear that a spokesman of the Democrat Party welcomed the end of inflation, it has long been my feeling that this concern is not shared by most Democrats.

Democrats, traditionally, have long enjoyed accusing Republicans of being responsible for economic difficulties. The worse the economy, they reason, the better chance for voters to support Democrats at the polls in November.

This seems to be the Democrat line this fall, now that November elections are coming up. However, there have been a number of signs recently that the war-induced inflation inherited by the Nixon administration from the guns-and-butter economy of the 1960's is easing. The prime rate is down. The cost of living has ceased its upward spiral. Workers' spending power has increased 4 months in a row. The money squeeze is easing. The balance of trade is healthy. The Standard and Poor's Index is up. Fears of recession are declining as corporate profits and total real output—GNP—increase steadily. Yet only one Democrat stood up to hail even one of these signs of the improving state of the economy. But as I leafed through back issues of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I discovered that at least a dozen Democrats have stood up on the floor to make speeches in the last month and a half criticizing Nixon's handling of the economy. They talk about a recession that simply doesn't exist, and call attention to unemployment, without explaining that it is inextricably linked to the winding down of the war in Vietnam which they were responsible for getting us into in the first place.

Which brings me to another point. It is the Democrat Party which is traditionally associated in the minds of most voters with getting this country into war. Both world wars, the Korean war and now the conflict in Vietnam were begun under Democrat administrations. That the Nixon administration was voted into the White House was due, in no small part, to this fact. People felt that Nixon was the man who could develop a sound Vietnam policy. Their hopes were justified, for almost daily we have evidence that the war in Vietnam is indeed being properly phased down. Troops are being withdrawn, the weekly death toll is lower than it has been in 4 years, and there is every sign of success in Vietnamization.

Yet, I hope I am not considered uncharitable if I suggest that I think that now, as elections are approaching, there

are many Democrats who continue to try to shift the blame for the war to the Nixon administration. They got us into the war, but they would not give Nixon credit for trying to get us out—at least not until after November.

The conclusion is logical: It is the Democrats and not the Republicans who are the party of war and inflation. The record shows that it is the Democrat Party which is responsible for both problems—war and inflation. And the solid Nixon record in handling both these problems left over from the Democrats will not let them get away with turning the issues around.

RESULTS OF A QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to inform the House of the results of a questionnaire I sent to my constituents, from which I have received 30,000 responses. In a time when the Congress is in session almost the year round, it is imperative that the Members find effective and frequent channels of communication with their constituents. I have found the mailed questionnaire to be such a device and have made it a practice to poll my constituents in this way about six times a year. I have always had a large return and found the results most informative and useful. I heartily commend this technique to my colleagues for their consideration.

The most striking result was that the economy is the issue of No. 1 concern. Forty-four percent ranked inflation or unemployment as having the highest priority to them. The Vietnam war ranked second and student unrest third:

I. WHAT TO DO ABOUT INFLATION

	Percent
1. Wage/price controls.....	26
2. Voluntary wage/price restraints.....	29
3. Decrease federal spending.....	35
4. Increase federal spending.....	5
5. Nothing.....	2
6. No answer.....	3

With respect to inflation, 35 percent urged reduction in Government spending, 29 percent asked for the Federal Government to establish a program of voluntary restraint on wages and prices, and 26 percent asked for mandatory Federal wage and price controls.

II. WHAT TO DO ABOUT UNEMPLOYMENT

	Percent
1. Federal job placement program.....	29
2. Federal subsidy to underskilled workers.....	7
3. Provide job training programs.....	25
4. Provide unemployment compensation.....	2
5. Two or more of above.....	17
6. Do nothing.....	13
7. No answer.....	7

As a solution to rising unemployment, 29 percent of the respondents wanted Federal programs to find jobs for youth and the unemployed. Closely related was 25 percent who favored Federal job training and retraining.

III. VIETNAM

	Percent
1. Leave the President the option of attacking enemy sanctuaries.....	38
2. Provide military aid to Cambodia.....	9
3. Prepare to reduce troop levels.....	28
4. Withdraw all troops immediately.....	19
5. No answer.....	7

Thirty-eight percent of the sample favored allowing the President the option of attacking enemy sanctuaries near Vietnam. Twenty-eight percent favored reducing our troop levels in Vietnam, and 19 percent favored immediate and complete withdrawal of our troops from Vietnam.

IV. STUDENT UNREST

	Percent
1. State government should have control over the campus.....	54
2. Use of local police and National Guard.....	23
3. Federal aid for riot training.....	13
4. Federal police force.....	0
5. No answer.....	10

To cope with campus disorder, 54 percent favored increased State government control of colleges, while 23 percent favored the use of National Guard forces.

CONGRESSMAN ESHLEMAN'S LATEST NEWSLETTER

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am sending to my constituents my latest newsletter. I am including the contents of that newsletter in the RECORD at this point:

WASHINGTON SPOTLIGHT—REPORT FROM YOUR CONGRESSMAN ED ESHLEMAN

PICK A PAMPHLET

A checklist is enclosed with this newsletter. It is a catalog and order form for government publications which cover a wide variety of topics. I can get these pamphlets for you if you so desire. Just complete the order form and send it back to me. The instructions for this procedure are in my brief note on the front of the checklist.

BIG DECISION

After 15 years and \$285,000 worth of planning, the Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission has decided to plant a rose garden to honor the Nation's 32nd President.

AN APPEAL

This is the time of year when United Campaigns in nearly all localities make their annual appeal for funds. Because so many worthwhile programs are supported with the money collected by United Campaigns, your contribution is not only charitable but extremely valuable to your community.

THE SYSTEM

In a paragraph which didn't get widely reported, Vice President Agnew gave a definition of the American system which bears repeating. He said, "The system—our democratic system, here in America—is not a something-for-nothing machine. It requires that each of us contribute. Its base is not government. Its base is the people. Its great strength is not the great strength of government, but the strength of the people."

DRUG ISSUE

Most of this edition of my newsletter is devoted to the problem of drug abuse. It

is an attempt to familiarize young people, parents, educators and community leaders with several aspects of the drug problem—the dangers to the individual and society, the different types of drugs, some of the language of the drug culture, and some suggestions for dealing with a deteriorating situation. I hope that I can communicate in some small way my very deep concern about the growing threat of drug abuse. I, also, am hopeful that this material will help bring about a better understanding of the whole issue.

DRUG ABUSE DEPENDENCE AND DISASTER INTRODUCTION

Drug use is a part of our human history—and so is drug abuse. Drugs may be defined as substances which alter the structure or function of a living organism, and they have been known to man since the days of ancient Egypt and China. Down through the centuries drugs have been a blessing to man as a medical tool. Unfortunately, they also have been a curse when misused.

In modern America we are faced with widespread misuse of drugs. No one is certain exactly why we have this drug abuse problem, but some educated guesses have been offered. Some experts feel that social pressures and tensions have contributed to an irrational and impulsive use of drugs. Others feel that the mass media and instantaneous communications have made us more aware of drug abuse and therefore more susceptible to it. Still others attribute the growth of the problem to the emergence of a drug culture which views drugs as magic potions, capable of working miracles. Nearly everyone agrees that the illicit traffic in drugs has been a contributing factor since "pushers" are extremely anxious to find new and larger markets for their product. The disastrous increase of drug abuse among our young people probably can be traced to simple causes—the desire to belong to an "in" crowd, and/or the desire to escape from physical or emotional problems.

Drug abuse, then, is not new. The reasons given for its growth in recent years are not particularly startling. Nevertheless, solutions to the problem have escaped us. It is apparent that the problem cannot be dealt with legally, socially or morally until more people can separate fact from fiction in the matter of drugs, dependence on them, and the personal and social disasters they cause.

THE DANGERS

The drug user enters a dangerous world. He endangers himself and the world around him. In some cases these dangers are known and rationalized away by the user. But in other cases the dangers are unknown to a person who engages in some initial drug experimentation. Too often, individuals and society suffer because ignorance of the consequences paved the way to drug abuse.

Drug addiction is a combination of both physical and psychological dependence on drugs. An individual gives up self-determination to become a slave to drugs. His dependence may start by smoking the first joint, injecting the first fix, or swallowing the first pill. The rest is downhill.

The days of screaming meemies and violent withdrawal are pretty much over when an addict is properly treated, but other horrors remain. There are still ugly cysts and sores, scars and amputations, V.D. and infection, all the results of filth and abuse of needles. Mental collapse and long range damage to vital body organs have been shown to be directly related to drug abuse. Perhaps more far reaching, some authorities suspect that drug use may damage or change chromosomes leading to abnormalities in future generations.

Another element which cannot be overlooked is the legal aspect of drug abuse. Even

the most casual exposure to certain legally controlled harmful drugs can lead an individual into a nightmare of courts, convictions and prisons which can taint an entire life and career.

The dangers of drugs to the individual are the most serious consideration, but the dangers to the whole of society cannot be ignored. All of us suffer because money is poured into the pockets of organized crime to sustain the narcotics traffic. We are the victims of the crimes committed by drug addicts who steal and even murder to get money enough to support their habit. Persons under the influence of drugs commit irresponsible acts which threaten innocent lives and valuable property.

This list of dangers is a blanket accusation of drug misuse. Drugs are guilty until proven innocent, and the responsibility for such proof rests with those who advocate legalization of the drugs we now outlaw. Until that evidence is forthcoming, drug abuse is not only illegal, it's harmful—and stupid!

DRUG TYPES AND EFFECTS

Marijuana (cannabis derivative)—This drug is worthy of some special mention because it is probably abused more than any other. It comes from the flowering tops and leaves of the hemp plant which are dried or powdered to produce a product that can be sniffed or smoked. The effects sought by the marijuana user are sociability, euphoria and intensified sense perception. The adverse effects are impaired coordinated and memory, and a disturbed sense of time. While there is no evidence that use of this drug leads to physical dependence, the user can become psychologically dependent upon it. In addition, some recent findings at St. John's University in New York indicate that marijuana usage results in genetic damage.

Hallucinogens (Psychedelic including LSD, peyote, mescaline, DMT, DET, psilocybin, and others)—Hallucinogens usually are taken for perceptual experiences, exhilaration, distortion of the senses and enhanced creativity. The adverse effects are intensification of existing psychosis, suicidal or homicidal tendencies, panic reactions and recurrent flashbacks. Most evidence does not point to either physical or psychological dependence, but a very definite possibility of genetic damage has shown up in some tests of the hallucinogens.

DRUG SCENE: TERMS

BAG: One's favorite drug or "thing"
BIG C: Cocaine
BLASTED: Under influence of drug
BUTTONS: Peyote (cactus buttons)
BUSTED: Arrested
BURNED: Bad buy, cheated
CAP: Capsule of any drug or narcotic
COLD TURKEY: Abrupt withdrawal
FIX: Injection of narcotics
GIVE WINGS: Give first heroin injection to a friend
HIGH: Under influence of drugs
HIT: On drag on a "Joint"
HOOKED: Dependent on drugs
JUNKIE: Heroin addict "HYPE"
MAINLINE: Inject drugs intravenously
OD: Deadly overdose, "Hot Shot"
OUTFIT: Paraphernalia for injecting
PEACE PILL: Veterinarian tranquilizer
P.C.P. "Hog"
PUSHER: Seller, supplier of drugs
SPACED: Unable to concentrate "Mental-ly drifting"
STONED: High on drugs
TRIP: High on hallucinogens
TURN ON: To recruit or start your friends on drugs
TURNED ON: To start, be given drugs; To be made happy or excited
TURNED OFF: To quit drugs
Narcotics (Opiates including opium, mor-

phine, heroin, dolophine, methadone and codein)—The narcotics user is most often seeking euphoria, freedom from pain and increased confidence. The effects found are depression of brain, nervous system and body functions; and a feeling of lethargy and apathy. The narcotics are both physically and psychologically addictive. Organic or genetic damage does not seem to be a threat, but there are other related dangers such as fatal overdoses.

Amphetamines (Stimulants including Benzedrine, Dexedrine, Desoxyn, Methamphetamine, Methedrine and Cocaine)—The effects sought by an amphetamine user range from increased alertness, to increased confidence in mental and physical capabilities, to loss of weight. The adverse effects which have been noted are excitability, sleeplessness, loss of appetite, and toxic psychosis. This type of drug probably does not lead to physical dependence, but psychological dependence is possible. In addition there are some indications that organic damage may occur.

Barbiturates (Depressants including Phenobarbital, Nembutal, Seconal Amytal, Butisal and Luminal)—Barbiturates are likely to be used for initial relaxation, anxiety reduction, "hazy joyousness", sleepiness, or dulling of pain. The adverse effects include slurred speech, sluggishness, loss of coordination, quarrelsomeness, and erratic behavior. These drugs can be both physically and psychologically addictive and could also bring about organic damage.

Volatile chemicals (Vapors including model glue, dry-cleaning fluids, ethyl alcohol, shoe polish, lacquer, paint thinner and others)—The user of these drugs seeks hallucinations, changed color perception, and a "floaty", relaxed feeling. The adverse effects of such use are impaired judgment and vision, slurred speech, irritability, dizziness, and loss of appetite. Physical dependence is not a very real possibility, but psychological dependence is. Organic damage is also a proven result of misuse of vapors.

TELL TALE SIGNS

We must recognize the enemy to fight it effectively. There are some common symptoms which may indicate that an individual is misusing drugs. Here are some things to watch for.

(1) Sudden changes in normal behavior and performance patterns. (2) Unusual flare-ups or outbreaks of temper. (3) Deterioration of personal appearance. (4) Wearing sunglasses at inappropriate times and places to cover bloodshot, watery eyes, with extremely wide or extremely small pupils. (5) Appetite extremes ranging from none or very little to huge, especially for sweets or liquids. (6) Adoption of abnormal ideas and ideals in place of a formerly strong values system.

If someone you know shows definite drug abuse symptoms, it's possible that a problem has developed or is developing. The drug abuser must have help to deal with his problem. The best source of aid is a doctor.

CONCLUSION

Drug abuse is expensive for all of us. We spend millions of tax dollars each year to control abuse and to treat people who have become drug dependents. The cost also must be measured in the millions of dollars of lost productivity from individuals who rob themselves of the ability to contribute to society. The drug abuse nightmare of personal destruction, social rejection and criminal activity touches each American.

Therefore, drug use is not a matter of pure individual choice, because drug use breeds drug abuse. Medical control and legal restraints must be there to guarantee that drugs will be used as tools for man and not abused in a cycle of dependence and disaster.

A REPORT FROM PARIS

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, the following is a very provocative report recently brought back from the Paris peace talks. The report was mailed to me by Mr. James M. Dennis, a member of the Wisconsin Committee to Stop the War, and was written by Mr. Adam Schesch.

The Schesch report is based on information gathered by a commission of inquiry—a grassroots citizens group from Minnesota comprised of farmers, trade unionists, businessmen and women, professionals, members of the Black community, and members of the university community. These citizens spent June 25 through July 2 talking with the delegations of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam, representatives of North Vietnam, and members of our own delegation. The commission emerged spontaneously from an independent attempt by private citizens to gain facts beyond the information available through the mass media.

Efforts of the citizens group are to be commended, and offer new and valuable insights into the social and political forces now operating in Vietnam. Such knowledge is essential if we are to make meaningful progress in our efforts to bring the tragic Vietnam War to a negotiated conclusion.

I commend to my colleagues' attention this interesting report:

A REPORT FROM PARIS

(By Adam Schesch)

INTRODUCTION

On June 27 and 28, a very unusual group of American citizens held two days of intensive meetings in Paris with the delegations of the Provisional Revolutionary Government of South Vietnam and the Democratic Republic of (North) Vietnam. On Monday, June 29, this same group, called a Commission of Inquiry, had a Conference with spokesman for the Patriotic Laotian Front, known in the United States as the Pathet Lao, and the acting representative in France of a brand new guerrilla movement, the National United Front of Cambodia (NUFK).

What made this group unusual was its purposes and its composition. The Commission had grown out of the spontaneous reactions in Minneapolis-Saint Paul, Minnesota, to the invasion of Cambodia on April 30, 1970. The Twin Cities' Commission was organized for a specific reason—to go to Paris to discuss the questions about settlement most bothering the American public, with the "Other Side."

From the start, the group was bound together by a belief that total and immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces from Vietnam is the best solution to the war. It knew, however, that it needed hard facts and concrete answers to the "Twenty Questions Americans Most Want to Know" if it was going to succeed in convincing a section of the American people that this solution is correct.

For this very reason, it decided that past expeditions to Paris had a fundamental weakness—they were not composed of the Americans who had the questions. So an American jury was picked. The people in

Minneapolis-St. Paul felt that the best group that could be chosen would be a cross section of a typical American city. They would be able to do what no group of Asian Studies experts, or famous dignitaries, or well known national antiwar activists could do. They could bring back information in a form people would understand.

The final delegation included: 1) a high school teacher (English), 2) an architect, 3) a Catholic priest, 4) a Japanese-American artist, 5) a farmer from a small town near the South Dakota-Minnesota border, 6) a Physics professor, 7) a writer, 8) a mental health worker, 9) a Vietnam Veteran, 10) a private investigator, 11 & 12) a wealthy Twin Cities businessman and his wife, 13) a Catholic mother of eight, 14) a retired assistant principal of a vocational-technical high school, 15) an electrician, 16) a dentist, 17) a mechanical maintenance worker, 18) a community organizer from the Black community in the Twin Cities, 19 & 20) two Black university students, 21) a Black secretary, 22) a physician, 23 & 24) a banker and his wife, 25) a shop steward in the United Auto Workers, 26) a truck gardener, 27) a Black educator, 28) a retired engineer, 29) a French language major, 30) a French language instructor, and 31) myself, a Ph.D. candidate in South East Asian history.

Our talks with the two delegations were held separately. On Saturday, we met with the PRG for 11 hours; on Sunday we held discussions with the DRV for 9 hours. The format of both the Saturday and Sunday sessions was similar. Each delegation chose to deliver an opening presentation, then followed a long period of questions and answers, a meal break and the showing of about an hour's worth of films. All in all, we were able to formally question the PRG delegation for more than five hours and the DRV delegation for more than four hours. Quite a bit was learned during the two hours smorgasbord meals with Vietnamese and French food, in which we broke down into small clusters of three and four and continued talking. For example, I had a half hour informal discussion with the official translator for the North Vietnamese delegation on the nation-wide village history project now underway in North Vietnam. (We are trying to gather together the personal notes from these discussions as they will enrich our account quite a bit.)

In formal statements and in the questions, the following topics took precedence: 1) the nature of the struggle in the South; 2) the question of withdrawal of American forces and the release of the prisoners of war; 3) the concrete aspects of a political solution including the holding of elections in South Vietnam; 4) the attitude of both groups to the question of reprisals; 5) the question of the Catholic minority; 6) the nature of land reform in the liberated zones in the South, in the program of the PRG, and in North Vietnam; 7) the relations between the PRG and the DRV towards Laos and Cambodia and the settlement of the Indochina question; 8) the destruction in the South and the question of reparations; 9) and the question of reunification of both halves of Vietnam.

Monday's schedule was quite different. Five people were assigned to go to the American Embassy to meet with Philip Habbid, the then acting head of the U.S. delegation to the peace talks. The basic purpose for seeing him was to find out what the official reactions were to some of the very concrete proposals we had obtained. This group spent two hours and fifteen minutes with him before rejoining the rest of the delegation which was meeting at the Friends Meeting House with three different delegations.

We met at six PM with several unofficial spokesmen for the Laotian Patriotic Front, the Pathet Lao, and from seven-eight PM with the acting spokesman for the new National United Front of Cambodia, the formal organization that grew out of the joining to-

gether of Prince Sihanouk, with the older Cambodian guerilla movement, as a result of the *coup d'etat* of March 1970.

The meeting with the Cambodian delegate brought some surprises. First of all, I obtained a copy in French of the program of NUFK which had just been released. Secondly, our group learned some unusual facts concerning the mysterious Columbia Eagle which was kidnapped on the high seas, a few weeks before Sihanouk's overthrow, by two so-called "hippies" and brought to Sihanoukville. Finally, we got a detailed explanation of the nature of Sihanouk's relation to Funk and the older "Khmer Rouge" guerilla movement of the 1960's.

Later on that evening, we attended a three hour reception given in our honor by the Union of Vietnamese in France, a large umbrella organization of more than a dozen groups whose membership is in the thousands, representing a large part of the 30,000 or so Vietnamese residing in France at the present.

With Monday night, the formal program of the Commission of Inquiry ended. Most of the group left for Minneapolis Tuesday morning. I had made arrangements however, to see several people on Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, in order to utilize the trip in a more complete fashion. I was able to arrange conferences with Jean Chesneaux, Philippe Devillers, Wilfred Burchett, with the Information Officers of the PRG and the DRV, and with Anneck Levy, a French authority on Thailand. Unfortunately, Burchett was unable to make my appointment on Thursday and I had to leave for Madison without having a private interview with him.

The following text is less than one-half of the original report I prepared.

THE PROVISIONAL REVOLUTIONARY GOVERNMENT

One of the key problems of the Paris Peace Talks is the continued refusal by the United States delegation, acting on instructions from Washington, to recognize the primary position of the new Provisional Revolutionary Government. For purposes of a settlement of the war, the various forces on the "other side" consider the PRG the "senior" member of their bargaining team. In their terms this means that the PRG is the group which is going to be the most directly involved in every phase of the settlement. This point concerning the withdrawal and a political settlement was made most emphatically to our Commission in Paris.

A typical example of the ways in which the United States delegation continues its policy of non-recognition was revealed in Ambassador Lodge's formal leave-taking of Paris last year. He said goodbye to the delegations from North Vietnam and Saigon, but did not even telephone the Provisional Revolutionary delegation.

The North, the Democratic Republic of Vietnam, admits that it is indeed helping its brothers in the South, but at the same time, makes it quite clear that it is playing second fiddle to the PRG in terms of the structuring of the settlement proposals. At no time did the southern PRG say to us, "The position of the North is as follows . . .", while on the other hand the North, the DRV, used the phrase, "As the PRG has stated . . .", several times during discussion of key questions. So, in order even to talk about the points covered at the conference, it is necessary to discuss the nature of the key delegation—the PRG.

The PRG is actually the concrete symbol of the southern guerilla movement's intention to move toward a post-war government of national reconciliation. The National Liberation Front has deliberately stepped down from the international podium in order to begin the process of creating conditions increasingly conducive to the formation of varied Vietnamese groups, formal and informal, which can unite around a basic, minimum policy of national independence and internal social change. This concept of

ever more embracing coalitions also seems strange because of the successful campaign over the years to represent the National Liberation Front as simply a monolithic Communist organization rather than a closely knit association of established groups and formerly unorganized peasants. In this coalition, the southern branch of the Communist Party of Vietnam, called the Peoples' Revolutionary Party, was and is a prominent but definitely minority member. No western estimates have ever put the Communist membership in the National Liberation Front at more than two per cent of the total.

The NLF, particularly since 1967, has been very definite about its desire to include in a post-war settlement, as many of the separate factions in the South as possible. Thus, during 1969, it took advantage of the growing support among previously uncommitted or formerly pro-Saigon elements, to launch the Provisional Revolutionary Government in which the NLF itself a coalition, is merely one part, although a large part. In addition to the NLF, there are two other sections to the Provisional Revolutionary Government, whose delegation we met in Paris—the non-NLF elements who joined with the NLF during 1968 and 1969 to create the PRG, and a section of seats in the top decision-making bodies which are vacant and reserved for groups yet to come in. Thus, in order to bring into focus those with whom we spoke, one must realize that the NLF is no longer functioning at the international level, although, of course, many of the PRG officials in Paris and in Vietnam were and are officials in the NLF.

THE WITHDRAWAL TIMETABLE

The question which was uppermost in the minds of the Commission and the Vietnamese delegations concerned the withdrawal of American forces. The opening talk of the PRG delegation on Saturday and some of their later responses attempted to clarify the meaning and the reasons for the PRG's use of the words "total," "immediate," and "unconditional" withdrawal of U.S. forces. They began with the explanation of the word "total."

The PRG feels that the Nixon administration is attempting to force a carefully worked out deception upon the American public. They argue that Washington is attempting to, remove during the coming year, almost all of the remaining combat ground forces in South Vietnam, and that the drastic reduction of combat casualties which will result, is purposely designed to weaken the antiwar movement by distracting a large portion of its participants from continued activity. They contend that Washington would like to leave between 200,000 and 300,000 men in Vietnam to carry on an intensified air war against the guerillas. They supported their contentions with some very hard figures on bombing tonnage increased throughout Indochina since Nixon assumed office.

The PRG's attitude toward this tactic is quite specific. They feel that by all past standards they have won the war on the ground and that the entire armed pacification program has been defeated in all its forms. Their view is that the air war is directed, not against guerilla forces, but against the population which provides the food, shelter and recruits for those forces. In other words, it is an air war of terror to drive huge sections of the population out of the rural areas and to concentrate them where they can be controlled by the Saigon troops reinforced with new equipment and supported by the United States Air Force.

The PRG contends that by this means, Washington's plan is to create a situation in which Saigon can hold on in much the same manner as South Korea.

From this argument flows one of the key demands, and a demand whose actual terms have been distorted for over a year. The PRG is demanding the total withdrawal of all

U.S. forces in the shortest time that such a withdrawal can mechanically be effected. No political conditions will be accepted as the price of that withdrawal.

"Immediate withdrawal" usually conjures up images of thousands of American soldiers dying horrible deaths as they run for their lives toward a Dunkirk-type evacuation. In fact, the Vietnamese have laid out an extremely complete and concrete timetable for the withdrawal of U.S. forces.

If the U.S. will agree in principle to a total withdrawal of all its forces over an immediate period of time which they define as extending over six months, they will treat as mechanical details the following items:

First they understand the six-month timetable to consist of an orderly, that is, a staged withdrawal, not the scramble for the boats Washington has depicted. They pointed out to the Commission that the U.S. command in Saigon has estimated a total withdrawal could be accomplished in only four months. On this point, I had the feeling that if the U.S. were to say seven or eight months, they would sit down and talk about it.

The PRG would treat the orderly withdrawal of Americans as "mechanical," i.e., not to be quibbled over. They also emphasized their willingness to treat in a similar fashion all the details of withdrawal referring to the safety of American forces. The word "safety" was used at least a dozen times during the discussion of this question.

Finally, as part of the phased military withdrawal, they would treat as mechanical details, not subject to political qualification, the release of all American Prisoners of War. This point became especially relevant when they discussed the fact that there are U.S. POW's now being held in South Vietnam by the forces of the PRG. When POW's would be released was clearly answered—all POW's will be released as part of the military ceasefire. This was repeated and emphasized. It would seem to make futile all efforts to obtain release of American POW's before such a ceasefire. Moreover, it would lay to rest any doubts that the release of the POW's would become a political football to be argued about after the war ended.

In summary, the PRG does want an immediate and total withdrawal. It has clearly stated that the word "immediate" is referring to a short and specific timetable—the period six months was used several times. The PRG would not quibble over all details connected with the orderliness and the safety of the withdrawal, and the simultaneous release of all American POW's.

The settlement of the war involves in addition to the military withdrawal of United States forces, which is seen as a necessary first step, the ultimate reconciliation of several elements among the Vietnamese people. These might be broadly grouped into four categories: 1) the Provisional Revolutionary Government, whose dominant member is the National Liberation Front; 2) the Saigon Government, which represents at this point mainly the civilian and military bureaucracy; 3) several formal and informal groups in the South who are caught between the two camps, including most of the Catholic community, several factions of the Buddhist community, intellectuals and professionals, segments of the two large religious sects (the Cao Dai and the Hoa Hao), and a small uncommitted part of the peasant population; and 4) the government and peoples of North Vietnam.

Immediately related to this complex problem of social reconciliation, is the political settlement, about which three key areas were discussed in Paris: 1) the holding of elections in South Vietnam and the creation of a post-war government; 2) the question and problem of reprisals; and 3) the question of reunification of the two halves of Vietnam.

The Provisional Revolutionary Government and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam

delegations both placed a heavy emphasis on the importance and concreteness of the settlement formulas given (8 May 1969) by the PRG's predecessor in Paris, the National Liberation Front. The PRG and DRV both indicated that the U.S. delegation had yet to give a concrete reply to specific sections of that proposal. During our discussions in Paris, the two delegations referred to key sections of this ten-point settlement proposal. For example, it outlines the creation of a Provisional Government to be made up of all parties who will support a minimal program such as that suggested in the following: during the intervening period between the restoration of peace and the holding of general elections, NO party shall impose its political regime on the people of South Vietnam. The political forces representing the various social strata and political tendencies in South Vietnam that stand for peace, independence, and neutrality, including those persons who for political reasons have to live abroad, will enter into talks to set up a Provisional Coalition Government based on the principles of equality, democracy, and mutual respect with a view to achieving a peaceful, independent, democratic, and neutral South Vietnam.

The Provisional Coalition Government will carry out the military agreements concerning the withdrawal of foreign troops. Its major duty, however, will be to provide an atmosphere of unity so that all parties can work toward the holding of democratic elections, the drafting of a permanent constitution, and the formation of a government based on both. To effect this, the Provisional Revolutionary Government must work to ensure full democratic rights, the release of all political prisoners, and the absolute prevention of reprisals. Its duty specifically is: to prohibit all acts of terror, reprisal and discrimination against people having collaborated with either side and who are not in the country or abroad, as provided for in the 1954 Geneva Agreements on Viet Nam.

Then having laid stress on the fact that the Provisional Coalition Government is composed of all elements, the Ten-Point Program outlines the step-by-step route to normal political conditions.

The people of South Vietnam shall settle their own affairs without foreign interference. They shall decide for themselves the political regime of South Vietnam through free and democratic elections. Through free and democratic elections, a constituent assembly will be set up, a constitution worked out, and a coalition government of South Vietnam installed, reflecting national concord and the broad union of all social strata.

North Vietnam is quite clearly excluded from every single step in this process. It is only after all these steps have been taken and after there is a functioning government of South Vietnam which is pursuing a neutral foreign policy, that any talks on reunification can begin.

The reunification of Vietnam will be achieved step by step, by peaceful means, through discussions and agreement between the two zones, without foreign interference. Pending the peaceful reunification of Vietnam, the two zones shall re-establish normal relations in all fields on the basis of mutual respect.

Both delegations in Paris were emphatic on two related aspects of the reunification problem. The first aspect is that both parts of Vietnam are equal during the gradual reunification process. The second aspect is that Vietnam is essentially one country. This is expressed forcefully in the Ten-Point Program:

The military demarcation line between the two zones at the 17th parallel, as provided for by the 1954 Geneva Agreements, is only of a provisional character and does not constitute in any way a political or territorial boundary. The two zones shall reach agree-

ment on the state of the Demilitarized Zone, and work out modalities for movements across the provisional military demarcation line.

The Vietnamese outlined the sequence of necessary steps to reunification. Thereafter, they talked at considerable length about particular aspects of each phase of the problem:

A. The Provisional Coalition Government is to be a major guarantee of peace. This was emphasized in the discussions relating the formation of the Provisional Coalition Government to the holding of elections and to the no-reprisal policy. The PRG argues that open participation of all groups in the PRG is in and of itself one of the best guarantees that no pressures will be brought to bear against any one faction. This is so because all factions will have a share of the interim power of the PCG as it runs South Vietnamese affairs.

B. The actual composition of the Provisional Coalition Government was intended to be a barrier against one side or the other controlling the nature of a post-war government. It is emphatically not an attempt to impose any kind of final government in advance. The PRG responded to President Nixon's charge that they wanted a guarantee of participation in a post-war government as part of a settlement package. The main goal of the Provisional Coalition Government is free elections whose outcome will rest with the voters.

C. As for the fairness of elections, three distinct points were mentioned: 1) all parties would be involved in creating and administering the election mechanism; 2) they were opposed to all outside forces intervening in the situation because it was a problem for the South Vietnamese themselves. (This is another reason why they feel the U.S. has to withdraw its forces first. While the United Nations was specifically ruled out, the International Control Commission was not banned as a possible observer of the elections. This might be worthwhile checking into); 3) the North Vietnamese are to have no role in these elections, or in the drawing up of the constitution for a post-war government for South Vietnam, or in any aspect of the political process which would begin with the formation of the Provisional Coalition Government.

D. The attitude of the North in this regard was quite clear. The North is completely in agreement with the PRG. Because of the actual history of the last fifteen years, reunification will be a careful and lengthy process in which South Vietnam participates as an equal partner with the North. The North believes, in principle, that the South Vietnamese people should decide the shape of their government themselves. Although the North is currently participating in the war in the South, its aid is not the same as U.S. aid to Saigon. They believe that Vietnam is ultimately one country.

E. Finally, the PRG made it quite clear that it wants to put its fate in the hands of the voters, obviously confident that it will get support from a significant section of the population. What Washington was unwilling to face in 1954 must be confronted by those now in power and that is that a large part of the population, this time in South Vietnam alone, is supporting a movement in which a native Communist Party is a trusted and major member. We must ask: Will we allow Washington to continue to prevent a nationwide election in South Vietnam as it did when Diem refused (1956) to hold the elections that the Geneva Agreements had specifically called for?

REPRISALS

After the opening statements on the elections in the South, the delegation felt that it should raise the question of reprisals against individuals or groups for their previous activities. We found that the PRG's discussions of the PCG and elections were

reinforced by the PRG's own attitude toward the question of reprisals and what it regards as proof of its good intention. These fell into four areas: the Catholics, political opponents, the nature of the Civil War, and land reform (see the analysis section).

The PRG and the DRV took a very firm stand on the question of the Catholic minority. They said that the bulk of the Catholic community was made up of peasants who were in all ways except religion, identical to the rest of the population of the South. In all respects except religious discrimination, they had suffered from the same things that drove the non-Catholic population into a resistance movement against Diem. The PRG and DRV maintained that they do not discriminate against Catholics. They both referred to the numerically significant participation of Catholics in both the leadership of the NLF, the PRG, and in the government of North Vietnam.

Referring to the active participation of Catholics in the resistance movement, a PRG delegate asked why should the movement want to shatter the unity it had already achieved between Catholic and non-Catholic. This point was accompanied by colorful examples of how ordinary Vietnamese Catholics aided the NLF during its years of struggle, even hiding NLF cadre from Diem's police in Saigon.

The PRG discussed the question of political opponents. Here the discussion started off with a logical question—the right of the United States and the Saigon regime to talk about this factor in light of their past records. Indeed, the Diem government has admitted that between 1954 and 1960, 48,200 persons were arrested as alleged Communists in South Vietnam. The DRV delegation maintained that these figures were actually over 500,000 imprisoned and over 70,000 killed.

It was pointed out that even if the end of the war might bring an unavoidable number of deaths from personal, non-official reprisals, it would be much less than the massive killing going on right now as the war continues.

At Saturday's conference with the PRG, we saw a color film prepared by a team of internationally known French movie makers. It explored all aspects of the "health question" in the South, including the incredible damage to the countryside and to the people from our bombings. For a person who is used to enjoying the beautiful farm country of Dane County (Wisconsin), it was torture to see formerly rich rice lands turned into a landscape resembling the moon with miles of fifty to one hundred foot wide bomb crater, three to five craters wide. The horror of the war against the people was brought home to us by the scene of napalmed women and children and burning villages.

Regarding reprisals, still another consideration about the nature of the war was presented. It is a civil war in which brother has been pitted against brother. Several personal examples came from our hosts. In one case, an uncle of the speaker was in the Saigon administration. In another case, cousins were in the Saigon armed forces. "With brother, parents, cousins, and members of the same village and province in all camps, how could one conceive of a 'bloodbath' taking place?" Perhaps it was too coincidental that the Vietnamese spokeswomen reverted to English for the word "bloodbath." When questioned after the translation was given, she stated that there was no word for "bloodbath" in Vietnamese.

THE SITUATION IN THE SOUTH

The material and memories that we brought back from Paris helped us acquire a more realistic view of the Viet Cong. We had discussed the nature of the land reform in the South as well as in the North, the nature of the Woman's Liberation Movement, relations with minority peoples, the

participation by ordinary people in the political decisions of the Liberated areas, and the kinds of programs being carried out by both the PRG and the DRV. For example, we saw the health programs of the PRG. This included color film sequences showing donated medicines from Europe being transported in trucks, on bikes, by foot, and in boats over South Vietnam countryside to reach village dispensaries and hospitals. At the same time, we viewed an underground jungle factory producing hospital equipment and watched an operation being performed in an underground surgery room. Finally, we saw a traveling medical team as it administered free inoculations to the members of a village. We thus realized that the PRG was already a functioning government, and that its supporters were human beings quite like ourselves. These are facts that should not easily be put aside.

As for the military situation itself, most of my information came from conversations and interviews outside the conference. (See last paragraph of Introduction for names of sources.)

According to my sources, the PRG/NLF has deliberately changed its whole military posture since Tet. It has purposely moved its operations from populated areas because the United States was relying on air strikes against all areas which appeared to be hostile. In order to keep aggressive American or Saigon ground units busy, the military strategy has been to carry out minor but continuous operations on the fringes of the populated areas, and to make daring strikes at military bases. In many cases, the Saigon Army commanders and units at the local level have either worked out secret agreements with the PRG/NLF or decided not to stir up trouble where overt military operations are not being carried out.

The military situation is reflected in the civilian aspects of the PRG. Because of the enormous gains made during the Tet offensive in rural areas, and because of its previous strength, the PRG no longer had to give military protection to its civilian governmental apparatus at the local level. In much of the rural areas, elections have been held to establish self-governing committees at the village level. In many cases, PRG officials also hold nominal positions in the Saigon bureaucracy. This kind of duplicity is intended to protect heavily populated areas from becoming the victims of indiscriminate bombing raids because they are classified as "contested areas."

A couple of very amusing accounts were told about this sort of thing, and it was pointed out to me that hardly a week goes by without some new scandal of "reconciliation" being uncovered by the Saigon secret police. Yet the overwhelming bulk of these "arrangements" have gone undetected. As one interviewer put it, "The PRG has spent the first two years eating out the Saigon administration like acid." He went on to describe Saigon as no more than a facade kept up to prevent more "Ben Tre's" (the city we "bombed to save"). In this same fashion, my French contacts discussed the steadily growing series of demonstrations for peace and negotiations in Saigon and Hue. The hand of the PRG is clearly present, and the demonstrations indicate that the question of possible reprisals is simply melting away under the impact of overt and covert arrangements.

ANALYSIS

In order to understand the political events of the last two years, one must briefly review the course of the Vietnamese revolution over the last generation. What marks the course of the Vietnamese revolution is a basic faith in the idea of a gradual revolution, a permanent revolution, the idea that the revolution is not simply a date but a series of steps to a goal.

What the Vietnamese revolutionaries have

is faith that if they are given a chance to explain and educate, they can bring the overwhelming bulk of the Vietnamese people along the road to a revolutionary transformation of present-day Vietnamese society. This belief partly rests on a proven assertion that many of the practices of a revolutionary society—like cooperation in rice farming in the village—have very strong roots in pre-colonial Vietnam. In this sense, the Vietnamese revolutionaries have correctly analyzed that there have always been strong cooperative and community-oriented tendencies in the Vietnamese culture and social arrangements. This historic element has allowed them to fashion a complex alliance of forces whose aim is a twin revolution—a nationalist and a socialist revolution linked as mutually re-enforcing goals.

The dual nature of the Vietnamese revolution is not supported by every single socioeconomic grouping in the society. This must be made clear. In addition, every single element of the social revolutionary program is not viewed in exactly the same way by all groups supporting it. But the Vietnamese Communist Party and other secular social revolutionaries have been able to obtain overwhelming support around a core of revolutionary goals. These are what might be called the "irreducible minimum." They are the reforms that will have almost universal appeal, yet at the same time allow for possible progress to greater forms of social cooperation, including Vietnamese socialism, by being the necessary "first steps."

A key example of this kind of "revolution-building reform" is the land reform program of the NLF. All but the tiny upper strata of the landlord class can agree to it. Yet even this group is not to be crushed under the land reform program. The land reform program of the united front of all groups, including the Communists, simply demands that all surplus land beyond that which a family needs for a family farm will be redistributed.

As the PRG put it, "Land policy is consistent with the special conditions of South Vietnam, i.e., in which the whole people are participating in the war effort. This means that there is a balance between the landless and the people with land. The key is land to the tiller at the place where he works. This means land to the peasant family including families of soldiers in the puppet army. We know that many men are forced to join the army."

As for the landlords, none will lose more than the surplus, the amount beyond what his family can cultivate.

It is certainly true that the two per cent of the top landlords who held forty-five per cent of the land right into the late 1960's will lose a great deal of wealth if they stay around. That is why several thousand of them will probably choose to leave the country with suitcases full of dollar bills, as several thousands have already done.

It might help here to point out that the much discussed peasant protests in the North in 1956 did not concern moves to force people into communes and collectives but rather a poorly administered and mechanically carried out land distribution program. This is an important difference. It is also significant that only by 1960 did the number of peasant families exceed fifty per cent. This gradualist approach is reflected by the fact that even as late as 1967, the United States Army Area Handbook for North Vietnam spent several pages describing the locally controlled cooperative system, which is still the main form of organized agriculture in the North. In fact, mechanisms still exist whereby a family which wants to pull out may pull out of a cooperative in much the same manner as in the United States, by going through a formal legal withdrawal process.

In addition to land reform, the other two

elements of the irreducible minimum program of social change are: 1) the emancipation of women from their subordinate roles, and 2) the granting of local control and autonomy to 750,000 hill tribes. These two aspects of the PRG program are seldom discussed in the United States, perhaps because Saigon has made no comparable commitment.

Proof of the PRG's commitment to women's liberation was the composition of the delegation. The Chairwoman of the PRG delegation and the Minister of Foreign Affairs is Madam Nguyen Thi Binh. She heads a staff which has a sexual balance at all levels of responsibility.

Women and members of minority groups are represented in important decision-making posts in the Provisional Revolutionary Government. Members of the Edeh and Jari minorities hold several posts, including the position of representative of the Autonomous Nationalist Movements in the Central Committee of the PRG and NLF. The Central Committee also includes representatives of the lowland Khmer (Cambodian) minorities, representatives of the Cao Dia and Binh Xuyen sects, and representatives of the Catholic and Buddhist clergy and laity.

The Vietnamese revolutionaries, in addition to working on the key areas of land reform, women's liberation and minority group rights, have encouraged and built upon the cooperative aspects of the Vietnamese village through such programs and through village clinics, free health care and the construction of communally owned irrigation systems. These types of activities produce a powerful tendency toward a socialist society. Yet, this program is accepted by non-Communists as a domestic policy around which they can all unite.

It has already been stated that the PRG has made strong guarantees of safety to these groups. The real point is, though, that since the Tet offensive, the NLF and PRG have been moving to implement these guarantees. According to Philippe Devillers and other contacts in France, the NLF and PRG have changed their focus of activity since Tet. They are concentrating on talking to people and on encouraging people to reach an accommodation with the PRG.

Over the last two years, the PRG has succeeded in reaching numerous supporters of Saigon, exiles, and fence sitters. This is extremely important. It indicates that the war in Vietnam has become a true war of national liberation, a war against a foreign invader.

In this grand anti-imperialist alliance, long-standing political differences have been put aside. This was the significance of the reception given us by the Society of Vietnamese in France. This is an umbrella organization, made up of many fence sitters, voluntary exiles, Catholics, professionals, etc., who had left Vietnam in various waves over the last few years.

The PRG has convinced large numbers of the Vietnamese community in exile that they have a positive role to play in post-war Vietnam. In Paris, there are many intellectual, doctors, professors, students, scientists, and managers who are planning for the first time to return to post-war Vietnam. How else can one explain the request which was put to me in great detail that Americans help collect scientific, medical, and professional text books for eventual shipment to Vietnam?

In Vietnam itself, the most sensitive question concerns what would happen to low ranking officers and non-commissioned soldiers in the Saigon Army. Battle casualties suggest that a tact understanding has already been reached. When the Saigon Army invaded Cambodia, they suffered casualties far higher than in the weeks before the invasion. Yet Saigon suffered these high casualties in Cambodia at the hands of a retreating army. The earlier casualties suffered in

Vietnam were presumably the result of the aggressive actions of the Saigon forces as they daringly plunged into the heart of the enemy's military concentrations. If this is so, how does Washington explain Saigon's low casualties in Vietnam?

As for the Catholic, the PRG stated to us, Archbishop Binh of Saigon, the head of the southern Catholic community, has formally endorsed the "no reprisal" assurances of the PRG/NLF and the sections of the political settlement. (Even more surprisingly, *Far Eastern Economic Review* on March 5, 1970, noted that Archbishop Binh and Denang's Bishop Pham Ngoc Chi, a refugee bishop, have even called for reunification with the North.) If they are satisfied, who are we to doubt?

In recent months, the Thieu-Ky regime has made wholesale arrests. All of the people arrested have been calling for peace and negotiations with the PRG. Those arrested include members of the Buddhist clergy, the university community, assembly members, trade union leaders, white-collar administrators, and Catholics. This means that members of all of these groups believe that the PRG has a workable program and that it will adhere to its guarantee for their well-being.

The picture, then, is that only a very small minority of the urban Vietnamese will not have worked out guarantees for their well-being and safety when the war comes to an end. In a real sense, the Provisional Coalition Government has already been formed. It includes, in addition to the PRG/NLF and its huge peasant base, the urban-based Buddhist sects, the Catholic community, the urban intelligentsia, and the reconciled civilian and military officials from middle and lower echelon positions.

Who is left? President Thieu has already shipped his two sons out of the country and his wife is rumored to have secretly purchased a villa in Rome. Others will also provide for themselves abroad. The wealthy merchants and landlords, the collaborators, the corrupt high officials, and the dope smugglers—these people will undoubtedly leave. In fact, as Devillers pointed out to me, one of the key points which is implicit in the PRG agreement to a staged withdrawal over several months was that this would allow the quiet and orderly departure of whatever upper class individuals chose to leave.

LAW AND ORDER

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gun as a tool of the criminal is a source of great concern. Accordingly I have proposed in House Resolution 17323 stiff penalties for possession of firearms by a criminal. I have continued, however, to oppose all proposals for Federal registration and licensing of guns. In my view, such would be unfair to the law-abiding gun owner and do nothing to deter the criminal.

I have also proposed that the Federal Government finance an expansion of the FBI academy—where several 20th district police have already received training—so all local police can take special training and refresher courses.

To help curb civil disorders I have proposed that the National Guard be given special riot weapons and training so it can serve more effectively in its growing role as a police reserve.

BEWARE OF THE "TROTS"

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, during the antiwar demonstrations here in Washington last October and November one organization which did yeomen work in reaching potential sympathizers and in organizing the demonstrations was the Student Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam—SMC. Cooperating with the New Mobilization Committee and the Vietnam Moratorium Committee, SMC played a leading part in the fall offensive, that program formulated months in advance of the October and November protests to produce a public ground swell of opposition to the Vietnam war and the administration's policy in that area. Before, during, and after the demonstrations, sources such as FBI Director Hoover and a number of us here in Congress pointed out that SMC was controlled by Trotskyites, through the Socialist Workers Party—SWP—and its youth arm, the Young Socialist Alliance—YSA—who, although divorced from Moscow nevertheless worked diligently for the overthrow of the U.S. Government.

With the advent of a new school year, it is especially urgent that students on college campuses and in high schools alert themselves as to the philosophy, strategies, and tactics of the "Trots" among youth circles. In the September issue of VFW, the magazine of the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Mr. Hoover provides useful information on these organizations in an article entitled "The Red University—Goal of Trotskyist Communist in the U.S." The article notes that today there are an estimated 50 YSA chapters on college campuses throughout the Nation and "they operate openly and effectively, representing orthodox communism's most extensive current beachhead in higher education." Mr. Hoover further emphasizes the threat of these radicals to young citizens and our way of life:

For that reason they seek to radicalize students, to teach them to hate America and jeer at our Flag, to encourage disrespect for our laws. They want young people to hate the military, to belittle our national leaders, to laugh at veterans organizations, such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and to ridicule the men and women who have so valiantly defended our nation around the world.

The VFW and Mr. Hoover are certainly to be commended for publicizing this information to correct the lack of knowledge about the Trotskyites and their designs for the youth of our Nation.

On September 24 the VFW issued a press release calling attention to the Hoover article in an added effort to spread the word about the Trots. I insert at this point in the Record the VFW press release of September 24 and the above-cited article by Mr. Hoover from the September issue of VFW.

J. EDGAR HOOVER ARTICLE DRAWS PRAISE FROM EDUCATORS

WASHINGTON, D.C. (Sept. 24).—The Young Socialist Alliance (YSA) today has an estimated 50 chapters operating openly and effectively on American campuses, according to J. Edgar Hoover.

In an article appearing in the September issue of the *Veterans of Foreign Wars* magazine, the F.B.I. director said these chapters represent orthodox Communism's most extensive current beachhead in higher education and are the largest and best organized youth group in left-wing radicalism.

Hoover said the Trotskyist youth group, founded in the late 1950s, has shown a vast membership growth and resurgence in the past 24 months. He cited the YSA's National Convention in Minneapolis last December that drew an estimated 1,000 members and observers.

"This sudden—and surprising—upsurge of Trotskyist Communism has sprung from the recent student unrest on our college campuses, especially the rise of New Leftism and the agitation against the war," the F.B.I. director explained.

The V.F.W. article stated a "ready-made channel of Trotskyist influence on the college campus is the Student Mobilization Committee."

Hoover said few people realize that the SMC movement is controlled by the Trotskyists and that this old-line Communism is making an almost unbelievable comeback in the U.S.

"Here lies a danger of great magnitude," the F.B.I. director warned. "This threat becomes clear when we realize that Trotskyists' activities on campus are really secondary to their main goal, namely, to bring about a Communist revolution."

"They want young people to hate the military, to belittle our national leaders, to laugh at veterans organizations such as the Veterans of Foreign Wars, and to ridicule the men and women who have so valiantly defended our nation," the director wrote.

The National Commander of the V.F.W., Herbert R. Rainwater from San Bernardino, Calif., commended Hoover on the magazine story which he said has drawn praise from educators throughout the nation.

THE RED UNIVERSITY—GOAL OF TROTSKYIST COMMUNISM IN THE UNITED STATES

(By John Edgar Hoover, Director of the FBI)

A college student strode across the university campus. He was a clean-cut young man, his hair cut short, wearing a pair of brown trousers and a white sports tie. There was nothing of the beatnik or hippie type in his appearance.

In his hand he carried several pieces of paper, a small book and a magazine. He was on his way to meet a friend.

A few minutes later the student met his friend, another young student. The two shook hands and then started to talk in an animated fashion. The first student suddenly, as if he needed some printed data to reinforce a point he was making, took the magazine he was carrying, opened it to an article and then beckoned his friend to read it.

What was the magazine? It was a copy of "Young Socialist."

What is the "Young Socialist?" It is the organ of the Young Social Alliance (YSA), the nation's top Trotskyist youth group. (The magazine has now been replaced by another publication.)

The two young men were on their way to a meeting of the campus chapter of YSA.

On the West Coast a conference opened in a school auditorium. It was a blustery winter day, but attendance was excellent. Into the auditorium walked a tall young man and an attractive young lady. They were to be speakers at the conference.

Who were the people attending this Conference? They were members of the YSA and its parent group, the Socialist Workers Party (SWP).

What was the young man on the university campus showing his friend in "Young Socialist?" An article entitled "YSA Program for the Campus Revolt." He pointed particularly to a paragraph (under the heading "A Revolutionary Strategy") dealing with the "Red University," a major concept of Trotskyism.

"The concept of a 'Red University,'" the paragraph read, "oriented toward the needs of the working class and the oppressed first arose in Europe. The concept means that the university ought to be transformed from a factory producing robots into an organizing center for anticapitalist activities, a generator of revolutionary education, an arena for mobilizing youth in the struggle for the complete transformation of society."

The discussion in the campus YSA meeting that evening was on the role of the university in making a Communist revolution.

What was the topic of the speeches of the tall young man and the attractive young lady entering the auditorium to attend the West Coast Conference?—the "Red University."

The young man lashed out savagely against American universities. The university, he charged, was playing a despicable role in society by allowing ROTC training and military recruitment on campus. The real function of the university, he asserted, should be to expose the fallacies of capitalism and to train students to bring about a "socialist" (in Trotskyist language "socialism" means Communism) revolution.

The lady speaker was even more bitter. She denounced universities as mere "factories" producing "technicians" and "robots" for capitalism. Trotskyists, she said, must encourage young people to become dissatisfied—not only with their schools but also with the whole structure of society. That's the way to bring about the revolution. That's the way to radicalize and agitate students. That's the way to bring about the "Red University."

In these two incidents, a campus meeting and a West Coast conference, we see the everyday operations of an Old Left Communist group known as Trotskyists. We see also one of their major current aims—the influencing of young people leading, they hope, to establishing the "Red University."

Much less has been heard about the Trotskyist brand of Communism than the Stalinist Communists of the Communist Party, USA. The Trotskyists are old-line, orthodox Marxist-Leninists, basing their ideology on the teachings of Marx, Engels and Lenin.

However, they follow the interpretations of these Communist "masters" by Leon Trotsky, Lenin's famous collaborator in the Russian Revolution of 1917, instead of what they call "Stalinism," that is, the kind of Communism developed by Stalin and his successors in the Soviet Union. To the Trotskyists, Stalin "corrupted" the original teachings of Communism (especially through his terror tactics) and only they, the Trotskyists, possess what they call the "pure" version.

The Trotskyists (followers of Trotsky are called Trotskyists; their opponents call them Trotskyites) detest the Soviet Union and its representative in the United States, the Communist Party, USA (though recently the two groups have worked together in antiwar programs, more or less tolerating each other for tactical purposes).

For years, the Trotskyists (the Socialist Workers Party was founded in 1938 by members expelled from the Communist Party, USA, as a result of the Stalin-Trotsky feud) were orphans in the ideological vineyards of the left. They were small, ineffectual and virtually forgotten when compared to the much larger Communist Party, USA.

But the tables have now turned. The Trotskyists, especially its youth group (YSA was founded in the late 1950's), have shown a vast membership growth and resurgence in the last 24 months until YSA is today the largest and best organized youth group in left-wing radicalism. Trotskyist influence is especially strong in the youth field, particularly on the college campus.

For example, at YSA's National Convention in Minneapolis last December, roughly 1,000 members and observers were in attendance. Enthusiasm was high. The convention was effectively organized and run. A number of new recruits were obtained.

This sudden—and surprising—upsurge of Trotskyist Communism has sprung from the recent student unrest on our college campuses, especially the rise of New Leftism and the agitation against the war. Trotskyist leaders have skillfully exploited this situation for their own advantage.

For example, the "YSA Program for the Campus Revolt," which the two young students were discussing on the University campus, is filled with so-called "immediate demands" to attract the extremist student: "end campus complicity with the Vietnam war, abolish ROTC, end all ties between the university and the military. No military recruiters on campus. End cooperation with the Selective Service system, abolish the draft."

Then there are demands for "student-faculty control of education:

"Student-faculty control over the university, including the hiring and firing of faculty members and administrative officials, repeal all anti-student legislation, no police on campus."

In addition, YSA's program demands: "Free education through the university level for everyone who wants it. Abolish tuition. An annual salary for all students with automatic increases to offset inflation. Guaranteed jobs upon graduation."

Today there are an estimated 50 YSA chapters on college campuses throughout the nation. They operate openly and effectively, representing orthodox Communism's most extensive current beachhead in higher education.

A ready-made channel of Trotskyist influence on the college campus is the Student Mobilization Committee (SMC). The SMC is a nationwide antiwar group which, along with the New Mobilization Committee to End the War in Vietnam, has influenced literally thousands of students, faculty members and others against the war in Vietnam. SMC has received extensive publicity in the national news media and its leaders are frequently interviewed as "representatives" of student opposition to the American presence in Vietnam.

Early in 1970, an SMC National Conference was held in Cleveland, Ohio, for the purpose of organizing antiwar protest strategy. Some 4,000 individuals of varying ideological backgrounds attended. Yet, few people know that SMC is controlled by the Trotskyists. YSA and SWP leaders hold top positions in the SMC and call the signals.

Under the banner of Leon Trotsky, old-line Communism—virtually unopposed—is making an almost unbelievable comeback in the nation. Here lies a danger of great magnitude. This threat becomes clear when we realize that Trotskyists' activities on campus are really secondary to their main goal, namely, to bring about a Communist revolution.

"Our participation (in campus agitation)," says YSA's *Program for the Campus Revolt*, "is designed to demonstrate in practice how the student struggle is linked to the broader struggle to replace capitalism with socialism (Communism)."

In other words, the current situation of unrest on campuses is being used by the

Trotskyists merely as an agitational point, to stir up discontent, to radicalize students and to obtain YSA and SWP recruits. The main goal is a total transformation of our society along Marxist lines.

That's why the Trotskyists have developed the concept of the "Red University." They know that the young people of today will be the leaders of tomorrow. For that reason they seek to radicalize students, to teach them to hate America and jeer at our Flag, to encourage disrespect for our laws.

This YSA-SMC attempt to stir up discord among GIs is not motivated by any legitimate concern for the GI. To the Trotskyists, this agitation is just another tactic, as their program on campuses, to radicalize young people and to lay the groundwork for the Communist revolution.

In this process, the Trotskyists seek—in orthodox Communist teaching—to create a strong centralized party, with discipline and organization, which can serve as the vanguard of revolution. This Trotskyist resurgence should be a matter of concern to all patriotic Americans.

As citizens, veterans and Americans, you should know more about Trotskyist Communism in our country—its origins, tactics and aims.

You should be familiar with the Socialist Workers Party, the Young Socialist Alliance and the Student Mobilization Committee. The next time you see or hear about their activities, you will realize that they are not some distant, strange groups or some bland, non-revolutionary organizations which intend no harm to our country.

Many citizens, unfortunately, equate the word "socialism" as used by the Trotskyists with a democratic form of socialism. Nothing could be further from the truth. In Trotskyist language, "socialism" or "socialist" means Communism. Trotskyism is revolutionary Communism working for the destruction of this nation.

To meet this Trotskyist challenge, we must be positive in our support of America—its ideals, its values, its principles.

As never before, America needs help. In today's world, with so many forces endeavoring to disrupt democratic government, each citizen must be willing to stand up and boldly say: "You can count on me."

A free society can survive only through the wholehearted, intelligent and vigilant support of its citizenry.

I know, speaking for the readers of the *V.F.W. Magazine*, that you will do your share.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert into the RECORD a letter I received from Robert L. Kahn, president of the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues, expressing support for my equal rights resolution, House Joint Resolution 264. The letter follows:

THE SOCIETY FOR THE PSYCHOLOGICAL STUDY OF SOCIAL ISSUES,

September 14, 1970.

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS,
House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues is a group of approximately three thousand psychologists and allied social scientists who seek, in various ways, to bring theory and practice into focus on human problems of the group, the commu-

nity, and the nation as well as the increasingly important ones that have no national boundaries.

The Society supports all women in their determination to achieve constitutional equality, and strongly urges the Senate to pass the Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution without change as presented by the Honorable Martha W. Griffiths.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT L. KAHN,
President.

STATEMENT BY DR. IVAN HINDERAKER

HON. RICHARD T. HANNA

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. HANNA. Mr. Speaker, in this time of increasing student unrest, I call the attention of my colleagues to a recent statement by the chancellor of the Riverside campus of the University of California, Dr. Ivan Hinderaker.

I have known Dr. Hinderaker personally for over 15 years. Over these years I have come to have a high regard for Dr. Hinderaker both as an educator and as an administrator. His statement is a constructive contribution to the unending efforts to reconcile dissent with orderly progress.

The statement follows:

TO ALL STUDENTS AT UCR

(Statement by Dr. Ivan Hinderaker)

You are members of a unique generation. It is a generation extraordinarily concerned not with things as they are but things as they should be. In this concern, you should both be encouraged and commended.

UCR has a tradition of coupling its concern for change with an equally strong concern for change with non-violence. This campus has developed in an atmosphere of freedom—an atmosphere which has allowed all of us, students, faculty, and administration, freedom of expression, freedom of dissent. In particular, UCR students have been encouraged to "do their thing." The result has been a campus where ideas, not people, have been in conflict, and vigorous inquiry, not violence, has obtained.

Apathy, or worse, indifference to such issues as war, environmental pollution, economic exploitation is not a virtue with me. It is not a virtue at UCR.

Campus rules governing dissent and its expression are few. We cannot, and will not, tolerate any action that interferes with the rights of another individual or that interrupts the functioning of this campus. That's it. The individual who cannot live within this simple policy should plan now to leave. We cannot compromise or be flexible on this issue.

So demonstrate if you choose. Present a collective statement of your views. Do so by voice, or with placards, posters, and leaflets. But do so in the awareness that dissent, like all human action, has its limits.

Dissent and demonstrations are good when they serve as a means of expressing ideas—for alerting our society to injustice, to alienation, to inequality of opportunity. Demonstrations are bad when they become an end in themselves, when they are destructive of both human needs and resources.

Students who resort to violence to express their anger or release their frustrations help destroy the one bright hope we have: the freedom of ideas and inquiry. Any UCR student who resorts to violence or any UCR student who interferes with the rights of

others or interrupts the functioning of this campus will be dismissed.

The limits of dissent at UCR are broad. But when dissent crosses the line into disruption, it must be—and will be—stopped. The survival of the University and this campus is at stake today and we will not permit the actions of a few to destroy the freedom of us all.

SENATOR SKIDMORE OF TUSCALOOSA COUNTY

HON. WALTER FLOWERS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. FLOWERS. Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, September 23, we lost a great man from my home county of Tuscaloosa in the untimely death of our Alabama State senator, E. W. Skidmore. A true man of the people, "Skid" had abilities found in only the very few, and characteristically he was most generous with his time and talents in service of his fellow man. Although never afraid to take a stand on controversial matters, Senator Skidmore was equally loved and admired by friend and foe alike.

He was an old and treasured friend of mine and in tribute to his memory I include the following article from the Tuscaloosa News of September 24, so eloquently written by Associate Editor Paul Davis, at this point in the RECORD:

SENATOR SKIDMORE OF TUSCALOOSA COUNTY

(By Paul Davis, associate editor)

The old log cabin was like something out of a picturebook. It was built of logs, had a sagging front porch and those giant oak trees out front.

In the fireplace, the oak logs crackled and the senator, in khaki pants and shirt, told one tall tale after another.

It really wasn't cold enough for a fire, but the setting demanded it. There was a nip in the air and fall was on its way. All the boys had been swinging from ropes dangling from the branches of the oaks and they perspired as they sat in front of a fire that was too hot.

The senator first produced popping corn and later peanuts. There was an appropriate pan for each and the boys took turns shaking the pans over the fire, passing the handle on to a companion when the handle grew too hot or the fire started to make the knuckles on a small hand start to burn.

The older folks sat in rockers and cane-bottom chairs, but all attention was on the senator, not the kids. Finally, after much urging, he took down a black-frayed case from the mantle over the fireplace and took from it a shiny violin—he called it a fiddle.

He held his fiddle tenderly, almost caressing it.

He plucked the strings about midway up the neck and the sound attracted the attention of the youngsters in front of the fireplace. They turned and watched as he twisted the wooden pegs and the vibrations on each string were perfect.

Then he took his bow and played the beautiful tunes you could hum, like "Beautiful Dreamer" and "Greensleeves." Then he'd throw in one of the real old fiddlin' tunes that made you pat your foot.

That was the man, the senator, E. W. Skidmore—a giant in the eye of young boys who clustered around him.

I was one of those boys who had the opportunity—through family and church ties—to be around the senator so many times and

spend those long Saturday afternoons at his cabin and in his home. Many of those afternoons were spent on the sleeping porch of the house which for many years now has served as his office.

With his son Paul, we built houses in the trees and melted lead and made toy soldiers by the hundreds. When a mold wouldn't tighten just right and the soldiers came out a bit heavy on one side, the senator could, with a screwdriver and a pair of pliers, solve the problem in minutes. He always had a minute or two to spare.

When he died Wednesday, he was doing what he loved best, practicing law in the courtroom with 12 jurors at his side to listen to the beautiful oratory. He loved to speak and people loved to hear him.

He used the oratory as a toy many times, playing with words simply to entertain his audience. At other times, he used all the compassion he had and in a masterful way blended the words that could melt the hardest of hearts.

He used this great power to push through some of the state's most meaningful school and mental health legislation. He served the mentally ill and retarded of Alabama well and for four years was on the national mental health board.

Yet, deep down inside there was the politician image he loved.

He was the Deep South Senator that has been pictured in a thousand cartoons. He could start a rumble deep in the pit of his stomach and belch out those deep velvet tones that could make a woman swoon and every man jealous.

He was a symbol of manhood, strength and power.

He wore his trousers high, well above the stomach he developed in later years of life. The trousers were drawn in at the top and he looked like he wore a girdle. Then there was a massive chest which made him look more like an operatic baritone than a senator. But it served him well.

His son Paul had said two weeks ago that the senator was doing well, had cut his civic work load, was organizing his time and was really in his most productive years.

He had a quiet office where he was surrounded by his books and his guns. He loved the guns. They were on the wall, in his desk and he for years carried a tiny handgun in his pocket. That was during the years he was prosecuting people twice a week in city court and he often wondered if some drunk might someday become unhappy enough with him to do a foolish thing. Thus he carried the little gun, often in his coat pocket.

And on his necktie there was a miniature pistol. He delighted in showing it. He would take it off, reach into a drawer and get a cap, put it in the tiny gun and fire it, blow away the smoke and put it back on his tie.

He always loved that fiddle, too. Just a month ago, he played a tune or two at a meeting of the Tuscaloosa Civitan Club. He didn't do this sort of thing much anymore. A lack of practice and fingers that were no longer nimble make fiddlin' a bit of a chore. In his younger days, he could play half the night away, joining with fiddlers like Bob Kyle and Temo Callahan.

Another side to the senator's life—and a major side too—was his church, the Northport Church of Christ. He had been known to teach classes and preach when called on.

Church officers talked among themselves about an occasional \$100 bill which popped up in the Sunday collection plate. In fact, it was once discussed in a business meeting, but the senator didn't say a word. He placed the bill there, but it was never mentioned. His regular contribution was by check, the bill was just slipped in once in awhile because he loved his church.

He was a deep thinker and he involved himself totally in everything he did—from his church work, to his legislative duties

to his legal work. And he was doing just that when he died.

"I think that's the way he wanted it to end," his son Paul said Wednesday afternoon. "He loved that courtroom and a jury trial. That was just the greatest joy of his life."

Paul is an attorney, too. While his father worked in the courtroom of Judge Dominick Wednesday, Paul was a few floors away in Judge Mize's courtroom. On his jury was the County Coroner Rufus Strickland and it was Strickland, a friend of the senator's, who gave the mouth-to-mouth resuscitation to try to save the life of a friend.

It was almost a year ago now that the senator received his first warning about his heart and the setting was similar. He was arguing a case before the Alabama Supreme court when he fell. That time he made it. This time, the heart was gone and he was dead before he reached the hospital.

Gov. Albert Brewer summed it up well yesterday:

"He used his eloquent speaking ability to plead the cause of the less fortunate and left his mark on much progressive social legislation . . . his accomplishments will benefit generations yet unborn."

The Senator was a good man.

HORTON SALUTES NANCY TURNER, OUTGOING PRESIDENT OF WOMEN'S COUNCIL OF MEMORIAL ART GALLERY

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, when I think of the outstanding cultural benefits accruing to the greater Rochester, N.Y., area because of the Memorial Art Gallery, I always think of the oft-quoted biblical statement that "man does not live by bread alone."

I was reminded of this recently when I read a fine tribute in the Rochester Democrat and Chronicle to Mrs. Richard L. Turner. This was in a column headlined Nancy Spotlights The Doers and it enumerated many of the fine contributions that Nancy Turner continues to make to her community.

She recently completed 2 years as President of the Women's Council of the Memorial Art Gallery. Her tenure was marked by many outstanding events and inspiring progress in the history of the gallery. For the past 10 years much of Nancy's volunteer time has been devoted to the furthering of the Art Gallery's impact on the area. We are all indebted to her for her splendid leadership.

Especially noteworthy is Mrs. Turner's statement of appreciation for the gallery. She said:

Art nowadays is more important than ever. We all have so much leisure, and we can't spend it all worrying about the problems of the world. The gallery is a place to refresh, to re-investigate ourselves. It is important to preserve the fine things that have been done—Rembrandt, Cezanne, the others—as well as to press on to new accomplishments.

It is always refreshing to be reminded that the Nancy Turners of this world are mighty important and valuable people. They are indeed the doers, and all of the rest of us benefit in many ways by their devotion to their causes.

I would like to share with my colleagues in the House of Representatives the newspaper column from the Democrat and Chronicle, for I believe all will find it inspiring. It was headed "It Is a Place To Refresh" and pays a well-deserved tribute to Nancy Turner. The article follows:

IT IS A PLACE TO REFRESH

"When we gave our Greek Ball at the gallery this June, it occurred to all of us that it might be interpreted as frivolous. The world, the country, everyone's own little bank account were in such jeopardy . . ."

"But we were confident that we were having a beautiful party in a place which is well worth thinking about."

Mrs. Richard L. (Nancy) Turner, who this May completed her two-year term as president of the Women's Council of the Memorial Art Gallery, has spent most of her volunteer time for the past 10 years thinking about the gallery. She started as a docent (one of the volunteer guides) and took on, successively, posts as chairman of volunteers, chairman of hospitality, and the presidency.

The presidency made her ex-officio member of gallery committees, as well as of the board of managers. She took the job in May 1968, three months before the gallery reopened after extensive re-modeling. "It's a job where you work intensely, but in spurts."

Mrs. Turner, petite and well-tanned with a casual curly hairstyle, is the mother of four children, ranging in age from 10 to 17.

Her husband, also on the board of several volunteer groups, is chairman of the board of Schlegel Manufacturing Co., a local firm making weatherstripping. Their 10-room, 130-year-old Greek Revival house at 22 Stoney Clover Lane in Pittsford overlooks a huge chunk of Western New York, five acres of which they own. They moved the house to Pittsford from Henrietta 12 years ago, cutting it in half and carting it down the highway.

At the gallery, Mrs. Turner and the Council face a similar task of reconciling an old institution with a changing environment.

The 185-member council has recently expanded its numbers, but it is still an Old Rochester, membership-by-invitation-only organization. "We're slowly becoming aware of the problems of reaching out to the community. We want to be a place for everyone . . . After all the gallery has a terrific membership, more than 8,000 members."

The Women's Council does not work with selection of exhibits or the actual running of the gallery. "Our role is supportive, to help the staff, to provide services beyond what they can do. We also do some fund-raising, of course."

Volunteers come from gallery membership lists and low-key recruitment campaigns, as well as from the Women's Council itself. "We have need for so many different kinds of abilities. We try to involve anyone interested in the gallery, and draw the most dedicated people into the Council."

The Education Department is supported by volunteers who work as docents; operate the 30-school traveling exhibit program; transport students in the Monday sculpture class for the blind and the summer-school program for inner-city youngsters; run parties for students in gallery art programs and sponsor art-appreciation courses.

Volunteers help staff the Gallery shop, as well as the Lending and Sales Gallery. They raise money through projects like the outdoor cafe at the Clothesline Art Show, the tours of foreign art centers, smaller projects like this fall's three-day tour of the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York. That conscience-pricking Greek Ball raised more than \$4,000 which probably will go towards the purchase of an art object for the gallery.

"We do our share of sherry-pouring, too,"

said Mrs. Turner. "You might say we provide the woman's touch at those affairs." Such affairs include openings, teas, receptions, dinners and conferences where the Gallery inevitably offers guests sherry from a glass pitcher and coffee from an urn, served by a gracious Council Volunteer.

"An important function of the Council, of any women's council really, is to generate enthusiasm for the organization. But you must be careful not to do things which are connected in people's minds with old-fashioned, very social affairs. We do some thinking before we undertake a project."

The Gallery, she thinks, is a place more people should know about, and enjoy. "Art nowadays is more important than ever. We all have so much leisure, and we can't spend it all worrying about the problems of the world. The gallery is a place to refresh, to re-investigate ourselves. It is important to preserve the fine things that have been done—Rembrandt, Cezanne, the others—as well as to press on to new accomplishments."

Besides the Gallery, Mrs. Turner is active in the Allen's Creek Garden Club, which is helping restore the Stone-Tolan House; the Women's Council of the Rochester Museum, and of the alumni clubs of Smith College (B.A. in theater) and The Masters School in Dobbs Ferry.

CRAMER ANNOUNCES FILING IN SUPREME COURT

HON. WILLIAM C. CRAMER

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues in the House know, I have filed an amicus brief in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg case which will be heard by the U.S. Supreme Court on October 12, to consider the legality of busing in our schools. At this time I want to bring to the attention of this body the leadership role played by Congressman ALBERT WATSON in this important matter.

After counseling with me for some time, Congressman WATSON asked to join on my brief which outlines the legislative history and congressional intent of sections 401(b), of which I was the author, and 407(a) of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibiting the transportation or assignment of students in public schools to overcome racial imbalance.

Due to his strong belief that busing is illegal and that the courts and school officials are defying the will of Congress and of the people in this matter, Congressman WATSON then set out to secure the support of other Members of Congress.

Greatly to his credit and as evidence of his influence with his fellow Members, 83 Congressmen and Senators agreed to join in my brief.

Answering his persuasive call were representatives of 22 States, almost equally divided between Republicans and Democrats.

Last Friday, September 25, I filed a motion in the Supreme Court formally asking leave for those 83 Members of Congress to join in my brief.

Having such a large number of Congressmen petition to enter this case is of historical importance. Hopefully it will communicate to the Court the fact that the Congress of the United States wants

and expects its prohibitions against busing to be heeded.

Were it not for Congressman WATSON'S efforts, this demonstration of congressional support would never have occurred. All of those who believe in local government and personal liberty can be proud and thankful of what my friend and colleague, ALBERT WATSON, has accomplished.

Following is a list of the 42 Democrats and 41 Republicans who joined in my amicus curiae brief:

PETITION

ALABAMA

Sen. John Sparkman (D).
Sen. James B. Allen (D).
Rep. Jack Edwards (R).
Rep. William L. Dickinson (R).
Rep. George Andrews (D).
Rep. Bill Nichols (D).
Rep. Walter Flowers (D).
Rep. John Buchanan (R).
Rep. Tom Bevill (D).
Rep. Robert E. Jones (D).

ARKANSAS

Rep. John Paul Hammerschmidt (R).

CALIFORNIA

Rep. Robert B. Mathias (R).
Rep. H. Allen Smith (R).
Rep. Del Clawson (R).
Rep. John G. Schmitz (R).
Rep. John H. Roussetot (R).
Rep. Barry M. Goldwater, Jr. (R).

FLORIDA

Rep. Robert L. F. Sikes (D).
Rep. Don Fuqua (D).
Rep. Charles E. Bennett (D).
Rep. Bill Chappell, Jr. (D).
Rep. Louis Frey, Jr. (R).
Rep. James A. Haley (D).
Rep. William C. Cramer (R).
Rep. Paul G. Rogers (D).
Rep. J. Herbert Burke (R).

GEORGIA

Rep. G. Elliott Hagan (D).
Rep. Maston O'Neal (D).
Rep. Jack Brinkley (D).
Rep. Benjamin B. Blackburn (R).
Rep. Fletcher Thompson (R).
Rep. John J. Plynt, Jr. (D).
Rep. John W. Davis (D).
Rep. W. S. (Bill) Stuckey (D).
Rep. Phil M. Landrum (D).

ILLINOIS

Rep. Edward J. Derwinski (R).
Rep. Philip M. Crane (R).

INDIANA

Rep. Earl F. Landgrebe (R).
Rep. William G. Bray (R).
Rep. Roger H. Zion (R).

KENTUCKY

Rep. M. G. (Gene) Snyder (R).
Rep. Tim Lee Carter (R).

LOUISIANA

Rep. F. Edward Hébert (D).
Rep. Joe D. Waggoner, Jr. (D).
Rep. Otto E. Passman (D).
Rep. John R. Rarick (D).
Rep. Speedy O. Long (D).

MISSISSIPPI

Rep. Thomas G. Abernethy (D).
Rep. Jamie L. Whitten (D).
Rep. Charles H. Griffin (D).
Rep. G. V. (Sonny) Montgomery (D).
Rep. William M. Colmer (D).

MISSOURI

Rep. Durward G. Hall (R).

NEBRASKA

Rep. Glenn Cunningham (R).

NEW JERSEY

Rep. John E. Hunt (R).

NEW MEXICO

Rep. Ed Foreman (R).

NORTH CAROLINA

Rep. Walter B. Jones (D).
Rep. L. H. Fountain (D).
Rep. David N. Henderson (D).
Rep. Wilmer (Vinegar Bend) Mizell (R).
Rep. Alton Lennon (D).
Rep. Earl B. Ruth (R).
Rep. Charles Raper Jonas (R).
Rep. James T. Broyhill (R).
Rep. Roy A. Taylor (D).

OHIO

Rep. John M. Ashbrook (R).

OKLAHOMA

Rep. Page Belcher (R).
Rep. John Jarman (D).
Rep. John N. (Happy) Camp (R).

PENNSYLVANIA

Rep. Lawrence G. Williams (R).

SOUTH CAROLINA

Sen. Strom Thurmond (R).
Rep. L. Mendel Rivers (D).
Rep. Albert Watson (R).
Rep. John L. McMillan (D).

TENNESSEE

Rep. John J. Duncan (R).

TEXAS

Rep. John Dowdy (D).
Rep. James M. Collins (R).
Rep. George Bush (R).
Rep. Robert Price (R).
Rep. O. C. Fisher (D).

VIRGINIA

Rep. G. William Whitehurst (R).
Rep. Watkins M. Abbott (D).
Rep. W. C. (Dan) Daniel (D).
Rep. William L. Scott (R).

ISRAELI SECURITY AND THE U.S. COMMITMENT

HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Evening Star this week carried two especially perceptive articles on the subject of United States-Israel relations in this time of great crisis in the Mideast. I believe they deserve special attention.

The first, on September 23, was written by Richard Wilson and the second, on September 24, carried the byline of Crosby S. Noyes.

Both these columns—considered individually or together—present a convincing case for a clearer and more decisive expression of the U.S. commitment to the independence, territorial integrity, and security of Israel.

This is an objective I have long and strongly advocated—for these reasons:

First. Ambiguity or equivocation about this country's commitment to Israel can only weaken Israel's confidence in the United States and provide dangerous encouragement to Israel's enemies.

Second. Hesitation or delay now can only increase the cost and the risk of any future assistance the United States provides Israel, assistance it must provide in any event if Israel's security becomes more directly threatened by joint Soviet-Arab operations or weapons.

Third. Clear, explicit, and demonstra-

ble U.S. support of Israel security will help stabilize the Mideast situation by removing all doubt about the U.S. position on the part of the disputing parties. In a shifting, complex, sensitive situation, doubt is dangerous and clarity desirable.

Fourth. Unqualified U.S. support will not arouse any greater hostility toward the United States than already exists among the Arab nations. It will not bring any added risk of further hostilities, for Israel is not an aggressive power and the Arabs can only be deterred by the certainty of effective response. Nor will such a U.S. posture reduce our ability to advance a peaceful settlement in the Mideast. By helping to equate the balance of power in that area, we would be contributing to the possibility of realistic negotiations and an equitable settlement.

The articles follow:

[From the Washington Evening Star,
Sept. 23, 1970]

ARMS FOR ISRAEL SEEMS TO BE BEST FOR U.S.
(By Richard Wilson)

The net result of events in the Mideast is that the United States is now more deeply and directly involved than President Nixon originally intended.

While the odds are considered to be against direct United States intervention in Jordan, contingency plans have had to be considered. In general, involvement of U.S. forces which have moved into the eastern Mediterranean area cannot be ruled out.

These were the conditions the President wished to avoid in his original delay in withholding from Israel additional Phantom jet fighters-bombers and in making his proposal for the Mideast cease-fire. But now, following Premier Golda Meir's visit, it appears more unavoidable than ever that the United States will be compelled to supply Israel with the highly sophisticated equipment it desires to counter the Soviet-manned missile bases.

The American airline hostages held by the Palestinian Arab commandos and civil war in Jordan, with Syria's evident intervention, have immensely complicated the problem. Taken separately the fate of King Hussein is not considered vital to American interests, but as part of the general turmoil in the Middle East this is a highly explosive factor which could set off a chain reaction.

Several factors need to be borne in mind when judging what President Nixon will do in this highly dangerous situation.

It should be recalled that in the case of the seizure of the USS Pueblo by North Korea, with its crew held hostage and subjected to severe torture, the United States took no direct retaliatory action. The action was not taken because it might have endangered the lives of the Pueblo crew and because there was no way, short of an unthinkable direct invasion of North Korea, that retaliation could have been effective under the circumstances.

A similar condition seems to exist with respect to the air passenger hostages. They have been dispersed into several groups and thus could not be released in a single attack even if they survived while the rescue operation was under way.

This would seem to rule out any dramatic airlift carried out by stealth in the dark of night. Evacuation of other American personnel in Jordan, if the fighting continues, might be another matter but the State Department has seen no need for this action yet. If Nixon follows the methods used to obtain freedom for the Pueblo crew it will be attempts by secret negotiation.

Insofar as direct intervention to rescue the government of King Hussein is concerned, Washington apparently is relying heavily on the unshaken belief that the Soviet Union does not desire a confrontation from which there could be no backdown.

In spite of the bad faith of the cease-fire, during which the Egyptian military position was greatly strengthened, the Nixon administration is relying basically on Russia's interest in not having a major war in the Mideast. This faith may be proved misplaced but it is being given a further test.

Summed up, the U.S. policy is expected to continue to be so, although each day the United States is drawn in more deeply.

In the end, this may cost the United States more than a billion dollars in economic and military aid for Israel which President Nixon had been seeking to avoid.

Some speculation has centered on the point that Nixon is capable of direct and dramatic action, as in Cambodia, and thus he may act similarly in Jordan or Israel. This speculation leaves out of consideration the fact that the Cambodian operation was controllable and low risk, quite different from intervention in the Middle East where our forces are not large, when they exist at all, and do not have the immediate backup of the half-million men who were nearby in Vietnam.

The best bet, therefore, seems to lie with strengthening Israel so it will be made evident that a new Russian-backed attack by Egypt and other Arab countries would be at a very high risk for them.

This is the process which will have to begin now, and Mrs. Meir seemed to indicate when she left Washington that it would begin. Perhaps it is too late, but it is better late than never.

[From the Washington Evening Star, Sept. 24, 1970]

ISRAEL DOUBTS ON THE UNITED STATES FAR FROM RESOLVED

(By Crosley S. Noyes)

Despite the atmosphere of cordiality and mutual comprehension generated in the course of Golda Meir's visit, some grave and possibly insoluble problems will continue to trouble relations between Israel and the United States.

In the immediate and fairly superficial context, the Israeli prime minister's trip was a success. She was successful in breaking the linkage—assuming any linkage existed—between an American willingness to supply arms to Israel and Israel's unwillingness to engage in any peace talks as long as Egypt and the Soviet Union continue to violate the terms of the cease-fire agreement.

On this point, the Israeli case is strong.

There is no question at all that the Egyptians and Russians have taken advantage of the cease-fire to move a complex system of anti-aircraft missiles into the zone bordering the Suez Canal's west bank. There is no question that this move—taken after all parties agreed to a "standfast" arrangement on the construction of military emplacements—seriously threatens Israel's defense lines if shooting begins again.

In this situation, any peace negotiations are out so far as the Israelis are concerned. It isn't just that the Egyptians and Russians acted with callous duplicity in the matter of the cease-fire. In the Israeli view, the violation of the cease-fire agreement is proof that any agreement that might be reached with the Egyptians would be worthless, regardless of what assurances might be given from the other side.

It also confirms their suspicions that the intention of the Egyptians and Russians is to renew their "war of attrition" against Israel as soon as they feel the time is ripe. The arrival in Egypt of bridging and am-

phibious equipment reinforces expectations of an attempt to break Israel's Bar-Lev defenses and invade the Sinai peninsula.

To negotiate in these circumstances, the Israelis say, would be to negotiate "with a pistol at our head." The choice, they are convinced, would be to accept the Russian and Egyptian terms or face the possibility of a military defeat. Accepting the Russian and Egyptian terms, in the Israeli view, would be the equivalent of accepting the inevitability of another all-out war.

The Nixon administration, with considerable reluctance, has agreed to go along with this line of argument at least part way. Assurances have been given that some, if not all, of Israel's military needs will be supplied, including aircraft and electronic equipment designed to offset the new sophisticated Russian missile system. The Americans also concede that Israel has been put into a sticky military position. But they also suggest that Israel's position will be no less disadvantageous if there are no negotiations and if the war of attrition resumes at the end of the 90-day truce.

The problems between the United States and Israel, however, go far deeper than this disagreement over tactics. They go, in fact, to a fundamentally different concept of how Israel's security can best be assured.

The Nixon administration apparently is basing its policy on the hope that the Soviet Union's interests are best served by avoiding a new outbreak in the fighting and a direct confrontation with the United States in the Middle East. It is convinced that negotiations under the auspices of Sweden's Gunnar Jarring offer the best possibility of a settlement of the Middle East conflict. And it seems willing to bring pressure on Israel to get the negotiations started.

For their part, the Israelis, whose sole concern is for their own security, cannot understand American passivity in the face of the rapidly expanding Soviet military presence in the Middle East. To them, this presence represents a deadly threat. For while they are confident of their ability to deal with the Arabs, they know that they cannot fight the Soviet Union and win.

The Israelis have no real trust in American assurances when it comes to our willingness and ability to guarantee Israel's security. They remember only too well how Britain, France and the United States repudiated their own guarantees of Israel's borders on the eve of the 1967 war. And their confidence has not been bolstered by the American performance in the case of the present cease-fire violation.

They are painfully aware also of their dependency on the United States as a source of arms. They fear, with some reason, that if a negotiation gets under way, the United States will use this leverage to force Israel into disastrous concessions to the Arabs—that they will, in fact, be negotiating "with two pistols at their head" and will have no choice except capitulation to Soviet-Arab terms.

In short, the crisis of confidence is very far from over. And it will take a good deal more than reassuring words to convince Israeli leaders that the United States, in a time of great peril, is a trustworthy ally.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 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?

OLEAN WOMAN DIRECTS VFW WAR PRISONER CAMPAIGN

HON. JAMES F. HASTINGS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, the other day Frank Borman spoke at a joint session of the Congress on one of the most agonizing aspects of the war in Vietnam—the fate of U.S. prisoners of war.

In connection with Mr. Borman's speech, it is most appropriate that I call to the attention of my colleagues the work of Mrs. Alexander Cottone, of Olean, N.Y., in my district, and the organization she so ably serves—the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

Mrs. Cottone was elected president of the Auxiliary of the National VFW at its meeting last month in Miami Beach, Fla. Her first official act on returning to Olean was to launch a massive petition-signing campaign aimed at mustering national public support to obtain the release of our captive servicemen, some of whom have been prisoners longer than any American in any war.

Mrs. Cottone reflects the deep concern we all feel for the safety of the approximately 1,400 held in North Vietnam and for their anguished wives and families. She is a woman of energy, wisdom, and great dedication. She believes deeply in this cause, and as a thematic guide for this effort, she has chosen the words: "Our Flag—so proudly we hail."

Her selection to head up this project is a source of personal pride to me and to our district, as well as all of New York State where her efforts on behalf of the VFW and its many veterans-aid programs are well known.

Mrs. Cottone says:

If Americans unite in showing that they care, they may be able to bring about the relief and release of American prisoners of war held in Southeast Asia.

It is my understanding that the United States officially lists 375 prisoners of war being held in North Vietnam; another 77 in South Vietnam, and three in Laos. Listed as missing are more than 1,000 servicemen.

The North Vietnamese have failed to live up to a single article of the Geneva agreement which they signed in 1957. They have barred inspection of prison camps by neutral groups such as the International Red Cross, and their treatment of prisoners violated all the basic standards of human decency.

It is a cruel irony that these men who hold freedom so dearly should be captive. We, as Americans, would be without conscience if we fail to do all we can to secure their release.

I urge every American to join in support of this effort by the VFW so that these prisoners of war can be reunited with their families.

ERODING PUBLIC CONFIDENCE IN THE BAR

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have long urged the disbarment of Attorney William Kunstler. On February 26, 1970, I wired the president of the American Bar Association as follows:

FEBRUARY 26, 1970.

BERNARD G. SEGAL, Esq.,
President, American Bar Association,
Philadelphia, Pa.

What are you doing about acting to put the American Bar Association or at the very least yourself as president on public record with the New York Court of Appeals requesting disbarment of Kunstler. Am advised Santa Barbara burning of Bank of America branch yesterday directly attributable to Kunstler inflammatory incitations broadcast on national TV. No person who so conducts himself in or out of court has the right to remain in good standing. There must be some way the American Bar can act to at the very least show the American people it cares something about such flagrant misconduct.

Regards,

Congressman LOUIS C. WYMAN.

On April 10, 1970, I wrote President Segal that—

Kunstler's activities are so blatant, flagrant, contemptuous, unethical, unprofessional, and violative of his oath as an officer of the court, as to warrant immediate effective disciplinary action.

Subsequently, on President Segal's recommendation, I wrote Attorney Bonomi of the Bar Association of the city of New York, inquiring concerning the status of proceedings to disbar Kunstler, only to receive a response that—

All records in disciplinary matters are confidential unless made public by order of the appellate division.

In my opinion the organized bar owes it to the public to purge itself of professional activists who urge criminal activity outside the law and who demonstrably incite to overt acts of violence in this country.

The bar owes its living to public confidence and reliance. Unless it deals firmly and responsibly with those who disgrace the bar, who defy and defile the law of the land, and who make a mockery of the lawyer's oath to uphold the Constitution of the United States, public confidence in lawyers and the bar will be destroyed. The continued undisciplined incitements of Messrs. Kunstler and others to sedition, insurrection, and civil disobedience, are an indictment of the organized bar, not only of New York but throughout the Nation. Even the great American Bar Association cannot afford to stay aloof from such deliberately contemptuous conduct.

In this connection a recent column by William F. Buckley, Jr., appearing in the Washington Star of September 25 is significant.

WHY NOT DISBAR WILLIAM KUNSTLER?

(By William F. Buckley Jr.)

The other day, asked by the moderator of a debate at the University of Rochester if I could suggest a measure that would help to bring judicial reform, I answered yes, the disbarment of William Kunstler.

Many of the students boomed. I replied that they could hardly be booing me, it must be that they disapproved the canon of ethics that binds lawyers in New York State.

Either Kunstler must be disbarred, I said, or the canon of ethics repealed: The two cannot coexist. The crowd was silent, but sullen, as was Kunstler, who shared the platform with me.

It was a coincidence that the day before, James L. Buckley (he is my brother, which is also a coincidence), running for the U.S. Senate in New York, called publicly for Kunstler's disbarment. He asked the other two candidates, Richard Ottinger and Charles Goodell, to join with him in asking the Association of the Bar of the City of New York to take action against lawyer Kunstler.

A still further coincidence is that the evening before the debate at Rochester I saw a pre-publication copy of the October Playboy magazine which carries a long interview with Kunstler. Some of the racier passages no doubt would have been quoted in the letter addressed by James Buckley to the president of the bar association, the Honorable Bernard Botwin, if James Buckley had read Playboy.

On resistance: "It is the role of the American left," says lawyer Kunstler, "to resist rather than merely protest: To resist illegitimate authority."

What is "illegitimate authority"? Why, the authority that ordains "the draft . . . any payment of taxes to support the war in Vietnam . . . the domestic and foreign policies of a government that crushes people on every level (he means the U.S. government) . . . all the things in this society that tend to degrade and destroy people."

In very plain English, Kunstler says no American need obey the law.

How, specifically, should we go about breaking the law? Well, take the college situation. "The students can take over (their) college by occupying its buildings." Just plain occupying them? No—the students should occupy the buildings pending the administration's capitulation. If the administration refuses to grant the students' demands, they move one step further. "Another form resistance could take would be the burning down of a particular college building."

This was too much even for Playboy. "You condone arson" Kunstler was asked.

"Yes," said Kunstler, "if a point has been reached in a given situation where the mechanisms of society are not responding to serious grievances."

In plain English that means: Go ahead and burn down the building if in your opinion your grievances are sincere, and the mechanisms of society have not appeased you.

Speaking for myself, I can count 68 times during the period since my 21st birthday, when, applying the Kunstler Code, I'd have felt compelled, personally, to put a torch to the White House.

Can we assume that when the Vietnam war is over, so will Kunstler's war against the United States? Not at all. "I would hate to think," he told Playboy, "that the war in Vietnam could be the only catalyst for resistance. There is so much more that remains to be resisted: The oppression of black people . . . poverty . . . unequal distribution of wealth, and so on."

Really, our society is surely suicide-bent if William Kunstler is permitted to serve as a lawyer. One might as well license a werewolf to practice medicine.

Kunstler is a revolutionary. He wishes ardently to politicize all American institutions, and he begins, of course, with the courts.

Was the recent mess in Chicago old Judge Hoffman's fault? Don't be ridiculous. "No matter who the judge was, the defendants would have tried to focus on the war in Vietnam, on the issues of racism, poverty, and youth culture," Kunstler now reveals.

There is a case to be made for giving an individual a certain amount of scope for his revolutionary ambitions. But there is no tradition whatever for permitting him to work from a privileged position within an institution—our judicial system—which requires loyalty to the processes of law.

INVESTIGATION DEMANDED

HON. WILLIAM H. HARSHA

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. HARSHA. Mr. Speaker, the Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography was created almost 3 years ago when Congress found "that the traffic in obscenity and pornography is a matter of national concern." (Public Law 90-100). Reportedly, however, as the time for the final release of the Commission's report draws near, the 18-member panel is planning to recommend a repeal of all pornography laws.

This, to me, seems to be a highly incredible solution to the ever-increasing prevalence of hard-core pornography in our society and its ever-continuing attack on our national moral fiber. Because I have long believed in the urgent and serious need for legislation to control the smut in our mails, literature and films, I seriously question the alleged findings and recommendations of the Commission. The public opinion against the rampage of pornography convinced the Congress that it should do something about the situation. It therefore created the Commission to investigate the matter, yet the Commission is supposedly suggesting that Congress do nothing but repeal what pornography laws they have already enacted. I am not alone in my concern over these developments, and on the basis of the dissenting views of one member of the Commission is supposedly suggesting I strongly suggest Congress take a closer look at the Commission's activities.

In the first draft of his statement, Keating accuses the Commission majority of recommending that "smut peddlers of the world—have—freedom to purvey in the United States their scatological, depraved, deviated, sick, sex products." According to Commission findings which have already been privately disclosed, pornography has no relation to crime or sexual deviancy. In other words, it is not a causal factor for crime and it is not a source of corruption for minors. In view of these findings, the Commission maintains that America should adopt a liberal and lenient policy allowing hard-core pornography on the market for consenting adults. How they reached this conclusion when many experts emphatically maintain that pornography is harmful and morally debasing is extremely hard to conceive.

I am most curious, as many interested and concerned citizens and legislators

are, as to the nature of the evidence and investigation which led the Commission to this irresponsible conclusion. Keating has charged that the public may never know exactly what the Commission did because, he maintains, it denied information to the public and blocked a full minority report. This was done in part by a "confidentiality" or secrecy pact adopted by the Commission. The Commission also refused to permit dissenting or minority Commission members a reasonable method by which they could report to the Congress and to the President—"much less the requisite funds, staff, and time to so report," according to Keating. He also cited instances where the Commission—or certain members of it—contracted for various studies or technical reports without the knowledge of the whole Commission. These technical reports themselves have never been submitted in their entirety to the full Commission and some of them will not be completed before the time of the Commission expires. Therefore, the complete evidence and findings could not have possibly been reviewed before the release of the Commission's final report. If Keating's allegations are indeed true, such procedures and conclusions by a Presidential Commission certainly warrant a more convincing explanation, and it is on this basis that I demand an investigation of this matter be conducted.

Mr. Speaker, the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography has spent 3 years and \$2 million on its study. Judging from the preliminary data on its activities and Keating's report, it looks like the public may have been shortchanged. The public has strongly indicated its desire to extricate the media from the mire of pornography into which it is sinking. It has clamored for protection from unsolicited pornographic mailings and finally received it in landmark legislation which I supported earlier this year. This is definitely not the time to stop and to forget about controls, as the Commission reportedly suggests. It is not the time to allow smut peddlers to grow fatter on their depraved, sordid, multimillion-dollar business. It is time we take a look at the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography and its findings to ascertain the validity of Keating's charges before the Commission's alleged libertine recommendations set a precedent which could break the dam wide open for the most vile and repugnant onslaught of pornography America has ever endured.

GOLD STAR MOTHER'S DAY OBSERVANCE IN ST. LOUIS

HON. LEONOR K. SULLIVAN

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1936, in Public Resolution 123 of the 74th Congress, the people of the United States set aside the last Sunday in September as Gold Star Mother's Day to honor those who had made "the supreme sacrifice of motherhood" in "the World War." This

was the war which was to have ended wars, and even though the seeds of World War II were already germinating, most Americans in 1936 felt and hoped we would never again be involved in warfare. Hundreds of thousands of Americans have been killed in wars since then, and American mothers are still joining the ranks of Gold Star Mothers, as civilization finds itself far from the objectives which were supposedly accomplished by the world in the termination of World War I 52 years ago.

Yesterday, at ceremonies at the Soldier's Memorial in St. Louis, it was my privilege to join with Gold Star Mothers of the St. Louis area in observing the day set aside by the 74th Congress to honor mothers whose sons have died in the armed services of the United States. My remarks on that occasion may be of interest to my colleagues in the House, and I submit them for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, as follows:

REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE LEONOR K. SULLIVAN, DEMOCRAT, OF ST. LOUIS, MO., TO OBSERVE GOLD STAR MOTHER'S DAY AT THE SOLDIERS' MEMORIAL, SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 27, 1970, AT 2 P.M.

The span of a human lifetime is so brief compared to the life of our country—now nearly 194 years old—that we know well only the most recent periods of that history, and take a lot for granted, or on faith, as to what transpired before our time. We studied about the heroes of our American heritage and the wise and far-sighted policies they were usually supposed to have pursued; we remember little, or never learned, about the deep and bitter discords which accompanied the development of those same policies.

There is much about present-day America which is disconcerting, disillusioning, and even frightening. On almost every plane of human endeavor, we are disappointed in the attitudes of so many of our people even while they are enjoying a level of material advantages never before known to any people on earth. And so we ask ourselves where America went wrong—what happened—why we have so much to divide us and worry us when we should be rejoicing as a people in the blessings of liberty which enable us to engage in our own ways in the pursuit of happiness.

Are these the "bad new days" compared to the "good old days" in our history? It is certainly easy to think so. Yet, if we look to the newspapers of any other era in American history, we find headlines and editorials which reflected even more emphatically than they do today a deep concern over the direction and course of American life and the impending doom of decency and civilization. If you read the debates in the Congress of the United States for almost any day of any bygone year, you will find expressed the same misgivings and fears for our country's future and the survival of good manners and decency as we find today.

FINDING ANCHORS OF NATIONAL FAITH

It is a good thing to refresh our understanding of our past by searching out the news and commentary of other days of strife and discord in America, for we thus develop some perspective on the worrisome problems and deep divisions we encounter today. Perhaps the tone of America is neither worse nor better today—but of course it certainly is different.

We have difficulty in finding anchors of national faith which can hold us steady against the swirling waves of controversy and the harsh winds of change and confusion.

Some say we have had it so good for so long

that we have lost our capacity as a people to cling together in any common cause. Many Americans see no threat today from outside and no danger at home, while others see only scourge and pestilence and disaster everywhere.

But things aren't really *that* good or bad. They are, as I said, different—different from what we had grown up expecting, different from what we remember, different from what we like to think were the conditions which preceded us in America. In company with, I am sure, the majority of you, I don't like a lot of these changes *either*.

And yet, the basic strength of the American experiment in self-government remains tough and vibrant and alive. Lincoln called it "the last, best hope of earth"—and he used those words during one of the darkest moments in our national existence, to describe a country whose survival was in doubt and whose people were engaged in destroying each other. We have been through many terrible ordeals since that time, but nothing to match our own civil war in terms of loss of American lives. In the past, too, we suffered economic disasters beyond the comprehension or belief of today's affluent young people, and there were wars of incomparable savagery; but we not merely survived, we grew to unmatchable economic and technological power.

THE LUXURY OF UNLIMITED CRITICISM

But none of it came cheap—or by wishing—or by accident—or by villainy.

I thought of these things as I left Washington to come back to St. Louis, knowing I would be meeting with you today and joining you in celebrating a national observance of deep significance to you and of great meaning to all of those Americans who truly care what we are as a country and as a people. Throughout our history, most Americans were called upon to give at least a little toward the common good; many gave a lot; some gave everything. At the time these events occurred the causes for which the sacrifices were made loomed larger, perhaps, than they often appeared later in retrospect—certainly larger than they *now* appear to those who have never had to make similar sacrifices, or make any sacrifices at all. The obligations of citizenship unfortunately fall unevenly, and always have. So too, do the rewards of citizenship fall unequally. But there is a sense of pride which comes to those who have had to do much, or give much, so that others who give little can nevertheless enjoy all of the advantages of citizenship in a country which permits any one of us the luxury of unlimited criticism of everything about our national life and heritage.

Much as we sometimes might despair over the shortcomings and defects of human conduct which affront our national conscience or besmirch our heritage, these are neither new nor fatal threats to our survival as a good people, a decent people, a nation which enshrines freedom not merely in statues and slogans, but in our hearts, too.

Of course, it is not easy to tolerate the constant attacks on and criticisms of the structure of our government and our laws or remain calm through the raucous challenges to public order and common decency.

But our heritage requires such tolerance—not to the point of permitting lawlessness without punishment, but to clearly separate illegal acts from unpopular thoughts and opinions.

"THE HOME AS FOUNTAINHEAD OF THE STATE"

We are not *nearly* as divided as we appear. But we argue a lot—and bitterly.

In passing the joint resolution which set aside the last Sunday in September as "Gold Star Mother's Day", Congress declared that we honor *ourselves*, as well as the mothers

of America, when we "revere and give emphasis to the home as the fountainhead of the state." This I deeply believe—that our country will retain greatness only as long as we revere the home as the focus, the center, of the values which give a people self-respect and national purpose. Much of the discord which attempts to destroy our unity as a people stems from the dissatisfactions and animosities and inadequacies of many American homes in providing the haven of love and mutual respect a child needs and craves for healthy growth. Where there is love and respect flowing to the child from parent and to parent from the child, there may not always be luxury or even comfort, but there is a rocklike sense of wellbeing and stability and security and that youngster will make it all right—will find satisfying avenues in life to translate his ideals into causes for his country and his fellow man.

There is great idealism among today's youth, even though it often doesn't show—or shows up sometimes in ways we find immature and offensive. Aside from the fringe of kooks and revolutionaries, most of the youth of today will find ways—satisfying and challenging ways—to contribute to change and improvement to American life, within the structure of what many of these impatient young people denounce as the "establishment."

"A PUBLIC EXPRESSION OF LOVE, SORROW, REVERENCE"

We can all remember our *own* impatience with authority when we were their age. And we have watched the older brothers and sisters of today's youth go through those same periods of doubts and questioning and even despair—and then find their way, too.

Nations go through those periods of self-doubt, too. But for those who gave a *great deal* to enable this nation to survive and to grow to its present incredible dimensions of strength and prosperity and opportunity and achievement, there can be no doubt that it was *not* in vain—this last best hope of earth, this sometimes united, often divided, raucous, argumentative place of free minds and searching souls and clashing ideas we have managed to hold together through nearly 200 years.

Young as it is among nations, the United States is the oldest democracy in all the world operating under the same written constitution. And the mothers here today for whom this day is named can take deep and personal and distinctive pride in that historic achievement, for it was made possible by sacrifices such as *they* have made. I salute the Gold Star Mothers as mothers of our heritage of freedom.

Some day, perhaps, the world will have learned other, better ways of assuring freedom's survival than those which have had to be used in the past. When that day comes, if it does, I'm sure every Gold Star Mother will thank God.

In the meantime, in behalf of all of your fellow citizens, I thank you as we here observe what Congress has instructed should be set aside as a day to demonstrate "a public expression of the love, sorrow and reverence of the people of the United States" for those mothers who suffered what Congress described in Public Resolution 123 of the 74th Congress as "the supreme sacrifice of motherhood." Thank you.

KY HAD TO BE STOPPED?

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the power boys had to stop Vice President Ky from

coming to the United States and from being a guest speaker at a fundamental Christian American rally to end the war in Vietnam by victory. The stakes were too high. Mr. Ky's appearance and his message might have jarred the apathetic silent majority into demanding an end to the Vietnam war.

Mr. Ky's appearance might have embarrassed too many decisionmakers who could not tolerate a sudden end to the war because it would upset international timetables.

Mr. Ky's message might damage the programs of those American Friends of Hanoi who need a no-win stalemated war to enable them to continue their divisive tactics and their operations of undermining our system of government.

Beyond any doubt, those who have worked diligently and long to discourage and prevent the appearance of Vice President Ky—at this time—and at the request of fundamental Bible-believing Christians, have revealed their typical double standard of behavior.

Is there a dime's worth of difference? Why can't the American people hear the truth for themselves, just once—at this time?

TENTH ANNIVERSARY OF AEROSPACE CORPORATION

HON. CHET HOLIFIELD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, the Aerospace Corporation, which is located in my home State of California, has recently celebrated its 10th anniversary. It was on June 25, 1960, that the U.S. Air Force Ballistic Missile Division, headquartered in Inglewood, Calif., called a press conference to announce the "formation of a new nonprofit organization, the Aerospace Corporation, to serve the Air Force in the scientific and technical planning and management of missile-space programs." A few weeks before that date, Aerospace had been organized and chartered under the laws of California.

The ensuing decade, for Aerospace, has been one of achievement. The Nation is the beneficiary of its technical genius in helping the Air Force to design missile and space programs which are so important to the defense and safety of the United States. This is the technical genius of no single individual, though many distinguished scientists and engineers have been, and are, associated with Aerospace. It is the technical genius of an organization which can bring many technical talents and disciplines to bear, to keep abreast of new technologies, to probe their possibilities for defense, and to monitor contractor performance in translating ideas and design specifications into workable systems.

And, in keeping with the trend of the times and Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird's recommendation that the civil departments of Government utilize the "unique capabilities" of such nonprofit organizations in "efforts to overcome our

domestic problems." Aerospace has been lending its talents to civil concerns. For example, techniques for analyzing human heart functions by use of computers were developed, initially by company funds and later by grants from the National Institutes of Health. This work has been expanded to encompass broad cardiac studies with the Loma Linda Medical Center.

Today, Aerospace expertise is being applied to a wide spectrum of problems in the civil sector; some are supported by earnings, others have received contract funds. Such programs include research on the chemical composition of smog—using rocket motor combustion theory, analyses of urban transportation problems, and conceptualization of personal transit systems. Other efforts include technical assistance to Los Angeles in acquisition of a police data handling system, and to El Segundo in design of a police communications system.

Aerospace also has undertaken to provide management assistance to the Department of Interior in the design and construction of a data center to process information from earth resources observation satellites. This new program is expected to result in greatly increased capability to detect, monitor, and conserve the Nation's natural resources.

In sum, within the span of 10 busy years, Aerospace has earned recognition as a powerful national resource in the world of technology. Its strength to date has been centered very largely on development of military space and missile programs; here the corporate commitment is to continue this effort. Additionally, as has been suggested so briefly above, the opportunities are very large to employ the special talents assembled at Aerospace on the many problems in the civil sector that demand early solution.

The technical excellence of this organization is reflected in the list of national leaders and other prominent persons who have served as members of the board of trustees throughout the decade. Representing leadership in science, engineering, industry, and public service, and vested with general authority over affairs of the corporation, they have established basic policies for Aerospace and have guided the direction of its work.

Without attempting to name all the distinguished men who have served as Aerospace trustees, I will note those who were called to high Federal office while serving on the board; Dr. Harold Brown, Director of Defense Research and Engineering and later Secretary of the Air Force; William C. Foster, Director of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency; Roswell L. Gilpatric, Deputy Secretary of Defense; Dr. Robert C. Seamans, Jr., Secretary of the Air Force; Dr. Chalmers W. Sherwin, Deputy Director of Defense Research and Engineering; Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, scientific adviser to President Kennedy and Director of the Office of Science and Technology. Most recently, T. Keith Glennan was named by President Nixon as U.S. Representative to the International Atomic Energy Agency. The present chairman is James McCormack, a retired Air Force general and former chairman

and chief executive officer of the Communications Satellite Corporation.

Mr. Speaker, I take note of the many achievements of Aerospace and the 10th anniversary of its formation because the Committee on Government Operations was largely responsible for that formation. The Military Operations Subcommittee, under my chairmanship, conducted extensive studies and investigations which pointed to the need for a new organizational arrangement to give technical support and assistance to the Air Force in the development of new and very challenging defense and space systems.

Looking back, those were turbulent and exciting years, with a zest for accepting technical challenges which characterized our Government leaders and military authorities, and which today unfortunately is questioned in so many quarters. I hope that the United States, in learning the lessons of the past and how to prevent a recurrence of past mistakes, will not lose its resourcefulness, determination, and energy in advancing new technologies for the common defense and the general welfare. Aerospace stands as a symbol of a decade of technical achievement, and I look forward to its continued achievements in the future.

ROTC—THE UNIVERSITIES' STAKE IN DEFENSE

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the military in general and the ROTC in specific has become the target for the radical elements of student groups and the New Left, and even to some extent members of faculties, I believe the following article written by John Bitner to be most timely. I commend its reading to all Members of this body:

ROTC—THE UNIVERSITIES' STAKE (By John W. Bitner)

It is time for Americans—all Americans—to take a close look at what is happening to the Reserve Officers Training Corps: the downgrading, even the elimination of the program in some of the nation's leading universities. The results can be far more serious than most citizens realize.

The roots of concern go deep into the American's attitude toward the military. National defense is, of course, essential; and it had better be in the hands of intelligent, well-trained men. But the nation has no place for a dominant military elite. Its defenders must understand the aspirations and peaceful pursuits of a free, self-governing people. And it is precisely in this light that the ROTC provides a sensitive balance.

For more than 50 years our country's ROTC program has leavened our officer corps, contributing to the strength of the civilian community and maintaining a bridge between civilian and military life. It is, and has traditionally been, the largest single producer of officers for our armed forces.

Since national security requires a well-trained officer corps, the nation is better off by far if much of that corps is com-

posed of men with the sound academic training, disciplined individual thinking and the understanding social outlook that our colleges and universities can contribute.

The truth of this was significantly underlined by a recent special committee of civilian educators and military officers, commissioned by Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird to study problems of the ROTC program. The committee and its advisory panel included not only two generals and an admiral, but also nine university presidents or chancellors and other men of academic and administrative stature representing leading universities in all sections of the country.

The members of this committee advised Secretary Laird a few months ago: "most American colleges and universities do have a responsibility to share in the defense of the free society of which they are a part. It is in their institutional self interest to contribute to the leadership of the armed forces." The committee also unanimously agreed that "If ROTC were to be removed from the nation's campuses there would be grave danger of isolating the services from the intellectual centers of the public which they serve and defend."

The grave danger is here and now. Faculty and administrative actions have already caused ROTC to be terminated at a number of leading universities. Several other universities are making it increasingly difficult—in some cases perhaps impossible—for the services to remain on campus. Last year Princeton reduced ROTC from departmental status, removed academic credit for course offerings, reduced the status of ROTC instructors, and imposed restrictions on them and their families with respect to schooling, housing and other matters. Here, as in certain other schools, the conditions imposed seemed to make the situation untenable for ROTC.

It is disturbing that the attacks on ROTC have originated mainly within the very intellectual centers that provide its relevance to the national civilian-military balance.

These attacks are spearheaded by sincere but emotional individuals who use the ROTC as a symbol against which to demonstrate their moral aversion to the Vietnam war without seeing the program in its larger context; and by groups bent on generating mass disruption through the use of force to block and wreck the actions of all those with whom they disagree. They seem to disregard the possibility that there might come a time once again when the United States would be called upon to defend itself or perish—or to defend an ally whose cause they considered just. For these people, as for all of us, to eliminate ROTC is to deliver a hostage to fortune.

Since such opponents of ROTC may not regard themselves as shareholders in the university's responsibilities to our nation's defense, the burden of these responsibilities falls rather upon the trustees, the administration, and a fully informed faculty—and, perhaps, dedicated alumni. It is to these groups that we must look for the assurance that decisions are made in mature and broad perspective, and only after full consideration of all relevant factors.

In military service, as in other professional disciplines, sound fundamental training and leadership qualities should be acquired early in life from experts; and for a career officers corps, these qualities are best acquired at a time when the young man's understanding of his world is being broadened in all directions: in the arts of living and thinking as well as in the skills of command. This is the unique function of the ROTC on the college campus.

To the extent that a school rejects ROTC, the school shrugs off the challenge of that unique function. Even more disturbing: it abandons a significant area of academic free-

dom: the right of a student to choose whether he will train for a military career at the same time he proceeds with his academic education.

Thus may a university help to defeat its own purposes. The erosion of ROTC is a threat not to the military, but to those Americans who fear and distrust the control of our armed forces by a narrow military point of view.

It is in the Ivy Group universities that the chipping away at ROTC is most alarming. No man is an island; nor is any intellectual center an island unto itself. The policies and decisions of such schools as those in the Ivy Group are watched by other schools, both large and small, all over the nation. When ROTC is shackled or banished by one institution, it becomes easier for other institutions to rationalize similar action, and to hasten the day when ROTC may be finished at the bellwether schools—and at others.

Officer candidate schools do not offer a satisfactory alternative to ROTC. Such commissioning programs are very useful when rapid expansion is needed in a national emergency. But the environment is not conducive to academic pursuits; the courses are brief, and in emergencies the faculties, quickly assembled, have no opportunity to relate the candidates to more than the restricted immediate objectives.

ROTC, on the other hand, embodies the strong asset of continuing contact between highly motivated military teaching staffs and critically-thinking, civilian-oriented faculties. Both bodies benefit from continued exposure to one another. None of the services believes that the OCS concept alone could satisfy the continuing officer procurement requirement.

The trend against ROTC programs can still be reversed. Early in 1970 Princeton, after new discussions with Army ROTC officials, relaxed some of its restrictions; and—as this is written—the Army will probably stay. The future of Air Force and Navy programs at Princeton is still in doubt; but there is at least an opening for reconsideration and negotiation by all the concerned parties.

This is the direction that all colleges and universities should be taking now: not capitulation to minority demands, frequently based on motives that are emotional though sincere; but a new examination of the function and the challenge of ROTC in the American pattern of freedom, security, and intellectual elbow-room.

Certainly there is ample room for re-examination of campus-ROTC relationships by men of good will representing both points of view. Let us then have new in-depth discussions between the colleges and universities where there has been a deterioration or cessation of ROTC on the one hand, and appropriate military department officials on the other: discussions which, with the best overall interests of our nation in mind, should be aimed at re-evaluation of how the academic world and our armed services can best relate in meeting the nation's defense training problems.

And let's have these discussions before more damage—possible irreversible damage—is done.

GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, while most Members of Congress are assigned to

only one legislative committee, it is my good fortune to serve on two committees—Foreign Affairs and Government Operations, The Executive and Legislative Reorganization Subcommittee, of which I am a member, has jurisdiction over all proposals to reorganize the executive branch of Government.

Public concern over air and water pollution and the general state of the environment was reflected in hearings on President Nixon's proposal to consolidate all related functions in an Environmental Protection Agency. The reorganization plan was accepted by Congress on September 28. It should provide farmers and city dwellers alike greatly needed protection of cropland, air, and water.

CONGRESSIONAL REPORT TO NINTH DISTRICT RESIDENTS— SEPTEMBER 21, 1970

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, violence, although always a part of our history, has increased in frequency recently. The bombing at the University of Wisconsin, the Mexican-American riot in Los Angeles, and the shooting of a Philadelphia park policeman in the last few days are grim reminders of its presence.

As the rate of increase of serious crimes in this country has gone up—13 percent in the first 3 months of 1970 over the same period in 1969—so has the number of crimes against police officers. From 1960 through 1969, 561 enforcement officers were killed in the line of duty—86 in 1969 alone. Fifteen policemen have been killed this year in unprovoked attacks.

Bombings, a more recent form of violence—though common in the late 1800's—have killed 40, injured 384, and caused some \$22 million in property damage in the 15 months ending last July. From January 1969, to April 1970, the Justice Department reported a total of 4,330 bombings, 1,475 attempted bombings, and 35,129 threats of bombings in this country.

The growing menace of violence threatens our society. It is corroding the central political processes of our democratic way of life, substituting force and fear for argument and reason. Almost every large community has been affected by some pattern of violence—racial disorders, bombings of public and private buildings, conflicts between radicals and the police, or disturbances on high school and college campuses.

As I have talked with Hoosiers during recent weeks, I have found them shaken and disgusted by the rising trend of violence. All have expressed revulsion and concern that we deal firmly with crime, disorder, disruption, riots, and bombings.

The stance is correct, because we all lose by violence. It must be brought under control to safeguard life and property and to bring about the understand-

ing and cooperation needed to remedy the underlying causes of violence. No society can remain free, much less deal with its fundamental problems, if its people live in fear. It is an ancient wisdom that a house divided against itself cannot stand.

The Government must work to make violence both unnecessary and unrewarding. To make it unnecessary, our institutions must be capable of giving each citizen a voice in the normal life of the community and the Nation. To make violence unrewarding, our institutions must be able to control violence when it occurs, and to do so firmly and fairly. Specific measures can and in some cases, have been taken:

Sharply increase the investment in the prevention of crime, and the administration of justice through law enforcement agencies, the courts, and the penal system.

Urge that public officials continue to develop effective tactics for handling both peaceful demonstrations and violent disturbances.

Give young people a larger role in shaping their own destiny by lowering the voting age, reforming the draft, and providing greater opportunities for youth to become involved in worthwhile service activities.

Improve the social conditions of family and community life for all who live in our cities and towns.

The objectives are consistent with the preamble of the Constitution. It does not speak only of justice, or only of order; it embraces both. Two of the purposes set out in the preamble are to "establish justice" and to "insure domestic tranquility." If we are to succeed in preventing and controlling violence, we must achieve both these goals.

Chairman Louis Lundborg of the Bank of America has said that—

We have two choices as to which way we can go. We can divide into armed camps and shoot it out, or we can try to find common grounds so that we can grow together. One course is easy but blind, the other course is hard and slow but it is the path of wisdom.

This is wise counsel.

SEPTEMBER MINSHALL OPINION POLL

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, following are the letter and opinion poll I am sending to the 23d Congressional District:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., September, 1970.

DEAR FRIENDS: Through the years I have found the Minshall Opinion Poll one very valuable way to make my voice in Washington genuinely representative of the views of the 23rd Congressional District. Combined with the first-hand information I obtain in my committee hearings and on the House floor, the consensus obtained from these polls is most important in helping me reach legis-

lative decisions. Further, on matters of Administrative policy-making, I always call results of the questionnaire to the attention of the White House and the President's Cabinet.

As in the past, a copy of this poll is being sent to every home in the District. If you wish additional copies, you may obtain them from my Cleveland office, 2951 New Federal Office Building, telephone 522-4382.

Because returns run into the tens of thousands, I am sure you can understand why it is impossible for me to answer each one individually. However, all will be carefully tabulated and results made known in the October "Washington Report".

No envelope is needed for the attached self-mailer. Simply cut along the dotted line, fold with the return address outside, stamp, and mail. *Please do not staple or tape together* as this slows the tabulating process. Should you have any specific question or problem in which you would like my assistance, I would appreciate your sending it separately from the poll in order to avoid delay in giving your request top-priority action.

It is always a pleasure to be of service and I thank you for giving me the very helpful benefit of your views through the Minshall Opinion Poll.

With best wishes,
Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Member of Congress.

MINSHALL OPINION POLL

1. Over 144,000 U.S. troops have been withdrawn from Vietnam by the new Administration with the promise that all our combat forces will be out by next spring. Do you feel this schedule is:

- (a) Satisfactory?
- (b) Too slow?
- (c) Too rapid?

2. In the Near East crisis, should the United States:

- (a) Avoid any and all intervention?
- (b) Play a diplomatic role only?
- (c) Continue present level of aid to Israel?
- (d) Increase aid to Israel?

(e) Send in American troops as well as aid?

3. Do you favor my resolution calling for phase-out of the draft and establishment of a peacetime All-Volunteer Army?

4. Do you approve of my vote against the Superionic Transport (SST) program?

5. Are you in favor of my federal revenue-sharing bill which would return part of all federal taxes to states and local governments for their use?

6. To eliminate crime and violence would you support:

- (a) Increased federal aid to local law enforcement agencies?
- (b) More severe sentences by the courts for law-breakers?
- (c) Greater emphasis on rehabilitation in penal institutions?
- (d) Outlawing extremist groups that advocate violence?
- (e) Stronger laws against illegal sale of drugs?
- (f) Stepped-up anti-poverty programs?

7. What policies should be adopted regarding campus violence:

- (a) Immediate suspension of students, faculty or other college employees who participate in riots?
- (b) Suspension of federal aid to colleges where administrators permit violence to disrupt academic pursuits?
- (c) Strict law enforcement to protect persons and property?
- (d) No outside interference—permit colleges to solve the problem?

8. As our country shifts from a wartime to peacetime economy, do you think the following sectors of society are pursuing correct policies to solve the problems of unemployment and inflation:

- (a) Federal government?
 - (b) State and local governments?
 - (c) Labor?
 - (d) Business and industry?
9. What do you consider the most critical problem facing our Nation today?

OUR NEW "LOW PROFILE" IN GREECE

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, the decision by the United States to resume full scale arms shipments to Greece, which for 3 years has been under the dictatorship of a military junta in complete opposition to all democratic principles, is appalling. At a time when the administration claims we are supposed to be lessening our military involvement worldwide, it is difficult to understand why we choose to support a regime which has no use for the ideals by which our own Government has endured and grown strong. I commend to my colleagues' attention the following editorial which appeared in the September 24 issue of the Washington Post:

OUR NEW "LOW PROFILE" IN GREECE

The game is over: fullscale shipment of arms to Greece is to be resumed. For three-plus years, since the colonels deposed an elected government in 1967, the United States had maintained a "selective embargo" on arms to its NATO ally, (although in view of the Pentagon's inscrutable arms-supply procedures, it remains to be seen just how "selective" the embargo was). Ostensibly, its purpose was to pressure the colonels back towards representative government. In reality, one suspects, the purpose was to appease the junta's many American and West European foes who contended, quite rightly, that a dictatorship had no proper place in an alliance of free peoples.

In the meantime, the interplay between an American bureaucracy habituated to supporting the Greek military and an outraged public was overtaken by events: first, by the Arab-Israeli war of 1967, which was quick and confined to local terrain, and then, more importantly, by the Soviet Mediterranean buildup of 1969-70 and its accompaniment of American concern. Thus did the Mideast crisis cast a regional shadow falling over Athens. When the Defense Department announced the "prudent positioning" of C-130s in Greece, for the Jordanian crisis, it was obvious time had run out. "Strategy" is back in the saddle after all; once again the celebrated "Nixon Doctrine" of diminishing involvement bites the dust.

And the United States is back in the unbecoming position of rendering its full sanction, with no semblance of official reluctance, to a regime which looks like enduring, but not much else. It is a regime which said it had to keep its promise—extracted under duress—to free Palestinian terrorists, but which refuses to keep its promise to restore constitutional government—even by its own constitution—to the Greek people. There have been some recent signs of relenting—some more political prisoners have been freed, some books taken off the proscribed list. Evidently this was done to sweeten the announcement on American arms.

A case can be made that the United States had exhausted whatever leverage its "selective embargo" had given it, and that nothing

further was to be gained by holding out. If that was so, however, then a new case can now be advanced: that the Nixon administration has, by increasing its involvement, increased its leverage too. One way to put the new involvement to some good purpose is to press harder for return to democratic rule. If there was one place in the Mediterranean to keep that "low profile" Mr. Nixon is always talking about, one would have thought it was Greece. Now that the United States is going to stand up straight there, it at least ought to do so in a way that will not leave the Greek people in doubt about whatever their liberty is of any American concern.

WHITE HOUSE COMMISSION ON PORNOGRAPHY

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, soon we are to officially receive the report of the President's Commission on Obscenity and Pornography, which is the result of 2 years of work and several hundred thousand dollars in taxpayers' money, which, incidentally, was a Commission that was not appointed by President Nixon but, rather, by his predecessor.

The final conclusions of this report are no secret; nor, in my judgment, are they acceptable.

The final conclusion recommends that we throw out all of our current laws relating to pornography, since, in the view of the Commission, "pornography causes no demonstrable social harm."

Quite frankly, such a conclusion is absolutely unbelievable. This House has, on two separate occasions, by a large margin, indicated that it strongly believes that pornography can, and must, be controlled. Now, a nonrepresentative group of people, not responsible to the electorate, tells us, in fact, that we do not know what we are talking about, and that we should throw away the results of several years' efforts to develop laws that will control the spread of this filth and still not violate the guarantee of free speech. America must wake up to the subtle efforts to distort the tried and true set of values among our people, particularly the younger generation.

I, for one, am not prepared to accept such a judgment on the part of a permissive group of people who controlled the Commission's activities and, hence, their final determinations. This attitude, in my judgment, has been one of the prime contributors to polarization and divisiveness in the country and has literally broken up many families.

For those who feel "free speech must be protected," I would strongly suggest that they take time to read the remarks of veteran newsman James J. Kilpatrick, which were aired on the American Broadcasting Co. on September 23. Mr. Kilpatrick has, in my judgment, presented a very rational, unemotional statement of the problem. His conclusion, namely, the rejection of the Commission's recommendations, is completely valid and rea-

sonable and I commend him for his efforts on behalf of those of us who wish to protect society from the disease known as pornography.

I am, therefore, including Mr. Kilpatrick's remarks in the RECORD at this point:

REMARK BY JAMES J. KILPATRICK

Within the next week, the Federal Commission on Obscenity and Pornography will release the report on which it has worked for the past two years. Officially, at least, the report is not yet available, but so many advance texts have been leaked around Washington that a few words of comment are in order—first on the nature of the commission and its report, and second, on the nature of the problem itself.

The commission is known as the President's commission, but it was created before Mr. Nixon came in office. He has named but one member to it, Charles Keating of Cincinnati. Mr. Keating has dissented at the top of his lungs, and the White House, in effect, has repudiated the Report before it appears. The majority of the commission, its director and staff, embarked upon their assignment with a pre-conditioned view that may fairly be described as the generally permissive view. The principal recommendations reflect that view, in concluding that "obscenity" is without a constant meaning in law; that pornography causes no demonstrable social harm and creates no clear and present danger to society; and that laws prohibiting a traffic in pornography, except as to juveniles, should be repealed.

From that conclusion, I too dissent. Many forces that act upon society, for good or ill, are incapable of measurement or demonstration. The positive harm that is done by pornography strikes me as one of those things. The debasement of love, the exploitation of the human body, the debauchment of long-accepted standards of good taste, can be sensed by rational men. And society, I believe, has a clear right to protect itself from the disease we know as pornography.

I love free speech. As a newsman, I live by a free press. But I have learned this much, that there is indeed a clear distinction between liberty and license. Freedom depends for its survival upon order; and order embraces the preservation of certain values that society itself decides are its values. In such a scheme of things, no place exists for the commercial pornographer, preying upon the base and ugly instincts that civilized men forever struggle to rise above. The pending report of the Commission on Obscenity and Pornography ought to be read, for it contains some useful information; and it ought then to be rejected.

DEMOCRATS FLEE THE LEFT FOR THE CENTER

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Columnist Joseph Alsop had noted the abrupt flip-flop of the arch-liberal wing of the Democratic Party on the issue of law and order. In his column, which appeared in the September 13, 1970, Baltimore Sun, Mr. Alsop also notes that the American people are fed up with violence and riots—and with those who have been encouraging and condoning the disruption of our college campuses and the cities of America. It is going to take a lot of fancy footwork on the part of the

"radiclib" to get this monkey off their back.

Text of Mr. Alsop's column is as follows:

DEMOCRATS FLEE THE LEFT FOR THE CENTER

(By Joseph Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—The liberal Democratic scramble to the center is so hasty, even so undignified, that it is extremely comic. But it is a nationwide phenomenon. It has great future significance. And it is getting less attention than it certainly deserves.

The fact of the scramble can be richly documented. Senator Edward Kennedy, of Massachusetts, for instance, has recently uttered the most eloquent, sensible and unqualified condemnation of student violence that has yet been heard from anyone. But it was produced in the campaign year, and not when the bullyboys of the New Left had the two leading universities of his own state in a literal state of siege.

In Illinois, again, Adlai Stevenson 3d was merely doing the fashionable thing, back in 1968, when he described the Chicago police as "storm troopers in blue." But the fashions for 1970 were revealed when Mr. Stevenson named a former U.S. attorney, Thomas Foran, the prosecutor of the Chicago Seven, as vice chairman of his campaign for the Senate.

In Connecticut, the pattern is the same. In 1968, the Rev. Joseph Duffey was the local leader of Senator Eugene McCarthy's forces and state boss of Americans for Democratic Action. That year, he told the English reporters of "An American Melodrama"—"I guess you could call me a revisionist Marxist." For Father Duffey, in those days, civil disobedience was also a useful tool of social change.

Today, however, as the Democratic senatorial candidate, Father Duffey is busily explaining to all and sundry that when he said "revisionist Marxist," he really meant that he was a strong anti-Communist. He issued a ringing statement of approval, too, when the Yale Corporation refused to give the student body two weeks off to conduct political agitation in the election year. The hard hats, he remarked in effect, do not have this kind of political privilege, so why should students have it?

In Minnesota, yet again, there is former Vice President Hubert Humphrey, who once remarked, when riots were more modish, that he could lead a pretty good riot himself. Today, however, Mr. Humphrey is being enormously aided in his Senate race by two facts indicating what is modish nowadays.

On the one hand, he is infinitely less wallowingly permissive than most other liberal Democrats in the period before the fashions changed so greatly. And on the other hand, he is remembered as the chief target of the Chicago rioters at the time of the Democratic convention two years ago. And folks in Minnesota tend to think that rioters' targets must be pretty fine fellows.

One could cite comparable data from just about every state in which a liberal Democrat is running for the Senate this year. Some candidates, indeed, have gone from words to action. In Maryland, for instance, Senator Joseph Tydings's sponsorship of the dubious and extremely controversial D.C. anti-crime bill is one of the biggest factors in his favor in what looks like a rough race.

The scramble to the center, then, is indeed a national phenomenon. One may guess that its first impetus came from the horrifying Gallup Poll, showing that a substantial majority actively approved the Kent State shootings. One can be sure, too, that one factor that has helped mightily to turn the scramble into a stampede is an admirable book, "The Real Majority" by Richard Scammon and Ben J. Wattenberg.

Yet the political data set forth by Mr. Scammon and Mr. Wattenberg were fully available to every liberal Democratic politi-

cian long before permissive wallowing became the unbreakable rule for all liberal Democrats.

What, then, are the deeper causes of this remarkably complete and abrupt change in political fashions? How was the "mini" replaced so swiftly by the "midi"—as it were?

The answer is, surely, that there has been a profound change in the country's political mood, which any politician would be a fool not to respond to. It took a long time for the vast majority of American voters to get good and mad about the riots, the disorders, the violence, the crime and the collapse of national values that the liberal Democrats used to pass over in silence, or even to condone.

The anger runs deep and strong today, however, and it is the anger itself that gives the change of political fashion permanent meaning. There is no question of the fashions changing back again. The only question is whether the liberal Democrats kept their "minis" on too long.

A STORY OF REAL PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE STATE OF WISCONSIN AND THE PEOPLE OF NICARAGUA

HON. VERNON W. THOMSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. THOMSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, a story of real partnership has just been brought to fruition that bears telling and, indeed, merits wide dissemination. It involves not only a successful people-to-people program between the State of Wisconsin and the people of Nicaragua, but also illustrates that successful U.S. assistance does not require billions of dollars. It is a story of cooperation between peoples and coordination between governments. And it is a story which should reveal that response to a specific need at a specific time is far more valuable than the aggregate of grandiose governmental programs.

Last year, a bacterial ring rot disease drastically reduced the potato seed supply in the Jinotega area of northwestern Nicaragua where most of the potatoes in the country are grown. A study undertaken in the area recommended the importation of new potato seed for a potato improvement program and also to supplement the loss of seed to the disease. Members of a local potato-producers cooperative obtained a credit loan for the purchase of 63 tons of certified potato seed from suppliers in New England. Unfortunately, nearly 60 percent of the shipment was spoiled in transit. The reduction in the yield from the usable seed impaired the ability of the farmers to meet their loan obligations as well as seriously limiting potato production.

The plight of the farmers was reported to the Nicaragua Partners of the Alliance, a private-citizens group which is paired under the Partners of the Alliance program with people in the State of Wisconsin. Wisconsin was a leader among the U.S. States to become involved in the Partners program, which joins citizen groups in the United States and Latin America working to attain the objectives of the Alliance for Progress on a non-governmental grassroots basis of cooperation. Today there are 40 U.S. States

joined with 40 areas of 18 Latin American and Caribbean countries. The Partners of the Alliance office in the Agency for International Development served as a catalyst in bringing these people-to-people committees together to work in the fields of agriculture, health, education, cultural exchange, and trade, serving as a complement to the government-to-government program of the Alliance for Progress. Partners groups are mainly concerned with small, though important, projects in rural areas, assisting in the development of cooperatives, the building of schools, providing equipment for health clinics, promoting student and teacher exchanges, and so forth.

When the Nicaragua Partners were requested to help on the potato problem, they voted unanimously to intervene on behalf of the farmers of Jinotega and the contact with the Wisconsin Partners was made. At this same time, Gov. Warren P. Knowles of my State led a delegation of businessmen on a trade mission to Latin America and their first stop was in Wisconsin's Partner country of Nicaragua. The request of the potato farmers was brought to the Governor's attention and he endorsed the idea of assisting in this emergency.

The project to respond to the request for 10 tons of potato seed was undertaken immediately by the Wisconsin Partners coordinated by Dr. Philip H. Falk, retired superintendent of schools in Madison, and executive secretary of the Wisconsin Partners. Wisconsin asked the Partners office in AID to contact the U.S. Department of Agriculture to secure approval for the importation of the shipment and to seek their help in getting the seed to Nicaragua in time for planting. Dr. William H. Conkle, leader, Extension Service, International Programs, USDA, gave valuable assistance, along with Mr. Lawrence McGary, USDA, extension adviser in Nicaragua.

Dr. Robert Hougus, a potato expert at the University of Wisconsin School of Agriculture in Madison, was instrumental in obtaining seed which was made available as a contribution to this citizen effort Partner's project. The producers in Nicaragua handled the transportation charges from Wisconsin to Jinotega. In December, shipment was made.

The seed arrived in Nicaragua in January of this year and was delivered to the potato producers in the Jinotega area. In accordance with a plan developed by the producers, the seed was distributed to farmers and planted. The yield was nearly triple the normal previous yields. The project proved to be an outstanding success.

Governor Knowles recently received and released a letter from Alfonso Lovo Cordero, Minister of Agriculture and Livestock in Nicaragua, which I include at this point in my remarks:

MINISTERIO DE AGRICULTURA
Y GANADERIA,
Managua, D.N., August 12, 1970.

HON. WARREN P. KNOWLES,
Governor of Wisconsin,
Office of the Governor,
Madison, Wis.

DEAR GOVERNOR KNOWLES: So often U.S. assistance abroad, regardless of its benefits, is

criticized both locally and internationally while little or no mention is made of many highly successful endeavors enjoying participation at all levels of the social structure.

The purpose of this letter is to relate to you the results of a complete success carried out in Nicaragua with the participation of the Wisconsin Partners, AID, the U.S.D.A., this Ministry and the potato growers of the Jinotega area in the northern part of the country.

For many years Nicaraguan potato production has supplied only about 30 percent of the demand. This is a result of a limited area suited to potato production and inefficient production practices. For example, there had been only one potato seed importation since the U.S. Marine supplied seed in the early thirties until 1969. The 1969 shipment resulted in a 60 percent loss in transit. The poor farmers were beside themselves. Even though the sound seed produced good yields the total operation resulted in a loss to the participating farmers who were unable to service their bank loans.

The Extension Service of this Ministry did not abandon the farmer. Instead, farmers were told that they could continue to depend on this source of help.

You will perhaps recall that during the course of your brief visit late last year the Nicaraguan Partners related the unfortunate circumstance to members of the Wisconsin Partners. Upon the return of your party to Wisconsin we were advised that 200 cwts. of seed potatoes were available for immediate shipment. The seed arrived here in early January. It was moved directly to the planting area and distributed to 33 producers in accordance with a plan previously developed by them. Planting was initiated immediately and the results were remarkable. Where fertilizer was applied yields averaged about seven tons per acre and unfertilized fields yielded about four tons. This is compared to normal previous yields of about two tons. In addition, the farmers received \$200 per ton for the potatoes sold. Needless to say, the farmers, as well as the related technical personnel were overjoyed with the results.

As a result of the good yields, six of the producers constructed suitable storage facilities for seed, three producers pooled their resources and bought a tractor, while one producer earned enough additional income to buy a farm.

Please excuse all of the details but they are essential in order to relate the entire magnitude of the success. Even though Nicaragua may not become self-sufficient in potato production, great forward strides have been accomplished in increasing yields, improving production efficiency and farmer income and, above all, at least 33 farmers are convinced that it pays dividends to use good seed and follow recommended cultural practices.

In this humble way, I join with the Nicaraguan Partners and the potato growers of Jinotega in expressing our thanks and gratitude to the Wisconsin Partners and to you personally for the meaningful assistance rendered.

Sincerely yours,
ALFONSO LOVO CORDERO,
Minister of Agriculture and Livestock.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE
BYELORUSSIANS

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEN
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. FARBSTEN. Mr. Speaker, on September 5-7, 1970, the participants of

the Ninth Convention of Byelorussians of North America, adopted the following resolution.

I commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION OF THE 9TH CONVENTION OF
BYELORUSSIANS OF NORTH AMERICA IN NEW
YORK CITY ON SEPTEMBER 5-7, 1970

Whereas the Byelorussian people in their land have been subjected to a colonial oppression from Moscow; and

Whereas the Russian Communist dictatorship in its dealings with Byelorussia's neighbors has torn away parts of the Byelorussian ethnographic territory having incorporated that largest part of it into the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic; and

Whereas the key positions in the Byelorussian SSR are occupied mainly by foreigners subservient to the Moscow center and unresponsive to the needs of the Byelorussian people; and

Whereas the Byelorussian people suffer from an incredibly low standard of living as a result of exploitation of their natural and human resources which have been used by Moscow to conduct its international schemes in Latin America, Indochina, Africa and now especially the Middle East, as well as in other parts of the world; and

Whereas a policy of forcible Russification is being carried out in the Byelorussian SSR, the Byelorussian language being eliminated more and more from administration, science, education, and publications in the BSSR; and

Whereas Byelorussia is deprived of genuine diplomatic and cultural ties with the outside world, is unable to participate independently even in such international events as the Olympic games, her only foreign representation in the United Nations being a tool of Moscow's policies; and

Whereas the Government of the BSSR, fully controlled by the Communist Party center in Moscow, does not care for any improvement of Byelorussia's political status and the economic and cultural well-being of the Byelorussian people, nor does it protest against economic exploitation and Russification of Byelorussia; and

Whereas the Byelorussian nation has and will never become reconciled to a state of colonial dependence, but has decidedly resisted Muscovite oppression in defense of its natural rights to be its own master; and

Whereas the Byelorussian people are still conducting their freedom fight—

We the Byelorussians of the United States and Canada unanimously reaffirm our will to support the fighting Byelorussian people in the Soviet Union in their struggle for cultural freedom and political independence. We are determined to seek further support for fighting Byelorussia among political leaders and statesmen of the United States or America and Canada. We and our children shall never cease our effort until Byelorussia will again become a free and democratic nation in accordance with the postulates and principles enunciated in the constitutional charters of the Byelorussian Democratic Republic whose freedom and independence were proclaimed in Minsk (Minsk) on March 25, 1918.

Long live Fighting Byelorussia!
Long live the Byelorussian Democratic Republic!

New York City, September 6, 1970

J. ZAPRUDNIK,

Chairman of the Convention.

W. STANKIEVICH,

Chairman of the Byelorussian-American Association.

A. HAYCUK,

Chairman of the Byelorussian Canadian Alliance.

CONGRESSMAN WOLFF'S REPORT

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, regularly I report to my constituents on my activities here in Washington and back in my congressional district. As I do on all these occasions I would like to include my current report in the RECORD at this point:

SEPTEMBER, 1970.

DEAR FRIEND AND CONSTITUENT: The 91st Congress is rapidly moving toward adjournment later this fall and pending matters are consequently speeding up here in Washington. Recently there have been a number of legislative and administrative actions about which I feel you should be advised. These items are detailed on the following pages.

I always indicate in these regular newsletters how greatly I value your comments or suggestions on matters pending in Congress. Please do not take these as idle words for I sincerely believe that I can better perform my job of representing and serving you if I know what issues concern you and what views you hold on matters of public policy. So once again permit me to say—please let me know whenever you have an opinion on a matter pending in Congress or whenever I can serve you. Best wishes.

Sincerely yours,

LESTER L. WOLFF,
Member of Congress.

WE MUST STOP HIJACKINGS

Recognizing that the only effective means of dealing with international air piracy is to deter hijackings, I recently offered a five-point program to head off any repetition of the reprehensible Arab terrorists' multiple hijacking. I was pleased that President Nixon immediately moved in the direction of my first suggestion—the stationing of special U.S. guards on all international flights of U.S. planes.

The other points I suggested were: installation of armor plates between cabins and cockpits of U.S. aircraft; a thorough search of all passengers and baggage in international flights; a comprehensive inspection of all U.S. aircraft prior to the time any crew or passengers board the plane, and an embargo on air traffic to any country which refuses to immediately return hijacking hostages and/or return the hijackers to the country of origin.

Moreover, I have introduced a resolution to crack down on hijackers. This resolution has been referred to the House Committee on Foreign Affairs, of which I am a member, and the Chairman, Rep. Thomas E. Morgan, has promised prompt hearings on my recommendations.

STOP DRUGS AT THEIR SOURCE

For years I have been active in the fight to control and end drug abuse. My work has convinced me that a most effective means of solving this problem would be to stop the drug traffic at its source to prevent the illegal importation of drugs. To put some teeth into efforts to control the international drug traffic I have sponsored legislation (H.R. 18402) to cut off American assistance to any country failing to take adequate steps to make certain that illegal drugs from those countries do not come to our shores. This legislation is based on the principle that such problems are most effectively stopped at their primary source.

WOLFF CREDIT CARD BILL GAINS

The House of Representatives has passed another bill of which I was an original spon-

sor—legislation to stop the unsolicited mailing of credit cards to protect the consumer from the many problems caused when a credit card is lost or stolen in the mail. This legislation will also mean that an individual will only have as much credit as he seeks and not be subjected to unfair credit practices.

REMEMBERING AMERICAN POW'S

I have joined with a number of my colleagues in the House of Representatives in a letter to the Premier of North Vietnam demanding that American prisoners of war be given humane treatment. As an original sponsor of legislation in support of our POW's, I believe we must continue to focus national and world attention on their plight and persevere in our efforts until they and all our men in IndoChina return home safely.

L. I. ECONOMIC PROBLEMS DEMAND ATTENTION

Unemployment on Long Island is running far ahead of the national average and it is obvious that our national economic ills are magnified in our own community. I am acting with many groups and individuals here on the island to ease our problem.

After a recent meeting with the Citizens Coalition to Save Jobs on Long Island, the Coalition and I wrote to President Nixon asking him to designate Long Island an economic disaster area to make us eligible for special federal assistance. We do not seek handouts nor giveaways; what we do seek is a fair share of work for Long Island in the crucial industries such as pollution control, prefabricated housing, mass transit development, educational equipment, etc.

I have undertaken to visit as many plants on the Island as my schedule permits to help devise new sources of employment for those members of our labor force out of work. In this time of economic stress I am doing all that I can to reverse the unhappy trends of rising unemployment and rising prices. But a final solution to our local economic problems cannot be achieved until our national economy is set back on the right path, as I outlined in the special letter I sent to you recently.

EMERGENCY HOUSING MONEY APPROVED

High interest rates and home building costs have been a significant inflationary factor and—since housing starts have been reduced—a cause of unemployment. Recognizing this, the House has passed the Emergency Home Finance Act, which I was pleased to support. It will make available one billion dollars for home mortgages so they will be more readily available at reasonable rates to low and middle income families. Also benefiting from this legislation will be returning veterans who today cannot secure home mortgages. This legislation will also be an indirect assist to those of you who are now unable to sell your homes because prospective buyers can't secure mortgages.

RECOGNITION DUE PUBLIC SERVANTS

Policemen and firemen serve invaluable roles in our society; we can never express adequate thanks to those men who risk their lives to make certain we are safer at all times.

In recognition of these fine men, I worked with the Nassau County Shields Organization to bring federal recognition to police officers who take such great personal risks for the benefit of society as a whole.

Also, I have sought to give due recognition to our firefighters by introducing three bills for their benefit. This legislation would do the following:

Provide federal compensation for firemen injured while protecting federal property or fighting fires in civil disorders.

Extend to non-profit activities of firemen

preferred second and third-class mailing permits to cut costs in the many valuable community programs sponsored by various fire companies in our area.

Provide financial benefits to aid the cost of volunteer fire training undertaken selflessly by hundreds of men in our area and tens of thousands of men throughout the United States.

Finally, I have joined with those seeking to permit regular New York City firemen who live in areas with volunteer and alert fire companies to volunteer their services to those companies when they are off duty. If these men are willing to give their time and expertise to help local fire companies, it is absurd for them to be denied this right.

Along with my colleague, Rep. Mario Biaggi, of the Bronx, I held an all-day hearing in New York earlier this month on the problems of unhealthy fad diets, food myths and diet pill abuse which confront the American consumer. We listened to fourteen witnesses, including doctors, nutritionists, dieticians and a representative of Ralph Nader, detail how the consumer is bilked of millions of dollars with phony promises of spectacular weight loss. Not only are most of these gimmicks unsuccessful, but according to the testimony we heard, many such phony diets are truly unhealthy.

What we have is a billion dollar a year "get slim quick" business in which the government has thus far failed to protect the consumer. My hearing is the first step in a program to make sure the consumer really is protected. I intend to follow this issue up with additional hearings in Washington and legislation to crack down on quack diet promotions.

Action is needed to enable the American consumer to find effective, healthy means of maintaining body weight without being subject to a host of quacks who will trade an individual's health for a quick profit.

L.I. SOUND STUDY UNDERWAY

As I indicated to you in my last newsletter, we had made progress on the Wolff-Ribicoff Long Island Sound Bill. Now I am pleased to be able to report that we have reached an agreement in Washington which effectively accomplishes the purpose of this legislation and which will speed up the needed study and "Master Plan" for the Sound.

The existing New England River Basins Commission will undertake a comprehensive study of the Sound with a guarantee of adequate funds for the three-year, \$2.8 million study. Most importantly, the Commission's authority will be enlarged to include all of the Sound and its shoreline. This is a great breakthrough since it should mean an end to the piecemeal destruction of the Sound.

Now, Senators Ribicoff and Javits, Representative Reid and I will devote our attention to creating a regulatory body with the authority and expertise to effectively enforce the recommendations made for the preservation of the Sound.

DEFENSE DEPARTMENT GRANTS WOLFF'S REQUEST FOR GI'S

The Defense Department has agreed to a request I made several months ago that those servicemen ordered into Cambodia this spring and others who have been serving in Laos be accorded the same tax benefits allowed GI's in Vietnam. Whatever one's view of the wisdom of our policy in IndoChina, I trust we can agree that all our servicemen should receive equitable treatment.

There is also pending in Committee legislation I authored to provide these same tax benefits to our men in Korea in recognition of the fact that conditions there are still hazardous. A majority of Congressmen (218) have cosponsored this bill which I drafted.

PUBLIC APATHY AND PRIVATE GREED

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, the Chula Vista Star-News, a suburban newspaper in my district, has taken on the local establishment in striking a blow for cleaner air.

At issue is the opposition of the Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce to a proposition on the November ballot which would permit California's counties to divert up to 25 percent of their gas tax allocations from highway development to mass transit and pollution control.

The Star-News is unhappy with the chamber's position, and characteristically does not mince words in saying so.

Copublisher Lowell Blankfort, who wrote the editorial, underscores our interdependence in the struggle for a better environment. If a few take a permissive attitude toward polluters, then all must suffer. Mr. Blankfort recently witnessed smog over the formerly pristine Sahara Desert. Now he warns that if something does not happen soon to reverse the despoilation of the earth, mankind's final epitaph might well read:

Here lies Homo Sapiens; he killed himself out of public apathy and private greed.

It is not a pleasant thought, but one to ponder. The editorial, which ran in the Star-News September 6, follows:

[From the Chula Vista (Calif.) Star-News, Sept. 6, 1970]

THE SMOG LOBBY

If you want to see a classic example of why our air and our rivers are filled with poison, why our hills and valleys are scarred with massive freeways and our birds and fish are dying, one need look no farther than our own Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce.

Chamber directors recently decided they would rather have yet more freeways than see adequate funds provided to fight smog and develop mass rapid transit as an alternative to the smog-spewing, traffic-congesting roads.

They went on record in opposition to a November ballot proposition, authored by our own state Senator James R. Mills, that would permit counties and cities, each at their own option, to divert up to a quarter of gas tax revenues to anti-smog research and developing mass rapid transit.

The chamber's reason: There isn't enough money for the highway programs. This at a time when the face of California, from Mission Valley to the High Sierras, continues to be slashed by freeways which, it has been proven, merely bring more traffic congestion after a few years and soon bring demands for even more freeways.

By 1980, at the present rate, the number of cars in California will almost double, to 20 million. How can they be accommodated? Other alternatives to the automobile and the poison it and industry spew must be developed.

But the special commercial interests who infest chambers of commerce and trade associations don't want other alternatives. They want more automobiles and more freeways.

Some of these special interests are obvious—people involved in the auto industry and the oil industry and the contractors and the highway engineers. Others are less obvious—subdividers and land speculators and

real estate interests who profit richly with every freeway that's built and who are the big beneficiaries of the gas tax that motorists pay.

The little guy who pays the gas tax may get home a few minutes faster—for a while, until the new freeway also becomes congested—but his benefits are puny compared with the fat cats. And for those few minutes, he is increasingly taking time off his life every time he takes a breath of what was once called fresh air.

However, the special interests know how to organize, propagandize and lobby the politicians—and the little guy doesn't.

They can afford to contribute heavily to political campaigns—which is one reason that Senator Mills' opponent, a multi-millionaire himself, also has found it easy to raise money from other special interests who want to see Jim Mills out of the legislature at any price.

The special interest lobby managed to kill every single anti-pollution bill at the last session of the legislature except Senator Mills' proposed constitutional amendment.

Now, through special-interest groups such as the Chula Vista Chamber of Commerce, they are attempting to defeat that measure at the polls in November.

A short time ago, when we were flying over Africa's desolate Sahara Desert, 100 miles south of the Mediterranean coast, we looked down into a pall of smog.

Over the public address system, the pilot announced that this new smog was only six months old—that oil refineries were near and the winds also were now blowing the smog from the Mediterranean shore. Even remote parts of the earth are no longer free from fumes.

Renowned scientists say that, at the rate we are despoiling our earth, the human race has only another half century to survive. Some say that the extinction process is already irreversible.

If there is anyone left to write humanity's epitaph, he might well write: "Here lies Homo Sapiens; he killed himself out of public apathy and private greed."

VFW FREEDOM SIGNATURE WEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the vigorous support that Congress is giving to all diplomatic and humanitarian efforts on behalf of American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia certainly reflect the wishes of the American public.

An example of public interest and support of our efforts is exemplified by a resolution adopted by the Marham, Ill., City Council in conjunction with which was adopted by a proclamation by Mayor Peter P. Wolff of Markham designating the week of September 20-26, 1970, as "VFW Freedom Signature Week." This is an outstanding example of the strong interest which the public has in the welfare of our American servicemen held by the enemy.

The proclamation follows:

PROCLAMATION

Whereas, there are over 1,400 servicemen held as prisoners in Southeast Asia by North Vietnam and her allies; and

Whereas, North Vietnam, despite appeals from neutral sources such as the International Red Cross, has consistently refused to divulge any information about the men on their health and well being, including even

naming those they are holding, or even permitting such groups to inspect North Vietnamese prison camps to determine if they meet the minimum standards of care and treatment embodied in the Geneva Convention; and

Whereas, such callous disregard for long-established international rules for humane treatment of such prisoners is causing unbearable anguish among these American prisoners and their families at home;

Therefore, I, Peter P. Wolff, Mayor of the City of Markham, do proclaim September 20-26, 1970, as "V.F.W. Freedom Signature Week" and urge all citizens of this community to demonstrate their obligation to these fellow Americans by signing petitions requesting the immediate release of all Americans held prisoner by the North Vietnam government and by Communist political front groups in Southeast Asia.

PETER P. WOLFF,
Mayor.

STATEMENT ON THE DEATH OF ADMIRAL MACMILLAN

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the recent passing of Rear Adm. Donald B. MacMillan in Provincetown, Mass., is the final chapter in the amazing life of one of our Nation's greatest adventurers. He was the last surviving member of Robert E. Peary's successful expedition to the North Pole but his life meant more than that. His continuing efforts to explore unknown frontiers and to enrich man's knowledge of his planet are a tribute to the finest quality in all men.

An editorial appearing in the New Bedford Standard-Times highlights this great man's life and accomplishments and under unanimous consent I include the editorial in the RECORD:

DONALD B. MACMILLAN

The nation, and much of the world as well, will remember Rear Admiral Donald B. MacMillan of Provincetown principally as an explorer, and this is as it should be.

He was for many years the only survivor of Robert E. Peary's North Pole expedition that fought its way across the bitter Polar Sea, and his own expeditions to little known and unknown Arctic areas spanned nearly a half-century.

Moreover, his treks into the North were made in an era before air transportation revolutionized exploration of this vast 50-below frontier. In MacMillan's day, it was man and dog sled against the elements, and only the hardy and knowledgeable survived.

Yet Admiral MacMillan was far more than an explorer. In the first instance, he was a sailor of outstanding competence. Especially along the Northeast coast, to think of MacMillan is to think as well of the white-hulled schooner Bowdoin in which he logged more than 200,000 miles in the interests of contributing to man's knowledge of the world. His exploits afloat in Bowdoin, meeting the challenges of ice and gales are thrilling chapters of accomplishment in themselves.

Finally, Admiral MacMillan was a perpetual scholar and educator. He prided himself on learning something new every day. The Arctic, its people, its flora and fauna, he looked upon as a vast new world to be learned about. He not only studied it himself; he took scientists and students North; he encouraged the young men of his schooner

crew to become scientists and teachers, and the total body of Arctic knowledge that he thus assisted in accumulating is immeasurable.

This thoughtful, gentle-spoken man, whose lectures on the North have delighted and informed thousands of Americans of all ages, made a major contribution to America and to American history, and his death will only reemphasize the lasting dimension of that contribution.

UNITED STATES ALLOWS APARTHEID REGULATIONS IN SOUTH AFRICA NASA INSTALLATION

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of our colleagues the fact that the United States has bowed to the racial hiring practices used by the South African Government. The United States National Aeronautics and Space Administration has an installation in South Africa and permits its personnel hiring to be done, under apartheid regulations, by a South African national agency under contract to NASA for the operation of NASA's facility in that country.

I have urged NASA to change its policy and hire directly. It refuses to do so. I have written to President Nixon urging that he require such a change by Executive order.

I include in the RECORD a copy of the correspondence in this matter and urge my colleagues to support this request:

STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK,
Stony Brook, N.Y., July 30, 1970.

Representative EDWARD I. KOCH,
Committee on Science and Astronautics,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KOCH: It has recently been brought to the attention of the U.S. scientific community in an article in *Science* (10 July) that Federal agencies, most notably NASA, NIH, and AEC, are using funds to support scientific research activities in South Africa that may well involve personnel policies which are discriminatory, and which appear to violate the ethical code that requires "informed" or "advised" consent from human experimental subjects.

Since the operations of NASA fall within the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Science and Astronautics, I would like to request that the Committee seek to ascertain the facts in this case and report to the public. It would seem that an arrangement whereby NASA contracts to support a tracking station in South Africa where the apartheid regulations are rigidly enforced is wholly inconsistent with the State Department policy that "the United States would not be party to any arrangement involving racial discrimination."

At a time when it is increasingly difficult for us to win public support for scientific research, and when fewer of our young people seem to be attracted to scientific careers, it is dismaying to learn that our most prestigious scientific agencies may be involved in such ventures. I would be very interested in hearing what course of action you thought might be effective in this case.

Sincerely,

LESTER G. PALDY,
Assistant Professor of Physics.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, D.C., August 4, 1970.

Dr. THOMAS PAINE,
Director, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. PAINE: I have received a letter from a constituent on the subject of NASA contracts supporting apartheid regulations in South Africa by permitting its hiring practices to be governed by these regulations.

I would appreciate having your response so that I may advise the constituent.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,

Washington, D.C., August 19, 1970.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: This is in further response to your inquiry on behalf of Lester G. Paldy regarding NASA activities in South Africa.

Under the terms of an intergovernmental agreement dated September 13, 1960, NASA contracted with the South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) to operate a NASA tracking and data acquisition station near Johannesburg. This station was established in South Africa under earlier cooperative arrangements with the U.S. Naval Research Laboratory in anticipation of the International Geophysical Year, some years before the National Aeronautics and Space Administration was established on July 29, 1958. A detailed statement on the functions and operations of this station and the reasons for its location in South Africa are included in the attached staff paper.

NASA does not support scientific research in South Africa and the only funds expended there are for the operation and maintenance of the NASA tracking station. NASA has similar staffing and operating arrangements with Australia, the United Kingdom and Spain.

Sincerely yours,

H. DALE GRUBB,
Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., August 27, 1970.

H. DALE GRUBB,
Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRUBB: Thank you for your letter of August 19. Your reply really does not reply to the basic question. That question is directed to NASA's employment practices in South Africa. I would appreciate knowing whether your hiring is governed by apartheid regulations mandated under South African law. If you are governed by them, then I would urge in your renewal agreement that, it being a United States installation, the facility be exempted from such regulations. If, on the other hand, that is already the case, I would be delighted to know that. I would appreciate the facts regarding this most basic question.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND
SPACE ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D.C., September 17, 1970.

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: This is in response to your August 27, 1970 letter regarding NASA's employment practices in South Africa.

NASA neither recruits nor employs personnel at its tracking and data acquisition station near Johannesburg, South Africa. As we indicated in our August 19, 1970 letter, the South African Council for Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) staffs and oper-

ates the station under contract to NASA. NASA has similar staffing and operating arrangements with Australia, the United Kingdom, and Spain. In each of these countries, hiring of local personnel by the national agency under contract to NASA for station operation is a local function.

As the staff paper we sent to you indicates, NASA's contractual relationship with the CSIR implements an agreement between the Government of the United States and the Government of South Africa, negotiated by the Department of State as in the net national interest. NASA must, of course, operate within the framework of national relationships with other countries.

Sincerely yours,

H. DALE GRUBB,
Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1970.
HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President, the White House, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I want to bring to your attention the fact that federal agencies such as NASA are engaging in hiring practices involving racial discrimination in South Africa. The defense given to me by NASA is that "NASA neither recruits nor employs personnel at its tracking and data acquisition station near Johannesburg, South Africa. . . . In each of these countries, hiring of local personnel by the national agency under contract to NASA for station operation is a local function."

I hope that you will agree with me that it is an intolerable situation which allows United States funds paid to persons performing services to the United States government, in this case NASA, to be used in support of racial discrimination. I would urge that you require that federal agencies hiring in foreign lands be required to have in their contracts with other countries provisions which permit only nondiscriminatory hiring practices in so far as they affect the United States agency.

I would appreciate knowing whether this meets with your approval and if such a directive will be forthcoming.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D.C., September 22, 1970.
H. DALE GRUBB,
Assistant Administrator for Legislative Affairs, NASA, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GRUBB: I have your letter of September 17 with further regard to NASA's employment practices in South Africa.

I believe that the practices you describe in your letter of having hiring done by the "national agency under contract to NASA for station operation" is racially discriminating and is NASA's way of evading its responsibilities.

I find that an intolerable situation and urge that a change be made.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D.C., September 24, 1970.
HON. EDWARD I. KOCH,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. KOCH: This will acknowledge and thank you for your letter of September 22 to the President regarding the hiring of foreign nationals by government agencies, with particular reference to NASA policies in South Africa. You may be assured your letter will be brought to the President's attention at the earliest opportunity.

With cordial regard.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM E. TIMMONS,
Assistant to the President.

PORT TOBACCO

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, the Conservation and Natural Resources Subcommittee recently concluded hearings on the Potomac estuary and the possible impact of uncontrolled planning for powerplants, oil depots, and other such facilities on the entire area. One vital aspect of the southern Maryland community which we must preserve are those elements which demonstrate the history and heritage of our people—we want this for future generations and for tourism.

Port Tobacco, in Charles County, was chosen as a theme in the Montgomery County Historical Society Contest, and it exemplifies one of the forgotten areas that was once an important place in America's heritage. Miss Kimball's theme speaks eloquently of the heritage we hope to preserve and I submit it for the interest of my fellow colleagues:

PORT TOBACCO
(By Carla P. Kimball)

Once a thriving river port, the business and cultural center of Maryland, Port Tobacco, like many other small towns in the state has faded into oblivion. It is only one of the towns and villages which has failed to gain the recognition that it deserves. Located in a valley near the point where the Potomac River bends around the lower end of Charles County, Port Tobacco is one of the few communities along the eastern seaboard that can boast of having had a living community for over three centuries. Other eighteenth century villages which sprang up along the Potomac are Leonardtown, Bladensburg and Georgetown; however, it seems rather ironic that these towns are large commercial areas today, when they were of minimal importance in very early years, whereas all that exists of the town of Port Tobacco is a vague memory.

Port Tobacco did not originate as a river port town, but rather as the site of the village of the Potabac Indians.

In the early years of the colony, Father Andrew White, a prominent figure in Maryland's religious history, made frequent trips to the village. In 1639, he converted the Queen of the Potabac Indians and 130 of her subjects. From Port Tobacco, Father White's home for the greatest part of his stay in Maryland, came the first work on Indian language, customs and religion in America.¹

The name, Port Tobacco, is also of Indian origin. Fessenend S. Blanchard, author of *A Cruising Guide to the Chesapeake*, wrote that the Indian name, Portofacco, meant "in the hollow of the hills,"² and the present name evolved from this. It is interesting to note the various versions of the name in its evolutionary process to Port Tobacco. In 1608 it was spelled Potapaco, Potobanos in 1632, Portobacke in 1635, in 1690, Portobao, and even Porto Batto at one time.³ As years passed, even the inhabitants of the town lost sight of the fact that the name was not derived from its location at a wealthy and prosperous tobacco port, but from the Potabac Indians, long since driven from their home by land-hungry settlers.

Like other ports on the Potomac, Port Tobacco was strategically located to tap the tobacco trade of the area and grew "under the warehousing requirements and factorage system of the colonial period."⁴ With the

coming of the eighteenth century, Charles County planters began to prosper from the tobacco fields, and Port Tobacco grew to be the business center and most important port in Maryland. Because of Port Tobacco's location on a spacious estuary, it enjoyed a fine harbour and ships could easily anchor to receive the annual crop of southern Maryland. This growing river port was one of the first on the Potomac to trade with England. In *The Dulaneys of Maryland*, it is written that each year the products of English looms and forges were brought to Port Tobacco on the trading vessels of London merchants in exchange for return cargoes of tobacco.⁵

When referring to tobacco towns, such as Port Tobacco, Frederick Guthelm, author of *The Potomac*, stated that in each, one would typically find a merchant with his office, store and warehouse, ready to buy tobacco and sell goods from London.⁶ As an indication of the size and commercial importance of Port Tobacco, Dr. Robert Honyman who stayed in Port Tobacco a short time in 1775 stated this about the town: "Port Tobacco is about as big as New Castle (Delaware) . . . There are six stores in the place . . ." Records show that these merchants included the following: Robert Fergusson, an agent for several Scottish firms; John Craig, a factor (i.e. merchant) for Cuninghame, Findlay, and Company; Robert Mundell⁷ and John Robertson, both representatives of Glassford and Company at Port Tobacco; and George Gray, a factor for John Jamieson and Son of Glasgow, Scotland.⁸

In 1658, Port Tobacco was made the seat of Charles County.⁹ In the same year, the first county courthouse was built¹⁰ and as the center of county government, the major portion of the population of Charles County must have lived in and around the town of Port Tobacco. By 1747, the poor quality of Maryland's tobacco, made it necessary for an Inspection Act to be passed to improve the quality and raise the price. Certain ports were designated as authorized inspection stations; Port Tobacco was one. The Inspection Act limited the number of ports which were permitted to export tobacco, thus Port Tobacco increased in importance.¹¹

By the end of the American Revolution, Port Tobacco had become the cultural center of Maryland. Situated on one of the most favored routes between the North and the South, the town "was absorbing sophistication like a sponge." This statement is supported by a record of the presentation of *The Beggar's Opera* in Port Tobacco, as early as 1752.¹² Jockey clubs came into being in the middle of the eighteenth century and distinguished meetings were held by such clubs at Port Tobacco, as well as Marlboro and Annapolis.¹³ To say the least, life in this town was not dull. Court records show that, "The townspeople traded and visited, sang and prayed; slandered their neighbors and got hauled into court for it; they played on the cittern, a sort of guitar, hunted, fished in the streams and river. . . ." As the town grew and prospered, many of the wealthy land owners sent their sons and sometimes even daughters to either England, Belgium or France to be educated. Generally, it can be concluded, that Port Tobacco was a town of "wealth and consequence."¹⁴

Located in a valley, the hills overlooking the town were covered with the tobacco crops of the wealthy plantation owners. Many of the mansions in what is known as the Port Tobacco Valley were masterpieces of colonial architecture and still stand today in their restored state. It is amazing that this river port town has gained so little recognition, when one considers that many prominent colonial figures were among its residents. One home which overlooks Port Tobacco is Mulberry Grove, the birthplace and home of John Hanson, president of the first Continental Congress of the United States. As previously mentioned, Port Tobacco was the home of Fr. White and other Jesuit priests

in Maryland, and in 1649, a large grant of land was given to Thomas Mathews as trustee for the priests.¹⁵ The building erected on the land became known as St. Thomas Manor; the author of *Potomac Landing* stated, that it "has been owned by the Jesuits and used by them as a residence uninterruptedly for the interval of nearly three hundred years."¹⁶ An Englishman, J. F. D. Smyth, touring the U. S. said that the sight of St. Thomas Manor "is the most beautiful place and the most elegant situation in the world."¹⁷ St. Ignatius Church, built by the Jesuits, adjoining St. Thomas Manor was not only one of the principle early churches of the colonies, but also is the oldest active parish in the United States.¹⁸

Another colonial mansion in the Port Tobacco Valley, built circa 1730, was Rose Hill, the home of Dr. Gustavus A. Brown, the physician who attended George Washington in his last illness.¹⁹ Rose Hill stands high above Port Tobacco overlooking the Potomac River. During the Civil War, the home was taken over and used as a base by Union soldiers. By 1865, the Brown Family had long since passed away and the home now belonged to the Floyds. Young Bob Floyd fought under the Confederate flag, while Mrs. Floyd and beautiful young Olivia remained in Rose Hill. Union soldiers camped on the grounds about the manor house, while officers occupied the spare rooms. Young Olivia, a loyal Southerner was in constant communication with the Army of Northern Virginia. She would creep away at night and ride to Ladler's Ferry with information she had been told by the Union soldiers.²⁰ However, to this day, the citizens of Port Tobacco dispute the fact that this young woman's name was Olivia Floyd, but rather, they contend that the inhabitant of Rose Hill during the Civil War was Bell Boyde, the famous Confederate spy. Nevertheless, Rose Hill stands today high above Port Tobacco overlooking the Potomac River.²¹

Habre de Venture is "one of the finest examples of Colonial and Southern architecture in Maryland." Built in 1742, it was the home of Thomas Stone, one of the state's four signers of the Declaration of Independence.²² In 1760, Dr. James Craik built his home, La Grange. Dr. Craik was a physician in the Continental Army and a close friend of President George Washington.²³ William Chandler, a colonel in the Revolutionary War built Chandler's Hope early in 1650, which later became the temporary home of the first Carmelite nuns in the area.²⁴ From Chandler's Hope, the Carmelites moved to their permanent home, overlooking the Port Tobacco Valley; Mount Carmel was "the first convent of religious women established in the original thirteen colonies."²⁵

With the American Revolution came the beginning of a series of destructive blows which brought an end to Port Tobacco as the business and cultural center of Maryland. Town commerce was almost entirely stopped; British factors were forced to leave the town; the prized tobacco warehouses were destroyed, thus cutting trade to a minimum. During the war years, Baltimore and other more urbanized trading communities such as Georgetown and Alexandria engrossed much of the trade and shipping that would previously have been handled in Maryland's smaller ports, including Piscataway, Bladensburg, and Chaptico, as well as Port Tobacco. Many of these areas declined.²⁶ As Port Tobacco's importance began to diminish, the town of La Plata, about three miles north of Port Tobacco, began to rise; the Popes Creek Railroad had established communication between the little village and the rest of the States. Moreover, by this time, the piling up of silt in Port Tobacco's harbour had made it impossible for ships to land there. By 1832, there was talk of moving the seat of Charles County from Port Tobacco to the rising town of La Plata. In 1892, the final blow was dealt to Port Tobacco, when by mysterious means,

Footnotes at end of article.

the courthouse was burned. "Whatever the cause . . . the fire did indeed settle the issue insofar as Port Tobacco was concerned." It would have been senseless to rebuild the county courthouse in a town which had been bypassed by the railroad, and which was no longer accessible by sea; therefore, in 1895, the county seat was changed from Port Tobacco to La Plata.²⁶ What was left of the old courthouse and other public buildings were sold and the proceeds were applied to the costs of the buildings in the new seat of Charles County. Naturally, business followed the court and residents followed business. Fifty years later, when the town was taken in hand by the Society for the Restoration of Port Tobacco, "there was little left of the public buildings but the memory."²⁷ Paul Wilstach wrote this about the abandoned town:

Nearly all the eighty houses have long since gone the way of those at St. Mary's, but the few remaining, with their mossy brick and sagging roofs and crazy chimneys, compose a unique and very quaint specimen of a derelict colonial town.²⁸

Stag House, built about 1709, is one of the two homes which are still standing in the exact location of the old town.²⁹ The buildings mentioned previously have been restored and are occasionally opened for public tours; however, for the most part, the corn and tobacco fields cover the area where the town once flourished.

It is hoped that the reconstruction of Charles County's courthouse will constitute the first major step of the restoration of Port Tobacco, and plans are being made by the Society for the restoration of Port Tobacco for this town to become a second Williamsburg. The preceding appears to be a tragic end to the story of a town which was so much a part of Maryland's colonial history, but perhaps, if the plans of the Restoration Society succeed, Port Tobacco will live again.

FOOTNOTES

¹ Ethel Roby Hayden, "Port Tobacco, Lost Town of Maryland," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XL (1945), 261.

² Fessenden S. Blanchard and William T. Stone, *A Cruising Guide to the Chesapeake*, p. 172.

³ Hamill Kenny, *The Origin and Meaning of the Indian Names of Maryland*, pp. 21-22.

⁴ Rhoda M. Dorsey, "The Pattern of Baltimore Commerce During the Confederation Period," *Historical Magazine* LXII (June 1967), 127.

⁵ Aubrey C. Land, *The Dulaneys of Maryland*, p. 3.

⁶ Frederick Gutheim, *The Potomac*, p. 72.

⁷ Hayden, "Port Tobacco," p. 268.

⁸ Information taken from a footnote of a letter from Alexander Hamilton to James Brown Company in "The Letterbooks of Alexander Hamilton, Piscataway Factor," Part III, 1775-1776, edited by Richard K. MacMaster and David C. Skaggs, *Historical Magazine*, LXII, p. 14-159.

⁹ Information taken from footnotes of letters from Alexander Hamilton to James Brown Company in, "Post-Revolutionary Letters of Alexander Hamilton, Piscataway Merchant, Part I, January-June 1784," *Historical Magazine*, LXIII (March 1968), 32-41.

¹⁰ A book compiled as the Maryland Writers' Project, *Maryland, A Guide to the Old Line State*, p. 490.

¹¹ Morris L. Radoff, *The County Courthouses and Records of Maryland*, Part One: The Courthouses, p. 61.

¹² Mathew P. Andrews, *History of Maryland, Province and State*, pp. 224-273.

¹³ Hayden, "Port Tobacco," pp. 267-269.

¹⁴ Paul Wilstach, *Tidewater Maryland*, p. 94.

¹⁵ Hayden, "Port Tobacco," p. 267.

¹⁶ Everett B. Wilson, *Maryland's Colonial Mansions and Other Early Homes*, p. 218.

¹⁷ By the rules of their Order, Jesuits were

not permitted to hold land individually. For further information see Mathew Page Andrews, *Founding of Maryland*, pp. 163-169.

¹⁸ Wilstach, *Tidewater Maryland*, p. 102.

¹⁹ Hayden, "Port Tobacco," p. 271.

²⁰ Literature published by St. Ignatius' Catholic Church.

²¹ Wilson, *Colonial Mansions*, p. 221.

²² Hayden, "Port Tobacco," p. 274.

²³ *The Counties of Maryland and Baltimore City*, p. 43.

²⁴ Wilson, *Colonial Mansions*, p. 216.

²⁵ Wilson, p. 223.

²⁶ *The Restoration of Mount Carmel in Maryland*.

²⁷ Alexander Hamilton, "Post-Revolutionary Letters," p. 23.

²⁸ Radoff, *Courthouses*, p. 71.

²⁹ Radoff, p. 71.

³⁰ Wilstach, *Tidewater Maryland*, p. 143.

³¹ Wilson, *Colonial Mansions*, p. 217.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrews, Mathew P., *Founding of Maryland*, New York, D. Appleton-Century Company, 1933.

Andrews, Mathew P., *History of Maryland, Province and State*, Hatboro, Pennsylvania, Traditional Press, 1965.

Blanchard, Fessenden S., and William T. Stone, *A Cruising Guide to the Chesapeake*, New York, Dodd, Mead and Company, 1968.

———, *The Counties of Maryland and Baltimore City*, Baltimore, State Planning Department, 1968.

Footner, Hulbert, *Maryland Main and the Eastern Shore*, New York, D. Appleton-Century Company, Inc., 1942.

Gutheim, Frederick, *The Potomac*, New York, Grosset and Dunlap, 1968.

Hayden, Ethel Roby, "Port Tobacco, Last Town of Maryland," *Maryland Historical Magazine*, XL (1940), 261-76, Baltimore, Maryland Historical Society, 1940.

Kenny, Hamill, *The Origin and Meaning of the Indian Place Names of Maryland*.

Land, Aubrey C., *The Dulaneys of Maryland*, Baltimore, The Johns Hopkins Press, 1968.

———, *Maryland Historical Magazine*, LXII (June 1967), Baltimore, Maryland Historical Society, 1967.

———, *Maryland Historical Magazine*, LXIII (March 1968), Baltimore, Maryland Historical Society, 1967.

Maryland's Writers, Project, *Maryland, A Guide to the Old Line State*, New York, Oxford University Press, c. 1940.

Radoff, Morris L., *The County Courthouses and Records of Maryland*, Part One: The Courthouses, Annapolis, The Hall of Records Commissions State of Maryland, 1960.

The Restoration of Mount Carmel in Maryland, literature published by the Society for the Restoration of Port Tobacco, Port Tobacco, Maryland.

St. Ignatius' Catholic Church, literature published by St. Ignatius' Catholic Church, Port Tobacco, Maryland, 1966.

Wilson, Everett B., *Maryland's Colonial Mansions and Other Early Homes*, New York, A. S. Barnes and Company, Inc., c. 1965.

Wilstach, Paul, *Tidewater Maryland*, Indianapolis, The Bobb-Merrill Company, 1931.

COLLEGE OF WILLIAM AND MARY TOLD TO LOWER STANDARDS

HON. WATKINS M. ABBITT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Speaker, press reports over the weekend have revealed that the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has blatantly de-

manded that the College of William and Mary take extraordinary steps to achieve a degree of integration which will satisfy the bureaucrats in the Office of Education.

According to the information available, HEW has insisted that the College of William and Mary, the Nation's second oldest educational institution, expand its efforts to achieve integration and if necessary lower its academic standards in order that more black students may qualify.

This points up once again the ridiculous position in which many educational institutions now find themselves as a result of edicts by HEW. Through its maze of guidelines and inconsistent pronouncements the Office of Education is attempting to establish percentage goals which many institutions find impossible to meet. The College of William and Mary has long been noted for its fine academic standards and its students come from all over the United States and from other countries as well. It does not exclude students of any race and accepts freely all those who seek enrollment, so long as they are able to meet the qualifications. Under this program, William and Mary has attained a substantial degree of integration of its facilities. Now, HEW is not satisfied—and seeks to substitute its own guideline in place of those established by the college administration. This is a pattern of operation which, if carried to its logical conclusion, would turn over the admissions policy of practically every school in the country to the HEW headquarters in Washington. Certainly we do not want to see this happen and if it ever should, control of our education would no longer be in the hands of the individual schools but left to the whims and fancies of fuzzy-thinking bureaucrats.

Last year I introduced a bill which would provide that any school which lowered its academic standards in order to take in otherwise unqualified students would lose its eligibility for Federal assistance. I believe very strongly that legislation of this type is very desirable in the times in which we live. It is now obvious, however, that even more stringent steps need to be taken to protect the schools from the Federal Government itself. I propose to go into this matter very fully and have strongly protested this action to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. It seems to me that we cannot afford to let steps of this kind go unchallenged.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT HEARINGS

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, at this time, I would like to insert in the RECORD a letter sent by the National Association of Women Lawyers, dated September 14, 1970, to the Honorable JAMES O. EASTLAND, chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary, and an article carried

in the New York Times. Raised are certain questions as to the selection and scheduling of witnesses before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the equal rights amendment. The items follow:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
WOMEN LAWYERS,
Chicago, Ill., September 14, 1970.

HON. JAMES O. EASTLAND,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, U.S.
Senate, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As members of the legal profession, we feel obligated to call your attention to patently biased actions in the selection and scheduling of witnesses for the Judiciary Committee hearings held September 9, 10, 11 (and to be held September 15) on the Equal Rights Amendment, under the chairmanship of Senator Sam. J. Ervin—and to protest the denial of a "day in court" to our organizations and to others who wished to be heard as proponents.

The three days during which Senator Ervin presided heard exclusively witnesses preselected as opponents of the measure, and who testified against it, with one surprising exception. We submit that the procedures followed, under your delegation of authority have reflected discreditably upon the Senate Committee on the Judiciary.

On May 5, 6 and 7, full-scale hearings were held before the Sub-Committee on Constitutional Amendments, on S.J. Res. 61. Both proponents and opponents were heard each day, alternately. Only Senators Birch Bayh, presiding, and Senator Marlow Cook attended regularly. Senator Ervin did not attend at all.

After passage of H.J. Res. 264 and its placement on the Senate Calendar by the Majority and Minority leaders, the Judiciary Committee, at request of Senator Ervin, announced additional "public hearings on September 9, 10, 11 by the full Committee" on S.J. Res. 231 and on H.J. Res. 264, purportedly "to elicit opinions from constitutional experts" and "enlist aid of competent constitutional scholars" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, 8-21-70, p. 29672).

Nevertheless, the first witness called by Senator Ervin on September 9 was not a lawyer, and was one who had testified at the May hearings, the Vice President of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union. In fact, only three of the eight witnesses scheduled during these three days, all invited as opponents, were law professors or scholars.

It was only after repeated requests from various sources that the hearings were extended to September 14 and 15 in order to give the PROPONENTS an opportunity to be heard. When the tentative list for those days was ascertained by arduous and persistent effort, it was revealed that 8 to 10 witnesses were listed for each of those two days—i.e. the same number in one day as had had three days to present the opposition.

The National Association of Women Lawyers and The Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia were denied any opportunity to testify either day, and were expected to be mollified by the assurance that we might "file a statement for the record." The delays and uncertainties about when, and if, appearances would be arranged were especially inconvenient upon witnesses who would come from Florida and Ohio, or other distant places. We mention the following, in the field of law, as having been so treated and as having had appearance denied or cancelled completely at the last minute (although these hearings were to devote legal questions):

The Women's Bar Association of the District of Columbia—(signatory to this letter)—one of the largest such groups, with some 400 members in the Metropolitan Washington area.

The National Association of Women Law-

yers—only national bar for women in the legal profession—has representation in the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association.

The Women's Equity Action League—civil rights for women in employment and education engaged in court test cases on sex discrimination.

Dr. Paul Murray, attorney and legal scholar, Brandeis University.

Miss Marguerite Rawalt, former President of the Federal Bar Association and of the National Association of Women Lawyers.

United Automobile Workers of America, Counsel Bernard Ashe, who has been on amicus briefs in test cases under Title VII.

National Organization for Women, Regional Vice President, Miami, and other organizations whose membership includes "housewives and mothers" who stand FOR the amendment and whose requests to testify were not honored:

The General Federation of Women's Clubs—800,000 members in over 14,000 clubs in the United States, largest organization of women in the world—international president denied listing.

National Federation of Republican Women's Clubs—with thousands of members actively supporting the Amendment—denied listing.

Soroptimist Federation of America—largest organization in the world of women in executive positions.

Many advocates, denied opportunity to be heard, have expressed their feeling that they have been treated with disdain, not to say contempt, and certainly in a manner designed to weaken their espousal before the Senate and the public. And this under the aegis of the Committee of the highest legislative body, the Committee which is the watchdog for the nation over judicial due process.

We make the observation that had the desire to elicit opinions from constitutional experts and scholars been sincerely paramount, the witness list should have been weighted with such persons. The fact is that out of a total of 23 witnesses scheduled, there were six law professors and an additional four attorneys, while the two leading bar associations of women lawyers, and three organizations active in test litigation involving sex discrimination, were cancelled out or never scheduled at all.

On the second day of hearings, Senator Ervin announced that he would not chair the hearings agreed to be extended to September 14 and 15 in order to let the proponents be heard. He asked Senator Marlow Cook, the only other Senator attending these hearings, to preside. Senator Cook could not be available on September 14, but readily agreed to preside over September 15 hearings. Apparently, no other member of the Committee was willing to chair the 14th meeting. Six witnesses for the amendment were thus foreclosed from testifying, with cancellation of that day's hearings. This summarily cancelled out two outstanding women lawyers one of whom was the only black woman witness. Further, the only two bar associations of women lawyers were denied any opportunity to appear, despite the focus on developing the constitutional ramifications. Another cancellation important to the proponents was that of the Counsel for the United Automobile Workers International, the representative of millions of workers, and the leading labor union advocate of the Equal Rights Amendment.

To lawyers, such manipulated arrangements translate into a denial of due process and a cause for righteous indignation. When eight amendment opponents, upholding the views of the chair (with one unexpected exception) were allowed three days time to testify, while sixteen proponents were limited to two days, only to have half of them summarily cancelled out entirely and the other

eight compacted into one day, this may well be labelled with the opponents' favorite phrase as a "blunderbuss approach" (Note: chairman and opposition witnesses repeatedly called the Equal Rights Amendment a "blunderbuss approach" to equality of rights).

It is submitted that this one-sided testimony for which wide press coverage was prearranged, has unjustifiably promulgated the negative view to the public. Since the House-passed Resolution is scheduled for debate the last week of September, since we are informed that your Committee is meeting September 16 to consider this matter, and since we do not desire any postponement of full Senate consideration, we do not ask for extended hearings or any other action that might postpone full Senate consideration.

We trust the Committee will do what it can to rectify the damage done our just cause by the unfair hearings conducted in its name by reporting favorably on Wednesday the Equal Rights Amendment as originally introduced in both Houses. The tenor of the Senate Committee report can reflect the favorable testimony offered by legal authorities that will otherwise not be known to the Senate or the public.

Respectfully yours,

MARGARET LAURENCE,
National Legislation Chairman, National
Association of Women Lawyers.

MARGARET BELLER,
President, Women's Bar Association of
the District of Columbia.

[From the New York Times, Sept. 13, 1970]

EQUAL RIGHTS: WHO IS AGAINST IT AND WHY

WASHINGTON.—Prof. Leo Kanowitz of the University of New Mexico Law School testified before Congress last week in favor of the equal rights amendment to the Constitution, but it was all a terrible mistake.

He had been invited to appear before the Senate Judiciary Committee because Senator Sam J. Ervin, Jr., Democrat of North Carolina, the leading opponent of the amendment, had the mistaken impression that the professor, too, opposed the amendment, which would prohibit the denial of any legal right to any person because of sex.

Professor Kanowitz thus turned out to be the only favorable witness in three long days of hearings in which Senator Ervin sought to establish that the enactment of the amendment would mean that husbands would no longer be required to support their wives and children and that such sex distinctions as separate prisons and separate public toilets would be declared illegal—arguments that supporters of the amendment say are simply ridiculous.

That Senator Ervin has "staked" the hearing is demonstrable. He has started off with the opposition witnesses, contrary to usual Congressional practice, and is apparently planning to use the excuse of the press of other Senate business to limit the testimony of favorable witnesses to a single day this week.

PRESIDES AT HEARING

As he has presided over the hearing (he is not the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, but James O. Eastland of Mississippi, who is the chairman, has let him act as chairman in this case), Senator Ervin has shown that he shares scarcely a single idea or principle with the backers of the amendment. In the packed committee hearing room, it is almost possible to hear the amendment's advocates grind their teeth in anger and frustration as the Senator takes off on one of his oratorical flights concerning the "good Lord's plan" that men and women should be different.

However, not everyone who opposes the amendment holds to the Senator's view that, even today the place of most women is in the home. One witness who disagreed most

emphatically—but was nevertheless perhaps the most forceful of all the week's opposition witnesses—was Myra K. Wolfgang, a labor union leader from Detroit. Mrs. Wolfgang is a national and local officer of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders Union, and she is no "pussycat" embracing the idea that domination by males is her natural and happy fate.

She told Senator Ervin, at one point, that the men in the union movement were just like men elsewhere—"full of male chauvinism."

But Mrs. Wolfgang opposes the equal rights amendment because she believes it would hurt the working women that she represents. Specifically, she fears it would wipe off the books state laws that set maximum daily and weekly hours of work for women, but none for men. Women, she said, need more protection than men from the demands of employers that they work large quantities of overtime—60 hours a week, and more—because when their day's work on the assembly line or in the laundry or hotel is done, they have to go home and cook and clean and take care of children.

And, she continued, the husbands of these working-class women rarely give them any help.

With a jerk of her head toward the college-educated women who were filling most of the seats in the hearing room, she went on to say that 10-hour days might be all right for "lady lawyers" and other women in the professional and managerial fields, whose jobs are not physically exhausting, who can pay for household help, whose husbands are more disposed to lend a hand at home and whose children, if any, are probably grown.

Mrs. Wolfgang's testimony thus highlighted the fact that much of the opinion on the equal rights amendment may be dividing on what amounts to class lines.

The relatively affluent, educated women who are supporting the equal rights amendment feel strongly that even laws that genuinely protect women should not be retained

only for women because, as long as women are protected from certain hardships, they will also be looked down upon, and kept down, both professionally and personally. They will take their chances, willingly, with any hardships that true equality brings.

Mrs. Wolfgang's view is that such women do not know what real hardship is and that she is not about to risk such hardship for working class women for the sake of some theory about equality.

Professor Kanowitz has quite a different answer, shared by many of the amendment's advocates—namely, that the risk to the working class woman really is not great because states probably would not invalidate the maximum hours laws for women but would, instead, extend them to men.

This argument appeared likely to become the central issue over which the amendment is fought in the Senate. Eighty Senators—much more than the required two-thirds—had signed their names as sponsors of the amendment. But that was back when no one in the Senate thought the amendment would ever get through the House, which it did last month.

Now, however, Senators know their votes on this issue will matter. Many are troubled by some of the arguments that was highlighted last week. Whether the supporters will be able to answer them all in their brief day before the committee remains to be seen. The equal rights amendment has been placed on the "must" list for consideration by the Senate before it adjourns this year.

STRIKING GENERAL MOTORS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, September 28, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, as the strike by the United Auto Workers Union

against General Motors Corp. continues, the adverse impact on the economy, on the employees of the company, and certainly on consumers of General Motors' products cannot be minimized. An extremely objective and penetrating editorial commentary by WBBM-TV, channel 2 in Chicago on September 17 sets the strike in its proper perspective:

STRIKING GENERAL MOTORS

A long strike at General Motors Corporation by the United Auto Workers Union could cause new dislocation of the economy. There are predictions the strike will last six to eight weeks . . . and this could hurt the nation. The Wall Street Journal points out such a strike could imperil the recovery of the economy . . . could cause layoffs in plants dependent on General Motors . . . raise the total unemployment figure and make consumers cautious about spending extra funds.

General Motors sells nearly 20 billion dollars worth of products in the United States annually . . . spends over 13 billion dollars on services and materials—including 10 percent of the nation's steel output.

We haven't even mentioned the inflationary effect a costly settlement at General Motors and at the other auto companies and the rise in car prices might have on the total economy. The government has always stayed out of autoworkers' strikes . . . but we believe it should be jumping into this walkout.

We believe the administration should have set wage-price guidelines in the past—should have worked harder to forestall this strike. We believe it could enunciate guidelines for settlement now . . . certainly insist on continuous bargaining.

The public has a major role in this confrontation between the two giants of labor and management . . . and its voice should be heard through its government.

The government does not work for General Motors or the UAW alone, but also for you.

SENATE—Tuesday, September 29, 1970

The Senate met at 12 noon and was called to order by the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The Reverend Horace Churchman Lukens, pastor, the Presbyterian Church, Vienna, Va., offered the following prayer:

Almighty and gracious God, who dost overrule the affairs of men and nations, grant the presence of Thy spirit in the Senate of our beloved country.

Deliver us from the pressures of the moment. Guide us by Thy humility and wisdom.

When we are weary in well-doing, refresh us with Thy power. Bring wholeness to our tortured spirits. Clear our minds with Thy truth and move our wills into Thy will.

Send Thy gifts upon us, the spirit of openness to Thee, the spirit of honesty and love, the spirit of understanding and forgiveness.

Feed our hearts with Thy love and guide our minds in the way of peace.

Heal our land, O God, and make us a people pleasing to Thee, who hast demonstrated Thy saving mercy in Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

CXVI—2142—Part 25

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, September 28, 1970, be dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DIRECT POPULAR ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND THE VICE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair now lays before the Senate the unfinished business of the previous day, which will be stated.

The assistant legislative clerk read as follows: Senate Joint Resolution 1, proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the election of the President and the Vice President.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution.

CONTROLLED TIME UNDER CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the order entered on Friday, Septem-

ber 25, 1970, the first hour of today's session will be equally divided between the Senator from Montana (Mr. MANSFIELD) and the minority leader, the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. SCOTT).

Who yields time?

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I yield myself 1 minute before I turn the time over to the distinguished Senator from Indiana (Mr. BAYH).

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Montana is recognized for 1 minute.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Finance, the Committee on Commerce, and the Subcommittee on Public Lands of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

Mr. BAYH, Mr. President, although it is with great reluctance, consistency compels the Senator from Indiana, who realizes the pressures and the obligations of the majority leader, to object.