

1. In responding to your questionnaire, I am taking the liberty to differentiate between OEO funds, HEW funds and Labor Department funds. Response is as follows:

A. Present funding level:

OEO	-----	\$336,687
HEW	-----	261,804
Labor Department	-----	93,000
Grand total	-----	691,491

B. OEO's reduced funding level; reduced funding will be in Local Initiative Funds at approximately \$13,000 to \$19,000.

C. Reasons given by OEO for cut in funds; failure of Congress to make appropriations.

D. Impact on program; decrease in Local Initiative funds would mean loss of personnel and services provided to the low-income. It would mean complete shut-down of certain Program Accounts.

2. Please estimate what funding level would be necessary to maintain your present program, in terms of a percentage increase in present budget.

We would estimate conservatively that a 10 percent increase would be necessary to maintain the present program operations.

3. What percentage of the eligible or needy population are you now serving?

We would estimate that we are serving approximately 65 percent of our needy population.

I should mention here that the agency will not experience any cut in its Head Start budget as we have been funded for this Program Year. However, we are opposed to any cuts that may be planned for the future and support all efforts to defeat plans to cut the Head Start budget.

Sincerely,

ERNEST D. DENNY,  
Executive Director.

## EMERGENCY FOOD PROGRAM

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. President, as we consider appropriations for the Office of Economic Opportunity, I would like to share some of my experience with OEO use of funds available to alleviate hunger. It is a subject I feel particularly close to.

As Federal feeding programs go, the budget for the emergency food and medical services program is one of the smallest. But the impact of that program is enormous. The emergency food program was established out of the desperate need presented to this body in the first of the hunger hearings, in 1967. There were Federal feeding efforts then, as now; and then, as now, there were eligible and needy individuals for whom the available programs were not working. The emergency food program was instituted to help those programs better meet existing needs, and to support efforts to improve national nutrition.

Unlike the food stamp and commodity distribution programs, emergency food has concentrated on using small amounts of money to experiment and to demonstrate methods for improving overall program operation. Its projects will make it possible for the food dollars in our larger programs to do a better job. Last year the program supported some 400 projects. Food services were provided to individuals at a rough cost of \$10 per person. Badly needed information in areas like food enrichment, school lunch research, nutrition education, how poor

people spend their food dollars was developed. These projects will help us improve the operation of all of our family feeding efforts, and upgrade the nutritional status of the general public.

The return we will realize in national nutrition, in more rational planning, and in improved nutrition for all American schoolchildren, is incalculable. It is for such ends that we vote today to strengthen the OEO appropriations.

## RECOGNITION OF SENATOR GOODELL TOMORROW

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, immediately following the disposition of the reading of the Journal and any unobjected-to-items on the legislative calendar, the Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) be recognized for not to exceed 20 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

## ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 10 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn in accordance with the previous order.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 19, 1970, at 10 a.m.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### MILITARY MEN IN SPACE

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently an article entitled "Military Produces Space Heroes" written by my good friend, Col. William C. Moore, vice-commander of Headquarters Command, U.S. Air Force, Bolling Field, Washington, D.C., appeared in the Air Force Times. Because so very few people realize the great contribution the military has made to our space program, I include the article in the RECORD at this point:

#### MILITARY PRODUCES SPACE HEROES

(By Col. William C. Moore)

Two national heroes retired from the USAF recently. Col. Frank Bowman, commander of Apollo VIII, which orbited the moon and blazed the trail for Neil Armstrong's moon landing, ended 20 years of AF service July 18. Eight of those years were with the space program.

Col. Leroy Gordon Cooper, one of the original seven astronauts and commander of "Faith 7," the last of the Mercury flights, retired at Ellington AFB, Tex., July 31 following 21 years' service, 11 with the space program.

Each received the Legion of Merit. The citations emphasized their military service along with their service to the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The U.S. space effort is essentially a non-military program oriented to peaceful purposes, and from its beginning the military contribution has received limited public recognition. Military men assigned to NASA seldom wear their uniforms.

However, at a recent ceremony at the Manned Space Center in Houston, at which 70 military men with NASA received military medals for their service to the space program, all wore their uniforms.

For some who had been in the space program for as long as 11 years it was a rare occasion. They had never seen so many uniforms. Some didn't realize so many military men were working with the space program.

Little public attention has been given to the fact that, of the 73 astronauts who have been selected for the space program, 49 are military—25 Air Force, 19 Navy and 5 Marine.

Twenty-four are civilians. Of these, only Neil Armstrong, John Swigert, Russell Schweickart, Walter Cunningham and Fred Haise have flown. All are ex-military pilots—Armstrong and Haise, Navy; Swigert and Schweickart, Air Force; Cunningham, Marines.

Less public attention has been given to 165 other military men, including 150 USAF, who work for NASA. These men range in rank from sergeant to lieutenant general (Sam Phillips, who returned to a military assignment after the moon landing is the lieutenant general). Many have seen service in Vietnam.

Their military expertise is far ranging: radio biologist, aerospace trajectory analyst, lunar surface operations officer, space radiation technician, Apollo flight planning engineer, lunar module vehicle engineer, physical training supervisor.

The lack of recognition for their part in the space program understandably annoys people in the military services who would like to identify themselves and their service with the heroes of the space age. Marines still grimace when recalling John Glenn's ticker-tape parade down Broadway in a business suit. To them he was a Marine. He was the product of a system that gave him the stuff of which heroes are made. To all Marines, the uniform which is symbolic of the system, deserved the accolades as much as John Glenn.

Marines didn't know the character of Colonel Glenn before he was a Marine. But they know what the system gave his character: Self-discipline, resourcefulness, elan, cool courage, competence, pride, self-reliance, technical expertise—all the things so essential to being a hero.

A Navy system not unlike the Marine's produced Wally Schirra, Charles Conrad and Alan Shepard. The nerves of Wally Schirra, who performed the first rendezvous in space with such precision and self-reliance, were conditioned long before by the exacting standards demanded by the Navy in routine formation flying.

An Air Force system not unlike those of the Navy's and Marine's produced Frank Borman, Gordon Cooper, Buzz Aldrin and Gus Grissom. Long before he made his lonely, record-breaking orbit in "Faith 7", Gordon Cooper had been conditioned to the loneliness and apprehension he would experience in orbit by flying as an Air Force "fighter jock" in single-place fighters having only one engine. Frank Borman was conditioned in "Beast Barracks" and "Plebe Year" at West Point where he adopted the motto "Duty,

Honor, Country" as his life-long code long before he devoted every minute and every hour to each word in that code during the days he and his crew became the first to orbit the moon.

Tom Stafford, now Chief Astronaut, is a product of two systems, having graduated from the Naval Academy and now serving in the Air Force as a colonel.

The military systems that produced the heroes of today's space age are not much changed from those that produced yesterday's heroes whose exploits were in the interest of building the nation; Captain Lewis and Lieutenant Clark, along with other adventurers and fighting men who won and opened the West; Adms. Evans and Sperry, leaders of President Teddy Roosevelt's good-will voyage of the Great White Fleet; Gen. George Goethals and the building of the Panama Canal; Army Gen. William Gorgas and the fight against malaria and yellow fever; Commodore Perry and the opening of Japan; Adm. Richard Byrd and his exploration of the Arctic and Antarctic; General Lindbergh, who learned to fly in the Army Air Service only two years before his epic flight to Paris.

Today the system that produced the men to do all these things is much maligned. Never has the military been so badly treated. Never has its image been so poor.

Yet the system will continue to produce men like Frank Borman and Gordon Cooper, who have now retired. They have received the accolades heroes deserve. It is sad to report that the system that produced them has not.

## NEW IMPETUS FOR "NEW TOWNS"

### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the decay of the quality of life in our urban areas has produced a trend in the establishment of planned cities.

The trend is not widespread but it does offer one alternative to the housing and residential patterns that have become so widespread.

I have followed some of these developments with interest and in a recent article, George Favre reports on one of the more successful "new towns," Columbia. He reports that progress in Columbia is not overwhelming but compared to other cities it does seem to offer a promise for an improved quality of life.

I commend this article to the readers of the RECORD:

PREPLANNED DEVELOPMENTS: NEW IMPETUS FOR "NEW TOWNS"

(By George H. Favre)

COLUMBIA, Md.—Urbanists who said the postwar committee to build "new towns" had been canceled by high land, labor, and financing costs may have been a bit hasty.

There are hints of new life in the "new town" movement. The towns of Columbia, Md., Reston, Va., and Irvine, Calif., are the prototypes of totally preplanned developments that include homes; recreational facilities, shopping and business areas, and schools. These "new towns" were conceived as a better alternative to the sprawling growth taking place throughout the United States.

The latest sign that more Columbias, Restons, and Irvines may yet be built comes from Congress. The Senate now has passed

an omnibus housing bill that included \$240 million for "new town" development. If it survives in the joint committee compromise version, builders will be encouraged to float bond issues for "new town" efforts, knowing that the funds are there to back the bond issues and help pay interest costs.

In face of this prospect, the now existing new towns are bound to get more scrutiny than ever.

Columbia, Md., is as good a place to start as any. Planned and built by the Rouse Company of Baltimore, it combines the planning idealism of James Rouse, company president, with his hard economic realism.

#### COMPROMISE REACHED

The result is not an architectural tour de force, as was the original concept of Reston, Va. It is a compromise, combining the ideal of maximum open space, convenience, and livability with the architectural orthodoxy that best suits midstream American tastes.

On those terms, Columbia is a success. More important, it succeeds handsomely in the profit area which, in this capitalist society, is, after all, where it's at.

Three years and three months have passed since the first resident moved into Columbia.

In that period the town has begun to develop growing pains. They could be termed the signs of early urban puberty.

Political activity is still in the earliest struggle stages, a chick pecking the first opening in the walls of the corporate shell. As the town grows and the parent company disengages itself—another six to eight years—these spasms may be expected to increase in regularity and intensity.

#### COUNTY PLAYS ROLE

Columbians now number 10,000. That means they already make up one-fifth of the population of rural Howard County, to which the town looks for most of its services. Though the county welcomed this prodigious infant into its family of communities (it had little choice; Mr. Rouse bought up the land quietly and presented the county with a fait accompli) it must face the day when Columbia will dominate it by sheer force of numbers.

Eventually the town will reach 110,000 citizens, double the county's entire present population. The adjustments to this new political reality will most certainly incur tensions along the way.

Racially, Columbia comes close to an ideal mix, so far. While Rouse Company keeps no ethnic census—to do so would invite manifold problems, since some 30 nationalities are already represented in its citizenry—a rough estimate of 15 to 20 percent nonwhite residents appears to exist.

#### NO ABRASIVE INCIDENTS

If racial tensions exist, they have yet to surface in any deeply abrasive way.

Yet there are feelings that more blacks should be represented in the "village" association boards, in the ranks of businessmen who service the town, and—curiously—in the ranks of Rouse Company employees. James Rouse is a committed integrationist. It was he who set the policy of full integration in the new town. It is he who sees that the policy is carried out.

But as yet, there is only one black businessman in town. Robert Harper is owner of a dry-cleaning establishment in the village of Oakland Mills.

Robin Harper, his attractive and thoughtfully spoken college-age daughter, is an enthusiastic Columbian. "We love it here," she told a visitor, adding that her family finds it a totally different experience from East Baltimore, where they had lived.

#### SUBSIDIZED HOUSING PLANNED

She admits there have been incidents that could be interpreted as racist. While blacks

live in a totally desegregated pattern and mix freely with whites, she says, "It took my father three years to get in here. We think the delay was unnecessary. And when you apply for housing, you don't see blacks working in the sales offices."

Economically the mix is lower- to upper-middle income. There are few really low-income families, for the obvious reason that they cannot afford Columbia housing. But subsidized low-income housing does exist, and more will be built.

Perhaps the "new town's" biggest challenge lies with its young people. The Rouse Company, through the Columbia Park and Recreation Association, provides teen centers, swimming pools, and a host of social and recreational services. Even so, many teen-agers complain there is "nothing to do."

Drugs are available and in wide use. The problem is an open one, openly discussed. A series of hard-rock concerts, held in the magnificently located outdoor music shed this summer, had to be curtailed because of violence and wide-open drug peddling.

#### SELF-CONTAINED CITY

Despite the problems, which are the same problems of almost any suburb, Columbia is a living, breathing community of people. It works. Compared with most suburbs, it works exceptionally well.

Rouse Company officials do not think of Columbia as a suburb. It was designed with loving care to be a self-sustaining city, economically independent of either Washington or Baltimore, though it lies astraddle U.S. 29, halfway between both.

When Columbia reaches its goal of 110,000 residents, it will be a city in fact as well as a name. Currently it is quintessentially suburban. Most of its breadwinners work in one of the two larger cities. But when fully developed, an anticipated 65,000 jobs will mean Columbia will have its own suburbs and be a net importer of workers.

For now, says housewife Brenda Ericsson, "I think of it as a suburb, but more exciting than Greenbelt [Md.] where we lived before. We really love it, being in on the beginning of something new." As she watched her two children dance around the edge of a fountain in the Wilde Lake village center, she added:

"Of course, it is still a company-owned town. We don't yet have the political control we would like. But that will come in a few years. Even so, I'm more interested in community affairs here than I was in Greenbelt."

## CAMPUS VIOLENCE ANALYZED

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, unemotional discourse on the problem of campus violence has become the exception rather than the rule. After observing numerous campaigns nationwide that threw much heat but little light on this problem, I found the following article to be most refreshing. I recommend it to my colleagues as "must" reading:

[From the New York Times Magazine, Nov. 8, 1970]

THE UNHOLY ALLIANCE AGAINST THE CAMPUS (By Kenneth Keniston and Michael Lerner)

American higher education is taking a beating from political extremists of both the right and the left, and the beating is having its intended effect. Polls show that Americans are fed up with campus unrest, which they



consider the nation's No. 2 problem. During the political campaign, politicians found that attacking "violent students" and "lax faculty members" was an excellent way to win votes.

The most highly publicized attacks on the universities have come from the right wing. The Administration's acrimonious alliteration has barnstormed the country, blaming campus disorders on "the disgusting permissiveness of campus officials." Gov. Ronald Reagan agrees: "The campus . . . has now become the arena for oppression by revolutionaries, vandals, arsonists and terrorists." And Martha Mitchell, the wife of the Attorney General, summed up the views of many rightists when she said: "The academic society is responsible for all our troubles in this country. These are the people that are destroying our country."

But the attack on higher education from the extreme left is just as vehement. "American universities are absolutely central components of the social system of technological warfare-welfare capitalism," says an S.D.S. pamphlet. According to the Free Speech Movement in Berkeley in 1964, the student is a mere "mercenary, paid off in grades, status and degrees, all of which can eventually be cashed in for hard currency on the job market. . . . Credits for courses are subtly transformed into credit cards as the multiversity inculcates the values of acquisitive society." Said a radical Harvard student recently: "It isn't just one man . . . it's a lot of men who sit on the Corporation, who have certain interests. They may not think such nasty thoughts all the time, but they do things that are a lot nastier. And they don't come down to see us; they send their pigs down here to do it for them."

Behind their superficial differences in rhetoric, right-wing and left-wing extremists are in astonishing agreement about higher education. First, they agree that campus discipline is unjust and politically motivated—for the rightist, it is permissive; for the leftist, it is repressive. Second, they agree that universities systematically indoctrinate their students with abhorrent political ideas—for the rightist, with radical and revolutionary ideas; for the leftist, with the values of the welfare-warfare state. Third, they agree that American higher education has become "politicized"—for the rightist, into a launching pad for revolution; for the leftist, into a tool of the military-industrial Establishment. In short, the radical extremes are allied in blaming the campuses for unrest.

Many Americans reject these extreme charges. But they are aware that higher education has myriad failings—the multiversity is impersonal; educational quality is often poor; many campuses have been inadequately prepared for disorders when they came. Thus, even though they reject the extremist attacks, many people have been persuaded that the shortcomings of the campus are a crucial cause of campus disruption, and that campus reforms would lessen or perhaps eliminate the disorders that have swept higher education.

But this conclusion, however plausible it seems, is incorrect. We have examined hundreds of studies of student protesters, of the institutions where protest occurred, of the attitudes of students and faculty members toward protest issues and of the consequences of protest. These studies support neither the extremists' charges nor, more important, the view that campus reforms will significantly affect campus unrest.

There is a widespread impression, created by the mass media and reinforced by certain politicians, that disruptive and violent disorders are typical of campus unrest.

In fact, the overwhelming majority of campus protests in recent years have been peaceful, orderly and clearly within the bounds of dissent protected by the First Amendment of the Constitution. A study of campus protests in 1968-69 showed that more

than three-quarters of America's 2,500 colleges and universities experienced either no protests at all or peaceful protests. Violent protests involving property damage or personal injury occurred on fewer than 7 per cent of all campuses. During the last academic year, the American Council on Education found that incidents occurred on two-thirds of all campuses, but only about 9 per cent reported violence. And last May, after Cambodia, Kent State and Jackson State, only 4 per cent of 1,800 college presidents reported violent protests on their campuses. The evidence, then, is clear: violent and disorderly protests are the exception, not the rule, in American higher education.

Furthermore, the absolute number of protests on American campuses has not increased dramatically in the last six years. From a 1964-65 study of 849 colleges, we can estimate that there were about 370 student protests per 100 colleges. A roughly comparable study conducted in 1969-70 showed only a small rise to 386 protests per 100 colleges.

How, then, has the impression been created that an ever-larger proportion of campus protest involves illegality and disorder? What are the facts?

The number of campus protests concerned with social, political and off-campus issues has increased sharply in recent years. In 1964-65, only 34 per cent of protests concerned off-campus issues. But in the last academic year, more than 80 per cent of all incidents involved issues like the war, racial policies and ecology. A survey of college presidents showed that in May this year 57 per cent judged that Cambodia, Kent State and Jackson State had had a "significant impact" on their campuses.

Where violence has occurred, it has become increasingly intense. On the one hand, there have been more incidents of burning, trashing (i.e., systematic window smashing) and bombing—although many of them have not been perpetrated by students. On the other hand, these incidents have led to greatly increased police and National Guard intervention and to the unwarranted violence of civil authorities at Kent State and Jackson State. The percentage of campuses reporting students arrested increased from less than five in 1968-69 to almost twelve in 1969-70.

American students show diminishing confidence in the ability of established institutions to achieve social changes that students consider increasingly necessary. For example, in May, 1970, 75 per cent of American college students agreed that "basic changes in the system will be necessary" to improve the quality of life in America, while only 19 per cent believed this country "is currently on the right track." More important, 44 per cent maintained that "social progress" was more likely to occur through "radical pressure from outside the system" than through the "major institutions in our system—government, business, etc."

Last year saw the rise of a new urban terrorism initiated by a tiny handful of young, mostly nonstudent extremists. The killing of a graduate student in the terrorist bombing of the Mathematics Research Center at the University of Wisconsin is the most dramatic symbol of the emergence of groups willing to use violence systematically. Even more disturbing is the attitude of a minority of students who condone terrorism.

Political rhetoric and selective reporting by the mass media thus conceal the real complexity of the situation on the campuses. The average protest was no more likely to be violent last year than the year before. There has been no major increase in the number of protests, although their focus has shifted dramatically to off-campus, social and political issues. But in a few protests, the level of violence on the side of both students and the police has increased greatly. And students are more convinced of the need for "basic change" in society but less confident

of the capacity of "the system" to produce it. Terrorism has increased, and a minority of students is unwilling to condemn terrorist activities.

But political rhetoric thrives on oversimplification. The media, too, portray the dramatic confrontations but not the far more common peaceful protests. The terrorist acts of an infinitesimal fraction of one per cent of young people are used to condemn the majority of students. Neglected in this oversimplification is the fact that the vast majority of American students, at the same time they become more frustrated, more opposed to the war and less confident of basic American institutions, have so far remained committed to peaceful dissent.

Most American students, then, like most of the American public, are caught in a pincer movement between the extreme right and the extreme left. On the one hand, rightist politicians tar all student protestors with the brush of terrorism. On the other hand, the handful of terrorists are equally eager to identify peaceful dissent with guerrilla warfare and to persuade Americans that there is no middle ground. Each extreme feeds on the other in what Clark Kerr, not noted for overstatement, has called an "unholy alliance against democracy." Without real student violence, the extremists of the right could not call for repression, and without the violent call to repression by the extreme right, left-wing terrorists would find little support among their fellows.

In the middle are 99 per cent of American students, constantly told that they either are or must be violent. Erik Erikson long ago suggested that if you label a person with opprobrium long enough, he will eventually accept this "negative identity." Together, the extremists of the right and the left who dominate the headlines are helping enforce an identity of violence upon students. At the same time, these extremists are succeeding in convincing other Americans either that peaceful dissent is unjustified or that the only effective form of social action is violence.

But what does cause the unrest that clearly exists on American campuses? Most people would agree that even one violent protest on campus is one too many. The 500 to 600 that occurred last year were clearly too many. The question remains, then, whether the extremist analysis of the causes of dissent is accurate: Are the universities permissive or repressive? Do they indoctrinate their students with abhorrent political ideas? Is the campus becoming politicized? And are these alleged failings the causes of campus unrest?

"One element in the current wave of disruption is the failure of college administrators to vigorously uphold the law . . . . To allow permissiveness in the enforcement of campus laws is to teach delinquency with respect to community laws. Administrators are being severely exploited by hardcore militants who know that the conscience of an administrator in an academic environment leads him to bend over backwards . . ."—Gov. Ronald Reagan.

"A University which orders a thousand club-swinging Fascist cops against its students and praises their action, a University which directs plainclothesmen to viciously beat innocent spectators and praises their action, a University that permits mounted police to violate her grounds and to trample students and faculty outside her gates and praises their action, this University is not safe for Man."—"The Communes" at Columbia University, after the police bust, 1968.

Extremists of right and left agree that university discipline is both unjust and politically motivated. The argument that dominates the headlines from the right is that the "permissiveness" of campus authorities and faculties is responsible for the "wave of violence" on the campuses. Left extremists

agree that student violence is related to unjust discipline, but they see it as a response to the unjustified punishment of students and to police brutality. Leftists claim that police actions at Columbia and the Chicago convention or the deaths at Kent and Jackson State demonstrate the "repressive" nature of the American system and the complicity of the universities with that system. In fact, of course, some extremists work to provoke police violence, just as the police have hired agents who incite students to violence. Each side then uses charges of "police brutality" or "student violence" to recruit new supporters.

But the facts suggest that neither critique of campus discipline is correct. Though exact figures are hard to come by, available evidence indicates that campus officials have not as a rule failed to punish students for violent, illegal protest. There are exceptions that make headlines: the black students who appeared with guns on the Cornell campus shocked the nation, even though they were later turned over to local authorities for prosecution. But media exploitation of these examples hides the basic trends. One study of 28 colleges and universities showed that campus protests resulted in 950 suspensions or expulsions of students along with another 800 reprimands. Another study found violent protests were followed by campus or civil-court discipline in more than 75 per cent of the colleges where they occurred. Considering that "violent protests" included protests in which fistfights broke out between demonstrators and counter-demonstrators, the finding that 75 per cent of these protests resulted in disciplinary actions against students suggests a firm response.

Are student demonstrators being coddled by civil authorities? The number of students arrested increased from 4,000 in 1968-69 to 7,200 last year. If we study in detail some of the most publicized campus disorders, like Berkeley 1964, University of Chicago 1969, Columbia 1968 or Harvard 1969, in every case students were either convicted by the courts (almost 800 at Berkeley) or suspended and expelled by the university (123 at University of Chicago).

As to the left-wing charge of the systematic repression of students, this, too, has little substance. Clearly, police have far too often reacted with illegal violence to campus disorders that profoundly threaten them on many levels, and for which they are usually ill-trained and ill-equipped. But this is scarcely the norm. The behavior of New Haven police during the May Day demonstrations is a case in point. Faced with rock-throwing demonstrators eager to provoke trouble, Chief Ahern's highly professional force responded with minimum violence and inflicted no serious injuries on anyone. Similar stories of police restraint could be told in countless other communities during the student demonstrations that followed the invasion of Cambodia and the deaths at Kent and Jackson State last year. Those two colleges provided the tragic and inexcusable exceptions. But 1,500,000 students were involved in demonstrations during May 1970, and the overwhelming majority met a restrained response from civil authorities.

"[In] last year's lurch-ins, smash-ups, and lock-outs on so many distracted campuses . . . the real common denominator was the covert encouragement given the neo-Nazis by certain professors. It amounted to a surreptitious, lip-smacking, 'Go-ahead-and-bust-things-up - and - we'll - stand - behind-you' prodding . . . these mixed-up mentors encouraged their present hecklers to rebel for the sake of rebelling, to demonstrate for the sake of demonstrating, to flout authority for the sake of chaos."—Max Rafferty.

"The faculty is engaged in the process of

transmitting lies from one group to another, and the lies they tell, especially in the social sciences, are lies that help to perpetuate the status quo . . . Or else they teach the wrong stuff. If you're in economics . . . they teach you how to do statistics so you can work for the Pentagon or for G.M. Or, if you're in sociology, you don't learn how to criticize the society . . . It's complete ideology we get from our professors . . . That's why so few professors side with us."—Mark Rudd.

The second charge heard from extremists is that college students are systematically indoctrinated—either to become violent radicals or complacent robots of the System. Rightists assail radical professors; leftists view the universities as centers of indoctrination for the military-industrial complex.

Clearly there are radical professors, and clearly universities do train students for careers in the American system. But once again the facts contradict the ominous cast which extremists try to lend to these realities. For example, one extensive study of the role of faculty in campus unrest finds that faculty support or leadership of disruptive and violent protests was extremely rare. From this study, we can infer that in fewer than 2 per cent of campus protests were any faculty members involved as leaders of disruptive or violent actions. And in most such cases, faculty leadership consisted of one or two men in a faculty community overwhelmingly opposed to their actions.

Faculty members do, however, frequently support nonviolent protest against the war or social injustice. One study showed 49 per cent of all protests involved at least one faculty member. Another study found that 15 per cent of a national sample of faculty members had supported the goals and tactics of the most recent campus protest, although faculty support was almost entirely restricted to nonviolent protests. Indeed, the most common role of faculty members has been to deter headstrong students from disruptive or violent action. Even most "radical" faculty members are as committed to nonviolence, or as opposed to counterproductive violence, as they are committed to basic social change.

Even if faculty members do not actually lead their students into violent protests, it could still be true, as rightists charge, that they indoctrinate their students with revolutionary or violent ideas. But this claim is also incorrect. The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education in a recent comprehensive survey of American faculty members found that 81 per cent of faculty members agree that "campus disruptions by militant students are a threat to academic freedom," while 79 per cent believe that "students who disrupt the functioning of the college should be expelled or suspended." Indeed, the typical American faculty member emerges from the Carnegie study as a man with political views like those of most other Americans with comparable education and background. He tends to oppose the war and racist practices. But predictably, as far as his own campus is concerned, he is generally conservative, defending institutional neutrality and strongly opposed to disruption and violence.

The radical left, in contrast, charges that higher education indoctrinates students with a military-industrial, racist-imperialist mentality. This charge also suffers before the facts. Studies of the effects of higher education show that it lessens rather than increases students' unquestioning acceptance of the status quo. When students who go to college are compared with youths of equal ability and motivation who do not, we find that the college students become less authoritarian, more open to new views, less dogmatic and more inquiring and open-minded. In brief, if college inculcates anything, it is the necessary qualities of democratic man. Such studies show that higher education, far

from processing students into robotlike acceptance of the military-industrial society, leads them to great independence, precisely because it provides that "intellectual stimulation" which Vice President Agnew reports he found so rewarding in his own college years.

The most decisive refutation of the leftist charge that the universities are centers for reactionary indoctrination is the growing liberalism of college students. Radicals who claim universities castrate their students intellectually find it impossible to explain why American students are taking an increasingly active role in attempting to redress the injustices of American society.

In short, the charge of indoctrination—right or left—does not stand well with the facts. What higher education does do, though doubtless not well enough, is to help promote a more questioning, open-minded, tolerant and searching attitude in its students. But this is a consequence not of reactionary brainwashing or radical indoctrination, but of "intellectual stimulation" itself.

"The rich and powerful private universities, the gigantic state universities (which pay no more attention to their state governments than an overgrown spoiled brat to a neurotically indulgent parent), and innumerable colleges which follow in their wake are taking the parents' and taxpayers' money and maintaining privileged sanctuaries within which irregular hostile forces wage psychological and urban guerrilla warfare against the United States . . . The universities are killing themselves, killing America, killing civilization."—M. Stanton Evans, associate editor, *American Opinion*.

"We began to understand the university system in a different way. No longer could we criticize it for being an ivory tower, because we began to see that the university itself was a key part of the machinery of violence that was being used in Vietnam. Our professors were using their so-called academic freedom to perfect methods of torture, methods of chemical and biological warfare. The Department of Defense was financing endless studies of how to defeat guerrillas and revolutionaries."—Tom Hayden.

The third charge on which extremists basically agree is that the universities have been politicized—transformed either into revolutionary bases or tools of militarism. The traditional posture of the university has been "institutional neutrality." Extremists believe this posture has today been abandoned with disastrous results. Reactionaries say politicization has made the campuses into launching pads for revolution: even the involvement of students and faculty as private citizens in anti-war and anti-racist politics is seen as an erosion of academic neutrality. Radical leftists in turn seize upon the issue of military research and training to demonstrate the "complicity" of the campuses with the military-industrial complex.

The facts fail to support either of these positions. To be sure, "institutional neutrality" is, in the broad sense, a "political" position. And the university is necessarily a part of the society that sustains it. But the evidence shows that extremely few American colleges or universities have taken institutional positions on anything except matters that directly affect their immediate self-interest.

Again and again, members of campus communities have tried (though not always successfully) to make it clear that they speak as individuals, not as representatives of their colleges. This distinction between the actions of individual members of academic communities, acting as citizens, and the actions of their institutions is often lost on the public. Last May the sight of college presidents joining students in talks with Congressmen



on the Vietnam war often created the impression that colleges as institutions had taken a position on the war. In fact, only 4 per cent did.

Surveys of faculty opinion make clear that "politicization" of the university would be bitterly opposed by the overwhelming majority of faculty members. The Carnegie survey of faculty opinion found that when it comes to protecting their own turf or allowing anyone else to speak for them on political issues, most faculty members are very conservative. Indeed, as a group, they are considerably more dedicated to academic freedom and institutional neutrality than are most members of the general public.

The extreme left charge of politicization relies heavily on the fact that a few major universities have been dependent on secret research funds for their teaching and research operations. But, in 1966-1967, the Federal Government in fact contributed only 13 per cent of the direct instructional costs of higher education. If we include indirect costs, the Federal share shrinks to 4 per cent—a remarkably tiny indicator of the university's complicity. It is true that the Federal Government provides the lion's share of research funds: about 87 per cent of \$2-billion dollars in 1967. But this year only 1.89 per cent of Federal research grants were classified. In short, out of the total university research budget, about 1½ per cent is related to secret military work.

Some would say that even 1½ percent is too much, while others would deplore the dependence of a few institutions on military research contracts. But whatever view one takes, the charge that American higher education is dominated by military research money hardly stands up to examination. M.I.T., generally cited as the classic instance of a military research-dominated institution, is ending all classified defense research but does not plan to go out of business. In fact, most Federal grants, like most business contributions, go to areas that are little involved in politics. Medical education, for example, is largely dependent on both public and private grants. But it takes a twisted logic to argue that Federal support for training researchers to study cancer or control pollution is part of a reactionary plot linking universities to the war machine.

The more general leftist charge that the universities are unduly tied to political and corporate interests often starts from the fact that boards of regents and trustees are weighted with corporate executives. Their political views are usually more conservative than those of the campus communities they oversee. As Jerry Rubin puts it, "We learned the inside story . . . The very same racists who controlled the business world controlled the university, too."

Yet it is ironic that leftists, who once bitterly assailed Senator Joseph McCarthy's tactic of "guilt by association," today use this same tainted brush against all trustees with business associations, arguing that their business contacts prove they are mere tools of the military-industrial complex. Trustees from the business world can be enlightened—witness the governing board of Yale. Or they can be vindictive—witness many of the regents of the University of California. In our view, trustees and regents should represent a far wider range of views, ages and interests than they generally do. But on principle it is perfectly proper that those who help finance higher education should have their representatives involved in overseeing institutions supported by alumni gifts and public taxes.

There are dangers of politicization of the university. But they are more subtle than the extremists of either the right or the left recognize. One danger is that there might develop on American campuses a climate of

opinion so unanimous that active discussion of some issues would be effectively silenced. By and large this has not happened, but it is a danger against which academic communities must constantly guard. Another danger is that "string-attached" research, training or action grants could lead universities into massive "complicity" with controversial political policies. Yet the over-all trend in recent years has been away from such "string-attached" grants. The greatest danger of politicization, however, today comes from a public rapidly being persuaded that the universities are centers of sedition and causes of unrest. Politically motivated efforts to "get rid of campus radicals," however profitable they might be to unscrupulous candidates, would indeed erode the fundamental principles of institutional neutrality and academic freedom.

The three major extremist charges against the university must all be labeled false. Improper discipline, indoctrination and politicization are dangers that higher education must constantly resist. But the claim that American higher education has systematically employed disciplinary procedures in either a permissive or a repressive way is simply not supported by the facts. Nor have colleges and universities brainwashed their students into bomb-throwing revolutionaries, much less converted them into obedient robots for the military-industrial complex. As for politicization, the over-all trend in recent years has been toward increasing academic freedom and institutional neutrality. On all counts, then, the extremist allegations that point to the "failings" of the campus as the causes of campus unrest are simply not supported by an overview of the facts.

Few Americans would completely agree with the extremist positions that we have outlined. But many conservatives, moderates and liberals, in the very act of refuting the extremist charges, have uncritically assumed a *casual link* between the shortcomings of the campus and student unrest. Americans know there is much wrong with higher education; they know there is much student unrest. In the process of rejecting the specific content of extremist charges, they have unwittingly begun to accept the underlying assumption that campus unrest is the result of university shortcomings. But this alleged casual link simply does not stand up before the evidence.

Consider the common charge that unrest is caused by the "impersonality of the university." There is no question that vast campuses with immense classes and little personal attention for students have grown up: one-quarter of our 7,000,000 college students are today enrolled on campuses of more than 15,000 students. Since protests are both more common and bigger on these large campuses, it is easy to assume a connection between impersonality and protest.

But the connection is false. There is more of everything at larger institutions. Large campuses are also more likely to have chapters of Young Americans for Freedom (a right-wing group), literary magazines, science clubs, fraternities, and massive football rallies. The obvious explanation is that, compared to small colleges, large universities have more students available for almost everything. Not surprisingly, they have more and bigger protests as well.

But suppose we compare large and small campuses in terms of the number of protests per 10,000 students that occur on them. We come to the paradoxical conclusion that there are fewer protests per 10,000 students at large institutions than at small ones. The statistic is partially artificial: protests are not like the number of cases of influenza, which should bear a perfect relationship to campus size. But this statistic does put in

perspective the allegation that the "impersonality" of the multiversity causes campus unrest.

The second apparently plausible charge is that the educational deficiencies of colleges cause campus unrest. Students generally arrive at college with high expectations about both the educational experience and the social life that await them. They are invariably disappointed. Colleges with a rich social life are rarely as stimulating intellectually as students expect, and vice versa. Many students' hopes are dashed in their freshman year; as a result some are genuinely dissatisfied with their college experience.

Surprisingly, however, 75 per cent of college seniors at all institutions (including the vast multiversities) consider the higher education "basically sound," while only 4 per cent judge it "basically unsound." Another poll found that college students have a higher opinion of universities than of any other institution in American life. More important, research has shown no relationship between the student's educational dissatisfaction and his involvement in protests. A study of the Free Speech Movement at Berkeley in 1964 found that arrested students and their supporters were just as pleased with their education as their non-protesting classmates. Another study compared S.D.S. members and student-government leaders at Michigan State: both groups thought they were getting an equally fine education.

Furthermore, if protests result from discontent with education, we would expect those who get the worst education to protest most. But other studies show that student protesters tend to be more intellectually oriented and somewhat better students than non-protesters. As a result, at any given college, protesters generally receive more personal attention (smaller classes, honors programs) and more intense intellectual stimulation. Furthermore, the colleges and universities where protests have been most common are not those that provide inferior education. The roster of colleges with large protests includes most of America's most distinguished institutions, where the quality of undergraduate education is highest.

One study demonstrates especially conclusively the absence of any relationship between college characteristics and the proportion of students involved in anti-war protests. The researchers first "held constant" the characteristics of incoming freshmen. Enabled by statistical techniques to assume that all of the colleges studied admitted identical students, they then examined the effects on protests of 58 different objective characteristics of each college.

But once the characteristics of incoming freshmen were accounted for, the researchers found that only one of their 58 measures of campus characteristics was related to the percentage of students in anti-war protests. That one measure was the presence on campus of many organized musical and artistic activities! And taking that campus characteristic into account increased the accuracy of their prediction about anti-war protests by only one half of one per cent—hardly a notable increase.

Among the campus characteristics that did not have any connection with the percent of students in antiwar protests were the type of college or university, the type of administrative control (public versus private), geographic region, the severity of administration policies about a variety of student activities, the verbal aggressiveness of students in the classroom, the cohesiveness and school spirit of the campus, the regularity of student sleeping habits, the extent to which classroom activities were formally organized, the degree of student involvement in classroom discussions, and so on.

This study, like a similar study of protests

over racial issues, shows that once we control for the kind of freshmen admitted, campus characteristics have a negligible effect on student involvement in protest. If this is true, then arguments that the campus itself is the cause of unrest are simply incorrect. And proposed solutions to the "problem of campus unrest" that urge campus reforms are building on a frail reed indeed.

The liberal critique of higher education starts from real shortcomings of American campuses. But the apparently plausible argument that these shortcomings—impersonality, poor education and so on—are *casually* related to campus unrest turns out to be completely untrue. The mountain of studies on campus unrest indicates that the campus itself has virtually nothing to do with whether protests occur on it. For an explanation of campus unrest we must look elsewhere—on the one hand to the changing characteristics of the students entering American higher education, and on the other hand, to the issues about which they protest.

Research on student protest and campus unrest indicates very clearly that the best way to predict the presence or size of protests on any given campus is to study the characteristics of incoming freshmen. In the previously mentioned study, researchers found that simply knowing the kinds of freshmen admitted to American colleges would have enabled them to predict with 83 per cent accuracy the percent of students involved in anti-war protests. A freshman class that has high percentage of students who mark "none" for religion on questionnaires, many National Merit Award winners and many students who seek competence in a performing art, tends to have large anti-war demonstrations. In all, 33 different characteristics of the freshman class were related significantly to anti-war protests. Comparable results were obtained in a study of protests over race-related issues.

This study confirms what dozens of other researchers have found: students who protest are different in a variety of ways from those who do not, and the main reason some campuses experience more and bigger protests than others is that these campuses admit more of the kinds of student who appear "protest-prone."

Aware of this conclusion, some Americans have begun to argue that the best way to "stamp out campus unrest" would be to deny college admission to students who are "protest-prone." Yet once we begin to study the implications of this policy, it turns out to be both illegal and disastrous in its results.

First, a policy of excluding the "protest-prone" would of course be illegal, unconstitutional and quite contrary to the spirit of American democracy. Peaceful dissent and non-violent protest—which comprise the overwhelming proportion of campus unrest—are not only legal but in the long run essential to the vitality of this nation. Under the First Amendment, the Constitution explicitly protects the right of free speech and dissent. Discriminatory admission policies aimed at excluding potential dissenters would be contrary to the hard-won freedoms of this nation. Any institution that adopted such a policy would violate the very law of the land, which the policy was intended to protect.

Furthermore, the students to be kept out would include many of the best students in the country. Study after study has shown that students involved in protests tend to be above-average students who do well on aptitude tests, who are intellectually independent and inquiring. They place special stress on values like serving their fellow men, acquiring a good education, expressing their convictions and feelings directly, and solving the problems of their society.

Protest-prone students, then, tend to be

young men and women that most American families take pride in, that American high schools consider their best products and that colleges consider themselves lucky to attract. To keep them out of American higher education, colleges would have to give preference to students who do *poorly* on aptitude tests, who *lack* intellectual independence and curiosity, who have *little* interest in serving their fellowmen, who do *not* wish to express their convictions and feelings, and who are *not* interested in solving the problems of their country. To bar potential protesters from college would thus deprive American society of the educated talents of young men and women whose ability and idealism it desperately needs if the problems of our society are to be solved.

But even if we considered it desirable to exclude protest-prone students from colleges, we have no way of doing so with any accuracy. It is fairly easy to predict the *institutions* that will have large protests against the war or alleged racial inequities. But it turns out to be very difficult to predict the *individual students* who will be actively involved in protests. Predictions of protests by institutions have an accuracy of up to 80 per cent. But predictions of individuals who will protest are only about 18 percent accurate. Any net cast out for protest-prone students would therefore catch mostly students who wouldn't become involved in protests at all.

Finally, to try to close the college gates to potential protesters would be extraordinarily counter-productive. It would produce precisely the kind of bitterness, rage and turn toward violence which it attempts to prevent. No imaginable policy could be better calculated to turn moderate high school graduates into extremists, liberal students into arsonists and revolutionaries. Students locked out of American campuses on the dubious grounds that they *might* engage in protests, a small proportion of which *might* be disruptive or violent, would be rightly embittered and enraged. A policy intended to reduce disruption and violence would only produce and even justify it. In short, an effort to exclude students who might protest would be not only illegal, destructive to society and impossible to achieve, but massively counter-productive.

We conclude that most political discussions of campus unrest bear almost no relationship to the known facts. They are a mixture of misinformation, innuendo, stereotyping and falsification. The "disgusting permissiveness" of American campuses is not responsible for student unrest. Nor is the political characterization of student protesters as bums, rotten apples, nihilists and animals applicable to the vast majority of students who protest local practices and national policies.

American higher education, despite its many defects, has accomplished the extraordinary feat of educating nearly half of this nation's youth—something never before achieved in world history. And American students, despite their myriad shortcomings, have shown a concern with social justice, peace, and the quality of American life that commencement orators have been urging upon them for decades. The view that "campus unrest" is a national disaster to be solved by attacking higher education or protesting students is both inaccurate and unjust.

Research on campus unrest and student protesters agrees on one critical point: the major determinants of protest among students are their values and their perceptions of the world around them. Over the last generation, we have carefully brought up our children to be committed to social justice, racial equality and peace. But simply having high values and a special sensitivity to in-

justice and hypocrisy is not by itself enough to produce protest. In addition, students must see their values contradicted and their commitment to social change obstructed by the actual practices and policies of their society. Today, our society still is deeply involved in a war that most Americans believe we never should have entered, still accept widespread psychological and social racism, still does not provide many Americans an adequate standard of living and health, still cannot restore the quality of the environment. These social facts, which contradict the values taught to young Americans in their homes, their schools and their churches, must be considered as much the "causes" of campus unrest as the growing readiness of students to protest in the service of their ideals.

If the continuing deficiencies in American life are to be remedied—and most Americans agree they must be—then both higher education and college students desperately need public understanding and support, rather than politically motivated attacks. For although the shortcomings of higher education do not cause campus unrest, they do severely limit the capacity of our campuses to educate a generation adequately equipped to deal with the problems of the last third of the 20th century.

Many criticisms of American higher education seem to us fully justified. The mammoth multiversities are indeed impersonal. Most young Americans do not receive the quality of education they deserve. American universities need serious reforms in governance. More adequate preparations for campus disorders are called for. Greater emphasis must be placed on teaching and learning. Campus members must be more explicit about their responsibilities, and not simply about their rights. And American campuses must work to re-create a real sense of community. If American higher education is to educate well the many millions who will enter college in the next decades, it must change; and change will in turn require the understanding and support of the American public.

Nor should we forget the shortcomings of protesting students. For all of their intelligence, commitment and idealism, they are at an age when thinking tends to be particularly ideological. Their intelligence and social concern in no way guarantees the wisdom of the policies they propose. Many naively believe that the personal ethics by which they are attempting to shape their individual lives can be projected without modification as guides for a national policy. Many lack awareness of the social, legal, economic and political requirements of a technological nation of 200,000,000 people. Many show great empathy for the downtrodden, oppressed and poor, but astonishingly little empathy for working-class and middle-class Americans. Many pride themselves on being a post-Freudian generation, but are bad psychologists with little awareness of how painful it is for people to change the convictions and values on which they have built their lives. And many lack understanding of the enormous obstacles that must be overcome before the social changes they desire can be achieved.

In short, dissenting students are usually idealistic and intelligent, but not always wise. The very shortcomings of youth mean that today more than ever before they must be *educated*. The qualities youth inevitably lacks—experience, informed intelligence, an awareness of complexity, tolerance for others with different views, compassion for one's adversaries, and above all wisdom—these are precisely the qualities which higher education at its best helps stimulate in the young. The unprecedented challenge to American colleges and universities is to help inform



the idealism of dissenting students with understanding and wisdom.

It is for this reason that the crisis produced by the attacks of extremists against higher education is so grave. The first result of a triumph of extremists would be to cut off support from higher education. We already see this beginning to happen. Yet without support, higher education cannot improve; and without vital colleges and universities, the young cannot be educated to deal with the problems of the nation. Colleges must deal firmly with disruptive protest and pursue terrorism with severity. But firmness will be of no avail if support for higher education is choked off, and if violent protest and its severest pathology, terrorism, are not recognized as the tragic symptoms of basic national problems.

Higher education must be reformed to serve society better, not destroyed as a scapegoat for underlying national problems. Students must be educated to be wise, humane and effective, not attacked as anarchists and terrorists. And the extremist attacks on higher education must be seen for what they are—efforts to polarize the nation further, insults to the decency and intelligence of the American public, divisive calls to anarchy or repression.

#### FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE

**HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.**

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 17, 1970*

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, the following testimony was delivered before Subcommittee No. 2 of the Committee on the Judiciary, October 7, 1970, by Sgt. Jack Stonebraker, national legislative representative of the Fraternal Order of Police.

It is men such as Sergeant Stonebraker that make law enforcement a profession. It is time we begin treating law enforcement officers as professionals.

The testimony follows:

#### FRATERNAL ORDER OF POLICE

There follows the text of the testimony of Jack Stonebraker, Jr. National Legislative Representative of the Fraternal Order of Police, before the Subcommittee No. 2 of the House Committee on Judiciary with regard to H.R. 7989, October 7, 1970.

My name is Jack L. Stonebraker, Jr. I am National Legislative Committee Chairman for the Fraternal Order of Police, the oldest and largest of National police organizations. I am a full-time police officer, have been for 14 years, in the city of Muncie, Indiana. I come to Washington, D.C. bi-weekly to promote legislation beneficial to police officers nationally, and to the professionalization of law enforcement so we may enjoy the preservation of life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness as these were granted by the Constitution and the Bill of Rights.

Mr. Chairman, thank you for affording me the privilege of presenting facts in behalf of H.R. 7989, introduced by Representative Andrew Jacobs, Jr. and over 100 of his colleagues. I am most happy that this Committee is considering this legislation which would provide extended benefits to law enforcement officers and firemen not employed by the United States who are killed or totally disabled.

As professional law enforcement personnel we feel that we serve the citizens of the United States on the home front, as the

"Thin Blue Line" as the military services of the country do on foreign soil, in that we provide the citizens with the protection of life, liberty, property, and the pursuit of happiness.

Police officers are charged daily with making split second decisions which in effect can "give a life, save a life, take a life," including their own lives. Such decisions are more often than not reviewed by the community, and in many cases by the judicial system which in many instances takes months, or years to resolve.

As this committee knows, in 1967 the Congress approved legislation of a bill extending the benefits of the Federal Employees Compensation Act to police officers killed or disabled in the line of duty provided that such duty involved the enforcement of a Federal law.

The measures before this Subcommittee today, introduced by Representative Jacobs of Indiana and more than 100 other Congressmen would extend survivor benefits to any police officer killed or disabled in the line of duty. In other words the survivor benefits would be extended, if state law was involved and, as we interpret it, even a local ordinance.

The benefits would be reduced by the amounts provided for survivors by the states and local governments but let me point out that eighteen states and the District of Columbia provide no benefits to policemen, or to firemen, killed in the line of duty.

Under ordinary circumstances, a policeman's life is not an enviable one. The pay has always been poor; J. Edgar Hoover and other authorities terming it a national disgrace. Within the past two or three years, the burdens laid upon law enforcement officers have been greatly increased.

The danger which is present even in relatively calm times, has been compounded by a series of developments of which the Subcommittee is well aware. The tremendous increase in violent demonstrations on and off the campuses, has added to the perils of police work. Moreover, in 1969 and 1970, militant groups dedicated to violence and, in some instances having as a particular objective the murder and wounding of police officers became active. I refer in particular to the Black Panthers, described by Mr. Hoover as a "black extremist organization, consisting for the most part of hoodlum-type revolutionaries."

Mr. Hoover also said:

"Since its inception, the BPP has reserved its most vicious invectives for law enforcement officials. 'Off the Pigs' jargon for 'kill the police' is a familiar shout at Panther rallies. Panther publications abound with cartoons encouraging physical attacks on police depicted as pigs. Toddlers in Panther 'school' do their exercises to the accompaniment of the chant, 'There is a pig upon the hill—if you don't kill him the Panthers will.'"

Undoubtedly, the Panther propaganda has had its effect upon other extremist groups who also hate and attack police. Already, in 1970, 18 policemen have been killed without provocation. Hundreds of police officers have been wounded, and many firemen also have been attacked as they tried to put out blazes or answered fire alarms.

Only recently police intelligence information received from within the State of New Jersey showed that the Panthers had rescheduled a "National Kill a Pig Week", from the 1st of October to the 7th. We have no way of knowing how many states were included in this program, nor what the results will be. Since 1960, a total of 561 professional law enforcement officers have given their life in order to protect the rights of the majority of our citizens. Another 365 officers

have been killed by accident making the total 926.

The increasing physical danger to police officers is shown by other records which show a steady rise in the number of policemen killed in the line of duty. At least 57 have already died in the line of duty in 1970 and there were 86 such deaths, an all time high, in 1969.

The crime rate goes up and up. In many cities, the streets are not safe at night and there are some areas where the passerby is not safe in the daytime. Many businesses in the larger cities are folding, simply because they are robbed and burglarized so often that continuation is impossible, particularly in view of the fact that insurance is unobtainable in many instances and, in others, is so high that the premiums cannot be paid by the operators or owners of business houses.

All this is familiar to most of you and we appreciate your concern for the welfare of police and their families, as is evidenced by the legislation upon which I am testifying. Obviously, an orderly society is impossible without adequate and efficient policemen. Today, many police forces are understaffed, an almost chronic condition in cities with high crime rates. Young men are avoiding police work. Not only is the pay comparatively low, but the danger is ever present. As a police officer for more than 14 years, I know that the wife and the family of thousands of policemen in this country wonder, when he leaves for duty, whether he will come home again and, if so, will he be wounded when he does arrive.

The Fraternal Order of Police feels that a series of measures should be enacted by The Federal Government to make police work more attractive. One of the most important is to extend survivor benefits to all police officers killed or disabled in the line of duty. I don't think that I have to emphasize the point that almost all crime is, in reality, interstate in character.

Let us say, for example, that a car is stolen in the District of Columbia and transported a short distance into Maryland and that, in an attempt to recover the vehicle, the officer is killed. The officer's dependents would be entitled to survivor benefits under the Federal law. The widow would receive 45 percent of her husband's monthly wage rate until she remarried.

The widow with dependents would receive 40 percent of her dead husband's salary. Each child under 18 would get 15 percent of the father's salary, up to a maximum of 75 percent.

In instances of disability without dependents, the widow's benefits would equal two-thirds of the monthly salary. With dependents, it would equal three-fourths of the monthly salary.

But let us assume that the automobile is stolen in the District of Columbia and that in an attempt to recover the car, an officer is killed, or disabled. His dependents get nothing, even though, as in the case of the other officer, he was simply trying to do his duty.

Should the dependents of a police officer killed or disabled in the line of duty be subjected to the daily hardships and crisis just because their husband or father believed in the foundation upon which our nation was founded, swore to uphold the Constitution of the United States, and gave his life in hopes that they might enjoy a society free from violence, murder and hatred? We of the profession and of the Fraternal Order of Police throughout the United States of America say no and that no is without reservation or prejudice.

I submit that this situation is most unfair to the unfortunate District of Columbia officers and his dependents in the hypothetical instance where the stolen vehicle did not go

across a state line. I submit that the situation which exists today is unfair to the officers in the other 18 states which provide no specific benefits to policemen, or firemen, killed or disabled in the line of duty—unless a Federal crime was involved.

The fact that more than 100 members of the House of Representatives have introduced companion bills to the original Jacobs measure is very gratifying and heartening to us. We regard it as a sign that members of Congress are beginning to realize that the police forces over this country must be at full strength and must be efficient. Any program to curtail crime will fail unless we maintain adequate and capable policemen on duty in sufficient numbers to discourage the criminal and to apprehend him quickly when he does break the law.

Nor need I point out the death of a police officer is also a financial burden upon the community, as the funds invested in his training etc., are lost completely as a replacement must be trained and schooled.

I do not have to tell you that the overwhelming majority of policemen are family men. Nor do I need to emphasize that the death of a policeman, or his disability, results in almost every instance to most serious consequences to his widow and children, to say nothing of the grief and sorrow which must be undergone.

As an example, look at the recent burglary of an Armory and the holdup of a bank in the City of Boston where a law enforcement officer was killed. This act was committed by known felons either on bond for a previous crime, or released from the penitentiary.

I could cite example after example where officers have been killed in the line of duty, leaving a wife and children as survivors. And in most cases the benefits provided them by city, county and state statutes were and are little or nothing, amounting really to an insult to the society which the husband or father protected. I submit to this committee that we have an obligation and responsibility to those who protect us from day to day, in light or darkness, rain, sleet, snow or shine. Let us show the member of the "thin Blue Line" that we so appreciate his dedication, and let us endorse this legislation and approve it so his mind can be set at ease. He will know that if he isn't to return home, his family will be protected, and benefits provided.

Nor do I have to tell members of this Subcommittee that we are engaged in a war with crime, a war which we are losing. There is much talk of reviving the downtown and ghetto areas in many of our major cities, where crime is rampant, as it is in most ghetto sections and in many down town sections too, this talk of restoration is idle unless law and order can be restored. I want to point out to you that most of the sections blighted by riots during the past few years are still blighted. Only recently, a good part of Fourteenth Street in Washington, hard hit by disorders which followed the death of Martin Luther King, once again were hit by violence and looting. Many of the victims of the rioters were black.

Adequate and efficient police forces across the country are not all that needs to be done in the crime field. The FOP feels that the whole field of criminal law must be completely done over so that criminals may not spend months, or years, after lawless acts, awaiting trial, meanwhile committing other crimes. We feel that the Courts must face reality and realize what a cancer crime has come to be and what a curse it has come to be to the country as a whole.

But first steps first and that is why we urge the passage, as quickly as possible, of HR 7989, which would extend survivor benefits and which would help in the objective we

all seek—a stable, orderly and prosperous society.

Gentlemen of the Congress, I sincerely appreciate the opportunity to appear before you, and I ask your most serious and sincere deliberations on HR 7989. Thank you.

#### CAMPAIGN IN SUPPORT OF FAMILIES OF U.S. POW'S

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, within a very short period of time, tons of mail from aroused citizens of the United States will be dumped on Hanoi; the Vietcong, and North Vietnamese delegations in Paris relative to their treatment of American POW's. This action has been stimulated by not only the National League of American Prisoners of War families but veteran organizations, labor unions, and other patriotic groups. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include an article from the November 1970 issue of Navy magazine and an article from the November 1970 issue of the VFW magazine which outlines these activities:

[From the Navy magazine, November 1970]  
GROUND SWELL OF PUBLIC OPINION HEARTENS FAMILIES OF U.S. POW'S  
(By Heather M. David)

Within the next two months, some 100 tons of mail from concerned citizens of the United States will be collected in New York for shipment to the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong delegations in Paris, urging a change in their treatment of American prisoners of war and those missing in action in Southeast Asia.

The letters, from all over the country, representing every element of the economic and political spectrum, will be transported by Teamster Union volunteers to New York, and loaded by the Longshoreman's Union for shipment abroad. They will express the increasing, country-wide concern about the welfare of American servicemen held by the North Vietnamese, the Viet Cong, and the North Vietnamese and Pathet Lao in Laos.

The mail shipment will be tangible evidence of the ground swell of public opinion on the POW-MIA issue. The response of the American people to the letter writing drive, the many new newspaper and magazine stories (see NAVY, June 1970), and the actions of Congress including the historic joint session addressed by Frank Borman, have been heartening to the families, who feared their men and had been forgotten.

The wives and relatives of the servicemen held captive for so long are beginning to feel they are not alone in their concern, and they are warmed by the number of letters which have come from all corners of the country offering help and comfort.

The families formally organized the National League of Families of American Prisoners and Missing in Southeast Asia June 30 in Washington, D.C., in a room in the Reserve Officers Association building on Capitol Hill. Here several wives work full time answering calls, and coordinating the efforts of the 2,000 or so family members of the League throughout the country, who are trying to arouse the public on this problem.

#### WIVES STIFLE EMOTION

The wives have been incredibly valiant, stifling their own emotional problems and overcoming a natural reluctance to publicize their personal lives and emotions. They have made hundreds of speeches and quietly make their rounds to editors offices swallowing their pride when rebuffed and refusing to let discouragement overcome them.

They have been encouraged by donations—most of which have ranged from \$1 to \$100—from the many people who, unsolicited, want to help. The total nears \$40,000, and does not include the equally valuable professional assistance donated by such people as Washington journalist Louis Stockstill and lawyer Charles Havens who have worked long hours giving them, respectively, press relations and legal advice.

Others, like the Disabled American Veterans, are donating their efforts in producing radio and television spots with actors and actresses. The Jaycees have also done a tremendous job in helping get mail to the North Vietnamese, as have other service organizations. The Air Force Association has been particularly active in publicizing the problem.

The wives and family members themselves, however, probably have been the most effective force. Their appearances, wherever they go, have stimulated interest and sympathy. Recently, they drew an almost 100 per cent response from members of the House and Senate in getting signatures on pledges to support the cause.

In addition to continuing the things they already are doing, the members hope to enlist support among college students. "Facing radical elements does not faze us," says national coordinator Jo Ann Vinson. "Our appeal is humanitarian, not political." Other activities, such as a national billboard campaign, are in the offing.

The recent worldwide trip by President Nixon's own representative, former astronaut Frank Borman, was also effective in at least producing ripples of protest around the free world. Although the response in some countries was disappointing, one of the most hopeful signs, surprisingly enough, was the apparent sincere and genuine willingness of the Algerian government to help on this issue, despite its disagreement with the U.S. position on the war. This unexpected source of support was most encouraging, and the kind which many feel will do the most good.

Another encouraging sign has been the willingness of the North Vietnamese delegation to meet with U.S. Congressmen in Paris. The VC initiative in offering the POW's as a main bargaining point also is seen as a hopeful sign; although some fear the men's lives may be used as political levers to gain points in negotiations.

#### POW'S SECOND CHOICE TO MIDE

Press coverage on the POW's, particularly newspaper and magazine, has greatly increased in the past few months. Television continues to be the least responsive of the elements of the news media to the issue—but even this has improved. ABC recently aired a one-half hour special, NBC reportedly has one in the works, and CBS has shown an increased interest in the subject, including a five minute special report.

The coverage by no means matches that given the holding of hostages by Arab guerrillas or even that given mini versus midi skirts, but the wives try to be philosophic about it and are grateful for what they do get.

Congressional support has also grown, although there are still some notable holes in the curtain. Eighty-nine Senators, and 406 Congressmen signed the letter carried in August to the North Vietnamese delegation, a



significantly greater number than that on the Joint Congressional Resolution a year ago. Eleven Senators did not sign, however, for a variety of reasons.

All this has helped. The number of men permitted to write from North Viet Nam has increased to 328, 224 more than just a year ago. One letter even has come from South Viet Nam, the first out of a Viet Cong prison camp. And there have been other recent encouraging signs.

But despite the ground swell of activity which at the very least has been a comfort to the families, not one man has been released in the last year. Only one letter was received from the South, where 541 men are missing in action. None has ever been received from Laos, where 227 are unaccounted for.

Neither have there been impartial inspections of prison conditions in North Viet Nam, Laos or South Viet Nam, nor lists of names, and many men have not yet even been permitted to write their families.

#### MOST HELD SEVERAL YEARS

The total number of letters, about 2,100, is only a small fraction of the number which should have been received had the North Vietnamese and VC been complying with the Geneva Convention. Several men have been held for six years, many for more than five. Almost all in the North have been there more than two years.

Each holiday time, many of the families hope the North Vietnamese will release a few men as a humanitarian gesture. This year is no exception. Officials, however, are somewhat less optimistic.

"I'm not very hopeful," one Defense Department official says. "There has been so much pressure now, that the token release of one or two prisoners would simply call the world's attention to the North Vietnamese and reveal the treatment for what it has been."

Some of those concerned at the Defense Department feel prisoner release is now an all-or-nothing situation.

Sometime in the near future, a delegation from the League of Families will travel the now well-worn path to Paris and will try again to persuade the North Vietnamese and National Liberation Front delegations to address the POW issue at the negotiating table.

This is a coequal point in the President's proposals for peace in Southeast Asia, one, it will be stressed, which could be immediately negotiated. With the tons of mail and Congressional signatures, the League hopes to reinforce its point that the North Vietnamese and NLF have nothing to gain by continuing to mistreat the prisoners.

[From the VFW magazine, November 1970]

#### POW CRUSADE HAS JUST BEGUN

"My crusade has just begun," Commander-in-Chief H. R. Rainwater pledged after being refused a chance to present to the North Vietnamese peace delegation in Paris petitions signed by more than 2 million Americans demanding the release and humane treatment of American prisoners of war held by Communist forces in Southeast Asia.

After three days of attempting to make an appointment with Mai Van Bo, North Vietnam's delegate-general at the Paris peace talks, Rainwater and Mrs. Mary Cottone, President of the Ladies Auxiliary, went to the residence of the delegation in Paris to hand over the petitions personally.

This is the account of the rebuff, according to Leon G. Turrou, Commander of V.F.W. Post 605 in Paris:

"Upon arrival at the residence, the Chief rang the bell, whereupon an official of the North Vietnamese delegation appeared at the spy-window and asked the Chief who he was. "He then handed him his calling card as

well as that of Mrs. Cottone and asked to see the chief delegate. After about two or three minutes, the same person appeared again, accompanied by another North Vietnamese. He made the 'victory' sign and repeatedly uttered 'no, no, no,' meaning that the chief delegate declined to see him. It was apparent to the Chief that quite a bit of excitement was going on inside."

French police assigned permanently on guard at the residence then asked Rainwater and Mrs. Cottone to leave and they returned to their hotel.

At a press conference later Rainwater told correspondents:

"Perhaps I was vain to think after so many others have already failed, that the so-called peace negotiators would see me and accept these 2 million signatures of Americans from all walks of life. I did believe, however, that because I do represent an organization of 1,600,000 men who served their country on foreign soil during time of war, I might be granted special consideration.

"Our members and the more than 450,000 members of our Ladies Auxiliary understand intimately the problems of war and the problems of prisoners of war and for that reason I was hopeful that these people would talk with us.

"I still stand ready to talk with them any time or any place, be it Paris or Hanoi, but at the same time promise North Vietnam and its allies that my crusade has just begun."

Rainwater said that on his world tour "I shall expose the inhumanity of North Vietnam to all who will listen" and that when he returns to the U.S. he "will do all in my power to generate a national movement by all the American people demanding the release of the not forgotten American prisoners of war."

Continued refusal by North Vietnam to act humanely on the prisoner issue, Rainwater said, could result in his suggesting to President Nixon that "we review all of our country's options regarding action against North Vietnam as I was directed to by the delegates attending our last National Convention."

With Rainwater and Mrs. Cottone were the wives of two prisoners. One of them has heard nothing of her husband for five years and she has been refused any information about him by the North Vietnamese delegation in Paris.

Rainwater warned that North Vietnam "may soon discover that whatever gains it has made in influencing public opinion in the U.S. have been dissipated by its failure to abide by the standards established by the Geneva agreement regarding prisoners of war."

The petitions, weighing 1,200 pounds, were sent to Paris in 11 cases. The signatures were collected by V.F.W. members in less than four weeks.

While in Paris Rainwater met with Henry Duvillard, French minister for veterans affairs, through Turrou's efforts. Duvillard praised the efforts being made by President Nixon to end the Vietnam War and called the refusal of the North Vietnamese to see Rainwater "a grievous error."

[From the VFW magazine, November 1970]

#### HELP FREE THEM!

Members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary know too well the horrors of war such as death and crippling injury. But even worse is cruel imprisonment—as evidenced by the inhumane treatment of Nazi concentration camps of World War II or the brain-washing techniques used by the Communists on American prisoners of the Korean War.

Perhaps there is no crueler example of physical and mental subjugation than that of American servicemen held by the Communists in Southeast Asia. Held in cages, sub-

jected to a diet fit for pigs, beatings, torture and the anguish of being fed propaganda slanted to indicate their fellow Americans do not care about them. These are just some elements of this inhuman treatment.

But now you, as members of the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its Ladies Auxiliary, can do something about this barbaric treatment.

Commander-in-Chief Herbert R. Rainwater sought personally to do something about the POWs and men missing in action believed held by the North Vietnamese. He was rebuffed at every turn—they would not look at or even accept petitions containing over 2 million signatures of American citizens concerned over the inhumane treatment these estimated 1,400 POWs are receiving. They shut the door in his face. (See page 24.)

But this rebuff has not halted Commander-in-Chief Rainwater. Firmly believing that a show of concern—that Americans are united over the wellbeing of our POWs—he called upon all V.F.W. and Auxiliary members to launch a massive letter writing campaign.

"At no time in the history of the V.F.W. has the importance of such a campaign been so vital. We must clearly demonstrate that we firmly hold to our belief in helping our fellow man—and there is none more evident than the POW issue. It is not one hollowly espoused by our members," he said. "I may have not been able to personally deliver those petitions containing signatures of 2 million concerned Americans to the North Vietnamese in Paris, but I'm certain the 2 million V.F.W. and Auxiliary members can get their message through via mails."

The letters are to be addressed to:

Xuan Thuy  
Delegation of the Democratic  
Republic of Vietnam  
8. Avenue General Leclerc  
94 Choisy-le-Roi  
Paris, France

Postage will cost only 20c. Your letter should contain the following points: (1) The names of all Americans held (prisoners of war and missing in action) be released. (2) Humane treatment of all held. (3) The return home of all prisoners starting immediately with the sick and disabled.

Following is a suggested letter to Xuan Thuy in Paris. It can be adapted to your needs.

"Sir:

"I appeal to you, your government and its citizens to honor the Geneva Convention in your treatment of American and Allied prisoners you hold in Southeast Asia.

"As a fellow human being, I urge that you immediately release the names of all those held prisoner of war, that the Geneva Convention be abided with in their treatment and the return home of all of them—starting immediately with those who are sick or disabled.

"I am one of among millions of Americans who strongly feel there can be no peace settlement until such action is taken by your government. Without such a civilized policy, I will be compelled to urge the government of the United States of America to undertake in the strongest measures possible—military, economic and political—to resolve this issue."

"Sincerely,"

(Your Name).

These are fellow Americans we are talking about. If you were one of them, wouldn't you expect—and truly believe—that someone cared and was doing something about it?

[From the VFW magazine, November 1970]  
LET US SHOW OUR CONCERN: 1970-71 GOALS OF VFW OUTLINED BY COUNCIL AND NATIONAL COMMITTEES

Expanded Veterans of Foreign Wars programs were outlined to members of the Na-

tional Council of Administration when they met in Kansas City, Oct. 5 and 6.

Commander-in-Chief H. R. Rainwater urged that V.F.W. members continue working on behalf of American prisoners held by Hanoi, the Viet Cong and the Pathet Lao.

"We must show our men over there that they have not been forgotten by the American people," Rainwater said.

"We will not ease up in our campaign on their behalf until we are successful in gaining their release."

At the same time Rainwater reported on plans to deliver petitions to the North Vietnamese delegation at the Paris peace talks containing more than 2 million signatures (see page 24). He has since launched a letter campaign (page 25).

"The petitions have been circulated by V.F.W. Posts throughout the nation," he said. "They show that Americans are deeply concerned and are solidly united on the prisoner issue."

During the Council sessions one bundle of petitions bearing 1 million names was sent to Paris.

Rainwater also announced that membership has increased 200,000 more than at a comparable period last year.

The Council of Administration voted to hold the 1972 National Convention in Minneapolis after deciding at the 71st National Convention in Miami Beach, Fla., to withdraw the 1972 event from New York.

This action was taken because of New York Mayor John Lindsay's comment that the "heroes" are those who go to Canada or Sweden to avoid military service.

The Council also approved a record high budget of \$5,588,000, an increase of \$350,000 over the previous high established a year ago. The higher budget was made possible by a boost of 87,000 in membership to put the total to 1,600,000, largest in V.F.W. history.

In the evening of Oct. 5 Adjutant General Julian Dickenson was presented with the V.F.W. Distinguished Service Medal by immediate Past Commander-in-Chief Ray Gallagher in recognition of his 20 years of service in office. The presentation was made in accordance with a testimonial resolution adopted by the 71st National Convention praising Dickenson for his contributions to the organization.

Cooper T. Holt, a Past Commander-in-Chief and Executive Director of the V.F.W.'s Washington Office, warned that adoption of a bill introduced in the Senate by Sen. Edward Kennedy (Mass.) and Rep. Martha Griffiths (Mich.) to establish a national health insurance plan could result in VA hospitals being absorbed by other federal agencies for use by the general public.

"This is the most dangerous thing for veterans," Holt said. "The 166 VA hospitals would be the first to be taken over."

Other speakers included Senior Vice Commander-in-Chief Joseph L. Vicites who called on the Council members to "go out of here filled with enthusiasm to increase membership." He pledged also that in 1970-71 "I will speak up on the issues."

Junior Vice Commander-in-Chief Patrick E. Carr told the Council members "to attend every statewide event in your districts because the Council is the governing body between Conventions. Make your suggestions to Department Commanders and they will be glad to receive them."

#### NATIONAL COMMITTEES MEET

Prior to the Council of Administration meeting, National Committees on V.F.W. programs held sessions to make plans and set goals for 1970-71. Following are brief reports on these meetings. (See page 20 for Legislative, National Security and Foreign Affairs and Civil Service and Employment.)

## IS WORLD WAR III BEING KINDLED IN THE MEDITERRANEAN?

HON. LEONARD FARBSTAIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. FARBSTAIN, Mr. Speaker, in view of the ever-deepening crisis in the Middle East and the danger that this crisis presents to world peace, I share with my colleagues the very interesting analysis, "Is World War III Being Kindled in the Mediterranean?", that appeared in a recent issue of *Prevent World War III*:

### IS WORLD WAR III BEING KINDLED IN THE MEDITERRANEAN?

The emergence of a Moscow-Cairo Axis in the Middle East, with Libya and other Arab states as lesser partners, presages a clash with the Free World powers that must be avoided by wise statesmanship now, before the nations enter upon the dark, one-way road that leads to global warfare.

It is obvious that men and women who believe in freedom cannot allow a totalitarian force to destroy the rights of small nations—and here we speak not only of Israel, but also of Arab states like Lebanon, Tunisia and Jordan, as well as non-Arab states like Turkey.

The world is already in a precarious state of balance—a balance of nuclear terror—between the two super powers. If that balance were to be notably upset—as it would be if the Soviets were to overwhelmingly increase their ascendancy in a major part of the world such as the Middle East—then instead of a balance of terror, and instead of the faltering hope of detente which has been so carefully nurtured in the SALT talks and elsewhere, we would have a condition of complete and dangerous unpredictability. The result would be either an enormously accelerated arms race, an adventurist war of preemption, or the prospect of general war by accident. Common sense must reject all such alternatives.

#### ARMING FOR A NEW WAR?

For a long time, regional understandings such as NATO have helped to delimit, if not the spheres of influence claimed by East and West, at least the spheres in which war was a dangerous possibility.

For a generation, this delimitation has been accepted.

Now, with the open assignment of Soviet airmen as part of the Egyptian airforce, the open use of Egyptian ports by the Soviet fleet, and the sale by France of 125 modern planes to Libya (an adjunct of the Moscow-Cairo Axis), a totally new picture is being created.

Until recently, Moscow's regional propaganda line was based primarily on support to the Arabs, and sought political advantage in Middle East chaos. Now the position has changed; Russian propaganda justifies an armed Soviet presence in the Middle East, and the imperialist purpose becomes visible behind the diplomatic fog.

#### USSR STAKES OUT "SOUTHERN FRONTIER"

After many years of co-existence with the American 6th Fleet in the Mediterranean, Moscow chose the time of the NATO meeting in Rome to announce a new policy. Read the following broadcast by Radio Moscow, beamed to Italy just as the NATO ministers assembled on May 27, 1970:

"The situation in the Mediterranean has indeed worsened in these last few years—not due to the Soviet Union, but indeed be-

cause of the presence in this sea—which is thousands of kilometers from U.S. coastlines—of the U.S. 6th Fleet which the peoples of the Mediterranean describe very accurately as a policeman . . . NATO is the active ally of American imperialism in these matters . . .

"In regard to the presence of Soviet warships in the Mediterranean, a sea that lies close to the frontiers of the Soviet Union . . . the Soviet Union maintains its ships there to guarantee the defense of its southern frontiers."

Thus, for the first time since the Czars, we hear the Mediterranean spoken of as an extension of the "southern frontiers" of Russia. And "guarding" these frontiers is extended to include a "guarantee" of the Arab states, as well as "the southern frontiers of the socialist community." Therefore, Moscow openly asks the American fleet to get out, denouncing it as "the aggressor."

This is a radical change of attitude from the days when we thought the Cold War was coming to an end, when the Mediterranean was thought of as a *mare liberum*, and the Middle East was under some kind of United Nations supervision (ineffective though it proved to be).

President Nixon declared in his basic statement, "Foreign Policy for the 1970's," that "the United States would view any effort of the Soviet Union to seek predominance in the Middle East as a matter of grave concern." When Secretary of State Wm. P. Rogers, using the most moderate of language, complained of the Soviet increase in forces as "a serious matter," Moscow called his remarks "provocative," and openly admitted the increase in its armament.

#### CHAOS IN THE MAKING

Events in other places serve to add to our cause for alarm. If the Arab states have been divided between those attached to the Russian axis, and those in chaos, the situation is rapidly worsening. As we go to press, we hear of the murder of an American diplomatic attaché by guerillas in Jordan, the kidnapping of another, and two successive attempts to assassinate King Hussein. It is not too much, indeed, to say that because of the Soviet-Egyptian-supported guerrillas, a state of near civil war exists in Jordan, and may spread quickly to places like Lebanon. Every disorder of this type constitutes an excuse for further disturbance, and new adventurism by the Moscow-Cairo Axis.

We cannot look to the Security Council for solutions, because it has become prosecutor, judge and executioner for only one side of the dispute.

The situation is further complicated by the effort of Maoist China to establish some kind of presence of its own in the Middle East, leading to a constant competition between Moscow and Peking spokesmen as to which can use the strongest language in support of "the people's war"—i.e., the guerrillas. Long ago Peking made its radio available to El Fatah, and scarcely an issue of the official Peking REVIEW fails to present some major article bolstering up the cause of the guerrilla forces. On May 25, 1970, for example, Premier Chou En-lai himself addressed a letter to the El Fatah head, Yassir Arafat, reiterating Peking's "unswerving support of your struggle."

Meanwhile, on June 15, President Nasser, appearing jointly with the new Libyan Premier, proclaimed once again his "firm rejection" of any attempt to reinstate the United Nations ceasefire.

As 79 members of the United States Senate summed up the picture in a joint letter to Secretary of State Rogers on May 28, recent events have created "a growing military imbalance" in the area. "The Soviet Union," they write, "has taken the unprecedented steps of overly involving in increasing num-



ber of its own military personnel in a state far from its own borders," as part of a "reckless escalation of the Mideast conflict."

From the point of view of Israel, Prime Minister Golda Meir has put it even more plainly: "The Soviet Union in pursuit of its scheme to dominate the Middle East does not care if Israel goes up in flames."

Now is the time for the common sense of mankind to reassert itself. If we cannot have brotherhood, let us at least seek safety and order—because otherwise the alternative is too terrible to contemplate. Let us at least not try to upset balances that have worked for a reasonable number of years. Let us try, where these balances have come into doubt, to repair them, and to aid the freedom-loving countries on whose frail power they depend. The other choice, as Dean Rusk has put it, is "the path that leads over the cliff."

#### WAR POWERS OF THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS

### HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, yesterday we had the opportunity to define the powers of the President and the Congress relating to war and our commitment to send troops into areas of conflict.

Mr. Speaker, a resolution of this importance should have had the greatest possible exposure in this body. It should not have been brought up under a procedure that did not permit any amendments to it.

The resolution does nothing to alter the present course of the President and the Congress under existing laws and the Constitution. While the objective is meritorious, the language of this resolution is far from binding upon the President to refrain involving the Armed Forces of the United States in armed conflict.

I am concerned that section 2 of the resolution may be construed by the President as being given a "blank check" to embark upon a military adventure into any area of the world. The words "when-ever feasible" can be constructed by the President in any way that he determines. Under the broad powers of the Constitution he can send troops wherever he chooses, and there is nothing in the language of this resolution which would preclude this action.

This resolution, while a grand compilation of words, is absolutely meaningless. I believe that the Congress should assert its absolute power to require the President to desist from hostilities which may be undertaken without the declaration of war by the Congress. There are so many loopholes in this resolution's two sections, sections 2 and 3, that it tends to go in the opposite direction to what Congress intends.

Mr. Speaker, I have voted against this resolution because I am skeptical that the wording of it will attain our objective for peace in the world. I shall continue in my efforts to bring back our boys from Vietnam and from sending others into areas of combat.

#### VISA DENIED DR. ZAMOSKIN

### HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, the Department of State has recently denied a visa to Soviet sociologist, Dr. Yuri A. Zamoskin, who was scheduled to lecture in this country at over 15 colleges. All the necessary papers were ready until last Thursday when the State Department decided to take a harder line with the U.S.S.R. on the issuance of visas. I would like to submit for inclusion in the RECORD my letter of today to Secretary of State William P. Rogers urging that he instruct the U.S. Consulate in Moscow to release the visa prepared for Dr. Zamoskin.

The letter follows:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D.C., November 17, 1970.

HON. WILLIAM P. ROGERS,  
Secretary of State,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ROGERS: I am most disappointed in the position taken by the Department of State in not authorizing a visa to Dr. Yuri A. Zamoskin of the USSR to begin his scheduled lecture tour yesterday in the United States. Dr. Zamoskin, the Vice President of the Soviet Sociological Association, editor of the Journal of Philosophy, and author of 21 books, is a leading sociologist who was scheduled to speak on the problems of today's youth in the USSR at over 15 colleges, including Rutgers, Dartmouth, Kent State, Cornell, Columbia and Duke University.

His documentation and arrangements were all in order until last Thursday when the Department of State decided it was necessary to obtain an agreement from the Soviet government that they would entertain a reciprocal proposal for an American lecturer to speak in the Soviet Union. This assurance demanded by the Department of State is already implicit in the exchange agreement. It is my understanding that the Soviet government feels that this new position held by the Department of State contradicts the existing cultural exchange agreement between our two countries. This is seen as a new approach, a hard-line policy on the part of our government by demanding special assurances from the USSR that they will consider entertaining an American lecturer at a later date.

Dr. Zamoskin has visited the United States at least 5 times and has met and exchanged views with leading educators throughout this country. As recently as 1967 he participated in the proceedings of the American Sociological Association in the U.S. He is esteemed by sociological and soviet experts at our own universities and held by them to be a leading exponent of Soviet liberal views.

May I suggest that the Department of State immediately authorize the United States Consulate in Moscow to release the visa prepared for Dr. Zamoskin and then, at a later date, test the good faith of the USSR government when we have a specific lecturer or lecturers to suggest to them. If we find that there is no reasonable reciprocity on the part of the Soviet government, then, at that time, we can adjust our policies accordingly. The goal should be a fair and open exchange of ideas, particularly at the university level where academic freedom should flourish and be encouraged.

Sincerely,

EDWARD I. KOCH.

#### "GLAMOR" OF NARCOTICS CONCEALS A SORDID LIFE

### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, there is a necessary and, in fact, long overdue concern over the tremendous and adverse affect of narcotics in our educational institutions. The complications of drug abuse must be effectively emphasized and a program to convince youngsters that the avoidance of experimentation with drugs is essential to their well-being must necessarily be emphasized.

A very effective, hard-hitting editorial in the Harvey, Ill., Tribune, Thursday, November 12, emphasized the problem as effectively as any recent commentary that I have read. The item follows:

"GLAMOR" OF NARCOTICS CONCEALS A SORDID LIFE

The media was criticized by speakers at a recent Thornton Community college-Illinois Law Enforcement commission workshop for contributing to the drug problem by "glamorizing" the situation. But a newspaper's responsibility is to present both sides of a situation, and both the parents and the children involved in or contemplating involvement in drugs tend to glamorize the situation, within the strict definition of the word, themselves.

Glamorous means "having an imaginary and emotional appeal." For parents, many without the facts and operating on rumors, the situation becomes quite emotional. This is understandable among those who do care about their children, but when drug addiction symptoms become apparent, parental emotions often become unreasonable, sometimes resulting in compounding the problem instead of helping.

A booklet, "Living a Nightmare" put out by the Harvey Police department, suggests that parents in discussing the problem with their children be frank, honest, factual and definite. Copies of this worthwhile booklet are still available at the station located on Broadway across from the Municipal building.

Another way for parents to correct their mistaken ideas about drugs is to support drug abuse workshops and hear speakers available through police departments and schools. A drug rehabilitation center, Foundation I Clinic, recently opened on 154th street in Harvey, has indicated a need for both community and financial support.

Young people, too, have a tendency to glamorize the situation. To many of them, drugs make the ugly beautiful, the painful pleasant, and the real unreal. Another illusion youths hold concerning drugs is that within the peer group, involvement is "cool." This is true, but after a period of time, they find the error of their own illusion. An addict loses his cool in his desperation and soon becomes something for his former friends to pity. With those of his friends who accompany him in drugs, past friendship becomes a threat to the addict who can only see his next fix. As the brain cells die, the profound thoughts and beautiful music become jumbled and the beauty of sight and hearing are dulled instead of heightened.

Drug addiction is glamorous: but it is a romantic world of illusions which eventually shatters a young person's enthusiasm, talent and happiness and sometimes results

in death, a very ugly twist of fate for someone who seeks life most—the young.

Perhaps society's biggest job then is to get the "message" to its youth of the dire results of addiction. Prevention, in this case, is easier than cure.

#### DOMINANT ROLE IN ADMINISTRATION POLICIES?

**HON. JOHN D. DINGELL**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Tuesday, November 17, 1970*

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent article appearing in volume 35, number 19, of the Conservation News published October 1, 1970, by the National Wildlife Federation, the great national citizens conservation organization, entitled "Are Industries To Play the Dominant Role in Administration Policies?"

That superb article points out actions by the executive branch of the Government raising real questions as to whether the progress desired by all of our people is being achieved in preserving natural resources, protecting the public lands, combating pollution, and assuring a desirable environment. It follows:

#### ARE INDUSTRIES TO PLAY THE DOMINANT ROLE IN ADMINISTRATION POLICIES?

(By Louis S. Clapper)

In its first Annual Report, the new Council on Environmental Quality said that "historians may one day call 1970 the year of the environment."

Few persons would quarrel with that evaluation because, with the "Earth Day" observance and the enactment of significant new legislation, 1970 has been memorable. The Congress has adopted landmark legislation such as the National Environmental Policy Act and the Water Quality Improvement Act, improved environmental considerations in the Airport and Airway Development Act, and soon may approve of strengthening changes to existing laws on air pollution control and solid waste disposal. A historic court decision, in the so-called *Boca Ciega* case, said the Army Corps of Engineers has the authority to deny permits to dredge and fill on grounds of environmental damage. And, the President this year himself exerted significant leadership in a special message on the environment to the Congress, recommending a 37-point program. He also ordered Federal agencies to clean up their pollution, took important steps to prevent oil pollution and clean up any which occurs, and proposed taxes on leaded gasoline to reduce air pollution. Truly, 1970 has been the "Year of the Environment."

Despite all of these developments, however, there is a growing suspicion among conservationists and environmentalists that industries may be gaining a dominance where they can play a leading role in the formulation and implementation of Administration policies. Here are the reasons why 1970 may also become known as the "Year of the Industrialists":

*Item:* On January 28, the Administration announced a delay in imposition of the grazing fee increase planned for 1970. While this "moratorium" was imposed for at least one year ostensibly to allow the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior to study recommendations of the Public Land Law Review Commission, pressures from western live-

stock interests were instrumental in the decision. Actually, the practice of grazing of privately-owned livestock on Federal ranges has been "studied to death" and, before the moratorium, the fees were found to be so low as to constitute a subsidy for a tiny segment of the livestock industry. The grazing fee increases were programmed to reach full market value in ten years. Now, the livestock interests are working either to get the moratorium extended or the fee increases reduced. Due to these pressures over many years, public lands have been badly damaged through overgrazing.

*Item:* On April 9, 1970, the President announced the establishment, by Executive Order, of a National Industrial Pollution Control Council composed of 63 officials of major industries, including several polluters. Bert S. Cross, of Minnesota Mining and Manufacturing Company, was named as chairman. The 3-M Company manufactures a product widely used by its subsidiary, National Advertising Company, which is generally credited with being the biggest opponent to the removal of billboards in the highway beautification plan supported by the Department of Transportation. Others included in the star-studded lineup are executives of many of the Nation's largest lumbering, mining, oil, and manufacturing companies, some of which have been under close Federal scrutiny for polluting water and air resources. Then, the Administration sought \$475,000 for operations of this well-heeled group, or nearly one-third of the amount it requested for activities of the Council on Environmental Quality which is responsible for riding herd on all Federal activities, including those which supervise industries. How well will the Administrator of the new Environmental Protection Agency be able to crack down on polluting industries when they are represented in the Cabinet by the Secretary of Commerce and he is not?

*Item:* On June 19, 1970, the President ordered Federal agencies to formulate plans to permit increased production of timber, probably to the detriment of other valid uses of Federal forests. Even a Republican leader in the Congress, such as Mr. John P. Saylor (Pa.), described this as a successful end run by the timber industry to gain by Executive fiat the special advantages they could not achieve by legislation. Mr. Saylor credited the White House and said: "... conservation, environment, ecology, that is, the public's concerns, are to be subservient to the pressures and profits of the logging and lumber industry."

*Item:* In July, 1970, full impact of the insidious poisoning of lakes and streams by mercury wastes was sweeping across America, with evidence of the dangerous element found in waterfowl and fish and other creatures. The Secretary of the Interior said he was moving against ten industrial plants and "we are developing hard evidence against a number of other companies." He said these discharges "represent an intolerable threat to the health and safety of Americans." Then, in August, Alabama officials reportedly were ready to move to shut down industries discharging mercury into public waters. Yet, the Federal Government baffled Alabamians by pulling the rug out from under the State officials by establishing something of a temporary accommodation tolerance up to a half-pound per day for mercury dischargers, giving them time to install clean-up equipment. Mercury can be kept out of public waters entirely through recycling.

*Item:* On September 9, a writer for the New York Times authored an article attributed to White House sources which alleged that Carl L. Klein, Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Water Quality and Research, was a principal obstacle to the enforcement of anti-pollution laws. The article hinted that

Klein was too soft. In truth, Klein probably was too brash and tough. The condition of Puget Sound in Washington is an example. A conference, first step in complicated Federal law enforcement procedures was held in 1962 to initiate a badly-needed cleanup process. The second session of this conference was held in 1967, when the polluting municipalities and industries agreed to a cleanup compliance schedule. However, some of the polluters are not progressing as rapidly as many people think they can and should. The largest plant involved, the Scott Paper Company, has been given until 1978 by the State as a deadline to clean up part of its wastes—16 years after the initial conference had decided what should be done. Klein wanted to call a public hearing, second stage in the law enforcement process, for the purpose of bringing facts out on the table and to try for an earlier compliance deadline. However, orders "from upstairs" came to cancel the hearing and any pulloff had to originate either with the Secretary or at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. Klein resigned September 17.

*Item:* An almost-forgotten section called the Refuse Act in the 1899 Rivers and Harbors Act prohibits the discharge of "refuse matter of any kind or description whatever" into any interstate or intrastate navigable water of the U.S. except under a permit from the Army Corps of Engineers. While municipal sewage is exempted, almost all other pollutants supposedly are covered, including discharges of oil, chemicals, garbage from ships, and even heat. The Corps of Engineers has issued relatively few permits over the years and obvious violations of the Act are widespread. However, the Corps of Engineers and the Justice Department are bending over backward to not conflict with water pollution abatement efforts of the FWQA—or to prosecute violators. Curiously enough, Seattle attorney Marvin Durning in April asked the U.S. Attorney to prosecute and fine under provisions of the Refuse Act the industries which are dumping refuse into Puget Sound. When no action was forthcoming on July 9, he went to court against ITT Rayonier, Inc., charging the firm with dumping pulp wastes into the Sound. Thus far, there is little evidence that the Administration wants to develop a coordinated crackdown on industrial polluters, using either new or newly-rediscovered laws, or even to ask for additional funds to employ more people for increased surveillance.

*Item:* For years, industrial and business groups opposed a strong Federal water pollution control program, including grants to cities for the construction of waste treatment plants. This attitude stemmed from the realization that, once the cities cleaned up, the public finger would be pointed at industrial polluters. In 1969, the Administration proposed that only \$214 million be appropriated (as had the Johnson Administration) for fiscal 1970.

The Congress, however, responding to widespread public demands, appropriated \$800 million. Then, the Administration obligated only \$360 million, leaving a \$440 million "carryover." Much of this slowdown was due to a shortage of manpower to process applications from the States and cities. Of 150 positions authorized the FWQA was allowed only 90 and some of these were not filled.

Federal agencies now are busy drafting their proposed budget for fiscal 1972. After a thorough going over, this Budget will be sent to the Congress in January. Earlier this year, Thomas L. Kimball, Executive Director of the National Wildlife Federation, directed an open letter to the President. He asked: "Are you spending enough to repair the damage done to the environment—to safeguard our natural resources," pointing out that natural resources ranked 13th or dead last among the priorities in the 1971 budget request. How much money is allocated for wise



management of natural resources, for water and air pollution control, and for effective protective law enforcement will be an index toward how much influence industrial interests have gained within the Administration in this "Year of the Environment."

## SALT AND SANITY

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Marshall D. Shulman is a thoughtful and timely report on relations between the United States and U.S.S.R. It appeared in the New York Times of November 10, 1970:

#### SALT AND SANITY

(By Marshall D. Shulman)

(NOTE.—Marshall D. Shulman is Professor of Government and Director of the Russian Institute, Columbia University.)

The barometer of tensions between the U.S. and the Soviet Union has fluctuated wildly lately between "détente" and "confrontation" and there is a danger that an opportunity is being lost to bring some sanity to bear on the one problem on which the two countries have overlapping interests—strategic weapons competition.

That opportunity exists because, for the first time, there is a rough balance between the strategic nuclear arsenals of the two super-powers. The differences between the kinds and numbers of weapons on each side has no practical significance. However, the present gross balance is not likely to last long.

If the two countries continue to build up their strategic arsenals, we will soon move into a period of greatly increased instabilities, largely because the weapons now being developed and deployed are feeding doubts on each side.

The major reason why the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks (SALT) do not appear able to take advantage of the present opportunity, except for marginal aspects, is that the tides of politics are currently running in a conservative direction in both countries.

On the Soviet side, the orthodox wing of the party bureaucracy is currently in the ascendant, committed to conformism at home and unremitting struggle against "imperialism" abroad. This is a time of critical debate in Moscow—concerning the Five-Year Plan, the party congress to be held in the spring, decisions regarding resources and policies. During these debates, conflicting assumptions regarding Soviet relations with the United States will be argued.

To the leadership in Moscow, the dominant pressures in this country appear to be militarism and reaction. They note the talk of reduced military budget, but pay more attention to Administration pressure for rapid deployments of MIRV and ABM. They would be interested in the President's words regarding trade possibilities, but are more impressed with the rejection of the Ford deal. They find it difficult to distinguish between what is said for reasons of domestic politics and for reasons of state.

Moreover, expectation of gains from an active "anti-imperialist" campaign is stimulated by Soviet observation of disorders in American society, the American mood of contraction from involvements abroad, and the reduction in confidence in America on the part of its friends. The temptation to press political competition actively is made almost

irresistible by the prospect of decisive gains in the Arab world and in Western Europe.

With all this in mind, the Soviet Union is expanding its presence on the global scene, developing military capabilities and diplomacy, pressing political competition as hard as necessary and—in the case of the Middle East—as close to the margins of risk as the prize warrants.

Nevertheless, despite this prospect of heightened political competition, and despite ascendant conservatism in the two political systems, progress could be made in SALT if Washington operated on the basis of a more differentiated view of the relationship than is suggested by the alternation of "détente" and "confrontation." SALT does not signify détente or rapprochement. What it should signify is mutual interest in damping down the strategic weapons competition.

There are some in the Soviet Union who share this view, but it will take learning time and restraint on our side if this view is to become widely enough shared to overcome the military desire to catch up with the United States qualitatively (e.g., in MIRV testing) as well as to push ahead quantitatively.

We both need to improve our signaling about SALT. Previous signals have been smothered in the noise of domestic politics and short-sighted efforts to gain bargaining advantages. Soviet signaling is inhibited by the fear that an expression of concern will be taken as a sign of weakness. The possibilities for substantial and timely discussions of MIRV thus have been greatly reduced.

The moment is important. We may miss a time to influence Russian decisions about how much of their resources to put into strategic weapons; Moscow may miss the point that a conservative U.S. Administration can do some things more easily than a liberal Administration; and we both may miss an opportunity to improve our security by stabilizing the strategic weapons competition.

## THE COMPREHENSIVE MANPOWER ACT AND THE SENIOR AIDES PROGRAM

### HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, in order to provide a decent and meaningful life for all older Americans in this country, especially those of low income, I support the passage of the manpower bill which provides for continuation and further development of senior community service employment programs. This new concept toward helping our Nation's elderly poor will eliminate to a great extent many social-oriented problems in our communities.

The concept has been in effect in some 20 demonstration projects throughout this country for the past 2½ years. It has more than demonstrated its worth.

The Minneapolis program is operated by Minneapolis AFL-CIO Central Labor Union Council under contract with the National Council of Senior Citizens and U.S. Department of Labor.

The AIDES, all over 55 years of age, and all living on incomes of \$1,800 a year or less, are proving that their vitality, human spirit and willingness to help are assets we cannot afford to lose in meeting community problems.

The senior AIDES program in Minneapolis has won State awards for its services to the mentally retarded, has presented a plan for a model senior service center to the model cities board, and has helped local community agencies redouble its efforts to reach the isolated and the poor.

To date, approximately 500 have applied for the 60 positions offered as senior AIDES.

The senior AIDES program in Minneapolis, under the leadership of Mrs. Kersten, has demonstrated the need to further the efforts of senior citizens in this very vital area.

The passage of this bill will substantially advance this cause.

## CAMPUS VIOLENCE AND THE WAR

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Paul Linebarger wrote in "Psychological Warfare":

The intent of propaganda is always a result observable in action.

Many people have mistakenly blamed the Vietnam war for the violent and destructive activities carried out at home by students and nonstudents. But violence on campuses in the Western Hemisphere does not mysteriously erupt due to conflict in Asia. Nothing even slightly similar took place during the Korean war.

Student violence focused on our deployment of men to the Southeast Asian theater of the global war arises not from the war itself, but rather from student attitudes toward our resistance to Communist aggression in that area of the world. Their hostile attitudes have been purposely fostered and cultivated by various individuals whose mission it is to drive the United States out of Vietnam.

In 1965 the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee, in Senate document No. 72, 89th Congress, first session, stated—and supplied the necessary evidence to show—that "the control of the anti-Vietnam movement has clearly passed from the hands of the moderate elements who may have controlled it at one time, into the hands of Communists and extremist elements who are openly sympathetic to the Vietcong and openly hostile to the United States."

This 256-page report was put out 5 years ago. Since that time Communist and extremist control of the movement has not abated, although it has been camouflaged by the large numbers which have been rallied in support of Soviet foreign policy objectives in Southeast Asia. One of the more despicable aspects of this situation is that the colleges have paid to have their students indoctrinated with various distortions, misrepresentations, and blatant lies, whose influence upon the students is now reflected in ever-widening circles of blood and destruction. Just recently at Irvine, within

11 days of a speech at the UCI campus by the well-known revolutionary, Tom Hayden, a Stanford Research Institute building was bombed and the local branch of the Bank of America was severely damaged by fire.

The purpose of propaganda is always action. The purpose of anti-Vietnam, anti-American propaganda is action against America.

The House Internal Security Committee just concluded a study on campus speakers which gives us insight into the magnitude of the pro-North Vietnamese propaganda effort conducted on the campuses. The House committee sent out a questionnaire to 179 colleges and universities requesting information on speakers who had appeared on campus in the last 2 years. From the 95 colleges and universities which responded, in full or in part, to the committee's survey, it was determined that in the last 2 years no less than \$100,000 had gone to speakers representing organizations violently opposed to our actions in Vietnam and bent on revolution in the United States. These organizations ran the gamut from the Communist Party to the Youth International Party—Yippies.

When it is realized that these 95 colleges represent less than 4 percent of the educational institutions in the country, and that all of these 95 did not respond in full to the questionnaire, a little extrapolation allows us to see that well over a million dollars must have been paid to these revolutionaries. Is it any wonder that much feeling on the campuses is directed against our actions in Vietnam? In the name of free speech the educational institutions have not only helped spread violence among their students but have supported through speakers' fees the individuals who are responsible.

A study dealing with Chinese Communist indoctrination techniques, used so successfully against American prisoners during the Korean war, gives us the following information:

The indoctrination program was divided into two phases. The first phase was called by Army psychiatrists the "mind conditioning phase." During this period, the lecturer aimed at making the prisoners hate America. They were told that the South Koreans had treacherously attacked the peaceful North Koreans, etc., etc. . . .

The mind conditioning phase of enemy indoctrination procedures is now being undertaken in the citadels of higher learning in the United States.

Losing the war will not restore order on the campuses. Restoring order on the campuses will, however, strengthen the war effort and save American lives in Vietnam.

#### DEFENSE BUDGETS

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, recently I received a letter from my good friend Mr. Russ Clark, of Dallas, Tex.,

whose close association with our aerospace programs has prompted him to write of his deep concern for the future of our defense stature. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include Mr. Clark's letter:

DALLAS, TEX.,  
November 3, 1970.

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE,  
Congress of the United States,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR "TIGER": As a concerned citizen of Texas and the United States, I am writing to you to express my very deep personal feelings relative to the current position and projected trends in our U.S. Government support for Science, Technology, and DOD Defense Systems.

Because of my vocation, I have very recently had the personal privilege of hearing the Deputy Secretary of Defense, the Honorable David Packard, and the Director of Defense Research and Engineering, the Honorable John S. Foster, Jr., discuss in some privileged meetings the implications of the current, DOD-planned FY-71 Defense budget and the current guidelines to the DOD for the five-year preliminary Defense budget planning for FY-72 through FY-77.

A concerned citizen must be shocked if he understands that the proposed FY-71 budget, in terms of "real" purchasing power of our inflated dollar, is on the order of \$2 billion less than the FY-60 Defense budget.

Further, the thoughtful and knowledgeable citizen would be equally shocked if he understood that the DOD support of Science and Technology in its programs, again in terms of "real" dollars, for the FY-71 requested Defense budget is lower than recent preceding years; and, particularly, that the current guideline planning for the "out" years (FY-72 through FY-77), again in terms of "real" dollars, is projected to decrease year by year. The Science and Technology benefits that are realized from the DOD RDT&E authorized and appropriated budget have significant and enduring effect on our scientific and technology base for many other government programs, such as NASA, DOT, and improvement of our Ecology.

I know it is difficult to convey to the average citizen, but the lead time involved from basic research through applied research and development to useful products, whether it be defense systems or ecological systems, is long and difficult and requires sustained funding and dedication of scientific and engineering personnel.

I am sure I do not need to comment in depth on the well known threat to our society of the continuing advancements in Science, Technology, and Offensive-Defensive Systems of unfriendly countries who continually increase, year by year, their support, in terms of "real" dollars, in these activities.

Sir, my special, personal plea to you, who represent the people of Texas and our country, is that to obtain economic growth with social justice, and a national defensive capability that will effectively deter aggressive nations, you do all you possibly can to create knowledge and understanding of the issues among the people of Texas, whom you represent; and, particularly at this time, to support, as a minimum, the DOD FY-71 budget request; and, further, if you are as concerned as I am, to obtain authorization and appropriation of more Defense dollars than DOD has requested in FY-71.

I would be most pleased at any time when I am in Washington to amplify in person my concern as expressed above.

Let me thank you for your consideration of this critical subject.

Sincerely,

J. RUSSELL CLARK.

#### THIS WAY LIES MADNESS

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, an ancient Greek proverb said:

Those whom the gods would destroy, they first make mad.

There are times when it seems that today's America is bent on proving its truth anew.

On the same day recently, October 21, two news stories appeared in Eastern papers. One, an Associated Press dispatch from Baltimore, reported that a Federal judge had just ruled that the Baltimore City Police Department could not refuse to put a nudist on the police force, ordering that he be hired within 7 days.

Federal Judge Edward S. Northrop was said to have declared "that the decision not to hire the department's top applicant because of his membership in a nudist colony violated the Glen Burnie man's constitutional right of free association."

The other story, appearing in the Buffalo, N.Y. Evening News, and also reporting the action of a judge, began as follows:

Six of Mrs. Cecilia Gracey's nine children have been taken from her and placed in foster homes because she refused to send them to a school for "sex teaching."

Public school authorities in Oswego County, N.Y., have admitted that abortion was discussed in a class which Mrs. Gracey's children were required to attend. Judge Donald Comstock reportedly stated, regarding her children:

I have an obligation under the law to see that they get an education. I had no alternative.

At the time the story was written, Mr. and Mrs. Gracey did not even know where their three youngest school aged children had been taken.

A society which simultaneously, by court decision, compels the hiring of nudists as policemen and takes children away from their parents for not attending classes in which abortion is discussed, is a society well on the road to insanity.

Some will say these are mere isolated instances, and so they are—now. That is why they are still newsworthy. But the pattern of madness they reveal is spreading—and infectious. This is worse than moral bankruptcy; it is a total perversion of common decency and common sense.

For several years I have been warning of the dangers of the continuing drive by our Government school systems—which is the proper name to give to what we usually call "public schools"—to change and dominate the children who attend them, estranging them thereby from their parents. The current practice of administering amphetamines and related powerful drugs to young children in many Government schools, which was the subject of a special hearing September 29 by Congressman CORNELIUS J.



GALLAGHER's Subcommittee of the House Government Operations Committee, is further alarming evidence of this trend. Testimony presented at that hearing revealed the extent of the pressure put on parents who try to resist, or decline to consent to the drugging of their children at school.

To quote the testimony of Mrs. Daniel H. Youngs, of Indianapolis, Ind., formerly of Little Rock, Ark.:

The next few months the pressure was extreme. We received almost daily notes from the children's teachers and calls from the school. We were told our children had completely quit trying and were falling every subject. We knew what they were trying to accomplish by this, because we knew parents in the neighborhood that submitted their children to the program because they couldn't take the pressure. Believe me, it wasn't a pretty sight to see little children's personalities changed with the use of drugs.

My husband and I had no one to turn to. We knew that the school officials would do nothing. At this point we felt we had two alternatives: leave Arkansas or stay and fight. We chose to stay and fight. We knew there were hundreds of children on drugs and someone, somewhere would listen and help us put a stop to this program. We were wrong!

Mrs. Youngs listed no less than 15 officials and other persons to whom she appealed for help. None could or would do anything to protect her children.

But to take a child away from his home and his parents altogether, and place him in another home without his parents' consent or even knowledge because of a dispute over his schooling, is utterly unforgivable. This sort of thing is characteristic of the Soviet Union and Red China, but so far as I know this is the first time it has happened in the United States. In other cases children have been forcibly returned to government schools, or their parents have been fined or briefly jailed for withdrawing them from school, but never before to my knowledge has a child been legally removed from his home for this reason. And this case involves not just one child, but six.

That is why the case of the Gracey family deserves nationwide attention. If the reported facts are false, this should be established without delay. If they are true, they constitute the clearest proof so far of the full extent of the nightmare which our government school system is rapidly becoming, and of the crying need for action at every level of government to call a halt to such monstrous abuses of power.

#### ROORBACK STYLE: THE SMEAR ARTIST

### HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the integrity of our national politics is discussed in the following column by James Reston which appeared in the Kansas City Star of October 30, 1970:

#### ROORBACK STYLE: THE SMEAR ARTIST (By James Reston)

WASHINGTON.—The last few days of a political campaign are always the most dangerous, for then candidates are vulnerable to damaging and misleading attacks which they have no time to answer.

The last-minute smear is one of the oldest and ugliest tactics of American politics, and lately it has been used against Sen. Edmund S. Muskie of Maine, among others.

For example, a three-quarter page ad has recently been appearing in some Maine newspapers signed by Carl L. Shipley, a Republican national committeeman from the District of Columbia, who identifies himself as "Treasurer, Committee for a Respectable Congress."

The advertisement asks:

"What kind of man is Edmund Muskie?" and answers as follows: "You can't be sure by what he says today in Maine at election time. But you can find out something about him by taking a look at what he and his friends, whose support he accepts, have been saying all along. If you agree with their views on excusing lawlessness, on undermining national defense, on forgiving rioters and looters, and on accepting the use of marijuana and heroin by our young people, then Muskie is your kind of man."

Fortunately Senator Muskie had time to publicize and dramatize this as "a vicious, irresponsible, deliberate untruth," but a similar ad was run against Sen. Joe Tydings in Maryland and Congressman Tunney, the Democratic candidate for the Senate in California, and it is a warning of what can be expected in the closing hours of this squalid campaign.

The presidential campaign of 1844 gave a name to this sort of thing. It was called a "Roorback." At that time, when the Tennessee Democrat, James K. Polk, was running against Henry Clay of Virginia, then a Whig, the *Ithaca, N.Y., Chronicle*, a Whig newspaper, published what purported to be an excerpt from one Baron Roorback's journal in which Roorback claimed to have watched the purchase of 43 slaves by Polk with "the mark of the branding iron and the initials of his name on their shoulders . . ."

In actual fact, though this was widely reprinted just before the voting and Polk actually won the election, there was no such event, and there was no Baron Roorback; but the last-minute smear was established and we have had "Roorbacks" ever since.

What is interesting now, however, is not that the dirty tricks of politics go on but that they seem to be accepted so casually. Many of the one-minute political television ads are based on the same kind of misleading statements as the Muskie ad, with quotes taken out of context and the candidate accused of believing any statement ever made by any of his supporters.

Even our most respectable colleagues on the Wall Street Journal dismiss the current political appeals to fear by recalling, quite accurately, that the Democrats have often done the same thing. Boys will be boys, they seem to be saying a little sadly. "But let it pass; mostly we remember a quote from that wise old American philosopher, Mr. Dooley: 'Politics ain't beanbag.'"

Which is true enough, but one thing is fairly clear. This dirty stuff won't "pass" until the voters demonstrate that it doesn't pay off on election day. No doubt Shipley thought he would get away with the smear on Senator Muskie or he wouldn't have placed the ads.

Tens of millions are being spent on tricky TV ads in this campaign—all on the assumption that the papers and the voters will either let them pass or shrug them off.

Every campaign seems to develop new

techniques designed to mislead the public. For example, in this campaign, President Nixon has been condemning campus protesters, which is fair enough, but *Newsweek* magazine reports this week that in order to dramatize the President's counterattacks on the student radicals, "on occasion the President's staff leaks a few hecklers into the hall so that Mr. Nixon may back them down."

Hugh Sidey makes the same point in this week's *Life* magazine. "Nixon's advance men," he writes, "this fall have carefully arranged with local police to allow enough dissenters in the staging areas so the President will have his theme well illustrated as he warns to his job."

Well, as Carl Shipley would probably say, if that's the sort of politics you want, all you have to do is let it pass. But in a way, the real issue of the 1970 congressional elections is not the candidates but the tactics. For one thing is fairly clear: The President is making a test in this election to see whether his appeals to fear of crime, drugs, smut and permissiveness in general can be used to create a new conservative political majority in America.

If the Nixon-Agnew type of scare politics works in the '70 election, it is almost sure to be carried over into the presidential election of 1972, dividing and polarizing the politics of the nation even more than at present.

This is what this campaign is all about: It is about the integrity of our national politics and if this cannot somehow be established, it is hard to imagine how we can solve the rest of our staggering problems.

#### MAYOR CERVANTES SPEAKS

### HON. JAMES W. SYMINGTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. Speaker, a recent address by the Honorable Alfonso J. Cervantes, the mayor of the city of St. Louis, has been brought to my attention.

In his thoughtful discourse, Mayor Cervantes points out that:

Though the federal grants-in-aid systems for the central cities of older metropolitan areas has been substantially advantageous in many instances, on an over-all evaluation, the categorical grant system has been over-regulated, under-supported, divisive, wasteful, frustrating, completely beyond the federal bureaucracy's capacities, substantially ineffective, in the long run subversive of the very federal system that gave it birth, and that the whole system must be radically altered from a revenue grant system to a revenue sharing system.

Mayor Cervantes reaches the further conclusion that revenue sharing is the appropriate strategy to return to the cities' mayors the responsibility and authority to carry out their mandate. Without revenue sharing the authority over the various programs is located in Washington and not in the cities where the people and their problems are.

With Harvard Prof. Edward Banfield, author of the Model Cities Task Force Report recently released by the White House, Mayor Cervantes maintains that with the growth of Federal grants-in-aid from millions to billions the Federal Government is confronted with a basic decision: either the Federal Government will have to greatly expand its present

bureaucracy or it will have to return the administration of the programs to the cities themselves. Mayor Cervantes suggests that the unwelcome alternative of multiplying the Federal bureaucracy with the consequent minimization of the local authority is antithetical to our Federal system and that which our Founding Fathers envisioned.

Fortunately, the mayor was able to make his remarks before the very officials responsible for Federal grant programs at a conference at Annapolis, Md., held in furtherance of a 3-year program to improve and streamline Federal grant program administration.

I commend Mayor Cervantes' interesting and informative address, and am pleased to include it in the RECORD for the attention of my colleagues:

#### FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING AND THE CITIES:

##### A VIEW FROM ST. LOUIS

(By Hon. A. J. Cervantes)

Gentlemen: It may sound like a bit of banter and playful needling for a Mayor of one of the older, larger cities to initiate our discussion by stating:

"I have dreamed of the day when I would have the chief administrators of the federal grant program before me so that I could tell them exactly what I as a Mayor think of their whole system of categorical grants."

I know some Mayors who are so exasperated with the whole federal grant system that they would give up their own spleen and their cities' "maximum feasible participation" programs to have the opportunity to meet in one room with you chief administrators of the Departments of Labor, Justice, Commerce, Defense, Agriculture, Transportation, HEW, HUD and OMB to tell you that as far as the core cities and their poverty people are concerned the grant system itself hasn't worked, isn't working, and can't possibly work."

These Mayors would tell you that the whole system of categorical grants "is over-regulated, under-supported, divisive, wasteful, frustrating, completely beyond the federal bureaucracy's capacities, substantially ineffective, in the long run subversive of the very federal system that gave it birth, and that the whole system must be radically altered from a revenue grant system to a revenue sharing system."

I think, gentlemen, that you will agree with me that that would be quite a statement.

But it is not my temperate intention to make such a statement.

Furthermore, I need not make such a critical statement.

For, as I will document in a moment, this statement has already been implicitly made by our President, Mr. Richard Nixon, and by the conservative Republican Mr. Edward Banfield in his Model Cities Task Force Report released by the White House just two weeks ago.

#### MY ROLE BEFORE YOU TODAY

I recognize that I am before some of the most intelligent, committed, and capable administrators of which this country can boast.

You and your agencies' representatives have always treated St. Louis with a consideration and generosity far beyond the call of duty.

I wish to take this occasion to thank you and your representatives for all the creative assistance that you have afforded St. Louis and other cities, such as St. Louis, now in the throes of the urban crisis.

I know that the reason why we are here today is to address ourselves to the question of federal grant reform.

The particular categorical grant reform under consideration is that of revenue sharing.

My simple role is merely to give some informal observations on federal-city relationships as seen from the office of a Mayor.

My point of departure are the words of President Nixon and Professor Banfield in submitting why, and I quote the Banfield Task Force's principal recommendation, "most federal aid should go to the cities by way of revenue-sharing rather than by categorical grants-in-aid."

1. "Fiscal mismatch."—Fourteen months ago today, on August 13, 1969, President Nixon announced to Congress that he was submitting legislation providing "without federal strings" Federal Revenue Sharing with State and local governments.

Mr. Nixon first pointed out that "Revenues of the Federal government have increased ninety-fold in thirty-six years."

"Under our current budget structure," continued Mr. Nixon, "Federal revenues are likely to increase faster than the national economy. At the local level, the reverse is true. . . . The result is a 'fiscal mismatch' with potential Federal surpluses and local deficits."

#### NINE THOUSAND PRESENT!

My head swims and my mouth waters when I try to conjure with the concept of a ninety-fold increase of federal revenues in 36 years.

How does near-bankrupt St. Louis react to this?

Despite the fact that in the past 36 years St. Louis, as other older core cities, has become a concentration center of high cost citizens, its revenue increase has not been 9000% but 600% (from \$18 to \$109 millions).

In St. Louis we are averaging a yearly revenue increase of only 1.3% with a yearly cost increase of over 5%.

Income—1.3% increase.

Outgo—5.1% increase.

Clearly something had to give in St. Louis. Poorer City services, streets not fixed, one-third of the housing stock in serious disrepair, housing code enforcement lapsing, inadequate money to pay for policemen, firemen, teachers, city workers; peak taxation and peak deficits—the whole urban crisis bag—with bankruptcy not far down the fiscal pike.

#### A MARSHALL PLAN FOR AMERICAN CITIES

I have just returned from the International Conference of Mayors in West Berlin.

While attending the conference I was the guest of West Berlin's Mayor Klaus Schuetz.

The other evening I remarked to Mayor Schuetz how amazed I was that the cities of Europe so recently in war bombed ruins were now beautifully rebuilt. European cities that I saw do not have the core rot slums that infect American cities.

Mayor Schuetz with a shrug of his shoulders uttered two words that speak volumes: "Marshall Plan."

A Marshall Plan for ravaged European cities but no Marshall plan for ravaged American cities.

Here likewise is a type of "fiscal mismatch."

#### FEDERAL SPENDING PRIORITIES

You notice that I have not said that the federal government has not supplied the St. Louis community with money.

It has.

Lots of it.

According to the computer print-outs of the Federal Information Exchange System, in Fiscal Year '68 it was \$1.7 billion.

In Fiscal Year '69, \$1.5 billion.

During the first half of this past Fiscal Year it was \$571 million.

But as with the general national spending

priorities so with the federal spending pattern in St. Louis. Two-thirds of the federal spending in St. Louis is for military and defense-related expenditures, \$1.2 billion or 66% of the \$1.8 billion spent by the federal government in the City of St. Louis in '68 are listed under "Department of Defense" expenditures.

#### 50,000 NEW HOMES?

Of course I am proud of what St. Louis industries are doing for national defense.

But I am sure that you sympathize with me when I sigh a bit when I hear those billions of dollars of Phantom Jets roar over City Hall on the way to Viet Nam. I quietly think of what it would mean to our city if only \$1 billion of this investment could be put into St. Louis housing.

#### ONE BILLION!

A billion dollars would build 50,000 \$20,000 homes!

And that too is a fiscal mismatch. There were not 50,000 homes built in St. Louis last year but only 7 throughout the whole of the City.

2. *Inherent ineffectiveness of the categorical grant system.*—But the "fiscal mismatch" argument of federal-city relationship is of itself no argument whatsoever in favor of the revenue sharing plan.

And neither the President nor the Banfield Report says that it is.

All that the "fiscal mismatch" argument indicates is that the cities deserve more money from the federal government in order to fulfill their tasks.

Just because you put one gallon of gas in a Cadillac car for a five-gallon trip is no argument against the Cadillac because the gas investment brings the Cadillac far short of its goal.

Pour a greater gas investment into the same car and it will get you where you want to go.

And here we come to the cutting edge of the President's and the Professor's capital argument.

#### THE VEHICLE ITSELF IS DEFECTIVE

Their argument is, and I agree, that the more fiscal gas that the United States pours into this categorical grant vehicle the more clearly we see that the vehicle itself is defective.

The system itself is incapable of getting us where we want to go.

It's not the drivers of the vehicle—you administrators.

It's not the amount of gas—the amount of money that is poured into the system.

It is the categorical grant system itself which must be replaced by a new model called "Revenue Sharing."

#### EXAMPLES FROM ST. LOUIS

Let us take several examples from my home town.

a. *Education.*—Consider Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

It was certainly programed for the right goal. It was set to alleviate the educational distress primarily of the disadvantaged. That was the target goal.

It was juiced up with a billion dollars worth of gas.

But the system itself proved incapable of reaching its goal of assisting primarily the poor.

In the Office of Education's 268 page report analyzing Title I, the average Title I expenditure per participant in rich districts was \$226 as compared to \$107 in poor districts.

In the St. Louis Metropolitan area these appalling disparities mean that if a child is a resident of Clayton, an affluent suburb, almost \$1,500 will be invested in his education.

If he is a resident of the City of St. Louis one-half of \$1,500 will be expended.



If he is a resident of Kinloch less than one-fourth of the Clayton \$1,500 will be expended. And, I submit, the life's chances of each child varies accordingly.

The present federal grant system did not, as Congress and its administrators intended, lessen this inequality of opportunity. It had the opposite effect. It heightened the inequality.

We recognize that the impeding intervening variable is the State Government through which most grants to the cities, as those of the Office of Education, must pass through—or be rerouted or blocked. The system as it is established cannot reach its goal.

b. *Housing-Highways*.—Or take the cases of the federal mortgage and the federal highway grants.

These programs are heralded as having been eminently successful.

And they were.

Except for the older central cities of our metropolitan areas.

These programs have ringed the expanding black neck of the central city with a lilly white lasso and stabbed the heart of the central city with severing concrete knives.

Just how long will it take Secretary Romney and his Assistant Secretary Jackson, for all of their uniquely wonderful work, to bind up the federally inflicted wounds of a divided society with the alleviating ointment of suburban open housing?

c. *School Lunch Program*.—The following is a statistic that I simply cannot understand. It concerns the federal school lunch program. I don't understand it because I happen to know that the Department of Agriculture and the Office of Education have done everything possible to assist St. Louis in a very special way.

But the statistic is this. Throughout the State of Missouri 60% of the children are receiving hot lunches. In the affluent St. Louis County it is only 40%. But in the City of St. Louis where poverty is concentrated it is only 20% of the pupils who are receiving hot lunches.

During this past year there were over 30,000 children from aid to dependent children families in our St. Louis schools. Less than half of them received free lunches. (cf. *St. Louis Globe Democrat*, 3/2/70)

The grant system as now devised has not been able to provide preferential and compensatory mass services primarily for the no-income and low-income citizen even when it is so programmed.

d. *The Laus Delay*.—It is inevitable that a system as incredibly complex and run by individuals who are neither immediately present nor immediately involved should be characterized by delay and uncertainty.

St. Louis has been waiting for thirty-five years, through a whole succession of congressional delays, to see the completion of the Jefferson National Expansion Memorial.

Not all of our grants take this long to come through. But considering the number of steps and forms and processes that must be traversed before a grant-in-aid can be delivered to a city, it is a wonder that they don't take this long.

Year after year in our summer programs, for instance, we do not know until June how much money will be available for our various programs. Without these special federally assisted programs I know the city would literally go up in flames. But it would be a relief if we could plan not by crisis but by orderly process.

I look forward to the time when under a revenue sharing formula that considers not only population and tax effort but likewise need, the cities will know exactly how much grant money will be coming to them. I have much greater confidence in the speed and efficiency of a computer working in the basement of the Treasury Department in getting our St. Louis grants delivered than I have in my own efforts at walking with my

hat in one hand and a tin cup in the other from door to door in the Congressional and Department hallways.

#### THE PRESIDENT SPEAKS

President Nixon and Professor Banfield develop in greater detail why the categorical grant system is no longer solvent.

President Nixon speaks of the growing impossibility of a grant system to run a \$28 billion program spread over a half a thousand separate and uncoordinated aid categories in thousands of cities. He speaks of "overlapping programs at the State and local level"; of "the distortion of State and local budgets"; of "increased administrative costs"; of "program delay and uncertainty"; of the "creation of new and frequently competitive state and local governmental institutions"; and of the growing threatening loss of faith "in the power and efficacy of the Federal government."—President Richard Nixon, "Revenue Sharing With State and Local Governments" (August 13, 1969) in *The New Federalism*, p. 50.

#### THE BANFIELD REPORT

The Banfield Report bases its case against the categorical grant system on the grounds that the programs it funds have been over-regulated and under-supported. The Report's key point is that the system itself will no longer work:

"Now that billions instead of millions are being appropriated, the system simply will not work as it used to; Congress and the federal bureaus cannot possibly regulate and supervise the details of hundreds of programs operating in thousands of cities. It is necessary either to give local governments vastly greater freedom in the use of federal funds or else in effect to replace them with a much enlarged federal and state bureaucracy. We have no doubt whatever as to which alternative is preferable."

#### THE ST. LOUIS MODEL CITIES PROGRAM

To conclude our second consideration on the inherent ineffectiveness of the presently constituted federal grants-in-aid system let me cite our experience with the Model City Program.

Believe me when I say that from the very first day that this program was announced we went to work on it. Those supplemental grants that were a part of the program looked too good to be true: no strings attached, federal funds could be used to match other federal funds, every dollar might thereby attract another five or six dollars. There was no doubt about it—and I still have no doubt about it—that the Model Cities was indeed a giant step in the right direction.

#### HARD WORK

Literally hundreds of meetings were held in my office over the past four years trying to understand and work out this program.

We canvassed for thousands of petitions and signatures to send to Washington to get the legislation passed.

We worked far into many a night with the hundreds of volunteers needed to get what we thought was a rather sophisticated systems analysis proposal into Washington first. And it was the first to arrive.

But despite all our local hard work and despite all the hard work of the federal, regional and state administrators I believe the grants-in-aid system as embodied in the Model Cities program prevented full success.

Such a long range, comprehensive federal program as the Model Cities process demands continuity of administration, consistency of policy, and continued strong federal inter-agency commitment.

#### THE CHANGE OF ADMINISTRATIONS

But, as all elected officials know, continuity of administration depends upon the voters. There can be changes of administrations. And with these changes of administrations

there can likewise be changes of emphasis in policy, directives, and inter-departmental commitment.

This all sounds innocent enough until you start to reduce it to practical city politics. Such changes can put the dependent city administrations in an awkward bind.

Was the federal administration requiring a comprehensive or a selective approach to the problems of the Model City target area? Could or could not the Neighborhood corporations operate programs as well as plan, monitor, and evaluate them? And was the program itself a "Neighborhood" or a "City Hall" program?

#### A NEIGHBORHOOD PROGRAM

On this last item I had been given to understand that it was basically a "Neighborhood" program. And I accepted it as such. I was and am now primarily interested in getting the services to the low income peoples and if the federal government were deciding—as in the OEO program—to go the non-City Hall route, then I would abide by their decision.

Indeed I went so far as to arrange a massive luncheon to which I invited not only the local notables but likewise the top federal administrators of the Model City Program.

At this luncheon I delivered what I thought to be a mighty powerful talk declaring that the St. Louis Model City Program would be a "Neighborhood Power" program. The neighborhood residents themselves would decide how they would spend "their" Model Cities money.

I can still feel the pat on the back and the shake of the hand of the then prime federal administrator of the Model Cities program. And I can still hear the ring of his voice as he said: "Fine, Fine." And so said they all.

#### A CITY HALL PROGRAM

I won't go into the bloody details.

But I will tell you that the St. Louis poverty people's money—which is and was from the beginning my prime goal—was held up for nine months while we tried—and to some extent vainly—to turn the program around from a "neighborhood-without-City Hall" program to a "neighborhood-with-City Hall" program.

I would hate to have an unpurged dictionary of all the terms that have been informally applied to me as Mayor during this excruciating "back to City Hall" process.

Gentlemen, I have nothing but the highest respect for the ability and commitment of federal administrators.

But I say that under the present system of grants where you are congressionally charged with the ultimate responsibility and try to run everything from Washington for a hundred thousand different neighborhoods throughout a pluralistic country such catastrophic misunderstandings, seemingly contradictory directives, and riot-provoking discontinuities of promises and expectations are inevitable.

I agree with President Nixon and Professor Banfield—the system simply must be changed.

3. *The present system deprives the city of a mayor who has responsibility and authority*.—The federal grant system of its very nature deprives the local executive of his authority and effectiveness in whatever area it extends its assistance.

As a group we are not complaining. But I am merely giving you cues as to why the new system of revenue sharing must be instituted if we are to have a federal system based upon the ideals of our founding fathers—and of sound management.

"LOS ANGELES DOESN'T STAND FOR A DAMN THING!"

Let me give you this example.

It was during the days of the Urban Crisis hearings of the Senate Executive Reorganization Subcommittee.

There occurred a highly publicized confrontation between two Senators and a Mayor.

The famous Senators were after the political scalp of the Mayor of Los Angeles.

When their persistent questioning of Mayor Yorty elicited the agreement of the Mayor that he did not have control over manpower, welfare, education, housing, taxing, and a whole host of urban programs that a Mayor would have to have in order to be substantially responsible for the welfare of his City's inhabitants, one of the Senators tartly remarked: "Well, Los Angeles doesn't stand for a damn thing."

What these ill-tempered and misplaced words of this great Senator were really saying was that the Mayor's role in a City means very little—doesn't stand for a damn thing—if all of his chief functions have been preempted by a massive anonymous and distant bureaucracy.

#### WHAT ABOUT THE OTHER CITIES?

Despite the Senator's intemperate manner of expressing the situation, he was substantially correct.

But it is likewise true that with the expansion of federal grant-in-aid programs the cities no longer have control over their own manpower, housing, welfare, taxing, education or other key systems. The grant system has taken them over.

And here I come to my key point.

As long as the categorical grant system is in control the local chief executive cannot be in control.

This is a severe condemnation of the total contemporary grant-in-aid system. I wish to document the statement.

#### "A DECLINE IN AUTHORITY"

President Nixon in his request for Revenue Sharing legislation stated that the "Rapid growth in Federal grants has been accompanied by. . . A decline in the authority and responsibility of chief executives, as grants have become tied to functional bureaucracies."

#### "PILING ON REGULATIONS AND MORE REGULATIONS"

The Banfield Report analyzes the red tape dynamics of this loss of local control from federally funded programs:

"As a rule Congressional purposes are stated in very general terms. Agency heads, in prescribing the detailed regulations by which these purposes are to be given content in particular circumstances, necessarily rely heavily on their own more or less arbitrary judgments. There is no reason to suppose that their judgments about what is or is not implied by a statement of Congressional intent is necessarily sounder than the somewhat different judgments that might be made by other persons—local government officials, for example. To be sure, the agency heads are under the discipline of knowing that they may be called publicly to account before a Congressional committee if they make determinations that are clearly inconsistent with the spirit, not to mention the letter, of the law. The effect of this discipline, however, is to incline them to play it safe by piling on regulations and more regulations. They know that they will not be praised for getting things done; their problem is to avoid being blamed for doing things that Congress—or rather certain Congressmen—do not want done, and the way to avoid blame is to take a few chances as possible. It is probably safe to say that timid bureaucrats produce more red tape than arrogant ones."

#### WHO IS THE PROGRAM ADMINISTRATOR?

What President Nixon infers when he states that there has been a decline of authority of local executives "as grants have

become tied to functional bureaucracies" and what Banfield spells out is that under the present system of grants you administrators in Washington are constrained to keep the controls over the programs and that you can't possibly hand over the authority to the Mayor or to anyone else.

You are the administrator and for all the euphemisms that are used with us Mayors we know you are the prime administrators.

You have the money to pay the piper and you call the tunes you see fit.

Your priorities are your priorities—and not necessarily the Mayor's.

Your application forms, your management devices, your multifarious reporting systems, your multiple audit systems are yours—a hundred strong and by no means standardized even in your own Departments.

This is all built into the present system. "Better that all should suffer rather than one should go astray."

More than that.

Your far-flung Department may detect the mishandling of let us say OEO or HUD monies in New York or Berkeley and all but immediately the St. Louis GAP administration is penalized with a dozen more "safeguards" though year after year the St. Louis Human Development Corporation has handled a \$17 million program with disadvantaged persons and has not been guilty of misplacing a cent.

Gentlemen, the United States can not have it both ways.

Either Washington will be the prime administrators of the program or the United States will adopt a system of revenue sharing whereby the authority can be handed back to the local communities.

#### A PLANE LOAD FROM ST. LOUIS

The sharpness of this dichotomy of either Washington or St. Louis will run the St. Louis program came home to me the last time I was in Washington several months ago.

The then Deputy Assistant Secretary for Model Cities had very generously agreed to listen to the St. Louis Model City's Neighborhood Residents' request that the Model City Agency be allowed to operate the programs they had planned.

With extreme patience Mr. Baida listened to the whole story from about twenty of us. In his explanation two points became pivotal: The Mayor was the head of the Model City Agency and those residents who were on the Board of Directors could not operate the programs.

When I suggested that if I were the head of the program then I could have these residents operate the programs they had planned, Mr. Baida replied: "No, I too have my responsibilities. We have our guidelines."

Mr. Baida was right. Within the present categorical grant system, Washington is the prime administrator of the program and not St. Louis.

#### A MAYOR AND "HIS" ANTI-POVERTY PROGRAM

Let me close with a story about the early days of our CAP organization.

I became Mayor in early '65 and found that my predecessor, a very able administrator, had organized in the Mayor's office an independent non-profit corporation known as the OEO-HDC. It had a magnificent Board of Directors. A dozen of the best citizens to made up what was really a "dream board."

But now there appeared on the scene from out of Washington a brilliant and charming young Lochinvar with stars in his eyes, down on his cheek and the fresh savor of his Ivy League garland still on his brow ready to do battle with all the iniquity of City Hall and this "unrepresentative" Board of Directors.

Our Washington emissary was immediately ready to program our operation.

First of all the Board Room of the Mayor's office was no place to hold anti-poverty program meetings. The meeting place had to be changed!

Second, even the blacks on the Board, our local Negro hero, a judge, who is still the Chairman of the Board; a Negro woman lawyer who is still on the President's Commission on Civil Rights; and several other Negroes of comparable stature were not, said Mr. Lochinvar, representative of the poor.

I suggested that if the Board must be enlarged could we not recruit our additional members from the elected PTA Presidents in the poverty neighborhoods?

This would not do, I was informed, since PTA Presidents even from the poverty neighborhoods were likewise part of the "power structure."

Today the Board of Directors of our CAP agency is composed of 36 members and I as Mayor have the right to designate three of the 36 members.

I judge our HDC organization to be one of the nation's best. In this evaluation I believe the OEO administrators will agree.

But this is beside the point.

The focal issue to be seized is that wherever the federal grant system provides its service to a city there is likely to be, in President Nixon's words, "an accompanying decline in the authority and responsibility of chief executives, as grants have become tied to functional bureaucracies."

#### "NEW APPROACHES"

Gentlemen, can you imagine my delight when I read in the paper just two weeks ago today this headline: "Nixon Administration To Revise Grant System To Aid Urban Revival."

I feverishly read on:

"In three to eight cities . . . City Halls will be given authority to use Model Cities money as they wish without prior approval from Washington. The usual Federal audits will be conducted later. . . ."

"In three to eight other cities, the Mayors will be given virtual veto, or checkoff powers, over all Federal grants flowing into the cities. This will give them authority to coordinate Federal spending at the local level. . . ."

"In several other cities, all poverty areas within the municipal boundaries will be included in what is termed the model neighborhood. . . ."

"According to sources who have been working on the revisions, the planned changes are an essential part of President Nixon's 'New Federalism Policy' which would give more money and authority to state and local governments."

#### A TELEGRAM FOR A PILOT CITY

This announcement of the Nixon Administration's "new approaches" could be an answer to a City's plight and its prayer.

As in this talk we spoke of:

1. *Fiscal Mismatch*, this new pilot program speaks of more money to the cities;

2. *The Inherent Ineffectiveness of the Categorical Grant System*: the new pilot program speaks of a City using Federal monies without prior approvals and with subsequent audits;

3. *The Present System Deprives the City of a Mayor with Authority and Responsibility* and the New Federalism Policy would restore the local authority to his traditional role within a strong Federal system.

You can rest assured that within minutes I had contacted Mr. Arthur Kennedy, the Director of our local Model Cities Program, and we dispatched this telegram to Secretaries Romney and Richardson who had made the announcement:

Dear Mr. Secretary: Greatly intrigued with your desire to make Model Cities effort a more effective part of the national urban pol-



icy. Am vitally interested in St. Louis being a part of the initial testing of this major new thrust.

Our Model Cities program, with its necessarily limited target area and our citywide *Challenge of the 70's* organization and process, make St. Louis an ideal major city to participate fully in this new endeavor.

Mr. Arthur Kennedy, Director of our Model Cities program, and Dr. Lucius Cervantes, Director of our Washington Office, *Challenge of the 70's*, will contact your office regarding the city's desire to meet the criteria of selection for this creative experiment.

#### THE NEW FEDERALISM

Gentlemen, you have been very indulgent in listening to me recount St. Louis' "Perils of Pauline" in its relationships with the federal government.

I thank God that I am a part of a federal democratic system where such dialogues can take place across party lines.

All of us in municipal management are grateful to Dwight Ink, Tom Graves and the Office of Management and Budget for this opportunity to present our views in a direct and first-hand manner.

This is the first time, so I am informed, that the chief administrator of a major American City has been invited to confer with the top administrative officials of the principal Federal agencies to discuss in depth our common goal—putting available tax resources into a working machinery to properly deliver services to our people.

I know that you are striving for what I am striving: the general welfare of our people.

You and I both believe that the federal system with its allocation of due powers to the federal government, the state government, and the local government is necessary for that dream to be realized.

Our President has stated that "through revenue sharing an important measure of political power is returned to the people" and that "revenue sharing is the financial heart of the New Federalism."

As the Mayor of a Midwestern River City, Chairman of both the Missouri Municipal League and the St. Louis Metropolitan Council of Governments (East-West Gateway Coordinating Council), a Democrat and a concerned citizen, I agree wholeheartedly with Mr. Nixon in what he rightly calls a bipartisan thrust for the establishment of a Federal Revenue Sharing System that will go a long way toward making the New Federalism a reality.

#### "VIETNAMIZING" VIETNAM'S ECONOMY

#### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, the issue of the war in Vietnam was not an overriding concern in the recent elections, yet it remains one of our most important national problems. Although many Members of Congress, I among them, have agreed forcefully for an accelerated end to a large-scale military presence in Southeast Asia, the Nixon administration has embarked on a much slower withdrawal rate in the hope that the Government of South Vietnam will be able to solidify its political base.

The cornerstone of the "Vietnamization" program is that the Government of

South Vietnam will be able to effectively deal with its economic deterioration. The United States has been attempting, with limited success, to help stabilize the Vietnamese economy, but the problems are not only caused by a large U.S. presence but also by the lack of action on the part of the South Vietnam Government to take a forceful stand on inflation.

Dr. Stephen Enke, in an informative article, has suggested two immediate economic goals for South Vietnam—a realistic exchange rate of the piaster and a more adequate system of taxation.

I commend this article to the readers of this RECORD.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 5, 1970]

#### "VIETNAMIZING" VIETNAM'S ECONOMY

(NOTE.—Over the weekend the South Vietnamese government decreed a "parallel" exchange rate among other measures designed to curb inflation; for certain transactions, notably exports and piaster purchases by foreigners (including allied soldiers), the rate was set at 275 piasters to the U.S. dollar. Many in the U.S. Congress do not think the steps are adequate. The following article, written just before the announcement, gives an idea of why the legislators feel that way.)

(Dr. Enke has been a division head at Rand Corp., a visiting professor of economics at Yale and a Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense (economics). During the past five years he has directed several studies of the Vietnamese economy. The views expressed in this article are his responsibility, not that of his past or present employers.)

(By Stephen Enke)

Vietnam, according to reporters, is headed for an "economic" crisis that will jeopardize "Vietnamization." But the impending crisis is in reality financial rather than economic, and the remedy is not more U.S.-financed imports but a realistic exchange rate for the piaster and increased domestic taxes in South Vietnam.

The South Vietnamese piaster is at this date still officially exchanged at a rate of 118 to the dollar. This is the rate at which our Government buys the piasters it needs to hire local labor, buy local provisions, and so forth. It is the rate at which Vietnamese importers officially buy foreign exchange if they can get licenses and dollars to import. It is the rate at which GIs are supposed to buy piasters, but seldom do, for the black market rate runs between 300 and over 400 piasters to the dollar. The 118 rate is more than five years old, and during this time the domestic price level has tripled.

#### DEFICITS AND PAPER MONEY

The piaster depreciates because money in circulation has been increasing around 30% a year on an average. When the Saigon government's budget is in deficit it issues additional paper money to fill the gap. Even after receipts from customs and other import-related taxes, there is a large and increasing deficit every year.

The South Vietnamese government receives more from import-related duties and customs than it does from all domestic taxes on land, beer, gasoline, business and other incomes, and everything else. The income tax falls disproportionately upon government employees, who almost alone have tax money withheld from their wages, and yields little. Agricultural land pays almost no taxes even though good rice land may produce a crop worth 25,000 piasters or so per hectare at the farm.

It is imports that provide most government receipts. These are financed by the U.S. Government, not by exports. They cost

the U.S. one way or another over two-thirds of a billion dollars a year. These varied imports include rice, building materials under the Commodity Import Program, together with motor-scooters, durable consumer goods and other "luxury" items otherwise financed. These imports have not, however, been yielding all the government receipts they could. This is because import licensing is restricted, and the piaster is officially over-valued.

Consider imported widgets. As inflation continues, the sale price of widgets in Saigon rises. But the cost to the importer is the same, if the piaster price in dollars or yen is unchanged and the import taxes paid are unchanged. The widening margin results in excess profits for the importer, except insofar as he must share them with officials. These excess profits and pay-offs are a sort of "leakage" in U.S. support.

If only nominal profits were earned, the South Vietnamese government would receive more piaster receipts per dollar of U.S. support. This would happen if the piaster price of foreign exchange increased as the internal purchasing power of the piaster declined. A substantial across-the-board devaluation of the piaster and institution of a flexible piaster price on dollars to licensed importers is therefore urgently needed.

The South Vietnamese government is likely to have larger deficits and print money more rapidly because of past and future U.S. troop withdrawals. Presumably the Department of Defense and GIs will buy fewer piasters with dollars as fewer soldiers remain in the country. It is these dollars, which the Saigon government sells to importers for unrestricted use, that yield the most budget revenues per dollar through high "luxury" goods duties. Accordingly, foreign exchange reserves have been falling, until recently import licensing was restricted to reduce sales of foreign exchange to importers. The result has been to make import licenses and associated exchange more profitable to those fortunate to secure them. The loss of potential government receipts per dollar of U.S. support is thereby increased.

Those U.S. officials who influence our annual support level must attempt some very difficult estimates. They must try to assess how much faster domestic prices will rise relative to the circulating money stock and how much socially divisive inflation is tolerable. If these officials want import licensing to become unrestricted, in an effort to plug the leakage in U.S. support, they must try to guess what piaster exchange rate (X) is compatible with what U.S. support level (Y) and what budget deficit (Z), all subject to the requirement, say, that the Saigon government's foreign-exchange reserves neither increase nor decrease.

No mortal economist knows how to juggle this collection of X, Y and Z. If the South Vietnamese Government taxes less than expected at home or spends more on wage increases than expected, the Z budget deficit will be greater than "planned." With unrestricted import licensing, importers will want to buy more foreign exchange, all financed by U.S. support. As a result, if foreign-exchange reserves are to be held constant, there must be either an increase in the Y support level or in the X exchange rate. More Y costs the U.S. taxpayer more and gives Vietnamese consumers more imported goods. A higher-than-X piaster rate costs our taxpayers no more and provides Vietnamese consumers with no less.

#### ARGUING FOR X RATES

The strongest arguments can be made for letting the X exchange rate be the variable. Then the related Y support level and Z budget deficit can be set annually for each year. Unexpected tax short-falls or spending over-runs by the South Vietnamese govern-

ment, resulting in more deficits and money in circulation, then alter the exchange rate but not the level of U.S. support or the physical inflow of imports.

Arranging for an officially flexible exchange rate is not difficult and requires very little time for preparation, whereas collection of a productive land tax would take a year to organize. There could be a weekly auction of unrestricted foreign exchange and of restricted Commodity Import Program dollar credits. The Saigon government as auctioneer could protect itself against collusion by setting a minimum plaster price each session. It should make sure that all legitimate purchasers of foreign exchange for current account transaction can become accredited attendees at such auctions. Dollar exchange in different "lot" amounts could be auctioned against sealed bids. The total dollar sum to be auctioned weekly is easily determined from the known level of U.S. support.

The alternative of a supposedly single act of devaluation can only be partially effective. For prestige and political reasons the new official plaster price on the dollar will almost certainly be set too low. As inflation continues the true external value of the plaster will continue to fall. Import licensing will have to be reintroduced, excess windfall profits and pay-offs will reappear, and U.S. support will again be partially wasted. So in time there will have to be another undignified "catchup" devaluation.

These suggestions are aimed at coping with a financial, not an economic, crisis. The plaster may be ailing, but the consumers of South Vietnam are not. The availability for consumption in Vietnam of non-military goods is probably a third higher than it was five years ago.

Obviously, the war and inflation have benefited some more than others, so that an internal redistribution of real income is desirable. Rice growers and farmers generally are doing quite well except when they are refugees from their lands.

One major reason that South Vietnam is not suffering economically is that unemployment has been eliminated. With new demands for services and goods, and more money in circulation to "lubricate" such transactions, there has been an increase in the gross domestic product for several years, with only moderate price increases. Young men might go into the armed forces, but their work around the farm was taken over by relatives.

Under these conditions, if real income needs to be redistributed for equity reasons, this should be done by usual fiscal means. Profitable rice and urban lands should be taxed to pay for supplemental soldiers' wages. There is no justifiable reason why the U.S. taxpayer should finance more imports so that the real incomes of those worse off can be supplemented by plaster expenditures without inflation.

Originally the idea was that U.S. support should compensate for lost domestic production of consumer goods because of mobilization for war. But no such consumption gap occurred during the years that underemployment was being eliminated. Gradually, the U.S. began instead to fill the budget deficit gap with imports, so that the less the Saigon Government taxed and the more it spent the more imports the U.S. financed to contain inflation. Less fiscal responsibility was rewarded with more consumer goods imports. Thus the U.S. Government during previous Administrations came to establish a perverse set of incentives for the South Vietnamese government.

#### THE GOVERNMENT MUST GOVERN

The fundamental object of "Vietnamization" is surely to make the South Vietnamese government and people more self-reliant and

independent. The goal of the U.S. is to help them to help themselves. In part this means that they do more of the fighting if we will give them the necessary equipment. But it also means that the South Vietnamese government must increasingly govern, not only as regards maintaining physical security, but also by performing more functions of government more adequately.

One such crucial function of government is taxation. No country can really become a nation that lacks a government with the ability and will to tax. The U.S. Government, as part of this serious exercise in nation building, needs itself to adopt policies that will encourage those with the power in Saigon to tax and govern fully.

#### SPEAKER McCORMACK'S WARNING TO AMERICA

### HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, an editorial in a recent issue of the Athens, Ala., News-Courier calls attention to and praises the observations of our distinguished colleague, the Honorable JOHN McCORMACK, concerning the dangers of misreading the significance of international communism and its designs on our country.

In view of our colleague's exceptional record of service to our Nation and his unique positions of leadership in this House for the past 30 years, his words of advice should have the widest possible distribution.

I am proud to associate myself with the editorial of Mr. Beasley Thompson in the Athens Courier, and I include his comments in my remarks so that my colleagues may know of these observations:

#### McCORMACK'S WARNING TO AMERICA

John McCormack has served in Congress for 42 years—under one-fourth of the men who ever lived in the White House—and as Whip and Speaker of the House for 30 years—longest of any man in the leadership of either major party in the history of Congress. For 14 months, after the assassination of President Kennedy, he was next in line for the presidency. He used to ask himself in those days about foreign developments, "Well, what would you do, John?"

In a copyrighted interview with U.S. News and World Report, McCormack issued a warning for the American people, a warning born of his long and close observation of our relations with other governments. In the 30s, he said he saw what appeasement did, when Britain and France let Hitler get away, first with the Rhineland—thinking he'd be satisfied—then Austria, saying "Well, we can live with him."

Today, McCormack finds a tendency in America to "misread the significance of international Communism and its designs upon our country." And, then adds, "Arrogant aggression, whether under Nazism or under international Communism, isn't something Americans can ignore and live with."

McCormack exploded the popular belief that Communism has mellowed as more and more people say, "We can live with Communism." As for himself, he said, "I can live with the Communists if they will leave other countries alone. But the Soviet and Chinese

Communists are just as much bent on world domination today as they ever were. There may be tension between the two, but they can get together overnight, and they'd both like to see the world dominated by Communism, with America isolated. Then they could fight it out to see who would be the No. 1 Communist nation."

If John McCormack does nothing else for the nation he has served so long and so well, his warning would be a great epitaph to a unique career. It should bring us back to the realities around us, not let the surface evidence blind us to the dangers through which we live.

#### GEN. W. C. WESTMORELAND, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY, ADDRESSES THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LAND-GRANT UNIVERSITIES

### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I wish to include the text of the address of Gen. W. C. Westmoreland to the Council of Presidents of the National Association of Land-Grant Universities. I commend its reading to all in this body who have any doubts as to the role the ROTC program has played in our defense structure:

#### ADDRESS BY GEN. W. C. WESTMORELAND

I welcome the opportunity to address the members of this Council this morning. As Superintendent of the United States Military Academy for three years from 1960-1963, I have more than a casual appreciation for the responsibility in heading an institution of higher learning.

Some in our society would place us poles apart . . . you in the academic world and me in the profession of arms. Yet our two professions do hold similarities:

Yours appears to be growing as hazardous as mine.

The turnover within your ranks is approaching the turbulence within mine.

And, finally, the maxim of tactical security that has long been a part of the Army lexicon is now a part of your vocabulary.

In a more serious vein . . . as a professional soldier responsible for your Army of over a million men and women . . . I can assure you we have much in common.

First, we are both vitally concerned with youth.

Next, we both seek to instill initiative and responsibility in those within our charge.

Further, we both share an interest in preparing young people for a future in our society.

Moreover, we both are eminently concerned with education and the betterment of the individual through learning.

And finally, we both engage our young people at a time in their lives that is crucial to them as individuals . . . molding life patterns that are vital to our future society.

Over the years, I have had the opportunity, like you, to know our young people. I have known the American serviceman in the most difficult and hazardous conditions. I have seen him in peace and in three wars. His dedicated and professional performance can in large part be attributed to what he has received from our schools—both civilian and military.



Like your profession, the Army today is deeply involved in every aspect of training and education. Because we replace about one-third of our manpower each year, our school system of necessity is literally the largest campus in the world.

In addition to the Military Academy at West Point, the Army school system consists of 2 colleges, 20 branch schools, and 11 specialist schools. In these schools, we offer over 900 different courses of instruction on a campus that is located in 17 different states. By the end of this fiscal year, we will have had 67,000 in the classroom each day of the year and will have enrolled over 350,000 servicemen in Army schools. These courses cover a wide spectrum of academic subjects as well as skills, trades and crafts. And most of these are transferable to civilian pursuits.

Education means a great deal to the soldier, the Army and the Nation. What is not well known are the additional educational opportunities the Army provides its personnel. Let me list a few:

During FY 70, 55,000 soldiers completed high school or received equivalency certificates and over 500 received baccalaureate or advanced degrees through the Army's General Education Development Program.

These were part of the 200,000 soldiers who took advantage of Army sponsored educational opportunities—from the elementary through the university level—during the past fiscal year.

Additionally, in this period, over 38,000 men who did not possess the necessary mental prerequisites entered the Army and have been given the opportunity to improve their basic level of education to meet our minimum standards.

While the Army provides extensive educational opportunities to those within its ranks, we do look to civilian institutions to provide the intellectual foundation so necessary for the enlightened leadership in our modern Army.

Today, over 90 percent of our career officers hold undergraduate degrees. Our goal is, of course, to attain 100 percent.

Some 25 percent of our career officers already hold advanced degrees. We estimate that approximately 75 percent of our career officers may expect the opportunity to gain advanced degrees during their service.

In working toward our goals, we currently have over 3,500 officers enrolled in civilian colleges and universities in pursuit of graduate as well as undergraduate degrees.

But nowhere is our dependence on the civilian education system more demonstrated than in ROTC.

In my opinion ROTC plays two vital national roles. It undeniably contributes to the defense and preparedness of the United States. But it also develops discipline, character, leadership, and patriotism in young people . . . young people who will be among the future leaders of this Nation.

ROTC is and will continue to be our major source of newly commissioned officers each year. We seek in this program to develop enlightened leadership in young men and motivate them towards service to country.

Our overriding concern must be that our soldiers are led by the very best. In a society which is growing more permissive, the selection of leaders not only becomes more difficult but also more important. If we cannot obtain the best from the campuses of America, where do we as a nation turn for quality leadership in the quantity we require in our Armed Forces?

ROTC is a valuable leavening and balancing influence on our Army Officer Corps that draws its men from a number of sources. Through ROTC, we acquire men who can think logically and clearly, who can articulate their thoughts and attitudes, who

bring with them from throughout our country . . . and from a variety of educational institutions . . . an understanding of local, regional, and college community backgrounds and viewpoints.

To achieve the quantity required without sacrificing quality means that we must exert every effort to improve the program at camps as well as on campuses. Because of my personal interest, I visited each of our camps during the summer of 1969. As a result, during the past year, we have made a searching examination of our Summer Camp Program. I believe that we have made sound progress in improving ROTC Summer Camps. To stress the high priority that we place on the Camp Program, I placed a brigadier general in command of each of the 1970 Camps. In addition, we have placed greater emphasis on making training more challenging and stimulating.

We have revitalized our Summer Camps along these lines. We have shifted our emphasis from a vocational approach to one of leadership development and evaluation. Our Camp theme is now "Preparation for Leadership." We have emphasized creation of a solid military environment with serious, no-nonsense training designed to afford each cadet maximum opportunity for leadership development.

Our philosophy is to encourage cadets to approach their training as apprentice officers . . . in short, to learn responsibility. Learning by doing is just a part of this task. Equally important, cadets must gain an appreciation for the planning, equipment, and coordination required to conduct each class. Cadets are encouraged to analyze each activity and discuss among themselves and with their instructors the teaching techniques used and how the training could be improved. They are encouraged to approach instruction . . . not just from the standpoint of taking required training . . . but rather from the standpoint of a young officer who needs to know how the training is conducted so he can use the knowledge later.

We have also instituted a successful and popular senior officer seminar program. These seminars were conducted by two senior general officers . . . at three of the six 1970 Camps—Fort Knox, Fort Lewis and Indian-town Gap. Our objectives were to inform cadets of the Army's role in American society and to provide cadets an opportunity to question senior Army officers directly. Two benefits stand out. These seminars have shown the young men that we care. And the panel members had a stimulating exposure to the ideals, values and goals of college students who aspire to be junior officers. The seminars were accepted enthusiastically . . . 98 percent of over 5,500 cadet participants recommended a similar program for 1971.

We are also examining the Basic Camp toward making it more attractive. The educational approach is being raised above the individual soldier training level. We want an approach that is appealing and challenging—at a level in keeping with the academic standing and future of the two year program applicant.

Next year we are pointing for as much progress as we have made this year. The theme "Preparation for Leadership" appeals to me as a logical carry over for next summer. Cadets must be challenged to view each training or leadership situation as an intellectual exercise. Each training situation should confront the cadet with two objectives: (1) a skill to be mastered and the rationale for learning it, and (2) how the cadet would teach the skill when he becomes an officer.

Perhaps the best indicator of progress in our camps is from cadet evaluations. Marked improvement was noted in leadership opportunities, physical and mental challenges, and

in the areas of camp management. The results of these evaluations are reassuring.

I now want to turn to ROTC on campus. Because ROTC is a visible symbol of the military establishment, and is close at hand, it has borne the brunt of antimilitary feeling. It will probably continue to be for sometime a prime target of hate, irrational behavior and emotional immaturity.

We are working, however, to improve our program on campus and to support better a meaningful dialogue.

Our new program of instruction for Senior ROTC has been published and was distributed on August 5. This flexible "Core Curriculum" is designed to fit the wide variety of institutions hosting ROTC. Professors of Military Science are given maximum flexibility in administering this program of instruction. They now have means to blend the precepts of the military profession with the philosophies of the institution. We anticipate, however, that modifications of the curriculum will be in order based upon experience and evaluation.

The key in sustaining a meaningful dialogue between the Army and students rests with the Professors of Military Science at those institutions hosting ROTC. We are instituting additional means to assist them in this regard. In view of the importance of the communication process, ROTC instructors must be thoroughly prepared for the problems they may encounter on campus. They must understand the importance of listening and identifying with students. They must be able to argue persuasively and thoroughly both sides of a question. What we need is empathy, not dogmatism.

How to engage in student dialogue is just as important as what to engage in. Techniques and attitudes are important. Give and take, admission of fallibility, and concessions of valid points are essential to establish credibility with young doubters. Not infrequently, how a course is presented is as valuable as what is presented. We are pointing for ROTC instructor orientation courses that will emphasize these areas in the future.

We are also taking steps to improve the quality and credentials of our ROTC staffs. We are stabilizing assignments. Officers possessing a master's degree will be assigned to a three year tour. In September, we began a program in which officers without a master's degree may volunteer for a maximum of two years graduate study followed by a two-year ROTC assignment at the same institution. So far, more than 700 officers have volunteered. And we estimate that 1,800 will enter this program over the next five years. We expect these actions not only to result in wider acceptance of our instructors by students and university officials, but also to improve the current image of the ROTC.

In another effort to improve that image, the Advertising Council has agreed to take on ROTC as a tri-service project. Advertising costs will be paid by the news media as a public service. Materials are currently being produced and should be ready for distribution to the news media by the first of January.

We are also seeking ways to increase the number of black cadets participating in the ROTC program. In an age of minority group awareness, our record at the junior leadership level is not good. In 1965, 3.5 percent of our first lieutenants were from minority groups. This percentage had dropped to 1.9 percent in 1970. Other company grade statistics are comparable. We realize that the Army is undergoing stiff competition for the bright, motivated black. Accordingly, the Army staff is currently examining ways to attract more blacks into the ROTC program.

During a recent inspection trip to Kentucky, I witnessed a unique program re-

cently started by the Army Reserve's 100th Training Division. On weekends, Reservists in this unit train ROTC cadets from five universities. These college students participate willingly and enthusiastically. Citizens from nearby communities provide land for small-scale field training exercises. I have asked the Army staff to see how this training can be expanded.

We are making every effort to improve Army ROTC. Our program must be dynamic—one that can adapt to changing circumstances and at the same time produce officers of the quality and standards that we seek. Although much remains to be done, I am optimistic.

Just as we seek quality in our Officer Corps, so also we need enlisted men in the required skills and numbers who are motivated, well trained, and dedicated to serve.

As you know, I have committed the Army to move with all its energies toward a zero draft—a volunteer force. Our task will not be easy.

The Army is in a period of sweeping transition. We are redeploying forces from Vietnam, inactivating units and reducing the size of our support base in the United States. And at the same time we are still fighting a war.

I am well aware of the arguments both for and against the draft. Yet if our citizens support the President in his efforts to end the Vietnam War, then I believe that Selective Service must be extended beyond its expiration date of June 30, 1971. Additionally, the draft must be retained as national insurance.

Movement toward a zero draft—volunteer Army will take time. To achieve our goal will require us to double or triple our enlistments and re-enlistments. A large part of our problem is to increase the number of volunteers in the Army Reserve and National Guard at the same time we increase volunteers in the Active Army. To emphasize the importance I attach to this task, I have appointed Lieutenant General George Forsythe as my Special Assistant in developing programs designed to achieve a Modern Volunteer Army.

How successful we are in attracting quality personnel in the skills we need depends on three things:

The professional climate we generate and sustain within the Army.

Resources, and I mean money.

And most important, how the Armed Forces are viewed by the public at large.

Our Army is an organization of young people. Today the average age of those in the Army is less than 23 years. Over three-fourths of our enlisted strength has less than three years of service. We must make the Army better understood by these young men who fill our ranks.

We will leave no stone unturned. We are reviewing all our policies and administrative procedures to make Service life more attractive. Nothing is considered sacrosanct except where military order and discipline are compromised. In this, we cannot and will not yield.

We will need to increase pay. And we will probably find that additional money will have little application to civilian pursuits... the combat arms. But success will not be forthcoming without support from the Administration; the Congress; the news media; civic, business, education and religious leaders... and the public.

We cannot attract the kind of soldier we need in an organization maligned by some, directly attacked by others, and halfheartedly supported by many. This country cannot have it both ways. If the Army is viewed by a large segment of the population, particularly the youth, as an organization to be shunned and avoided, no amount of money will encourage young men to enlist.

The Army as an organization... sworn to defend the foundation of our Nation... the Constitution of the United States... will continue to serve this country in its traditional role. But what the Army does and how well we do it depend on people.

The values we cherish hold our Army together. Without them we have no esprit de corps, no morale, no discipline. And an undisciplined Army is a menace to society.

The ideals soldiers cherish are valuable in all walks of life. Hopefully we engrain or reinforce these ideals in the majority of Americans who pass through our ranks. Like you... we also are concerned about America's most valuable asset—her young people.

## DRUG ABUSE: A GLOBAL MENACE

HON. LESTER L. WOLFF

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. WOLFF. Mr. Speaker, I know all my colleagues share my deep concern about the serious menace of drug use among young people in our society. What we sometimes fail to recognize is that this is an international problem affecting our friends throughout the world.

Edward H. Meyer, president of Grey Advertising, recognized the global implications of this problem in an important speech delivered at the United Nations on September 21, 1970. Since Mr. Meyer's speech was on so important a subject and so cogent in its comments, I believe all the Members should have an opportunity to read this speech.

Accordingly, I include Mr. Meyer's speech in the Record at this point:

### DRUG ABUSE: A GLOBAL MENACE

(By EDWARD H. MEYER)

Only ten years ago, a serious business thinker, Professor Theodore Levitt, writing in the Harvard Business Review, expressed the then prevailing view on the proper relationship between business and society. Said he:

"In the end, business has only two responsibilities—to obey the elementary canons of everyday face-to-face civility (honesty, good faith, and so on) and to seek material gain."

Eight short years later, C. W. Cook, Chairman of General Foods, expressed a new trend in business thinking when he said:

"As a matter of enlightened self-interest, more and more businessmen accept the fact that the social as well as the economic environment in which they operate has an impact on both corporate objectives and future growth."

Today's enlightened U.S. businessmen see a radical switch in business priorities. Says B. R. Dorsey, President of Gulf Oil:

"The first responsibility of business is to operate for the well-being of society."

That is a far cry from the traditional attitude that the sole function of business was to generate jobs and wealth!

And the pace of corporate involvement with the pressing societal issues of our time is accelerating rapidly in this country. Behind it lies the sudden recognition that the problems we face are so awesome and urgent that they are no longer susceptible of solution by people acting as private individuals, or even by government alone.

We see a growing awareness by business that we are indeed threatened on every hand—by the holocaust of war, by racial violence,

by the paralysis of our educational institutions, by the destruction of our environment, by the specter of world famine, by the burden of poverty, by the disaffection of the young.

We also see a concomitant awareness growing: that all of the social ills besetting us are not local or even national in nature. They are international in scope—and cry out for global action to alleviate them.

My presence here today at the U.N., in this most international of all settings, is symbolic of the tragically international character of one of the newer and more frightening crises we face. That is the mounting problem of drug abuse, particularly among the young people of the world. It is a global problem—one which threatens to destroy the health and strength of the society in which we function as businessmen as well as human beings.

If our tragic experience with drug abuse in this country is any guide, the problem is one which, once it starts, can snowball perilously fast. Grim statistics suggest that we here in the U.S. are in the grip of a heroin epidemic among the young. The prospect of thousands and thousands of teenagers involved in crime to support their habit and facing eventual death from the use of this most deadly drug is, indeed, a chilling one. No less disquieting is the prospect of a good percentage of a whole generation—the generation on which our future rests—opting for other forms of drugs as a way of coping with life—or coping out of it.

Close to home to business, too, is the appalling recent spread of drug abuse in industry. Newspaper headlines tell the story:

"Growing use of narcotics saps industry." (N.Y. Times)

"The rising problem of drugs on the job." (Time)

"Drug-taking a lot more prevalent than top management willing to admit." (Dun's Review)

"The creeping drug menace in retailing." (A three-part series in *The Merchandiser*, *Magazine of Mass Retailing*)

So acute has the problem become that the Commerce and Industry Association of New York recently held a top-level meeting, the first ever devoted to drug abuse in industry.

While the social and economic problems of drug abuse may be much more widespread and severe at the moment in this country than elsewhere, there is considerable evidence that it is growing in a number of countries. Let me read you something just published by our British agency. It's the opening section of a special drug-abuse edition of our international newsletter, *Grey Matter*:

"He was emaciated and filthy. His arms were covered with septic scars. He slept all day and went out all night. He died three days before his 23rd birthday."

"These are the words of a middle-class British mother describing her son, who was a registered heroin addict before he was 18. Like most people in this country, she had ignored the symptoms that American mothers have been forced to recognize."

"One of the biggest problems to fight," says an American expert, "is the attitude it can't happen here. The drug addict today is as socially taboo as the alcoholic 100 years ago. People intentionally adopt a position of ignorance in the childish belief that this will make the unwelcome problem go away."

The English text goes on:

"Britain—Next Victim? Dr. Sidney Cohen, head of the Narcotics Division of the U.S. National Institute of Mental Health, recently came to Britain at our request to look at the picture here. He found the present British situation equivalent to that in America five years ago. He thinks proper instruction in America five years ago could have stopped it in its tracks."



We agree, and that's the reason I'm here talking with you today.

The research that we and our 11 Grey International partner agencies have recently been conducting into the scope of drug abuse around the world suggests that the situation, as we shall see later, is already deteriorating in a number of countries.

And for those lands where the problem is not yet serious, in this age of instant communication and supersonic travel, how long can they really remain free of the threat of drug abuse? Particularly given the worldwide nature of the youth cult. Young people today are more similar to each other, country to country, in dress, music and attitudes than they act, look, think (and dance) like their elders at home. The generation gap looms far wider than the international gap—a factor which could well encourage drug abuse to leapfrog national boundaries far faster than people expect.

But what is the most disturbing to us, who have been so deeply involved in the problem here in the U.S., is that we see in most of the 11 countries we've studied terrifying similarities to the situation in the U.S. only a few short years ago. All too many of the other countries are refusing to admit the problem is serious. And they are unwilling, or unable to marshal the kind of major effort needed *before* (not after, as in the U.S.) the situation gets out of hand. The rest of the world must *not* make the same mistakes we did. They must not let ignorance about the problem, popular indifference (or even fear) and bureaucratic lethargy keep them from starting the broadest possible attack on this global menace right *now*. Believe me, prevention beforehand is infinitely preferable to attempted treatment afterward. My message today is an urgent one. Wake up world—before it's too late!

An effective program against drug abuse must bring to bear all the weapons that society offers: sound knowledge of the problem; proper laws and their enforcement; adequate treatment and rehabilitation; intensive education at all levels; and the *broadest possible dissemination of correct information on the threat*. And that is where we come in. One of the biggest problems in preventing drug abuse in our case in the U.S. was public ignorance of the facts. And as far as we can tell from our studies, the same is true overseas.

One of the most effective ways to inform people about drugs and alert them to the dangers involved is through the great modern channels of communication: television; radio; the press; posters. That's how we got involved; so before I report to you on the situation and progress overseas, let's go back and see what happened here.

Our special interest in and knowledge of the whole area of drug abuse began in 1968, when we accepted the assignment from the National Institute of Mental Health to develop this country's first advertising campaign aimed at combatting drug abuse.

Grey was not only the first advertising agency to approach the contemporary problem of drug abuse on the national level; it was also the first in action on the state level. Our West Coast office served as the volunteer agency on an anti-drug-abuse campaign for the State of California, where, according to Governor Ronald Reagan, drugs were nearing "epidemic proportions."

Going in, we knew we were entering a problem area fraught with controversy, emotion, anger, mistrust, and just plain misinformation. Violently conflicting opinions on every aspect of the problem, though loudly voiced, were frequently founded on fancy, rather than the few facts available.

To get the facts, an agency team of eight people spent almost a year on its homework. They talked to cops, physicians, parents, users, dealers, educators, sociologists, psychi-

atrists, current addicts, former addicts, housewives, and all the teenagers they could contact.

What came out of it all was not one campaign, but many, aimed at the different forms of drug abuse: LSD; "speed"; marijuana; "ups and downs"; heroin, and cocaine.

The results? A series of outstanding broadcast commercials, posters and print ads (they have won dozens of awards, including, most recently, two Gold Lions at The Venice Film Festival).

But, more importantly, they got broad exposure on television, on radio, in magazines and newspapers, on posters and buses; and they drew requests for over 20 million pieces of educational material on drugs.

Our experience in preparing these campaigns left us with some fine advertising materials, a rare depth of knowledge about a new and complex subject, and a burning desire to involve ourselves more deeply in the whole problem of drug abuse. Our partner agencies in other countries (you see the heads of many of them here with you today) were enthusiastic about investigating the possibilities of anti-drug-abuse programs in their countries, with the view to tackling it on an international basis.

Then, in June, under the aegis of the I.A.A., whose president, Jere Patterson, is here today, the newly established Institute of International Advertising designated Grey and International Partners as the volunteer agency on its very first international public service advertising project—a global attack on drug abuse. With that announcement, we went to work to survey the situation and the prospects for action in each of the 12 countries where we are represented.

We also studied the various types of drug problems in different countries, the degree to which the materials we have or can obtain are applicable, and the best ways to make them available to the public and private agencies which are trying to forestall or cope with the drug problem.

Naturally, there were tremendous variations, country by country, in the problems involved. The usefulness of U.S. educational materials on drugs varied widely, although we were surprised to find how much interest they evoked in a number of countries and how easily it was felt that some could be made useful. Finally, we found that the ways of taking action to implement the program and the speed of our progress varied in different countries because of profound differences in everything from the availability of public service media to bureaucratic attitudes and practices.

However, we are underway to varying degrees in a number of countries. Let me give you the highlights of what we found out and what's happening, country by country, in alphabetical order.

#### AUSTRALIA

Australia is one country where concern is mounting, after a period when many people felt that both state and federal governments were tending to play ostrich and deny the existence of the problem. Now it is recognized as serious. An investigation of the drug problem by the federal government is now under way. The government, health and parent organizations are aroused. The business world, in particular, is stirred to action. When *The Australian*, a prominent newspaper, offered 20 pages free to advertising agencies for ads on social problems, messages against pollution and the drug problem filled eight out of every ten ads. There is evidence that the tempo of the anti-drug crusade is mounting rapidly.

Our agency is in touch with broadcast media, which are already running anti-drug messages and documentaries, and it has presented the Grey campaign to them. Grey is also working closely with the leading drug-abuse expert in Australia, whose foundation is being backed by local business houses.

#### AUSTRIA

In Austria, where only "100 incidents of drug abuse were reported in recent years", the problem is apparently not considered grave. As the agency's report states:

"As drug abuse is not a serious problem, only school authorities are concerned about it." Understandably so, perhaps, since our agency reports drug usage at the high school level! Schools are distributing anti-drug-abuse literature to pupils this Fall.

#### BELGIUM

Belgium reports a potential problem with one of the most dangerous forms of drug abuse, "Speed" (amphetamines). Surveys at the Universities of Ghent and Louvain showed, respectively, that 25% and 33.9% of the students were using such drugs.

Other than that, the problem of drug abuse has apparently received little attention yet in Belgium. However, members of various government agencies and ministers are expressing growing concern, and the government is studying the possibility of having films produced on the subject of drug abuse.

Our agency there is arranging to have our anti-drug commercials shown to government representatives, with the possibility that adaptations will be broadcast on the National State TV network during a special week in November of programs against alcoholism and other additions.

#### CANADA

North of the border, Canada, too, is facing a mounting problem—with drug use penetrating down into lower schools. Prevention programs there are also stymied by the same two factors present in other countries and which originally hampered U.S. efforts to get going.

One is the lack of a central government authority dealing with the problem (responsibility, as in the U.S., is divided between justice and health).

The other is the same lassitude about the problem we once faced in the U.S. However, government concern is growing, as evidenced by the formation of a nation-wide commission on the subject (which just issued its report, suggesting, among other things, relaxing laws on "hash"). As far as our Canadian company can determine, there have been no moves by the private sector to tackle the issue. At the moment, the only material available is the program proposed by Grey.

#### FRANCE

In France, the realization is growing that drug abuse is a potential threat. Some indications: in 1965, arrests for drug abuse totaled 165; in 1969, there were 1,200; scattered reports in the press indicate spread of drug use even down to the lower schools. The Brigade des Stupefiants in the Ministère de l'Intérieur regards drug abuse as both a social and a legal problem. Paris is a center with one-third of the hard-drug users in the nation, estimated at 45,000.

The government, which has recently toughened both its drug laws and their enforcement, is studying a number of aspects of the problem, including the establishment of addict-treatment centers, more severe censorship on drug use in films, and the possibilities of a preventive-anti-drug-abuse program under the auspices of the Ministry of Education.

Dorland & Grey has made a public announcement of its intent to involve itself in the drug abuse area in France. They have assigned an agency task force to the problem and have already approached an organization called "Les Grandes Causes Nationales", which was supposed to have sponsored an anti-drug program in 1970, offering to coordinate any effort.

They plan to attack the problem by concentrating at first on one or two drug types particularly dangerous in France. However,

according to our French friends, they expect the task of fighting drug abuse there to be a "long and difficult" one. One handicap is in the area of public service advertising communication: apparently, media "are tired of giving free space."

## GERMANY

German popular awareness of the drug threat is growing, due to extensive coverage in the press. Our agency, Gramm & Grey, reports that in 1968 the number of drug-related crimes totalled 1,500. In 1969, it jumped to 4,405. That's an increase of 297% in one year. For 1970, the Germans expect an even bigger jump because that's when the drug abuse problem first became acute. Crimes, such as pharmacy burglaries, prescription thefts, and customs confiscations of drugs have multiplied, so that the public has become extremely concerned. The German government, too, is stepping up activities on all fronts. Public officials are quoted as saying that:

They were not going to wait with any preventive measures against narcotics until the figures were as high as those reported from Sweden and the U.S.

It is interesting, if depressing, to note in this connection that the vocabulary of German drug users consists mainly of American terms; a glossary included in the report from Gramm & Grey includes the following German colloquial names for better-known drugs:

Formal: Opium and opiates—Colloquial: "O", "hard stuff", "brown stuff" (raw opium), "H" (heroin), "M" (morphine).

Formal: Hashish and Marijuana—Colloquial: "heu", "hasch", "hash", "grass", "pot", "tea", "weed", "shite", "joint" (marijuana cigarette).

Formal: Cocaine—Colloquial: "C", "koks", "coke", "charley", "white stuff", "schnee".

Formal: Hallucinogens—Colloquial: "acid".

Formal: Stimulants—Colloquial: "prelus", "captas", "speed", "pep pills", "purple hearts".

This Summer, the German government allocated 1.5 Million Deutschmarks to fight drug abuse, including an educational program.

With the help of Dr. Cohen, Gramm & Grey got in touch with the proper officials at the National Health Ministry and the Central Office for Health Education. When our German colleagues get back after this trip here, they will discuss the drug-abuse program with both groups of officials, with a view to further action. Their present plan envisions presenting our material to see what use or adaptation—tailored to the needs of the German public—might be made of the U.S. advertising.

## GREAT BRITAIN

In Great Britain, the number of heroin addicts under age 20 has multiplied a thousand times since 1960. Present average age of death is 24—and declining. In that country, drug abuse is growing rapidly and the forms it is taking are similar in type—if not yet in degree—to the U.S. Grey in London has been exploring all avenues to give as broad exposure to the drug-abuse campaign as possible. Since many of the American TV spots are considered proper for the British situation, only changes in the voiceover are needed. If the effort succeeds to the point where new materials are required, it is expected that private or governmental support could be obtained.

We are seeking government support for our drug-abuse efforts. This is essential in Britain because, among other things, it is the key to gaining an entree to media, which contribute space quite infrequently and mostly at the request of the government. However, our agency is convinced that media would probably do more if more requests—public and private—were made for their cooperation.

Meanwhile, Grey has been actively contacting all possible avenues for exposure and coming up with some interesting opportunities.

One is a possible editorial feature on drug abuse in the *Daily Express*, Britain's middle-class daily, with a circulation of 4 million, plus running actual Grey Advertising print ads, with funds to come possibly from the Beaverbrook Foundation.

We have also been in touch with the Managing Director of Scottish and Grampian Television, who is very interested in drug abuse. He is willing to run commercials on fringe time on Scottish Television free, but would rather help us to raise outside money to pay for a proper heavyweight campaign across the network. To do so, he is working to set up a lobby among British businessmen and government officials to support our advertising and, thus, gain financial backing from the government's Central Office of Information (which has monies available for publicity in the safety and health fields).

We are also working with the British Bureau of Television Advertising (B.B.T.A.), which represents the fourteen regional companies constituting Britain's one commercial television network, and which has strong contacts with the independent/quasi-governmental bodies controlling commercial television. B.B.T.A., impressed with the drug-abuse films, plans to present them on September 22 to the Independent Television Association and Health Education Council, which controls government-financed drug-abuse publicity in the U.K. If favourably received then, the campaign could be well on its way to going on air in Britain.

In addition, Grey-London plans to show the campaign to top officials in the Home Office, to the Association for the Prevention of Addiction, who have also expressed interest in seeing drug-abuse commercials, and to Bow Group, leading group of young liberal members of the Conservative Party (the Conservative equivalent to the Labour Party's Fabian Society), who should constitute a major influence on Conservative government opinion.

## HOLLAND

In Holland, drug abuse is rearing its ugly head and is getting attention from more local and regional authorities. The Dutch government is becoming concerned. A recent survey of high school graduates showed that 11% had used drugs. Of this group, 65% had used hashish and marijuana, 12% hard drugs, and 23% both soft and hard drugs.

Dutch businessmen have always been noted for a keen awareness of their social responsibilities, and media contribute generous amounts of free-time space for public interest advertising. According to a recent cable from our partner in Holland, S.I.R.E. (Institute for Ideal Advertising), the agency which channels public service campaigns, will consider the possibility of sponsoring the drug-abuse campaign.

## ITALY

In Italy, the government has stepped up its fight on drug abuse, which is on the increase. Between January and July, 1970, police confiscated more than twice as much hashish as they did the year before and 30 times more than the 1967 total. Because there are indications of drug use in high school as well as college, the Italian government plans to launch an anti-drug campaign in the schools. O.T.I.P.I., the Italian association of full-service agencies, has recently created an arm, Pubblicità e Progresso, to sponsor public service campaigns in media donated by the F.I.P. (Space-Brokers Association). Its first project, an ad campaign encouraging blood donation, will start in February, 1971. Our Italian partner, Milano e Grey, has proposed an anti-drug campaign as the second project; it will be discussed at a meeting next month.

## JAPAN

Although drug abuse in Japan has not reached U.S. proportions, mass media are running warnings against drug abuse, specifically pills, hard drugs, and LSD (which was recently added to a tough anti-drug law). At the moment, according to Grey-Daiko, the urgent problems of air pollution and traffic accidents are getting most of the emphasis in the public service programs of government and the press.

Any effort to mount a public service anti-drug abuse campaign in Japan faces the fact that there is no tradition there of donation of free media space or volunteer agencies, such as we enjoy here under the auspices of The Advertising Council. However, our managing director there feels strongly that the anti-drug issue would be a good public service project for the Japanese advertising association to take on. At present, there is no official agency devoted to the problem, and it could help improve advertising's image. With the recent rising level of advertising in Japan, it is coming in for sharper consumer scrutiny and more criticism.

## PHILIPPINES

In this country, where we have a close working relationship with a local agency, National-Ad, the government is mounting a threefold attack on drug abuse: strict law enforcement; an audio-visual educational campaign aimed at schools and colleges, civic groups and the police; and treatment for addicts. Nation-Ad, which has already received requests for anti-drug material from schools, is using the Grey commercial and ads with teenagers.

## SPAIN

In Spain, where pep pills are more freely available over the counter than they are in the U.S., and where its proximity to North Africa makes it a favorite route for young drug users, drug abuse is regarded as an extremely serious problem. Seizures of illicit drugs at the border are three times as great this year as last year. A major clamp-down by the government is now under way.

Government-owned TV makes available air time for public service causes, and the government even solicits space and time from privately-controlled media. To date, however, it has been difficult to interest private enterprise in the problem. This is partly due to the fact that, like many other countries, the concept of public service by business is considerably less developed than in the U.S. and is of less public relations value. Rasgo-Grey in Madrid has made approaches to pharmaceutical companies in an effort to interest them in the drug-abuse problem and is working hard to find a "sponsor".

## VENEZUELA

Drug abuse is not yet considered a problem in Venezuela. However, there is increasing concern over a significant increase in marijuana use (especially at the high school level) and a moderate increase in the use of LSD and cocaine. Generally regarded as a problem for law enforcement, drug abuse now is also beginning to be perceived as a social problem. As far as we can determine, neither government nor private enterprise has developed plans for combating drug abuse, although efforts are being made to form a national committee to combat drug abuse; but the going is slow.

However, although media in Venezuela do not regularly contribute free time for public service projects, the three major Venezuelan networks offered Kittay-Grey our time gratis if the agency develops an anti-drug-abuse campaign, which they are now producing, based on the material from the U.S.

## UNITED STATES

Meanwhile—back at the ranch—here in the U.S., we have been active in several areas.



In New York City, we are working with the Urban Coalition's newest task force, one on drug abuse. We have volunteered our services and our materials for their use.

A recent issue of *Grey Matter*, devoted to drug abuse, has been widely circulated and published in six languages. Response has been extremely enthusiastic.

We have been actively soliciting on the outside all material, written and on film, available on the subject of drugs. We have received magnificent cooperation from the press and NBC, CBS, ABC, and Westinghouse, who have made available their comprehensive coverage on radio and TV to us. I would like to thank their representatives here today for their assistance.

At this point, we are probably the most complete source of anti-drug-abuse communications materials anywhere.

We are happy to make our facilities available to help extend distribution of this excellent U.S.-produced print, film and broadcast material overseas—wherever possible and useful. When so many millions of dollars and so much time and effort have gone into the U.S. anti-drug-abuse programs, what a waste not to disseminate it in other countries where it may prove useful!

We have had unsolicited inquiries from countries as far apart as Lebanon, New Zealand and Switzerland, saying they had heard of our efforts and offering their collaboration in their countries. We plan in due course to make these materials and our speeches available throughout the world in this common objective.

And, finally, we hope today to enlist the support of the U.N. in getting the ear of local government bodies, in reaching media, in reaching health authorities, in getting as much exposure as possible to stop—the extent advertising can help to stop—the spread of this insidious scourge.

We are happy to offer our services in coordinating, with your support, an exchange of information and communication on drug abuse that is truly global. For only through united action can we help to conquer this new and destructive global malady.

## LE GRAND CHARLES

### HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Charles de Gaulle symbolized the indestructible spirit of his beloved France as a leader of the Free French in World War II and later as its two-term President. He somehow seemed indestructible. With his death last Monday night at his country home in France at the age of 79, the world lost an articulate and dynamic statesman, for which we consistently admired him, and for which we respect his memory. Mr. Speaker I include the following article by John Quinn of the November 11, 1970, New York Daily News on the lonely vision of Le Grand Charles: a greater France. It tells succinctly and movingly of the crusading career of this brilliant statesman. The article follows:

THE LONELY VISION OF LE GRAND CHARLES:  
A GREATER FRANCE  
(By John Quinn)

He was an intransigent aristocrat in an egalitarian era, and the measure of Charles de Gaulle's greatness can be found in the marks he left upon it. When he died in

retirement of a heart attack Monday, he was less than two weeks away from his 80th birthday.

At his death, the old soldier who kept the honor of his beloved France bright during the dark days of World War II and who rescued her from internal collapse during the agonizing settlement of the Algerian rebellion was still characteristically appraising his own achievement in those elegantly worded and dispassionate memoirs that occupied his private hours after the war.

Charles Andre Marie Joseph de Gaulle was born in Lille, Nov. 22, 1870, second son of Henri de Gaulle, a professor of philosophy and science at the Catholic Institute of Paris and a provincial aristocrat.

According to family recollections, Charles was a "devilish" youth, addicted to practical jokes, but soon developed into a precocious student, particularly of military history.

He once refought the Battle of Agincourt, in which the ragged crossbowmen of Henry V of England humiliated the refulgent cavalry of France. In de Gaulle's version, the French won. For him, as for his well-remembered contemporary, Douglas MacArthur, there was no substitute for victory, no compromise with defeat.

Naturally he went to the military academy at St. Cyr, where he ranked 15th in a class of 200, and then into the regiment commanded by Col. Henri Philippe Pétain, who later led the collaborationist Vichy regime after the German conquest of France during World War II, while de Gaulle rallied the Free French to continue the fight against Hitler.

"What are you doing here?" British Prime Minister Winston Churchill asked the ragged gaunt de Gaulle when he fled to London with a skeleton staff after the collapse of France. "I have come to fight," he replied laconically, and fight he did—with Churchill and U.S. President Franklin D. Roosevelt almost as much as against the Germans.

He could not accept his senior allies' belief that defeat had made France a second-class power, and never forgave Roosevelt for not inviting him to the Yalta conference in which Britain, the U.S. and Russia laid plans for postwar Europe.

"He really does think he's Joan of Arc," Roosevelt once remarked to Churchill. "Yes," responded Winnie, "but the bishops won't let me burn him."

After the war, came the power and the glory—for a time, as de Gaulle tried to piece together from France's splintered political framework a modern state. Soon tiring of what he considered seamy political intrigue ("Since a politician never believes what he says," he once commented, "he is always astonished when his word is taken for granted."), he retired to the pastoral fastness of his home in Colombey-les-deux-Eglises to continue his memoirs, confident that the call would come again to save France.

It did, but not until 1958, when military pressure against the regime of Premier Pierre Pflimlin toppled the Fourth Republic, reincarnated in the Fifth Republic in the towering, awkward figure of the aging general.

And it was then, in the twilight of his life, that de Gaulle's public career began to approach its zenith.

He unhesitatingly put down (they would say "betrayed") the generals who had brought him to power, to keep Algeria French, notably Jacques Massu and Raoul Salan. With clear insight into historical force, he realized that an independent Algeria was an idea whose time had come. He believed that, freed from onerous burden of colonies, France might again exercise cultural and political sovereignty over Europe.

Disregarding the bitter rebukes of many of his countrymen ("a bunch of sheep," he once characterized them) he ruled, both domestically and internationally, virtually by execu-

tive fiat and had the new French constitution tailored to fit his idiosyncratic notions.

And his rule was replete with paradox.

An austere, even puritanical Catholic, he nevertheless actively and persistently courted the Soviet Union, although, as Walter Lippmann so acutely perceived, he never could have done so without having the American atomic wall behind which to retreat if needs be.

Yet he also found it essential to "the grandeur of France," which he so metronomically invoked whenever necessary to bring public opinion into line, to build his own nuclear "force de frappe," at a very great cost to France's straining economy.

Perhaps it was also requisite for French grandeur that he regularly beat the "Anglo-Saxons"—the U.S. and Britain—both verbally and, as occasion demanded, economically. So he continually found reason to frustrate Britain's desire to enter the European Common Market, ever protective of France's antique, ever-costly and underproductive agricultural system.

So he abruptly and remorselessly pulled France out of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and chased NATO headquarters out of the country.

So, in 1964 just as American involvement in Vietnam began in earnest, he decided to recognize Communist China, pointing out candidly that France couldn't ignore a nation of 600 million people, however unpalatable she might find its government.

So in 1968 he led a determined and marvelously orchestrated attack on the Yankee dollar and the British pound as norms of international currency. And what did the old aristocrat wish to substitute? Gold, naturally. Although the pound was humbled through deflation, America's gold reserves repulsed de Gaulle's sortie (one of the few battles he lost).

So, in 1967 he mounted a platform outside Montreal's City Hall and proclaimed, "Vive le Quebec Libre" the rallying cry of French Canadian separatists.

That this was a studied, deliberate insult to the Canadian government, whose guest he was, never for a second ruffled his immense aplomb.

And this was one of his few major pronouncements delivered publicly. Usually, he chose television as a forum to speak to France and the world in carefully constructed set pieces delivered in sonorous accents and always using the royal "we" ("We have decided," "We have demanded," "We have recognized").

His press conferences were also elaborately styled, deftly executed and frequently devastating. Questions were always required to be submitted in advance, and de Gaulle would answer or not answer them as he wished.

But de Gaulle was far more than a showman. History has already proved him to have been prophetic on a number of complex world issues.

As an obscure colonel in 1934 he virtually wrote the battle plan for the German blitzkrieg six years later. Convinced that motorized armor would pierce conventional fortifications, however massive—like a fleet running back leaving a ponderous lineman clutching the air—de Gaulle wrote his "The Army of the Future" in an attempt to alert France to its danger. Unfortunately, the German General Staff read the book with enormous interest. The French ignored it.

He counseled the late President Eisenhower not to become involved in Vietnam, and foresaw in surprisingly meticulous detail the almost endless mischief this has caused the United States both domestically and internationally.

His relations with the U.S. warmed somewhat after Nixon was elected President, for he regarded Nixon as "highly intelligent, well-informed and pragmatic." By that, he doubtless meant that Nixon would recognize

the imprudence of America's sprawling overseas commitments and gradually disengage from them, both in Europe and the Far East.

De Gaulle regarded the world as a dullard schoolboy to be dragged, usually unwillingly, to the path of rectitude. Sometimes he dispensed a sweet, more often a buffet. Hence those affronted by his arrogance were many.

He mortally offended Jews, for example, when, in switching France's allegiance in the Middle East from Israel to the Arab states, he did so in terms that Tel Aviv—to say nothing of Seventh Avenue—considered highly insulting.

As usual, de Gaulle rejected the beef.

Then, too, even though it was he who brought about the unanticipated postwar French alliance with the hated Germans, his unbending hauteur annoyed a number of Bonn officials.

Yet even his bitterest enemies would agree that he was a man of exceptional—even classical—character. Greatness was not thrust upon him. He seized it. But not, of course, for personal gain, only for the greater glory of France, his magnificent and lifelong obsession.

#### THE LATE MR. LOUIS A. ECKL, DISTINGUISHED EDITOR

#### HON. ROBERT E. JONES

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Louis A. Eckl, an outstanding public figure in our Nation and a friend of many Members of the House, passed away in Florence, Ala., last week.

He was an outstanding journalist and an effective community leader whose compassion for the conditions of others was boundless. For more than 30 years, I knew him as an intimate friend and valued adviser.

The kind of man he was shows through in the comments of his fellow workers and friends. I include three articles from the November 10, 1970, Florence Times-Tri-Cities Daily in tribute to him as a part of my remarks at this time:

TIMES DAILY EDITOR LOUIS A. ECKL DIES

(By Pete Kelley)

"Thou know'st 'tis common; all that lives must die, passing through nature to eternity."

Louis A. Eckl began his last published column with that quotation. Those who didn't know him may have thought they were reading about a premonition when they read that column in his beloved Florence Times Tri-Cities Daily after learning of Eckl's death Monday night.

Those who worked closely with him and knew him well, know it was nothing like that. For one thing, that column was written several days ago. But more important, they knew that he was too much an optimist for anything like that. There were many other unpublished columns, like the one scheduled for Nov. 22 trying to generate interest in a memorial to FDR in the Muscle Shoals area.

Eckl died Monday about 7:30 p.m., the victim of a reaction to penicillin. He had been having considerable trouble with an infected tooth recently and left the office about 3 p.m. Monday to see a dentist.

Two teeth were extracted and the dentist gave him a penicillin tablet. He had taken the drug before with no ill effects. He became ill at home shortly thereafter and a doctor

was called to his home about 6:30. The physician said Eckl was definitely suffering a mild penicillin reaction. The standard treatment for penicillin reaction was administered, even though the physician didn't think it was necessary at the time.

What happened later has not been determined, but he became much worse and was dead on arrival at ECM Hospital about 7:30 p.m.

Thus ended the career of a St. Florian farm boy who threw down his hoe in the cotton patch in June of 1928 and headed for Florence to look for work.

The qualifications he presented to J. L. Meeks, Sr., then publisher of the Florence Times-News, were "two years of college and a pretty good speller." His parents thought he had made a poor bargain when he was hired a few days later at no salary.

"Mr. Meeks told me I could come to work for experience," Eckl later remembered.

By 1932, Eckl had advanced to \$35 per week. Two weeks after his marriage to his Irish sweetheart, the former Patricia Dowd, of Tanner, his salary was cut to \$25.

It wasn't long before he acquired the title of "Editor."

"That was a joke," he later said. "I was it." Together with a lady proofreader, who doubled as women's editor and secretary to the publisher, Eckl got out the news side of the paper every day.

Over the years, honors and recognition from the community, state and nation came to the man who was pioneering for civil rights long before the Civil Rights Act of 1954 and the man who became the "Voice of TVA."

One of the highlights of his career was "Eckl Night" held Feb. 11, 1965 when some 300 Shoals and Tennessee Valley citizens joined with high government officials to honor the Executive Editor of the Florence Times Tri-Cities Daily.

Spokesman representing every phase of community life praised Eckl for his efforts in behalf of TVA, human rights, and general progress in the field of journalism. Representatives from business, industry, labor, religion and education were on hand to pay tribute.

As President of Citizens for TVA, Inc., Eckl was leading the fight to gain additional support for TVA.

Other observations in Eckl's last column Monday were:

"Although wise men have told us that it is not the length, but the quality of our lives that counts, yet it seems that we will do almost anything to keep from thinking of that inevitable day..."

"Yet nearing 62, we must admit that we were cheered up considerably the other day when we read that the way to live to be 100 (or more?) is to be contented and cheerful. To which we would add—grateful."

"... It would seem that the best way to increase longevity is to maintain a useful and satisfying role in society and keep a cheerful disposition."

"Other centenarians are tax assessors, physicians, farmers, and newspaper columnists. (That newspaper columnist bit is really exciting!)"

"Hope really does spring eternal in the human breast."

#### A TRIBUTE TO LOUIS A. ECKL

(By Bob Martin)

On the back of an award hanging on the wall at the Florence Times Tri-Cities Daily office there's the following typewritten comment:

"The Florence Times Tri-Cities Daily entries covered a variety of subjects, ranging from the private education financial crisis to Governor Brewer's concern over the race issue. Justice Douglas' attack on the Army Corps of Engineers and a review of what

makes the Shoals an unusual area. It was evident that this newspaper strove to present the issues fairly and to draw sound conclusions."

The comment was from John Seigenthaler, editor of the Nashville Tennessean.

The award was for the best editorials during 1969 in Alabama daily newspapers.

The recipient was Louis A. Eckl.

From June of 1928 until Monday night, Nov. 9, 1970, Louis Eckl lived and loved his career as a reporter and editor.

He was a newspaperman in the truest sense, and although he had his own opinions about subjects ranging the spectrum from religion to politics, he never failed to allow the issues to be presented fairly and he always attempted to draw sound conclusions.

Of journalism, Louis Eckl always said: "You'll never get rich," but his own life refuted that statement and he was one of the best examples of those folks who are rich in friends, in honesty, in love for their fellow human beings and in love of life itself. He always strove to be fair and honest and an excellent example of his fairness has always been in respecting the religious beliefs of all people. A Catholic, he always leaned over backward to be fair in print with other faiths and religions.

He had but one job in his 42-year newspaper career and that was here in the Muscle Shoals Area which he loved. He had three other loves in his life... his family, of course... his job... and TVA. If Louis Eckl's vocation was the newspaper, his avocation was TVA. He grew up with TVA and died as the long-time president of Citizens For TVA. At one time in recent years he was under serious consideration as a member of TVA's Board of Directors. He covered TVA in its infancy and became an active participant in furthering the authority in later years.

Over the years Louis Eckl's typewriter beat out a steady plea for human rights. He minced no words about kluxers, militants or governors. He's been both cursed and hated but he had a philosophy about this. "You can call me anything you want to. I'm sure I've been called worse before," he once told an irate telephone caller.

Of his many accomplishments, Louis Eckl's work in the field of human rights was his most cherished. In his early newspaper career he met a Negro professor from Tuskegee at a Federal Court hearing in Montgomery. The man was not allowed to vote. "We got to talking about the Negro's struggle to vote and I told the man 'You've got to be patient.'"

"He just looked at me and then he said, 'How long?'" Eckl recalled.

Of his many editorials on human rights, Eckl was most proud of one entitled "The Injustice of Man's Justice," published on May 2, 1963. "Governor Wallace has a chance to insulate both the whites and Negroes of Alabama against pain, poverty and disaster if he will stand for justice instead of their imprisonment and if he will fight for their right to the ballot and other rights under law of which they have been robbed far too long in too many places in the state," Eckl wrote.

Not only was Louis Eckl a distinguished man in his community and Nation, he was respected and loved by his fellow workers or his "fellow slaves," as he often said. He never ducked an argument about religion, politics or Notre Dame football and friendly debates over these matters were not uncommon in the newsroom and composing room.

He was the type of man you just didn't expect to die, but even though his earthly life has ended, many of the things which Louis Eckl said and accomplished will live in human hearts for eternity.

#### TRIBUTES FOR ECKL ABUNDANT

Tributes to Louis A. Eckl, executive editor of Florence Times Tri-Cities Daily, flowed into the newspaper office this morning.



Congressman Bob Jones said, "Louis Eckl was a giant in his community and his profession, and an outstanding public figure in our country. I knew him intimately for 30 years and I cherished and valued his friendship. I leaned heavily on him for advice on public issues, and I will miss his counsel."

Richard N. Hammell, president and publisher of Florence Times Tri-Cities Daily, said, "The untimely death of Louis Eckl is a tremendous loss to this newspaper, the community, the entire Tennessee Valley, the state, county, and the newspaper profession. He was a truly remarkable man and the most dedicated person I've ever known. We, at this newspaper, shall not see his likes again."

Barrett C. Shelton, publisher of the Decatur Daily: "The death of Louis Eckl takes from our midst a fighter for the rights of all people. He loved this Tennessee Valley. He loved the United States of America. He loved people. The imprint of his courage and sincerity will long sustain."

Fred Dillon, former managing editor of this newspaper, commented, "I don't know of any person who really loved the Valley and its people more than Louis Eckl. He always wanted to see the little man treated fairly. He rose from a country boy of the soil to the chief editorial voice of the Muscle Shoals area, and was highly regarded by his coworkers all over the state."

Mayor Bill Batson of Florence—"He was one of the first people I met when I moved to Florence, and had been my friend ever since. This is a great loss to me personally, as well as the community. He was a great citizen, always doing what was best for the area, never considering himself."

Frank Stone, who worked with Eckl for more than 40 years at this newspaper, commented, "He was a fine man, one of the finest I've ever known. He never had anything bad to say about anyone."

Bob Holloway, southeast public relations director for Reynolds Metals Co., said, "Louis Eckl earned the respect of every person who worked with the newspaper, both as a responsible journalist and as a warm human being who worked hard for the people of the Muscle Shoals area. Lou might well be called 'the conscience' of the community. He sometimes advocated unpopular viewpoints, because he was far sighted enough to see they would help the people of this area he loved so much."

Three directors of TVA joined in the tribute to Eckl with the following comment:

"Louis Eckl was a dedicated leader in the development of N. Alabama and the entire Tennessee Valley. His integrity and his knowledgeable approach to the needs and potential of the area made him an effective spokesman for the Valley and its people. The heritage he leaves is a region which is better than it was because he lived and worked here."

Frank Dirago, Colbert businessman and long-time friend, said, "We had worked together in church circles and he held one of the highest honors in the Church. Pope John appointed him a Knight of St. Gregory. He was one of the most valuable men to this community."

#### NEWSMEN SPEAK

### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, during the recent campaign, the Vice President made a number of questionable state-

ments. I do not detract from his right to express his opinion, indeed I defend his right to the fullest, but I do feel that his suggestion and charges must be subject to the most careful scrutiny and analyses.

In one of his more questionable suggestions, he stated that reporters should be subject to public examination to enlighten the American people about the reporters' prejudices.

Two distinguished reporters answered the Vice President's suggestion and I would like readers of the RECORD to have the opportunity to be aware of their positions:

#### NEWSMEN SPEAK

The Vice-President proposes that network commentators, like this one and brothers Smith and Reynolds down the street at ABC—people of that type, he says—be publicly examined by government personnel. The public has a right to know, he says, our opinions and prejudices.

The phrase, "people of that type" hurts a bit; we certainly don't think of Mr. Agnew as a type; we think he's an original.

What really hurts is the thought that maybe nobody's been listening all this time. If, after some 30 years and thousands of broadcasts, hundreds of articles and lectures and a few books, one's general cast of mind, warts and all, remains a mystery, then we're licked and we fail to see how a few more minutes of examination by government types would solve the supposed riddle.

Mr. Agnew wants to know where we stand. We stand—or rather sit—right here, in the full glare. At a disadvantage as against politicians; we can't cast one vote in committee, an opposite vote on the floor; can't say one thing in the North, an opposite thing in the South; we hold no tenure, four years or otherwise, and can be voted out with a twist of the dial.

We can't use invective and epithets, can't even dream of impugning the patriotism of leading citizens, can't reduce every complicated issue to yes or no, black or white, and would rather go to jail than do bodily injury to the English language.

We can't come down on this side or that side of each disputed public issue, because we're trying to explain far more than advocate and because some issues don't have two sides; some have three, four or half a dozen and in these matters we're damned if we know the right answer. This may be why most of us look a bit frazzled while Mr. Agnew looks so serene. . . .

Finally, at the risk of sounding a bit stuffy, we might say two things. One, that nobody in this business expects for a moment that the full truth of anything will be contained in any one account or commentary, but that through free reporting and discussion, as Mr. Walter Lippmann put it, the truth will emerge.

Second, that the central point about the free press is not that it be accurate, though it must try to be; not that it even be fair, though it must try to be that; but that it be free. And that means, in the first instance, freedom from any and all attempts by the power of government to coerce it or intimidate it or police it in any way.—Eric Sevareid, CBS-TV Evening News

A growing number of people, on the Right and on the Left, believe that journalism should be an extension of politics by other means. The New Left thinks we are tools of the Establishment; the New Right (in Washington) thinks we are a liberal conspiracy. Both sides want us to sign up and get on the team—get with it. But the people who say this don't understand the nature of the business.

Reporters, I confess, think somewhat alike. Men who work for the New York Daily News and the New York Times tend to come to similar judgments on men and events. This is because reporters share a communality of experience which is unique; reporters, by the nature of their work, spend time with the poor, with the hungry, with the wounded and dispossessed of our society. Young men who begin as police reporters see a sort of Dickensian underside of American life. When they begin covering politics, they see the differences between rhetoric and reality; this produces an important kind of skepticism. . . .

But any group of people professionally involved with the problems of poverty and hunger and crime and housing and race and war and domestic violence and politics—any group exposed to these things is likely to develop an attitude toward life. A bias. Reporters, I think, probably have a bias toward rational solutions to known problems; a bias toward social action; a bias toward people who are really trying to help, a bias toward pragmatism and common sense. Reporters are people—and they tend to appreciate other people who are not pompous and self-serving; they tend to appreciate competent and honest men; they tend to be hard on scoundrels and buffoons.

They learn—first-hand—that things must be done (in effort and money) to solve problems, and that gets them in trouble with the conservatives. They learn—firsthand, in the wars and riots—that violence and radicalism seldom solve anything, and that gets them in trouble with the New Left.

Most reporters are members of the extreme center—I am—and it's a difficult place to be these days.—John Chancellor, NBC-TV. Remarks to the American Civil Liberties Union.

#### DRUG ABUSE—WORLD'S NO. 1 PROBLEM

### HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, recently my good friend, Samuel F. Pryor, was invited to address the annual meeting of the International Narcotics Association in Honolulu, Hawaii. The meeting was concluding a week long discussion of one of the major problems all over the world—the abuse of narcotics and drugs. In his remarks, Mr. Pryor hit hard at some of the basics that we must keep in mind if we are to prevail in this battle against one of mankind's greatest illnesses. I recommend Mr. Pryor's remarks to every one of my colleagues. Under the permission heretofore unanimously granted, I include the remarks at this point in the RECORD:

#### SPEECH BY SAMUEL F. PRYOR

Thank you, Mr. Executive Director. You have given me a great privilege and an honor by inviting me to speak to such a dedicated group of law enforcement officers and their wives. This dinner marks the end of a week-long study and discussion of what is the most serious of all the world problems—the abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs.

It is appropriate that this international meeting of you narcotic agents and you who are our international guests—it is appropriate that this international meeting should

meet here in Hawaii. I may be partial because Mrs. Pryor and I are part-time residents here and two of our five children and six of our fifteen grandchildren are full-time residents. To us Hawaii is a part of heaven. I tried to explain this recently to my grandchild, Cynthia, age 9.

I told her that her grandmother and I had made a special trip around the world. We decided not to read a newspaper or look at television but just to look at the world around us without these influences. We proved to each other that we were truly living in a world of beauty except for those people who cause sorrow, war, pollution, racial hatred and self-destruction. I told her we truly live in a part of heaven. But, we are here on trial to see how we can keep it heaven.

Strange to say in this age of so-called double generation gaps Cynthia did not dissent but seemed to accept this somewhat rosy picture of our world and our society. I hope she grows up with a faith in what man can do rather than despair over what he has left undone.

Two weeks ago I attended the annual meeting of Interpol in Brussels and I came away from that conference with a strengthened conviction that narcotics abuse is truly our number one world problem. It can undermine our entire civilization. Eugene Rosides, the leader of the United States delegation made the following statement to the delegates there—delegates who were the foremost law enforcement officers of 102 nations.

I quote him: "The United States today is facing a domestic crisis in drug abuse which is unparalleled in our entire history. In New York City alone, three to four persons are dying each day, either from overdoses or from the synergistic effects of a combination of drugs. The State of Virginia reported only a few days ago that 150 persons had died last year from drug related causes. In the State of California arrests for drug violations are not numbered in the 100's or in the 1000's but in tens of thousands—and the really sad aspect is the fact that so many of our young people are the victims."

Then the U.S. delegation offered these resolutions: Resolution one

In recognition of the alarming rate of growth of drug abuse throughout the world, in awareness that drug abuse has cut across all social and economic strata and is increasingly corrupting the youth of all nations,

Interpol's International General Assembly, particularly recommends that all representatives urge their governments to eliminate the illegal cultivation of the opium-poppy, marijuana and the coca leaf.

#### RESOLUTION TWO

Resolve that in view of the epidemic proportion of the abuse of marijuana it is urged that all member nations engage in protracted responsible educational campaigns to alert youth on the dangers of marijuana.

Further that it should be specifically emphasized in such educational campaigns that the active ingredients in marijuana are dangerous and deleterious to the health and well being of youth.

The delegates from over 102 countries must have had faith in the judgment of the U.S. delegation for these resolutions were unanimously adopted.

I have often pondered over this matter of faith which I hope my grandchildren will grow up with as I have traveled over the world and visited the sites of ancient states and cities which are either in ruins or buried beneath the desert sands. As historian Arnold Toynbee has noted, in the case of civilization after civilization, destruction has invariably come from within. Rome, Egypt, Babylon,

Crete, Greece, Assyria and in our own hemisphere, the Mayas and the Incas, were not destroyed from without. When the final test came, these once healthy cultural systems found themselves sick and helpless. They could not defend themselves, because they had already lost faith in themselves. What part did the abuse of narcotics and dangerous drugs play in this loss of faith and develop a population of sick and helpless people?

We are today living through another testing time for man's faith in himself and his works. It is a period of contest and conflict. Between ideologies. Between the benefits and the costs of technology. Between the "haves" and the "have-nots" on a rapidly shrinking planet. Between the individual and the organization of society demanded by an ever-increasing population. Between the positive and the natural law—that is, between society's codes and man's conception of the rule of law. And, of course, between idealism and practicality—between what might be done and what can be done. This, today, is called the generation gap.

Such periods are the breeding ground of change, of the reassessment of goals and values. They call for both faith and flexibility. They demand patience and hard decisions. They encourage extremism, for they provide a social ferment in which the cop-outs and the militants and the opportunists—the slack end of society—flourish. But they are also periods of great opportunity, for they offer men of good will a chance to redress old wrongs and to improve the quality of life for everyone.

For the young, such periods of transition are particularly trying. They lack a sense of history by which to measure our steps forward and the tolerance to accept compromise. Many of the signposts which guided us are down. Many of the goals which beckoned to us don't seem to them worth the effort. They want to conform, to belong, and if their family life is wanting they will look for a substitute. Witness the "Manson family."

Our greatest gift to this rising generation is understanding and a safe mooring for the duration of the storm.

It is against this background that I would like to place our present-day drug problems.

What I say will be brief and general, for many of you have spent a week listening to the experts on all phases of the subject. And I hope what I say will be practical, for I have balanced my association with the enforcement agencies with many years' work with the Boys Club of America on the problems of our youngsters.

As I see it, there are today two separate but related problems involved in drug abuse. There is, first, the hard-core narcotic abuse and its related illegal international trade. This I will call the traditional drug problem.

Then there is the younger generation drug abuse problem—what we call in this country the pot culture. There is, of course, some overlap and the use of pot is but a step from mainlining, but the diagnosis and the treatment of the two problems should be quite different. One is a dangerous sickness, the other a death dealing fever.

I see no reason why, given the necessary international cooperation, courageous tough courts and some more help on the firing line, we can not control the traditional drug abuse problem. There are no apologists for the murderous trade in hard narcotics and no controversy over its costs to society and for the addict.

Here the law should strike fearlessly and without compassion. Fines and moderate jail terms are simply a part of the cost of doing

business in the illegal hard narcotics trade. We must raise the ante for those who deal in death and degradation. Society must demand mandatory death sentences—or, at the very least, life imprisonment—for the convicted drug trader and supplier. This would price that way of earning a dirty living out of existence. Unless the courts face up to the problem, we are abetting criminals and increasing crime.

The adolescent drug scene presents a different set of problems. In the case of pot, its common denominator, we do have a controversy. This odd controversy, in essence, is not over the question of whether marijuana is a dangerous drug but over the question of how dangerous it is. While we research the harmful potentials of marijuana, we already know that centuries of experience with various forms of the drug have shown that its continued use can degrade the life style of whole populations. And that in its stronger forms, the hemp plant can at times lead to extreme violence and murder. For the word "assassin" comes from the Arabic "hashshashin" which means hashshash-eaters. This is the same pot the Ottoman beys fed their teen-agers before they were sent out to murder the Christian leaders of the Crusades. And this is the pot some would have us sell our youngsters on the schoolyards and the campuses.

The pot culture has its apologists—a small but eloquent group of fuzzy-heads and weak kneed bleeding hearts who believe that if you can't solve a social evil today you should make it a way of life tomorrow. These advocates of the legalization of a mind-altering drug range from the headline-hunting anthropologist Margaret Meade, who knows better, to lip-smacking columnists like the Washington Post's Van Hoffman and Earl Ubel of CBS, who ought to know better.

Finally, we have the tawdry glorification of the adolescent drug scene by some parts of the entertainment industry and the press, the T.V. and by political militants who want to use the youthful spirit of dissent for their own ends. Selling pot by rock marks a new low for the so-called lively arts.

The amoral climate of permissiveness of misguided encouragement by certain public voices and the conformism which motivates so many young people makes the pot culture one of the greatest challenges of our time. It must be discouraged—the "in" thing must be made the "out" thing—if we are to ever have another generation of healthy, self-respecting world citizens.

It is a time for guidance and for education in the grim and nasty side of drug abuse. It is a time to polish the good and not the bad apples in the barrel. It is a time for every public figure—in politics and sports, in industry and the arts—to stand up and be counted. It is time, too, for the responsibility to be squarely placed where it so often lies—every parent should be held publicly accountable for his children's drug involvement. Law enforcement and punishment should begin in the home. The prime minister of one of these beautiful islands here in the Pacific answered me when I asked him why his island had such a good reputation for law and order—particularly as to young people using dangerous drugs. He answered me by saying: "Mr. Pryor—the answer is simple—if a young person, a teenager, disobeys the law—particularly our narcotic laws, we don't arrest him or her, we arrest their parents."

It is also time for us to enlist that greatest force of all—that tremendous majority of properly-motivated young people who know what the score has to be at the end of the tragic drug game. Let's enlist the strong and the clear-eyed to help the blind and the weak. I would like to see a missionary force



of young people boldly grappling with the pot problem wherever it occurs. There is both logic and justice in the young helping the young, for they speak the same language. The pot graduate will be the social problem of their generation.

Our young people face a difficult future. They will need all their strength and will to have a full measure of self-discipline to solve the problems that the times and we have bequeathed to them. The transient euphoria of drugs and dope will never solve these problems. Nor will the illusions of an altered mind.

They lead to another solution. I think Aldous Huxley, the late English writer, who knew whereof he spoke, had that in mind when he wrote:

"In the course of history many more people have died for their drink and their dope than have died for their religion or their country. The craving for alcohol and the opiates has been stronger, in these millions, than the love of God, of home, of children, even of life. Their cry was not for liberty or death; it was for death preceded by enslavement."

Finally, I believe the majority of the citizens of our Nation are united in their determination to combat the engulfing, vicious and rapidly growing tide of drug abuse. The President and the Vice President have undertaken personal leadership in a new and dynamic fashion.

Those who work against us are small in number and of dubious motivation. Their only weapons are tricks and words but they have proven extremely able in the manipulation of propaganda.

Since I have told you my talk with my grandchild about living in part of heaven may I close by telling you what I have written my five children and fifteen grandchildren quoting to them Matthew v: 17-19. When Christ started his ministry he made his position clear on law and order. "Think not that I am come to destroy the law. I am not come to destroy but to fulfill. Whosoever shall break one of these least commandments, and shall teach men so, he shall be called the least in the kingdom of heaven. . . ."

May God bless you all in your dangerous work, which is so important to our country and the world. Good night.

## CHILE TO BE ANOTHER CUBA?

**HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN**

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, November 16, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, few people realize the vast difference between a Marxist and a Marxist-Leninist. In a nutshell the latter is a Communist who adopts the Leninist theory of violence when and as necessary to achieve a Communist-dominated world.

A man with such beliefs is reported to be the new President of Chile, the South American nation with the vast coastline and the important copper deposits. Like Canada's recent legalizing of Communist diplomatic immunity in that nation by extending recognition to Red China, the Allende ascension to power in Chile can only mean more trouble and more violence for trouble-ridden South America. It also means trouble in capital letters

for American foreign policy to the South of us.

Of interest in this connection is the following Hemisphere Hotline Report of the Prewett Associates for the week of October 26, 1970. It should be remembered by those responsible for U.S. foreign policy that all Marxist-Leninists everywhere are fanatically committed to the destruction of the United States by any means possible. No amount of "being nice" to them will or can alter this dedication to the removal of the last remaining obstacle—so they think—to world domination by Communist totalitarianism which is the United States of America. Caution, restraint, and constant vigilance must remain the cardinal facets of our policy toward Chile under Salvador Allende.

The report follows:

### "BIG CON" STARTS OVER MARXIST CHILE

WASHINGTON, D.C.—The Chilean Congress has named a Marxist-Leninist, Dr. Salvador Allende, to be Chile's president for six years. And another big con is on.

For those observers who have lived immersed in Latin American affairs and in its history for many years, the "big con" now being set up over Chile recalls similar curtains of bland, favorable information that have closed down between the U.S. general public and extremist regimes hostile to the U.S. This happened notably during the 1930's, when Gen. Lázaro Cárdenas as Mexico's president took that country to the extreme left. It happened again in the 1960's when powerful organs of U.S. opinion took Fidel Castro on faith and reflected only minimally, if at all, the many failures of his system of applied Marxist-Leninism.

When Cárdenas left Mexico's presidency in 1940 after six years of waging economic war on U.S. interests and bolstering trade and political ties with Hitler's Germany and Mussolini's Italy, every sector of the Mexican economy was in ruins. (This was the subject of an on-the-ground study by Virginia Prewett, later published as her first book, "Reportage on Mexico.")

After its hot-fought 1940 elections, Mexico began to turn away from the Cárdenas stance and during World War II, the U.S. poured hundreds of millions into Mexico to rehabilitate its economy. After the war, Mexico's policy gradually changed until U.S. capital and U.S. tourists were being invited in on a large scale. Mexico has developed with this substantially pro-U.S. stance, while keeping alive the legend that its progress is somehow really due to its extreme leftist era.

Fidel Castro swung much farther to the left and was finally forced out of the family of Western Hemisphere governments. Castro's failures in attempting to create a viable communist-dominated economy outside the U.S. orbit (that is, without exports to the U.S.) have been spectacular, though Cuba has received Soviet subsidies of from \$365 to \$400 million a year. Castro himself admitted this in detail on July 26, 1970, although this confession received little notice from those U.S. sectors that had put their faith in him.

And now Chile, in its own way, will follow the same trail. And it will become just as hard, if not harder, to get balanced information out of Chile, as Allende conducts his particular experiment in applying Marxist-Leninism to a Latin American economy.

### SPECIFIC DETAILS OF THE "CON"

Now that the big con about Chile is on, anybody who reports anything not favorable will automatically be called a "rightist,"

with suggestions that he oppresses the poor. Already the picture being painted is that of "good guys" supporting Allende, and "bad guys" on the other side. We shall see much more of this.

As one example, one New York Times correspondent has of late started calling the newspaper chain of the Edwards family in Chile—which is a prime target of Marxist ire—a "near-monopoly" when it is mentioned. This is a slight coloration, actually the application of a pejorative description and therefore editorializing. News dispatches are not supposed to editorialize.

Another example of the subtle ways in which the big con will be pressed upon us concerns the press buildup of the character and role of Gen. Rene Schneider, the Chilean Army commander shot by unknowns just before Allende was confirmed as Chile's president.

Major dispatches to the U.S. painted him as a non-political general, symbol of objectivity vis-a-vis Chile's far leftists. In this light, he is shown as a martyr sacrificed by vicious "rightists" seeking victims among the uncommitted.

The truth is quite other. The "Hemisphere Hotline" Report No. 41, of Oct. 12, 1970, revealed an under-the-table deal between Chile's Christian Democrats and Allende over control of the military. When the CD's made their face-saving demands for new constitutional guarantees in return for voting for Allende in the Congressional runoff, they bowed to Allende's counter-demand not to give Congress the power to disapprove presidential appointments to high military commands. Dr. Allende insisted on keeping this power in his own hands, and the CD's went along.

This one detail obviously puts final power into Allende's hands. At need, he can invoke military rule and suspend all the guarantees of the new constitutional "Bill of Rights" insisted on by the CD's. Gen. Schneider was a friend and supporter of the CD's very leftwing leader, Radomiro Tomic, and the Christian Democrats could not have made the deal with Allende without his approval.

Giving this approval is one big reason why Schneider should have been singled out for assassination. For opponents of Marxist-Leninism in Chile feel that he sold out the military to Allende.

### HOW THE "BIG CON" CAN COME ABOUT

One reason why the "big con" can succeed and many dispatches to the U.S. can be colored without a conscious desire on the part of editors here at home for this to happen arises from the pressures brought on career foreign correspondents by leftwing governments.

The career correspondent is sent to Latin America by a big newspaper or chain of papers, he usually looks forward to going to Europe later, as a promotion to a better post. But if he gets in bad with Castro or some other leftwing government, this cuts into his chances at about half the posts in Europe—those in Eastern Europe. The latter posts are usually considered stepping stones to even more important assignments—in East or West Berlin, Paris or London.

"Keeping the bureau open" also hangs heavily over correspondents where extremists want to influence the outgoing news. For an irate government can not only expel a correspondent—as both Chile and Peru have expelled representatives of leading U.S. media lately—but the government can also forbid other correspondents from the same organization to come into its country.

U.S. correspondents over the world, against great odds, on the whole struggle hard to keep their news reports balanced. But often a

newspaper, to get out of the dilemma of keeping a correspondent in a leftist hotspot, will send there a man whose personal leanings are in that direction. Then faith and hope begin to color fact.

Also, in a country where extremists are riding high, sources for the other side of the story get harder to reach. Often the most searching reporter risks the liberty or the life of an anti-regime source, even by talking to him. In Castro's Cuba, for example, reporters are under strict surveillance at all times.

Another way the big con works is for the extremists to get hold of their country's media and produce saturation propaganda. This influences some observers even without their being aware of it.

## COMMUNIST VIOLATION OF CONSULAR TREATY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, during consideration of the pros and cons of our country entering into a consular treaty agreement with the Soviet Union, the proconsular lobby advanced as their prime selling point that under the agreement Americans captured or imprisoned behind the Iron Curtain would be able to enjoy early contact with their country through the U.S. Consul. Supposedly, this argument neutralized all opposition and the treaty was agreed upon.

However, like all treaties, the verbiage and provisions are no more reliable than the veracity or trustworthiness of the contracting parties.

The Soviet Union has never honored any treaty or international commitment unless it resulted in her advantage.

The first opportunity for a showing of compliance under the Consular Convention occurred in Communist Armenia on October 21 of this year. On that date, a border incident took place involving Maj. Gen. Edward C. D. Scherrer, head of the U.S. military mission in Turkey, Brig. Gen. Claude M. McQuarrie, Jr., head of the Army section of the mission, Maj. James Russell, pilot of the aircraft, and a Turkish liaison officer identified as Col. Cavdat Deneli.

According to Pentagon officials, a twin-engine Beechcraft plane carrying these officers was reported missing on a routine inspection of Turkish military installations along the Turkish-Soviet Armenian border.

On October 22, the Soviet Government announced it had the military officers in custody and American authorities asked for "consular access" to the three American officers.

The Soviet Government failed to honor this request until 5 days after the downing of the plane. Accordingly, on October 29, the United States charged in a note to the Soviet Union, protesting Soviet failure to release the officers, that the Soviet Government was in clear violation of the consular convention and called for the immediate release of the plane and its passengers. In what was

termed a "strongly worded protest" the United States said that there was "no justification for any further delay" in freeing the passengers.

The Soviet infraction of the Consular Convention related to the right of consular visit under the terms of the convention, Article 12, paragraph 3 of the convention states:

A consular officer of the sending state shall have the right without delay to visit and communicate with a national of the sending state who is under arrest or otherwise detained in custody or is serving a sentence of imprisonment. The rights referred to in this paragraph shall be exercised in conformity with the laws and regulations of the receiving state, subject to the proviso, however, that the said laws and regulations must not nullify these rights.<sup>1</sup>

This paragraph was further refined in paragraph 2 of a protocol to the convention which states:

It is agreed between the Contracting Parties that the rights specified in paragraph 3 of Article 12 of the Consular Convention of a consular officer to visit and communicate with a national of the sending state who is under arrest or otherwise detained in custody shall be accorded within two to four days of the arrest or detention of such national depending upon his location.<sup>2</sup>

In charging the Russians of violating the Consular Convention, the American note pointed out that Moscow had not allowed American diplomats access to the passengers until 5 days after they had landed on Soviet soil.

So the Russians continue to prove their inability to perform honorably even under their own treaties.

The retaliatory action by our diplomats has not been to vitiate or cancel the treaty but rather to report that our top echelon diplomats will shun high Soviet cocktail parties and permit only diplomatic novices to toast the Bolsheviks in public.

And so, history records another broken Soviet promise. The American people will never know the true facts of the capture of two U.S. generals in Armenia. Their briefing is top secret in the interest of preserving constructive U.S.-Soviet relationships. Full disclosure of the facts might make the American people mad.

I insert several newsclippings in the RECORD:

[From The New York Times, Oct. 30, 1970]

UNITED STATES SAYS SOVIET VIOLATED CONSUL PACT IN PLANE CASE

(By Terence Smith)

WASHINGTON, October 29.—The United States charged the Soviet Union today with a "clear violation" of the consular convention between the two countries and called for the immediate release of the United States Army plane and passengers detained in Armenia since they landed there eight days ago.

In a strongly worded protest note, the United States said that there was "no justification for any further delay" in freeing the two Army generals, an Army major and a

Turkish colonel who was accompanying them.

The note, which was presented to the Soviet Ambassador, Anatoly F. Dobrynin, at the State Department by Under Secretary of State John N. Irwin 2d, replied to a Soviet protest received in Moscow on Monday.

### RUSSIAN EXAMPLE FOLLOWED

Contrary to usual diplomatic practice, the State Department made public the text of its reply immediately. The Russians broadcast the text of their protest before the formal note was delivered to the United States.

Emerging from a 25-minute meeting with Mr. Irwin, Ambassador Dobrynin said that the passengers "might be" released, but that it would depend on an investigation of the incident.

He said that the consensus reached in his meeting with Mr. Irwin was that "it would be better for this sort of incident not to happen again and that generals should stay where they belong."

In accusing the Russians of flouting the 1968 United States-Soviet consular convention, the American note pointed out that Moscow had not allowed American diplomats access to the passengers until five days after they landed on Soviet soil.

"The consular convention specifically requires that access be accorded within four days at the most," the statement said.

The exchange of protest notes has raised the temperature of the United States-Soviet argument over the release of the plane and passengers. The State Department insists the plane strayed across the Soviet-Turkish border inadvertently, without "hostile or ulterior intent."

### HARD LINE CONTINUING

United States officials are visibly upset by the Soviet tactics, which they regard as another indication of a continuing Russian hard line in relations with the United States. One official charged that the Russians seemed to be "squeezing every soft spot they can find" in their dealings with this country.

Another concern among United States officials is that the Russians may be holding the passengers in an effort to force Turkey to turn over four Soviet airplane hijackers.

Soviet authorities have demanded the extradition of two, the Lithuanian father and son accused of killing a Russian stewardess and diverting an Aeroflot airliner to Turkey on Oct. 15. There has been no official request for the extradition of the other two, who diverted a small Aeroflot plane to Turkey on Tuesday.

Washington's note said the United States had acted in "restrained and constructive" fashion when Soviet aircraft or vessels recently intruded into American airspace or territorial waters.

It specifically cited a Soviet flight over the Aleutian Islands in March, 1969, and the intrusion into Alaskan waters in April, 1970, by the Soviet tanker Mozyr, which, the note charged, "extensively polluted United States territorial waters with oil."

In a subsequent statement, the State Department spokesman, Robert J. McCloskey, said that the United States had strictly adhered to the consular convention terms as recently as February, when Soviet diplomats were granted access to an accused spy within the four-day limit. The case involved Aleksandr V. Tikhomirov, a Soviet citizen working as a translator for the United Nations Secretariat. He was subsequently expelled.

### EMBASSY PRESSES SOVIET

(By James F. Clarity)

Moscow, October 29.—The United States Embassy pressed the Soviet Union today for the immediate release of the plane and the four officers—Major Gen. Edward C. D. Scherrer, head of the United States joint military mission in Turkey; Brig. Gen. Claude M. Mc-

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Congress, Senate, Committee on Foreign Relations, Consular Convention with the Soviet Union. Hearings. Eighty-eighth Congress, second session. Washington, U.S. Govt. Print. Off., 1967. p. 287.

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. 291.



Quarrie Jr., his aide for ground forces; Maj. James P. Russell Jr., the pilot, and Col. Cevat Deneli, a Turkish liaison officer.

Since the landing, in the border town of Leninakan, the Soviet authorities have given no public indication when they might release the officers and the plane, a twin-engine, six-seat Beechcraft U-8.

Boris H. Klosson, the American charge d'affaires here, went to the Foreign Ministry this afternoon and repeated the request for release to Georgi M. Korniyenko, head of the ministry's American desk.

Mr. Klosson, the ranking American diplomat here while Ambassador Jacob D. Beam is out of the country, also repeated the American contention that the violation had been accidental. He asked that embassy officials be allowed to see the detained officers a second time next Monday, if they have not been released by then.

The Soviet authorities declined a second visit Tuesday, after two American officials met with the officers in Leninakan on Monday.

#### PILOT'S ERROR BLAMED

The American consular officials who talked with the four said that the pilot had blamed heavy winds and his own navigation mistakes for the violation. The plane was said to have been taking the officers on a tour of Turkish military bases.

The Soviet protest indicated disbelief that the incursion had been accidental, but yesterday, Pravda, the Communist party newspaper, said that the violation had apparently been an accident.

Tonight, Tass, the official press agency, issued a long commentary castigating the United States, often in harsher terms than were used in the Government protest Monday.

The commentary, signed by Leonid Velichansky, described the craft as a "warplane of the United States Air Force." American military bases in foreign countries, Tass said, were "hotbeds of aggression, intervention and espionage linked with the United States claim to the role of a world policeman, dictated by the mad desire of United States imperialism to dictate its will to all mankind."

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

#### TWO U.S. GENERALS IN SOVIET UNION AFTER THEIR PLANE STRAYS

(By Bernard Gwertzman)

Moscow, October 22.—The Soviet Union announced tonight that a United States Air Force plane, missing on a flight over Turkey with two American generals aboard, had violated Soviet airspace and landed in Soviet Armenia near the Turkish border.

A statement issued by Tass, the Soviet press agency, said the small plane was in good condition and the four men aboard—three Americans and a Turk—were in good health.

Tass said the aircraft landed yesterday at a field near the border town of Leninakan. Known until 1924 as Aleksandropol, it is a textile center with a population of about 140,000 some 55 miles northwest of the Armenian capital of Erivan.

No details were disclosed and the wording of the Tass statement was noncommittal as to course of action the authorities might take.

[In Washington a State Department spokesman said Moscow had been asked to permit "consular access" to the two generals and their pilot, a major. The term is usually employed when officials are seeking to visit Americans in custody.]

#### LACK OF INVECTIVE NOTED

According to some Western diplomats in Moscow, the lack of invective in the Soviet statement seemed to indicate that Moscow would not make a major issue of the trespass

by the six-passenger craft, which the Turkish authorities have said was on a routine flight from Erzurum in eastern Turkey to Kars, some 50 miles from the Soviet border.

Tass said "the competent Soviet authorities have been instructed to investigate the circumstances connected with the above-mentioned violation of the Soviet Union's frontier by the plane of the U.S. Air Force."

The Turkish announcement had listed the men aboard as Maj. Gen. Edward C. D. Scherrer, 57 years old, head of the United States military mission in Turkey, Brig. Gen. Claude M. McQuarrie Jr. 45, head of the Army section of the mission, and Major James Russell of the Air Force. Tass identified the Turkish officer as a colonel named Deneli.

The incident came a week after a Soviet airliner with 46 passengers aboard was hijacked to the Turkish border town of Trebizond by a Lithuanian and his son. A Soviet stewardess was killed and the chief pilot and the navigator were wounded.

#### NO DECISION IN TURKEY

The Soviet Government has asked the Turkish authorities to extradite the men, Pranas Brazinskis-Koreivo and his son Algirdas, but the Turkish Government has announced no decision.

There was some speculation that the Russians might hold the military men until the hijackers were turned over, even though the cases were unrelated. Others maintained that Moscow might release them promptly to show good faith, putting "moral pressure" on the Turks to reciprocate.

When the United States Embassy was informed of the plane's whereabouts, the chargé d'affaires, Boris H. Klosson, asked for consular access. There was no immediate response.

In July, 1960, an RB-47, an American reconnaissance plane, was shot down by Soviet aircraft. The two survivors were released by Premier Nikita S. Khrushchev in January, 1961, as a sign of goodwill to the new American President, John F. Kennedy.

The most publicized violation of Soviet airspace was the U-2 affair, in which Francis Gary Powers was shot down in his high-flying reconnaissance plane in May, 1960. He was released in exchange for the Soviet spy Col. Rudolf Abel in 1962.

#### UNITED STATES APPLIES FOR ACCESS

WASHINGTON, October 22.—A State Department spokesman said today that the United States had asked for "consular access" to the three American officers.

A press officer, John King, said he did not know whether the Americans and the accompanying Turkish officer were being held prisoner. The term "consular access" usually indicates that officials are seeking to visit Americans in custody.

A Defense Department spokesman described as entirely likely a Turkish report that the plane, reported lost in bad weather, had been escorted to an airfield in Armenia by Soviet jets.

The Pentagon sources stressed that the men, with the Turkish colonel as liaison officer, were on a routine inspection of Turkish military installations.

The aircraft, a twin-engine Beechcraft, carried no reconnaissance equipment, the Pentagon officials said. It has a normal cruising speed of about 170 miles an hour.

The officials said they did not expect difficulties in obtaining the release of the plane and the Americans. There was some concern, however, that the Soviet Union might hold the Turkish officer as leverage in its effort to extradite the two Lithuanians who hijacked the Soviet airliner.

The mission headed by General Scherrer, who is from Shawneetown, Ill., advises the

Turkish armed forces on use of equipment provided by the United States. General McQuarrie is from Fort Benning, Ga., and Major Russell from Piney Woods, Miss.

Pentagon biographies show that General Scherrer has not had an intelligence assignment since 1950 and that General McQuarrie has had none.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 10, 1970]

#### TWO GENERALS WILL BE FREED, UNITED STATES IS INFORMED BY SOVIET

(By Terence Smith)

WASHINGTON, November 9.—The Soviet Union advised the United States today that it would release the two United States Army generals it has been holding since their small plane crossed the Turkish border into Soviet Armenia on Oct. 21.

Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin called Secretary of State William P. Rogers this afternoon and told him that Maj. Gen. Edward C. D. Scherrer, chief of the United States military mission in Turkey, and his assistant, Brig. Gen. Claude M. McQuarrie Jr., "will be released and permitted to leave the Soviet Union."

The State Department spokesman, Robert J. McCloskey, said the United States hoped the two officers would be released within 24 hours. Other sources indicated that the pilot of the plane, Maj. James P. Russell, who was also detained, probably would fly the small Air Force plane back to Turkey in the next day or two.

#### "CONSTRUCTIVE STEP" HAILED

In Key Biscayne, Fla., where President Nixon is vacationing, the White House press secretary, Ronald L. Ziegler, said the President considered the generals' release a "constructive step in United States-Soviet relations."

The Turkish radio announced earlier today that the fourth passenger in the plane, a Turkish colonel who served as liaison officer, had been handed over to Turkish authorities at Kizilcakak, just across the border from the Soviet Armenian town of Leninakan, where the plane and the four officers had been held.

The United States has said that the plane strayed across the border while the generals were on an inspection tour of Turkish military facilities. The Soviet Union charged that they had crossed the border with hostile intent.

Colonel Russell was quoted by American consular officials as having said that he was en route from Erzurum to Kars and had landed at Leninakan in the belief that it was Kars. The detained officers were visited twice by consuls attached to the United States embassy in Moscow.

The Soviet decision to free the men followed nearly three weeks of acrimonious argument between two countries over the nature of the border-crossing incident, straining the atmosphere between Moscow and Washington.

In exasperation at the Soviet delay in releasing the officers, the United States instructed its top-level diplomats to boycott Soviet celebrations marking the 53d anniversary of the Bolshevik Revolution.

United States officials said this evening that evening that they assumed the Russians had decided they had exploited the incident "for all the propaganda it was worth" and therefore agreed to release the officers.

Throughout the nearly three weeks of their captivity, the Americans were kept in a comfortable Government villa in Leninakan and occasionally permitted to tour the town under guard. On several occasions, they were submitted to what officials described as "lengthy and intensive" questioning about the incident and the scope of United States military activities in Turkey.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 7, 1970]  
UNITED STATES SNUBS RUSSIAN FESTIVITIES  
(By Murray Marder)

The United States deliberately displayed double irritation with the Soviet Union last night for the Soviet Embassy's gala 53d anniversary celebration of the Bolshevik revolution.

The equivalent of two diplomatic slaps on the wrist were delivered by the State Department, in carefully-calibrated quantity.

First, the department in mid-afternoon, announced that no high-ranking U.S. officials would attend Soviet anniversary celebrations around the world. That was to register American displeasure over the continued Soviet detention of two U.S. generals and a major, whose light aircraft landed just over the Soviet-Turkish border on Oct. 21.

Second, at 5:15, just 45 minutes before the start of the Soviet Embassy reception here, the embassy was informed that the United States is expelling a Tass news agency correspondent, Leonid Zhegalov, "in direct reciprocity for the unjustified expulsion" from Moscow two weeks ago of Newsweek correspondent John Dornberg.

To cap off the actions, the same middle-rank official—Adolph Dubs, chief of the Soviet desk at State—who delivered this expulsion notice was sent to the Soviet Embassy as senior official representing the United States. Originally, a higher ranking officer, Richard T. Davies, a deputy assistant Secretary of State, was scheduled to attend.

The decision to downgrade attendance at the Soviet Embassy reception was made so late that the word did not get passed around fully. State Department Legal Adviser John R. Stevenson turned up at the reception, coming directly from the United Nations, as did William H. Sullivan, deputy assistant secretary for East Asian affairs, and other junior officials. But no top-level officials attended.

At the reception, however, Soviet Ambassador Anatoly F. Dobrynin, dismissed the display of U.S. irritation as inconsequential.

One chief of mission was exempted from the rule of nonattendance. Ambassador Gerard Smith, head of the U.S. delegation to the U.S.-Soviet arms limitation talks in Helsinki, was given freedom of choice about going in line with basic U.S. policy to separate those talks from other U.S.-Soviet tensions.

In explaining the diplomatic snub, State Department Press Officer John F. King said it was ordered because "there has been no indication" that the detained U.S. officers "will be released shortly."

The Russians are holding Maj. Gen. Edward C. D. Sherrer and Brig. Gen. Claude M. McQuarrie Jr., and Maj. James P. Russell. Their U.S. liaison plane, U.S. officials say, "accidentally strayed 12 miles over the Soviet border, landing in Leninakan. With them was Turkish liaison officer Col. Civat Denli, whose impending release was announced Thursday.

There have been unofficial reports from Moscow, but no official confirmation, that the three Americans also will be released soon.

The U.S. decision to register rising impatience was authorized by the White House. Because of the "unwarranted detention" of the U.S. crew and plane, the official statement said, "it has been deemed inappropriate this year for senior American officials to accept the hospitality of the Soviet government on the occasion of the November celebrations."

The expelled Tass newsman, Zhegalov, is required to leave the United States within three days.

## REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. DAWSON—A GREAT AMERICAN

### HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, our colleague, William L. Dawson, spent close to 30 years in the House of Representatives to prove "with effective leadership that God did not handicap me by making me black." He proved his point, innumerable times and in many ways. For Bill Dawson was an American, a Congressman, and a Negro in that order. He served all of his constituents all of the time. His passing last week is a loss to not only those of us who were privileged to know and serve with him, but to the countless thousands of people who benefited from his sage counsel and progressive legislative record. Under the leave to extend my remarks in the Record, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include the moving tribute paid Mr. Dawson by Washington Post writer Ellen Hoffman.

The article follows:

#### REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAM L. DAWSON DIES (By Ellen Hoffman)

Rep. William L. Dawson (D.-Ill.), who once said he was a "congressman first and a Negro second," died yesterday of pneumonia at Chicago's Veterans Administration Research Hospital. He was the oldest member of Congress.

The 84-year old congressman was the first Negro to head a committee of the U.S. House of Representatives. In recent years, he had become a target of civil rights activists who claimed he placed loyalty to the Democratic Party over his commitment to his race.

House Speaker John W. McCormack, a close personal friend and political ally of Mr. Dawson, yesterday called the Illinois congressman "one of the most constructive-minded men I have ever met . . . He served people by fighting for the passage of humane and progressive legislation that meant so much to countless millions of Americans.

Mr. Dawson, who had served in Congress since his election from a predominantly black South Side Chicago ward in 1942, did not run for re-election this year. At the time of his death, he was chairman of the House Government Operations Committee and a member of the House District Committee.

Mr. Dawson turned down an offer to become the first Negro member of the Cabinet when President-elect John F. Kennedy asked him to serve as Postmaster General in 1960.

He said he could be more effective if he remained in Congress as a committee chairman. He also was vice chairman of the Democratic Party.

Mr. Dawson was born in Albany, Ga., where he attended a local teachers college before going on to attend and graduate from Fisk University in Nashville, Tenn. He worked as a bell-hop to earn money for college.

After graduating from Fisk, he went to Chicago in 1912 and studied at Chicago-Kent College of Law and the law school of Northwestern University.

In 1917, he joined the Army. He served in Europe during World War I and was wounded.

Returning to Chicago after the war, he began to practice law in 1920. He was not the first Negro congressman from the city. In

1920, a Republican, Oscar De Priest, was elected to Congress.

Mr. Dawson became active in the Republican Party in the early 1930s. However, he switched to the Democrats in 1939 when then-mayor Ed Kelley named him committeeman from the city's second ward.

In 1942, he was nominated and won the election for congressman on the Democratic ticket.

One of his first legislative actions as a congressman was to testify before the Senate Judiciary Committee in support of a bill that would have abolished the poll tax.

He was the only Negro in Congress at the time, and a number of his colleagues were white supremacists. "I've got a job to do, and I don't want to be distracted from it," he replied to critics who charged that he submitted too easily to Jim Crow laws.

When Mr. Dawson was named chairman of the House Committee on Expenditures after the 1948 elections, he had only attended two meetings of the committee. He spent most of his time in his Chicago office.

Along with Rep. Adam Clayton Powell (D.-N.Y.) he voted in 1951 against a bill that would have created a veterans hospital for blacks in Virginia.

But he and Powell, for some time the only other black congressman, later clashed over the question of how to push for expansion of civil rights.

On one occasion, Powell charged that Dawson and Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley were denying antipoverty funds to a militant black group called The Woodlawn Organization because they feared the money would be used to organize political opposition.

The National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) attacked Mr. Dawson for what they called his "silence, compromise and meaningless moderation" on issues including a bill Powell sponsored in 1956 to cut off federal aid to states with segregated school systems.

But throughout his career, Mr. Dawson maintained that his aim was "to prove with effective leadership that God didn't handicap me by making me black."

In his 1966 campaign for the House, Mr. Dawson was challenged by a young black Republican named David Reed. Reed argued in his campaign that Mr. Dawson did not bring relief to the poor black residents of Chicago's South Side.

Although Mr. Dawson did not receive the approximately 80 per cent majority that he tallied in earlier elections, he won in a vote of 91,000 to 34,000.

A member of the House District Committee since 1958, he went on the record as an opponent of freeway expansion in Washington.

Mr. Dawson had been ill for a long time and had not been seen much in Congress recently.

He is survived by his wife, Nellie B.; a son, William L. Jr., and a daughter, Barbara Morgan, all of Chicago.

#### RICHARD CARDINAL CUSHING

### HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, this country lost more than a spiritual leader with the passing of Richard Cardinal Cushing. It lost a man whose warmth and generosity transcended his religious role to touch the hearts of all Americans.



Prince of the Catholic Church, yet the first prelate to urge his faithful to attend Billy Graham crusades; Archbishop of Boston, with all the pomp that implies, yet so "down to earth" as to joke that his official residence was the "biggest joint on Commonwealth Avenue"; the cardinal was equally devoted to the famous and unfortunate in his flock.

To many he will be best remembered as the priest who, at the funeral of his friend the President, commended the soul of "dear Jack" to the angels in Paradise. But many Bostonians refer to him as the "Cardinal of Charity" for his untiring work for the poor and needy. His ability as a fund raiser was most evidenced when in 1962 he raised \$1 million in 48 hours as the anonymous donor to secure the release of Cuban prisoners of the Bay of Pigs invasion by Christmas eve.

Held with affection and esteem by men of all faiths, Cardinal Cushing believed that men could be wrong without being really bad. He encouraged interfaith cooperation and became one of America's foremost proponents of ecumenism. His support of brotherhood and attacks on prejudice were among his most remembered qualities.

We mourn the death of Richard Cardinal Cushing and extend our sympathies to the people of Boston on the passing of their beloved son.

#### FUNDING FOR HEADSTART

### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, last July the House acted on the fiscal 1971 appropriation bill for the Labor and Health, Education, and Welfare Departments.

Recently transferred to the HEW budget is the Headstart program, perhaps the most successful antipoverty program operated within the Office of Economic Opportunity. Headstart now is made an activity of the Office of Child Development in HEW.

President Nixon's budget recommended \$339 million for fiscal 1971. The House approved only \$321.3 million.

HEW has notified Members and local program units of cuts in their allocations ranging up to 13.5 percent for larger programs like the very successful program in my home city of Buffalo, N.Y.

The belt-tightening in our Buffalo program already has gone the limit in order to meet the cutback in funding from the previous year—fiscal year 1969. Further cuts can only result in curtailed enrollment and closing of centers in Buffalo.

This would be a tragic mistake. Headstart is a good program and should be funded so that it can continue at least at its present level.

The Senate is scheduled to begin considering the Labor-HEW appropriation bill on Wednesday. The Senate Appropriations Committee recommended the full budget request of \$339 million.

However, HEW Secretary Richardson has said that the agency will need still another \$11 million—a total of \$350 million—to maintain the fiscal 1970 level. The administration has not changed its original request.

Today, about 150 parents of Headstart children in Buffalo made an all-night bus trip to the Nation's Capital to visit their Congressmen and Senators in connection with the Headstart program reduction.

Their concern is well founded and I hope that their representations will produce the desired results.

I can speak well for the Buffalo group. It was well organized and dedicated to its chore of telling the story of Headstart. I spent some time with them during their lunch period and found them very attentive and quite well informed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope sincerely the Headstart program will receive the additional funding it needs and deserves.

As a part of my remarks, I include an editorial from the November 14, 1970, edition of the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News.

#### DO NOT CUT HEADSTART FUNDS

When Congress reconvenes next week, the Senate should restore spending cuts made by the House for Head Start, the popular pre-school education program for thousands of children from impoverished families.

As matters now stand, the House-voted cutbacks threaten to cost New York State \$2.7 million and Buffalo \$101,600 in Head-Start funds. If actually carried out, such a reduction would be penny wise and pound foolish.

The Nixon administration doubts the effectiveness of Head Start educational, health and social programs because studies have suggested that any gains derived from them faded after the children entered the regular school system. But the administration has no doubts about the fundamental concept of extra help for disadvantaged pre-schoolers. In fact the President has hinted that pre-school programs might profitably embrace children even younger than three, the existing Head Start minimum. Experiments to discover alternative programs are under way.

Hence, this is a holding period, really, when the concept of pre-school help is accepted and when Head Start, despite flaws, has shown at least some concern and transitory benefits. With no more promising alternative ready to go, Congress should reject the temptation, acquiesced in by the House, to shrink Head Start spending below the modest \$339 million President Nixon has asked for.

#### STATEMENTS OF WITNESSES APPEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

### HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, for approximately 3 hours today, I conducted a meeting in the District of Columbia Committee hearing room, at which an overflow, standing-room-only group representing the tourist industry in Washington, D.C., pre-

sented their pleas to Mr. Robert E. Jordan III, General Counsel of the Department of the Army, to reject a proposal to close Arlington National Cemetery to all sightseeing buses, charter buses, school buses, limousines, taxicabs, and tour guides with the exception of Landmark Tours, Inc., operating as "Tourmobile" under contract with the Department of the Interior.

Mr. Jordan was most cordial and assured the industry spokesmen their case would be carefully reviewed and the tentative decision to close the cemetery reviewed. In the meantime, however, I include at this point in the RECORD the prepared statements of some of the industry representatives, so that all Members of this body and all who read the RECORD may know the grave impact closing of Arlington National Cemetery to all commercial vehicles may have not only on the tourist business in our Nation's Capital, but on the comfort, convenience, and accessibility of visitors from across the Nation and from foreign lands.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in an effort to prevent such a disaster from occurring in our Nation's Capital.

The statements of the main spokesmen follow:

#### STATEMENT OF IRVING SCHLAIFER

Congressman Broyhill, and all of those here today, my name is Irving Schlaifer. I live at 1344 Kennedy St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20011. I am Chairman of the Emergency Taxicab Committee. Its membership is made up of those in the taxi industry and those in the sightseeing industry that may from time to time, find a need, that through it, they can voice their opinions and take a stand on the various problems that they face.

First of all, Congressman Broyhill, we want to thank you for all that you have done to keep Arlington National Cemetery open to all sightseeing buses, charter buses, school buses, limousines, taxicabs and tour guides. There were at least 35 members of the sightseeing industry and the taxicab industry that attended the 3 P.M. meeting in your office on Tuesday, October 20, 1970.

We met with you for almost one hour. We asked that you do everything in your power to keep the cemetery open to us. After hearing us out and questioning us, you agreed to help us all that you could. You got on the phone and called the Secretary of the Army's office, the Secretary of the Interior's office and the White House. In less than 24 hours you were able to inform us that the cemetery would remain open indefinitely and that you would arrange for a hearing with the Secretary of the Army's staff sometime after November 15th.

In our letter of Wednesday, September 23, 1970, sent to each Member of Congress we went into detail as to why we were opposed to the closing of the cemetery to the sightseeing industry and the taxicab industry. We want this letter to be made a part of this record. We also want our letter of Tuesday, November 10, 1970, that was sent to over 700 tour guides, to be made a part of this record.

All of us are opposed to the closing of the cemetery to our vehicles. We have sacrificed a great deal of talent, time and money to make the sightseeing industry and the taxicab industry of this city, the Capital of this nation, what it is today. A lot of sweat, blood and tears have gone into our efforts. Now, that we have succeeded in making

the sightseeing industry a strong and respectable profession, we find ourselves fighting for our lives, fighting to save our businesses, fighting to provide for our families and fighting to keep bread and butter on our tables.

Whether we are owners of buses, limousines or taxicabs, or, are only employed by owners of such services, we represent millions of tax dollars. We bitterly resent any attempt to use our tax dollars for the purpose of making us lose our businesses, lose our jobs, lose our livelihood, or, lose our opportunities for advancement. We believe in the free enterprise system. We can't survive, when the Department of the Interior, an agency of the United States government, outlaws our more than 50 year-established tour business in Arlington National Cemetery, franchising this business, exclusively, to a favored California based corporation.

There was a time, years back, that the general public and the small independent business men had to put up with the robber Barons of Industry. It was necessary to control their ruthless and cut throat activities through legislation. Now, we are faced with the same kind of robber Barons of Government, the bureaucrats. This is exactly what the Department of the Interior has become, and, it is obvious that we need legislation to control them.

We can easily understand a government agency stepping in and providing a needed service, when private industry fails or refuses to provide it. There has never been a need for the Department of the Interior to get into the sightseeing and transportation business in Washington, D.C. There has always been more than enough commercial operators to take care of all of the demands for sightseeing services or for transportation services. The rates charged by these commercial services have always been competitive and reasonable.

The Department of the Interior has trumped up an excuse for getting into the sightseeing and transportation business in Washington, D.C. So, they invented the problem, they then started up the problem, and, they then claimed that they had the answer to the problem. They use the greatly exaggerated excuse that a shuttle bus was desperately needed in the Mall area, from the foot of Capitol Hill to the Lincoln Memorial. First, they started out with a 10¢ ride. Then, it went to a 25¢ ride. Then, it went to a 50¢ ride. Then, it went to a \$1.00 ride, and now, it is a \$2.00 ride! In the past four years the Department of the Interior has authorized the Mall shuttle bus fare to be increased from 10¢ to \$2.00! 20-fold; 1,900%!

The Department of the Interior sold a bill-of-goods to the Secretary of the Army's staff, that they should have a complete monopoly on the sightseeing and transportation services in Arlington National Cemetery. They then decided to agree that because of an alleged traffic problem, it was absolutely necessary that such a step should be taken.

The Department of the Interior is determined to destroy an entire sightseeing industry. The bureaucrats in the Department of the Interior look upon our Arlington National Cemetery not as hallowed ground, but, as a "gold mine" to be exploited. Worst of all, it will not end here. The Department of the Interior is determined to expand its operation to other points of interest and exploit them. This shuttle bus operation will spread like a cancer, and, like a cancer it must be stopped immediately.

The shuttling of tourists from one point of interest to another, has always been well taken care of by the mass transit buses and by the taxis. We have one of the best mass transit bus systems in the world. It has adequate bus routes in and near the Mall area,

with frequent service. It is actually less expensive for these tourists on a tight budget to use our mass transit buses and taxis. With buses, they get transfer privileges at no extra cost, making it possible for them to travel great distances in the city for the same original fare. With taxis, these tourists get fast, efficient door-to-door service.

Even right now, many of the shuttle bus passengers must use taxis to get to the White House before it closes at 12 noon, and, use taxis to get to the Bureau of Engraving and Printing before it closes at 2:30 P.M. It just means that these passengers wind up paying double fare, first, to ride the shuttle buses, and after, to ride taxis. What these passengers thought was a bargain ride on the shuttle buses, proves to be no bargain ride at all. These passengers are in such a hurry to take advantage of this so-called bargain ride, that they don't stop to realize that the shuttle bus never promise to get them any place on time, it just says that it will get you there. It is not until these passengers have paid for their ride on the shuttle buses, that they find out that they do not have enough time left to reach points of interest which have definite closing times, that they suddenly realize that they have been taken for real suckers. This is exactly what will happen when they are required to ride the shuttle buses in the cemetery, and, then miss seeing the Changing of the Guard.

In virtually every tour trip that we offer to the public, the most important part of it is, the visit to Arlington National Cemetery. Take that away from us, and, you virtually destroy the sightseeing industry. This is exactly what is going to happen, if the Secretary of the Army's staff is allowed to go ahead with their plans to give a monopoly to the Department of the Interior to provide all of the sightseeing and transportation services in the cemetery.

This proposed monopoly, will not only eventually destroy the sightseeing industry, it will immediately destroy the delicate control of the very tight time schedule every bus operator and tour guide must work under. The most important reason that these tourists use our services, is that, they prefer to ride on a reserved seat basis, because their time is extremely limited, and, because they are relying on our professional knowledge and ability to show them all that we can, within the amount of time that they have available to visit the main points of interest in the Nation's Capital.

How in the world can 10, 20, 30, 40 or 50 buses, arriving at the cemetery with just 20 minutes to spare, make it in time for the Changing of the Guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers, if they must first unload their passengers in the new parking area, and, waste precious time loading these same passengers on the shuttle buses, just to ride a short distance to the Tomb? Limousine and taxicab passengers will just wind up getting lost in the crowd. If, any of these passengers miss the Changing of the Guard, it will mean for most of them, their last chance to have seen it, because, they are here for this one and only time. A great percentage of these visitors are here for just the one day and must travel on to other cities, or, to other countries.

The sightseeing industry is going to wind up with a lot of angry and dissatisfied passengers, if, what is proposed at the cemetery, is allowed to take place. If, the name of the game is to waste time, bring about complete confusion, create deep dissatisfaction and generate a great deal of anger when visiting the cemetery, then the outlawing of established sightseeing industry and the giving of a monopoly to the Department of the Interior will accomplish it.

The Department of the Interior and the

Secretary of the Army's staff acted very arbitrarily, and, in a very high-handed manner in what they did. The least that the Secretary of the Army's staff could have done, was to call in the key members of the sightseeing industry and the taxicab industry, and, asked them for whatever solutions they might have proposed to control the traffic problem in the cemetery.

It is obvious to us, that the Secretary of the Army's staff was sold a bill-of-goods by the Department of the Interior. The staff swallowed the scheme hook, line and sinker. Had the Secretary of the Army's staff gone down to the Mall and watched how the shuttle buses actually operated, day in and day out, they would never have touched it; not with a 10 foot pole!

During the busy summer season, it was not unusual to see 50, 60, 70, 80, 90, or more people, waiting in long lines for the shuttle buses. When the shuttle bus finally showed up, it could pick up only 3 or 4 passengers and then drive on, leaving the rest to stand and wait that much longer. It was also a common sight to see 2, 3, 4, or 5 of these shuttle buses just pass them up completely. We have seen them crowd on as many as 30 people in the aisles when all seats were taken, even though they claim there is a seat for everyone.

We have heard many complaints from the shuttle bus passengers about their being passed up and left standing in the hot weather, cold weather, rain and snow for long periods of time. What sense does it make to put an end to the excellent service already being provided by the sightseeing industry and the taxicab industry at Arlington National Cemetery, and, in its place, force people to use a shabby, unreliable service?

The independent tour guide, the independent taxi driver and the independent limousine driver, that we are speaking for, works strictly on their own. We are not on any payroll. Every bit of work that we get, comes to us the hard way. Nothing is put in our laps or handed to us.

When we take our sightseeing passengers to Arlington National Cemetery, we point out the gravesites of famous people and famous military heroes, such as, Robert Todd Lincoln, son of President Abraham Lincoln, President William Howard Taft, John Foster Dulles, General Leonard Wood, Astronauts Virgil Grissom and Roger Bruce Chaffee, General John J. Pershing, General George Marshall, General Bedell Smith, etc. We point out where they have buried those who had served in the Civil War, Spanish-American War, War I, War II, and, the military nurses' section.

When we show our sightseeing passengers all of these points of interest, we are using those roadways and traveling in those sections, where very few burials take place these days. The limousine and taxi tour guides are able to show much more of the cemetery than the buses. The buses are restricted to certain roadways and cannot tour the cemetery in the same way as the limousines and taxis. The proposed use of the shuttle bus in the cemetery will also be restricted to certain roadways. Since all buses are restricted, this is the main reason why the sightseeing passengers want and use the added service that the limousine and taxi tour guides can give to them.

If, we are prevented by the Department of the Interior from making our trips to the cemetery, as we have always done in the past, we will be virtually put out of business. Having a good day, or, having a bad day depends almost entirely on our getting a sightseeing trip. Over 90% of these sightseeing trips include a visit to Arlington National Cemetery. Many of our sightseeing passengers feel that they can see much of what



is in the downtown area pretty much on their own, but, realize that they are much better off with us, when it comes to visiting the cemetery.

Even if the Department of the Interior, in order to justify a monopoly at the cemetery, were to tell us that they would provide all of the transportation there free of charge, we would still reject the proposal as unworkable. The Secretary of the Army's staff must recognize that we have a very serious problem trying to be on time for the Changing of the Guard, so that our passengers can see it. Anything that will necessarily delay us at the cemetery, such as, boarding a shuttle bus, whether you pay for it, or, can go free, should not be adopted.

We agree with the Army that there is a serious traffic problem at Arlington National Cemetery. We agree that something should be done about the commuter vehicles, and, that something should be done about the private tourist vehicles. It would be to the advantage of the private tourist vehicles to be required to park in the new parking area by the main gate. It would keep them from getting confused and lost in the cemetery. It would be easier for them to walk from this new parking area to the main points of interest in the cemetery.

Another very important reason for the tourist vehicles to be required to use the new parking area, is for their own personal security and protection of their valuables. Last year alone, in 1969, over \$80,000 in cash was taken by thieves breaking into the cars that were parked all over the cemetery. Heaven only knows the full amount of these losses, when you add in the cost of stolen cameras, clothing, credit cards, etc.

The cemetery guards are not armed and they are not equipped with two way radios when on foot. It would be easy for them to prevent such thieves from breaking into the cars of tourists, if private cars were restricted to a designated parking area, where three or four guards could patrol it effectively. They could easily spot the thieves and they could quickly eliminate such tourist losses.

Once a suitable control is placed on the private tourist vehicles and the commuter vehicles, the cemetery roadways will become open and clear. The drivers of buses, limousines and taxis know what they must do and will not get lost or confused in the cemetery. Suitable bus route signs can be placed in easy to read locations. All commercial vehicles can be easily rerouted whenever a funeral procession is planned.

We recognize that priority should and must be given to funeral processions, those visiting the gravesites of relatives or friends, and, other official needs that take place from time to time at the cemetery.

A suitable sign can easily be posted at the main gate stating that only authorized vehicles are allowed to use the cemetery roadways. Listed in this authorized category would be, cars in a funeral procession, cars visiting the gravesite of a relative or a friend, cars attending official ceremonies, buses, limousines, taxicabs and cars driven by tour guides.

We would like to know why the shuttle buses are allowed to operate without license plates and without licensed guides? We would like to know why the shuttle buses do not have to pass D.C. inspection, meet the I.C.C. regulations, or display an insurance sticker in its windshield? We would like to see a complete financial report about the shuttle bus operation. We would like to know just who the stockholders are that operate the shuttle buses? It is extremely important that we know just who we are really dealing with, when we talk about the shuttle buses.

Congressman Broyhill, we deeply appreciate the opportunity you have granted us, to explain our dilemma and we ask for your help.

We see nothing wrong in honest competition in a free enterprise system. But, honest competition does not exist when it involves the Department of the Interior's shuttle bus operation. The Department of the Interior sees to it that their shuttle bus operator gets every advantage and that we get none.

The shuttle bus is allowed to advertise their services in the Mall area, with a big price sign on the outside of it, we are not. They are allowed to use tape recordings at the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, and at the Washington Monument, telling people to use the shuttle bus, we are not. They are allowed to advertise the shuttle bus service in the lobby and on the bulletin boards in the various government buildings, we are not. They are allowed to hang signs advertising the shuttle bus service on the information booths in the Mall area, we are not. They are allowed to distribute brochures advertising the shuttle bus services in the Mall area information booths, to tourists waiting in the line to go into the White House, the line at the Washington Monument and other points of interest, we are not. The Mall area information booths do everything that they can to promote the services of the shuttle bus and remain virtually silent about the other bus, limousine and taxi services. We are entitled to as much consideration and more, since we are licensed and the shuttle buses are not.

If we were to operate our vehicles without license plates, D.C. vehicle inspection stickers, D.C. insurance stickers and no licensed guides, we would be immediately stopped and arrested. We ask that here and now, that the shuttle buses' operation be stopped immediately until they comply with all of the rules and regulations that we must comply with. We object very strenuously to the idea that there is one set of rules and regulations for us, and, no set of rules and regulations for the shuttle buses.

For years and years the Smithsonian Institution museum buildings were always open to the public from 9 A.M. to 4:30 P.M. But, when the shuttle bus started its full-time operation in the Mall area, it is rumored that the Department of the Interior got the Smithsonian Institution to open its museum buildings one hour later, from 10 A.M. to 5:30 P.M. The truth of the matter, is, that at least one of their buildings, History and Technology, should be open from 8 A.M. to 10 P.M. year around. This would permit the sightseeing industry to spread its work load over a greater period of time.

If, as it is rumored, the Department of the Interior was able to get the Smithsonian Institution to open an hour later, so that it would work out better for its shuttle bus schedule, then what is to stop them from saying that in the cemetery, the first Changing of the Guard that they have scheduled for the shuttle bus will be set for 10 A.M.? This will mean, that for those of us that make the 8 A.M. and 9 A.M. Changing of the Guard, we won't be able to make it. We will be forced to work out our schedules to fit the shuttle bus schedules.

The two so-called temporary buildings of World War I, the Navy Department and the War Munitions buildings, on Constitution Avenue between 17th Street and 21st Street are finally being torn down. Once the land on which they stand, is cleared of these buildings, how will it then be used? Since the Department of the Interior will have control over the use of this land, it is rumored that they plan to make it into an enormous parking lot and terminal for their shuttle bus operation. This terminal will then be directly linked to the cemetery. In the meanwhile, the Department of the Interior proposes that the shuttle bus go from the Lincoln Memorial, across the Arlington Memorial Bridge, to the new parking area at the cemetery. The Army should refuse to let the shuttle buses enter the cemetery until they are properly licensed.

SEPTEMBER 23, 1970.

In re the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Department of the Interior decision to close the roadways of Arlington National Cemetery to all vehicular traffic, except those vehicles in a funeral procession, visiting a gravesite or attending special ceremonies. These two government agencies have summarily and arbitrarily decided that only one commercial transportation service shall be allowed to use the cemetery roadways, the Tourmobile, operated by Landmark Services, Inc., effective November 1, 1970.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: The transportation and sightseeing industry of Washington, D.C. desperately needs the help of every Member of Congress. Because of recent events, we are in serious trouble and face the threat of being put out of business unless you help us immediately.

On Tuesday, August 4, 1970, Page C-1 of The Washington Post, it was announced by the Army that the Arlington National Cemetery roadways will be closed to tourist and commuter vehicles, starting November 1, 1970, and, that, those wishing transportation to points of interest in the cemetery will have to use the Tourmobile operated by the Landmark Services, Inc.

It was alleged that the increased traffic congestion caused by commercial buses, tourist autos and daily commuter traffic made it necessary to take this step. According to a traffic survey made last summer, showed a daily average of 3,600 autos and 70 buses.

The traffic problem at the cemetery has been caused mainly by the thousands of visitors being told to drive their cars into the cemetery by the personnel manning the information booths in the Mall area operated by the Department of the Interior's National Park Service, and, by the personnel employed as drivers and guide on the Tourmobiles.

The National Park Service did this deliberately in order to create a serious and virtual uncontrollable problem of traffic congestion at the cemetery, so that, they could claim that they had a solution for it. Their solution was to bar all unessential traffic, any competitor, and, that the Tourmobile should be the only commercial service to be allowed the use of the cemetery roadways.

Naturally, an exclusive monopoly of this sort will prove extremely profitable and in their extreme greediness, they want it all for themselves. We say that this arrangement will create far more problems than it will solve. What the National Park Service and the Tourmobile operators propose to do, will destroy the dignity of the cemetery and turn it into something that can be best described as a carnival, a county fair, or, a state fair. What a sad end for this famous cemetery.

We recognize that priority should and must be given to funeral processions, those visiting the gravesites of relatives and the other official needs that take place from time to time at the cemetery.

It should be pointed out that the drivers of buses, limousines and taxicabs are well acquainted with the cemetery roadways and know just what to do. The number of commercial vehicles there at any one time is only a drop in the bucket as compared to the number of private vehicles that are sightseeing in the cemetery. The drivers of these private vehicles are constantly lost and confused on the cemetery roadways and therefore create virtually all of the traffic problems.

It is these drivers that should be required to use the new parking area just one block south of the cemetery's main gate. They can easily walk to the main points of interest in the cemetery from this parking area. Should any visitor desire transportation in the cemetery they should make arrangements to get it in the city where such services have always been available.

The traffic congestion at the cemetery is not a year 'round problem. It is a problem during the months of June, July and August. During the other nine months of the year there is no problem. The new parking area south of the main gate will take care of the traffic problems caused by the private vehicles that are just sightseeing in the cemetery. Walking should be no problem for them at the cemetery. Sightseers visiting Mt. Vernon, the home of George Washington, our first President, are required to walk even greater distances than they would be required to walk at the cemetery.

It is extremely important to remember that a great many of these visitors do not want to be forced to ride the Tourmobile and be shuttled around like a herd of cattle. They realize that the Tourmobile service is slow and not on any time schedule. These visitors are very often on very tight time schedules when they need to catch a bus, train or airplane. Even when they are driving their own cars, their time is often very limited. To them, it is worth the small extra expense to ride on a reserve seat basis in a regular sightseeing bus, limousine or taxi. Many visitors that have serious physical handicaps can only use a limousine or taxi to visit the various points of interest in the city and in the cemetery. Many thousands of trips are taken in limousines and taxis because visitors can see just what they want and use up very little time in doing so. The National Park Service and the Tourmobile take the attitude that if the visitors do not want to see it their way, then they should see nothing at all.

The Tourmobile is proposing to charge \$1.25 for each adult and 75¢ for each child. These charges can prove to be extremely expensive to large groups wanting or needing transportation in the cemetery. For example, a bus arriving at the cemetery with 50 adult passengers must park in the new parking area south of the main gate. Because these passengers want transportation to the points of interest in the cemetery, they must then pay out an additional \$62.50 to the Tourmobile operator for approximately one hour of waiting and riding. What a nice, legal way for the Tourmobile operator to clip the public. This makes the cemetery a real "gold mine" for the Tourmobile operator.

We say that it is highway robbery for these people who have already paid once for their trip, to be forced to pay a second time when in the cemetery. This is nothing more than a shakedown racket engineered by the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Department of the Interior.

Sightseeing buses, charter buses, school buses, limousines and taxis have always been welcome and encouraged to bring as many visitors as they could to the cemetery. These operators, over the years, have used a great deal of talent, time and money to build up the importance of why these visitors should take these trips to the cemetery. Now that is a very important part of the various sightseeing trips that they offer, they are being told that they are no longer needed, wanted or welcome. They are being bluntly told that the only commercial service that will be allowed to use the cemetery roadways, will be a less than 2-year old newcomer in the business in this area, the Tourmobile operator. The Tourmobile operator is to have a complete monopoly. The fact that we have "Grandfather Rights" means nothing.

The Tourmobiles are the only commercial vehicles in this area that are allowed to operate without a license plate of any kind. The Tourmobiles should be required to get District of Columbia license plates. Their guides are not licensed. Their guides should be required to have a guide badge issued by the District of Columbia. Our vehicles must have license plates. Our tour guides must be licensed. What justification is there for

letting the Tourmobiles operate without being properly licensed?

How is it that the Tourmobile operator can get preferential treatment, while the other sightseeing operators and transportation services that have been here for years, get the bums' rush and no consideration of any kind? Why is it right for two government agencies to hold secret negotiations and decide for themselves that they shall exercise life or death over other commercial vehicles that have always been permitted and encouraged to come into the cemetery? These two agencies have made no attempt to hear from those of us who will suffer the most. Apparently equal protection under the law means nothing to them.

The commercial transportation needed at the cemetery can be best taken care of by those of us that have always been providing it. Those of us that make frequent trips to the cemetery find it unbelievable that we were never asked or consulted as to what solutions we could offer that would help to solve the problem of excessive vehicular traffic in the cemetery.

We had no traffic problem in the cemetery prior to President John J. Kennedy's burial there in November of 1963. Naturally, the assassination of President Kennedy shocked millions of people. As many of them that could, have visited his gravesite at Arlington National Cemetery.

Originally, when the Army wanted some suggestions, they did call in the bus operators. The bus operators agreed to cut out their general tour of the cemetery and go directly to the parking area near the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. At that time, there was no Tourmobile and the National Park Service stayed out of it altogether.

Little did any of us dream that the National Park Service had developed a master plan, that over a period of several years, it would take over the functions of the mass transit buses, sightseeing buses, limousines and taxis wherever possible. First, in the Mall area between the U.S. Capitol building and the Lincoln Memorial. Second, in Arlington National Cemetery. We are convinced that their third step will be to run trips to Mt. Vernon, the home of our first President. Where will it stop? When will it end?

All of us pay dearly in federal, state and local taxes. Why is it necessary for the National Park Service to take the position that it must get into the transportation and sightseeing business in the Nation's Capital? There are already more than enough commercial services available to take care of the demand. Just what is wrong about having a tax-supported agency, such as the National Park Service, telling the visitors to make use of the many commercial services that are already available?

Over the years, the visitors to our Nation's Capital have been educated to leave their cars parked at their motels or hotels. These visitors made good use of the mass transit buses, sightseeing buses, limousines and taxicabs. Then along came the National Park Service with its information booths and cut-throat, cut-rate Tourmobiles, telling everyone to bring their cars into the already overcrowded and traffic congested downtown. The National Park Service and the Tourmobile has made an already terrible traffic problem even worse. Even some of the National Park Service's Park Police will tell you that the Tourmobile has caused more problems than it has solved and the best thing that could happen, would be for the Tourmobile to be put out of business.

The way that the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Department of the Interior have secretly conspired to deliberately give the Tourmobile operator a complete monopoly at Arlington National Cemetery stinks to high heaven.

This entire affair should be thoroughly investigated. Surely, you as a Member of Con-

gress can request that the General Accounting Office assign one of its top investigators to file a full report as to what are the financial arrangements that the Tourmobile operators have made with the National Park Service, the number of passengers it has carried, how much profit it has made and how much money the National Park Service has made on its contract with them. One other mystery that should be cleared up, is, just who are the stockholders in the Landmark Services, Inc., the operators of the Tourmobile.

We ask that you as a Member of Congress, request that the Secretary of the Army cancel its contract with the Secretary of the Department of the Interior until full public hearings can be held with them and, in particular, with the appropriate Committees of Congress.

We will appreciate everything you can do to stop what is happening to our industry. We will appreciate an early reply to this letter.

Sincerely yours,  
IRVING SCHLAIFER,  
Chairman, Emergency Taxicab Committee.

NOVEMBER 10, 1970.  
From Irving Schlaifer, Chairman, Emergency Taxicab Committee.

This letter is being sent to you to bring you up-to-date as to what is happening in regards to the announced November 1, 1970, closing of Arlington National Cemetery to all sightseeing buses, charter buses, school buses, limousines, taxicabs and tour guides.

First, the enclosed letter dated Wednesday, September 23, 1970, was sent to each Member of Congress objecting to the proposed closing of Arlington National Cemetery. Second, a meeting was held with Congressman Joel T. Broyhill of Virginia, at 3 P.M. Tuesday, October 20, 1970. There were at least 35 members of the sightseeing industry and the taxicab industry at that meeting representing all of us.

Congressman Broyhill met with us for almost an hour and was very impressed with what we had to say to him about keeping Arlington National Cemetery open. Congressman Broyhill immediately got on the phone and called the Secretary of the Army's office, the Secretary of the Interior's office and the White House.

Congressman Broyhill assured us that he would do everything in his power to keep the cemetery open. In less than 24 hours he informed us that the cemetery would remain open indefinitely and that he would arrange for a hearing with the Secretary of the Army's staff sometime after the 15th of November.

This hearing date has now been definitely set for November 17, 1970, 2:30 P.M., District of Columbia Committee, Room 1310, Longworth House Office Building, South Capitol Street and Independence Avenue, Washington, D.C. To make certain that there are no last minute changes you can call Congressman Broyhill's office 225-5136.

It is extremely important that you make effort to be there in person to attend this hearing. The more of us that show up, the better our argument will be to keep Arlington National Cemetery open. If, for some reason you cannot be there yourself, then be sure that your wife or husband, son or daughter, relative or friend, be there in support of us.

A number of us have already arranged to speak for those that we represent. It is important that you, as a licensed guide write to Congressman Joel T. Broyhill, Room 2109, Rayburn House Office Building, Washington, D.C. 20515, and, in your letter tell him that you are in support of those of us that are doing everything we can to keep the cemetery open. The fact that you will take the time and trouble to write this letter and the fact that you will take the time and



trouble to attend this hearing in person, will do more than anything I know of to help us win this battle.

The following is a copy of my statement to Congressman Broyhill, October 20th:

Congressman Broyhill, we have a cross section of men and women here today, who make their living in the sightseeing industry, and, who in one way or another provide transportation services to the millions of tourists that visit our Nation's Capitol each year.

All of us are seriously concerned about the announcement that the Secretary of the Army and the Secretary of the Department of the Interior released to the press August 4, 1970, that the Arlington National Cemetery roadways will be closed to tourist and commuter vehicles, starting November 1, 1970 and, that, those wishing transportation to points of interest in the cemetery will have to use the Tourmobile operated by the Landmark Services, Inc. Their proposed charges for this service will be \$1.25 for each adult and 75c for each child.

This proposed change at Arlington National Cemetery will put a great many men and women out-of-work. Thousands of jobs are dependent on the sightseeing work to and from Arlington National Cemetery. The Amalgamated Transit Union Local 689, Local 1131, Local 1138, and, other union locals in this area are opposed to this proposed change. These union locals represent thousands of men and women and they consider this proposed change a serious threat to their jobs, their livelihood and opportunities for advancement. We urgently request that immediate steps be taken to keep Arlington National Cemetery open to all tour guides, sightseeing buses, charter buses, school buses, limousines and taxicabs.

Congressman Broyhill, we are asking that you do everything in your power to protect us from the loss of our businesses, loss of our jobs, and, loss of our livelihood in the sightseeing industry that we have served so well.

Congressman Broyhill, we are asking that you do everything in your power to contact the Secretary of the Army and contact the Secretary of the Department of the Interior and in the strongest terms possible urge them to call off this closing date of November 1, 1970 and ask them that they continue to leave Arlington National Cemetery open until more conferences and more meetings can be held with all of the interested parties, so that, in the spirit of true cooperation a satisfactory solution can be worked out.

Please Note: It will be extremely difficult to park your car on Capitol Hill on the day you will attend the hearing at 2:30 P. M., November 17th. Park your car at a convenient downtown parking lot and take a cab or bus to Capitol Hill. Arrive early.

#### STATEMENT OF HARRY KELLY

I am Harry Kelly. I am a bus driver. I work for the D.C. Transit System. I am a member of the bus drivers' Union, Local 689 of the Amalgamated Transit Union. There are approximately 3,000 others like me. About 1 out of 4 of us lives in northern Virginia.

I appreciate sincerely, Mr. Congressman, the opportunity you have given us to speak with you about our problem with the threatened closing of roads in Arlington National Cemetery to vehicular traffic. I appreciate, also, that the Secretary of the Army was willing to cooperate to the extent of delaying indefinitely the effective date of the order to close the road and sincerely hope that through your good offices, Mr. Congressman, it will be possible to convince the Secretary that the orders to close the roads be completely lifted.

We, of course, have a selfish interest. To us the order means job opportunities, hours of work. It means the livelihood of men who live and work in the community and whose

wives and children are dependent on such work to continue to be a part of the community.

It is a good estimate that during the spring and early summer about 50 D.C. Transit buses each day go to the Arlington National Cemetery as part of their regular work. During Easter week that number even doubles. There are actually days when 100 or more D.C. transit buses carry visitors to the Nation's Capital to Arlington National Cemetery. Even apart from these important sightseeing seasons, on a regular day-in or day-out basis, there are not less than 10 of our buses going to Arlington National Cemetery each day.

We sincerely believe we perform a service in providing such transportation. The proposed order closing roads to vehicular traffic would reduce that service and would take our jobs away from us.

I would like to point out how important this is in another sense. In most other communities, local sightseeing must be done on the buses of the local system. Here in Washington, in the Nation's Capital, sightseeing work is done not only by the local systems but by all of the transit operations that come into the area. In that sense, then, although our interest in jobs is very, very important for us, we represent only a small portion of the work being done by bus operators in this field.

In addition to being bus operators who depend for a livelihood on this work, we are also conscious of the community's needs and are proud enough of that community in which we live to want it to be able to continue to operate. Our best guess is that if the proposed order is permitted to stand, our employer, the D.C. Transit System, will lose about 1/4 of a million dollars' worth of business a year. The simple fact is that that 1/4 million dollars of income will have to be supplied in some other fashion. That immediately raises the specter of another fare increase in a fare structure which is already so high as to deny public transportation to the people in our community who need it the most. Any order which suggests such a possibility must be looked at as unreasonable.

We are also proud to be a part of the community in which it is possible for visitors to come and see Arlington National Cemetery, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, Custis Lee's Mansion, and the Kennedy tombstone. With the present sightseeing arrangements under which a trip to Arlington National Cemetery is incorporated into the basic tours, it is possible to make such a visit with the existing fare structure. If the proposed order, which denies the Cemetery roads to vehicular traffic, becomes effective, the only way visitors to our area will be able to see the Arlington National Cemetery is by paying an additional fare or by walking. I sincerely believe that to thus reduce the attractions of our community either by making it unavailable or by making the Cemetery visit more costly is a mistake because it will reduce the flow of sightseers and therefore adversely affect that very substantial portion of our community which depends for its very existence on the flow of such sightseers.

There is no benefit which can be achieved by closing the roads to vehicular traffic which is even remotely commensurate with the very significant damage which would be done.

For these many reasons, we urge on you most strongly that every effort should be made so that the Secretary of the Army will rescind the order in its entirety.

To show a more disturbing cause which in our opinion is discrimination, this vehicle which runs in Washington, D.C. has no license; the people who conduct the lectures have never had to pass a test for that type of work in the District of Columbia; however, all other lecturers must pass a competent test given by the District Government,

secure a guide's license and a chauffeur's permit and each year the license must be renewed which takes our time and money. Furthermore, in times of emergency in the City, you will find no Landmark vehicles around government buildings for protection such as D.C. Transit and their operators provide, and, in addition, you will not find Landmark buses transporting civil disturbance units from place to place in Washington and helping the body of law enforcement officers in their work. We do this work, also, for the protection of the City.

Many of us are veterans of World War II, Korean and Viet Nam conflicts, and we, as such, are shocked that the U.S. Army and our Government would permit the situation that is now developing in Arlington Cemetery or in the Nation's Capital as a whole where sightseeing is concerned.

We ask, also, that private enterprise of the nature upon which America was built to be allowed to continue.

#### STATEMENT OF WILLIAM B. GROSSMAN

Gentlemen, my name is William B. Grossman and I am the Assistant Vice President and Manager of Casser Tours located in New York City.

My remarks today are based on the many years experience myself and my company have had in the motor coach tour business. In the past 25 years we have had the privilege of transporting many hundreds of thousands of people to points of historical and scenic beauty throughout the United States. Of these numbers, the majority have been to Washington, D.C. and the surrounding historic area.

We find the proposed granting of sightseeing privileges in Arlington National Cemetery to a private enterprise a most unfortunate circumstance. There are several reasons we object to this directive, which in our opinion is certainly against the interests of the general public.

It seems totally unfair in our opinion to tax the public's admission to an area that has become a national shrine. From our knowledge of the facts, the granting of this license will give a monopoly on the patriotic feelings of many Americans who visit the District of Columbia.

The problem of traffic in Arlington National Cemetery is certainly not to be overlooked. The orderly conduct of the normal affairs of this important landmark and resting place of many American heroes should naturally receive prime consideration. However, it does not seem reasonable or equitable to us that the solution proposed by the National Park Service is in the best interests of the traveling public.

To cite our own case, our tours of Washington, D.C., which originate in New York City and the surrounding Metropolitan area include in its cost the following items: hotel accommodations, transportation, guide service, and any sightseeing charges and admissions. Since the Tourmobile Corporation, upon the institution of its service in the Cemetery, plans to charge \$1.25 for its service it will be necessary for us to pass this charge on to the consumer.

Since \$1.25 in our estimation is more than a nominal charge, it will be impossible for us as a tour operator to absorb this cost. The addition of this charge to our tour price, for an item which heretofore had been free and which reasonably can continue to be so, is making one more inflationary burden on the consumer.

The granting of this exclusive franchise certainly seems to be very much in opposition to the traditional, democratic process by which most governmental agencies either municipal, state or federal, grant rights. For one, to the best of our knowledge, there has been no opportunity given for public bidding, public application or any form of public hearing on this matter. No consideration has been given to the many hundreds of com-

panies and individuals who have been operating in Arlington National Cemetery for many years. What is even more against tradition is the fact that at no time has consideration been given to the so-called "grandfather rights" which are normally taken into account. It seems to us that if a governmental agency such as the Interstate Commerce Commission sees fit to give cognizance to "grandfather rights" that this tradition be carried forward to other governmental bodies.

The total absence of hearings of the type mentioned in the preceding paragraph would certainly make one suspect that in the granting of this license all the facts were not presented to the public. It would seem that if the National Park Service had nothing to hide they should be more than willing to hold public hearings on this matter. What is even more disturbing is that if this unprecedented act were allowed to stand it might provide the basis for the arbitrary granting of exclusive business opportunities in parks and most areas of public domain.

We, in conclusion, strongly urge all members of this committee give utmost consideration to a review of the granting of this license. In view of the serious consequences of this act in depriving some persons of a part of their livelihood and a breach of the democratic process we humbly request that a public hearing on this matter be held.

#### STATEMENT OF MILDRED B. ELLIS

Ladies and Gentlemen, my name is Mrs. Mildred B. Ellis. I appear here today, representing the Guide Service of Washington, Inc., as their official testee. I am Secretary-Treasurer of the Corporation, also act as General Manager. Offices are located in the Dodge House at 20 E St. NW, Washington, DC. Our business furnishes licensed guides for charter buses, or families in their private automobiles, for the purpose of sightseeing in the Metropolitan Area. For the season 1970, we have 62 English speaking guides, some of whom have foreign language capabilities, and then, another group of 10 who do only foreign language tours; all of these ladies are personally trained as guides by our Organization, duly licensed by the District of Columbia, and work only through our office. When we have more requirements than can be filled by this staff, we also employ other licensed, free lance guides of the Area.

This year, as of November 15th, we have personally handled some 107,500 persons for tours of the area. Almost without exception, all of these tours have gone to Arlington. Many have been conducted in foreign languages. The people we have cared for, have ranged in age and experience from the little Cub Scout of about 8 years of age to the senior citizen who sometimes measures ten times that age.

My contention that Arlington procedures should remain as at present, is based upon two-fold reasoning: the financial one, and the other, perhaps even more important, the emotional, or I might say, moral and human side of the question.

Were Arlington Cemetery closed to charter buses or guide driven automobiles and limousines guide services will be cut drastically, in many instances, completely. Our Corporation could not exist on "half day" reservations. Therefore, basing our opinion upon the almost certain influence of closing Arlington to charter buses, I can firmly say that the Guide Service of Washington could no longer exist. Hence, as a Corporation, it would quickly go out of business, and these some 75 persons presently working with us (and next year's staff was to have been greater), would be bereft of this income.

And now, to the second reason—Gentlemen, what is Arlington? It is the largest National Cemetery. It has become one of our National Shrines. It is a symbol—a symbol of the reverence and respect to our War Dead, and therefore, a dedication of our

Country to Freedom, to the individual his right to his pursuit of happiness, to our American way of life. It is not reasonable to deny people the privilege, as well as the right, of visiting these points, to pay their respects, to show their beliefs.

First, let's speak of the foreign visitor. Of the nearly 2700 tours we have handled this year, 360 were with foreign groups, roughly, 14,400 people—(breakdown—112 French Groups, 89 Italian, 53 German, 44 Spanish, 57 Japanese, and 5 Miscellaneous). It cannot be emphasized enough as to the importance of Arlington to the foreign visitor. Their tours here usually consist of only 2½ to 3 hours. Hence, it means they have a riding tour past the White House, the Federal Triangle, the Capitol, but, always, always a stop at Arlington! The time consumed by walking into the Tomb, or transferring them into other transportation to coordinate with the Change of the Guard on the hour, makes such a plan not just unrealistic, but impossible.

Thinking now beyond the welfare of the individual, the visit of the foreigner to Arlington has immeasurable other benefits. Our government yearly spends thousands of dollars promoting its people-to-people programs around the world. What is a better program, really, than we are putting into action here? The misconceptions of the foreign visitors about the American people are appalling! Our image abroad, gained through newspapers, magazines, movies, has been of concern to our government for years. In this time in Arlington, it is so beneficial for the visitor to have the personal contact with a cultured, well-educated and well-informed guide. Here we have at our fingertips, this people-to-people approach. We should grasp such an opportunity, not throw it away. Our guides make up a really dedicated group, and take great pride in their work; our files are full of comments about this very personal rapport that comes through the visit to Arlington. Without the capability of communication in the language, and the time gained by our present method of handling, none of these side benefits could be reaped.

The American visitors—many of our very young or very senior citizens could not walk in. Can you also appreciate the problems involved, even under the best of conditions, in keeping groups of children, or almost worse, of senior citizens, together? This is the task of the experienced tour guide, and would be the impossible task of any other type of service.

Since those coming to Washington usually are on a very tight schedule, time is always of essence. Every minute we can save in the accomplishment of each item, is very important. If we can no longer adhere to schedule as we do now, we will soon find that Arlington will be eliminated from the tours. This will be a serious plight, especially for student groups, who in these turbulent times, probably need more than any other group, the image and symbolism found there. This is, in reality, then taking away their privilege and right to visit Arlington.

These are the very sincere views of our Organization. If we can be of further assistance to those who must make the final decision about Arlington, it would be our privilege to help.

In closing, I will speak again of Arlington as a symbol, and thereby, of special meaning to ALL the citizens of the World. Let us take away with us the last lines of President Harding's address, at the Dedication of the Tomb of the Unknowns, on November 11, 1921: . . . "He died for his Country, and greater devotion hath no man than this. He died unquestioning, uncomplaining, with faith in his heart and hope on his lips—that his Country should triumph and Civilization survive."

That, gentlemen, is Arlington. We cannot deny that symbol to anyone.

Thank you.

STATEMENT OF MR. JACK E. BROWN, EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT, THE GRAY LINE, INC., WASHINGTON, D.C.

The Gray Line, Inc., respectfully requests that the Department of the Army reconsider the announced decision to ban all but official vehicles from Arlington Cemetery.

Along with our predecessor companies, we have been operating daily sightseeing tours in the Nation's Capital including visits to Arlington Cemetery since prior to 1913. In that period we have had the privilege of showing, literally, hundreds of thousands of tourists important historical areas of the Cemetery. Since the completion of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier with the formal dignity of the Change of the Guard, the subsequent burial of unknowns from the other services, and more recently the interments of President John F. Kennedy and Senator Robert Kennedy, the cemetery has become one of the primary points of interest for all visitors to Washington.

Our service includes the pickup of visitors from all points of the world at their respective hotels throughout the Metropolitan Washington Area, taking them on the tour of their choice and then returning them to their hotel. This is a great service to out of town guests who are generally without their own transportation and who in any case find our guided tours more convenient.

In the last 2 years the Gray Line has provided tours in the cemetery for more than 171,000 persons. If we had not been able to offer this service, and these people had to find their own transportation, at an average of three passengers per vehicle, the cemetery would have had to handle the 57,000 motor vehicles necessary to accommodate them. These vehicles would be in addition to the thousands of private vehicles per year that are already visiting the historical site.

The proposed ban would necessitate visitors walking the steep hill to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, then to the Kennedy Grave Sites and back to the parking lot. Many of these people could not make this trek due to age or infirmities. Even for the young and hearty, this would be an exceedingly time consuming and undesirable hike. Further all of our sightseeing passengers to Arlington visit the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier on the hour to witness the World renowned Changing of the Guard. It would be impossible to coordinate enough of any proposed conveyances to schedule transportation for these people in an efficient and orderly manner, so that they could make the best use of the limited time they have for viewing the many points of interest in our exciting area.

We fully appreciate that Arlington Cemetery while a National Shrine is still a place of dignity and repose. Our driver lecturers remind all of our passengers of this prior to entering the area. This is especially emphasized to youth groups, students, Boy Scouts, Girl Scouts, etc. visiting the cemetery as part of their educational trip to their Nation's Capital.

The Gray Line, Inc., along with other local sightseeing operators, is always willing to cooperate with the Department of the Army, as past experience has proven. However, we feel the proposed ban on vehicles in Arlington Cemetery is unnecessary and definitely not in the best interests of the citizens of our Nation who should have the right to visit this National Shrine in comfort and convenience.

STATEMENT BY GRAY LINE SIGHT-SEEING COMPANIES ASSOCIATED, NEW YORK, N.Y.

(Presented by Mr. Jack E. Brown of the Gray Line, Inc., an affiliate)

The Gray Line Sight-Seeing Companies Associated, with principal offices at One Rockefeller Plaza, New York, New York, through its President, Patrick R. Sheridan, respectfully submits this statement with re-



spect to the Department of the Army's proposed exclusion of charter and sightseeing vehicles from Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia.

Gray Line Sight-Seeing Companies Associated is an international trade association of independently operated sightseeing facilities throughout the world. Its membership is in excess of 120 companies, employing thousands of persons, and operating a vast fleet of modern motor vehicles and sightseeing vessels at principal points of interest throughout the world. One of its members is The Gray Line, Inc., Washington, D. C.

Gray Line is recognized as the historian of the sightseeing industry, a title justly earned because of Gray Line's memorable and dependable sightseeing services throughout the free world. For this reason, it is understandably concerned with the proposed action by the Department of the Army leading to the contemplated exclusion of motor bus facilities from, to, and within the Arlington National Cemetery, Arlington, Virginia.

The United States Government, among others, is expending vast sums in sightseeing and tour programs, such as "See America" and "Discover America." These programs are beamed to the United States as well as foreign travelers. One of the most frequent inquiries received by our national office is with respect to the facilities within the Washington Metropolitan District and the availability of tours inclusive of Arlington National Cemetery.

Many of our members located at points other than the Washington, D. C. area annually transport children and adults, citizens of the United States and elsewhere, to the Washington Metropolitan District for sightseeing therein. Gray Line companies at Philadelphia, New York, Boston, Buffalo, St. Petersburg, are illustrative only of the interest of our organization in the maintenance of reasonable, convenient, and economical access to the Arlington National Cemetery. The Army's proposal to require persons to transfer from one vehicle to another at excessive cost, will materially impair as well as reduce the numbers of persons traveling to and from the Arlington National Cemetery.

The Tomb of the Unknowns is a respectful and treasured point of interest, not only to the citizens of the United States, but to all peoples of the world. The Department of the Army's precipitate action, without consultation with the sightseeing industry, denies reasonable, economical, and convenient facilities to those who have and shall desire to visit the Arlington National Cemetery.

Gray Line Sight-Seeing Companies Associated respectfully urges the Department of the Army to reconsider its proposed action; afford the sightseeing industry an opportunity to participate in such conferences as may be necessary to establish reasonable regulations for the continued operation of sightseeing services to, from, and within the Arlington National Cemetery. It cannot be overly emphasized that the present proposal by the Department adversely and unwarrantedly affects every person to whom memory, patriotism, and man's worth are cherished ideals.

Gray Line Sight-Seeing Companies Associated, at its recent international convention in New Orleans, Louisiana, by resolution, authorized the submission of this statement at this hearing.

STATEMENT BY MR. EARL A. FAWBUSH, DIRECTOR OF SALES, ALEXANDRIA, BARCROFT, & WASHINGTON TRANSIT CO., ALEXANDRIA, VA.

The Alexandria, Barcroft, and Washington Transit Company, Alexandria, Virginia, doing business as A. B. & W. Transit, has a vital interest in the proposed action by the Department of the Army with respect to its announced intention to restrict unwarranted

motor bus facilities within the Arlington National Cemetery.

A. B. & W. Transit Company operates over a vast network of routes within Northern Virginia and the District of Columbia. It has served Arlington National Cemetery virtually from the inception of its operations, commencing in the early 1920's, and the proposed exclusion of A. B. & W. from continuing to provide a needed and essential service within Arlington National Cemetery is a matter of gravest concern to the management of this company.

A. B. & W. employs approximately 550 persons. It owns and operates approximately 285 modern motor busses which, with other investments in Northern Virginia, represents an initial cost of more than eight million dollars. In the fiscal year ending with March 31, 1970, A. B. & W. paid more than one-half million dollars in various taxes and license fees to the Federal, State, City, and County governments.

While A. B. & W. is principally a suburban transit operator, its charter and sightseeing revenues were approximately \$625,000, for the above mentioned fiscal year. Without charter and sightseeing revenues, the regular route services of A. B. & W. would be seriously impaired and possibly substantially curtailed.

A. B. & W. and other carriers, provide sightseeing service in the Washington metropolitan area, and the focal point of interest of the monuments, government buildings and other attractions, is Arlington National Cemetery. Convenient, comfortable, and dependable sightseeing and charter bus facilities to and from the Arlington National Cemetery and within the cemetery itself have provided a convenient, and attractive mode of transportation for this visit. The concomitant proposal of the Department of the Army and the Department of Interior to require persons to debark at a point and transfer to other vehicles for travel within the cemetery itself would be, in the opinion of the management of A. B. & W., costly, inconvenient, and a substantial barrier to the reasonable access to the cemetery by the public. A. B. & W. and other carriers, transport annually a vast volume of persons interested in visiting the Tombs of the Unknown Soldiers, and the gravesites of the late John F. and Robert F. Kennedy, as Arlington Cemetery has become a national shrine that attracts every person throughout the world.

The proposed action by the Department of the Army, without consultation with A. B. & W. or other carriers, ignores the employment of A. B. & W.'s personnel, and the dependence thereon by employees' families. The Department of the Army's action also ignores the substantial investments of A. B. & W. within the Commonwealth of Virginia that will be affected adversely by the department's proposed action. More importantly, in my opinion, is the discomfort, inconvenience, and unreasonable cost that will immediately ensue if the department's intention becomes permanently established.

A. B. & W. respectfully urges that the action of the Department of the Army be abandoned; that the operation of motor vehicles within the Arlington National Cemetery be controlled reasonably in the public interest and A. B. & W. pledges its support to the Army to secure and enforce reasonable regulation.

STATEMENT OF T. S. TRIMMER, ASSISTANT VICE PRESIDENT, OPERATIONS

The closing of Arlington National Cemetery to buses will result in a curtailment of our charter and tour sightseeing. Those who visit the Cemetery come from all parts of the country, as do many from foreign countries, and from all walks of life, the old, the young, the rich and the poor. The majority come in groups by bus or private automobiles. Buses over the years have proven to be the most

economical and convenient means for visitors to come and pay their respects. Very rarely does any group visit the Nation's Capital without including Arlington National Cemetery on its itinerary. If buses are banned from entering the Cemetery, thousands of visitors to the Nation's Capital will be inconvenienced, many of whom will not be physically able to make the long walk, and many others will not be financially able to pay an additional charge for shuttle service that is proposed and we understand for which a contract has been signed.

D.C. Transit System, Inc. is the largest among hundreds of carriers who provide bus service for those desiring to visit the Cemetery. From late March through May our company will average more than fifty (50) buses daily during the hours the Cemetery is open to visitors and several days during the weeks before and after Easter more than one hundred (100) buses are required to serve our patrons. Between June and March we operate on the average of 10 buses daily. The average number of passengers on each bus over the entire period is approximately forty-five (45). D.C. Transit System, Inc. perhaps provides more service to the Cemetery, about 5,600 buses annually carrying an estimated 250,000 passengers, than any other carrier. One can easily visualize the chaotic conditions which would exist unless some convenient access is provided to Arlington National Cemetery for the many local carriers along with other carriers from all parts of the United States.

In our most recent fare order of the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission served June 26, 1970, and finally made effective July 11, 1970, the fares authorized by the Commission were determined after projecting for the future annual period operating revenue from charter and sightseeing services as \$2,402,968. This amount is only \$37,000 less than the projected net operating income of \$2,440,283 for future annual period. Inasmuch as this revenue is applied in determining the rate of fare to be paid by patrons on our regular line services, one can easily determine that if the company is deprived of the charter and sightseeing income, as some of the most knowledgeable persons in the business predict, the fares will necessarily be increased by 2 to 3 cents in order to make up the difference.

D.C. Transit System, Inc., employs approximately 3000 persons, 200 of whom are licensed tour guides. Closing of the Cemetery will not only affect the income of the tour guides but will threaten the livelihood of many others, we estimate at least 10,000 persons in D.C. Transit's entire family.

Our sightseeing guides are carefully selected and trained thoroughly, as I am certain are many others throughout the industry, and they are familiar with the roadways, restrictions, and priorities within the Cemetery. They well know every square inch within the confines of the Cemetery and, as attested to by many letters of commendation, are most informative and helpful to visitors to our Nation's Capital.

During the past week we have received dozens of letters from airlines, railroads, tour and travel agencies from all over the country. I wish to take this opportunity to read a couple of them and at the conclusion to give the originals of all letters along with copies of many letters addressed to Congressmen of various states to this committee to be made part of the record.

Thank you.

DAYTON AUTOMOBILE CLUB,  
Dayton, Ohio, November 14, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: We want to oppose the proposal submitted by the Secretary of the Army, suggesting Arlington Cemetery be

closed to all vehicle traffic, except official cars.

This proposal would directly affect our Arlington tour over-all cost to us and our customers.

We are asking for reconsideration on this proposal.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. VIRGINIA ADAMS,  
Tours and Charters Department.

BOYCE TRAVEL AGENCY,  
Sarasota, Fla., November 15, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: I understand that the Secretary of the Army has proposed to close Arlington Cemetery to all vehicle traffic, except official cars and funerals. As you know we have groups of students and adults who visit Washington, their nation's Capitol, throughout the year. A major tour of interest is the visit to their National Cemetery, and to expect them to walk through the entire area, or put them to the additional expense of using another mode of transportation in the cemetery, would undoubtedly adversely affect our sales of tours to Washington.

I hope you will be in a position to oppose this latest move against the interests of the people of the United States by our bureaucrats in Washington, and I am also writing to the Honorable James A. Haley, our congressman to request his support against this move.

Our dealings with your organization have been of such a fine nature that I'm sure you will need my request for your support, and I hope you will be successful in defeating this motion.

Thank you.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK S. BOYCE.

PHILLIPS TRAVEL SERVICE,  
South Lyon, Mich., November 14, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit Co.,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This has reference to the order from the government to close Arlington National Cemetery to all vehicle traffic except official cars or funerals.

For over thirty-five years I have been taking groups of all ages to Washington but in the last eighteen years most of the groups have been high school groups. Always a high point of these visits has been the changing of the guard at the Tomb of the Unknowns, and more recently the Kennedy grave has been of unique interest.

If this order is not rescinded or modified to permit local Washington Sightseeing operators in Arlington the schedule of many tour operators handling high school or elementary school groups, or any groups, will be seriously impaired. It may even reach the point where the visit to these two outstanding American shrines will have to be eliminated.

Please use all your influence to have the government rescind or modify their order.

Sincerely,

EDWIN D. PHILLIPS, Sr.

SWISSAIR,  
New York, N.Y., November 13, 1970.  
Re: The closing of Arlington National Cemetery to all vehicular traffic.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: It has come to our attention that the Secretary of the Army proposed to close Arlington National Cemetery to all vehicular traffic.

If such is the case, we understand that our customers will not be transported to the place where parking is permitted near the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. Since it takes

a good half hour to walk from the main parking field to the entrance of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, this new regulation may greatly disturb the visit of the Cemetery which is unquestionably one of the highlights of our Capital City to foreign visitors. We hope that this decision is not final and that the hundreds and thousands of customers coming in groups from Switzerland and parts of Central Europe may still be allowed to visit Arlington National Cemetery, as it was done before.

This, in the light of the encouraging policy of the United States Department of Commerce and its United States Travel Service, endeavors to make European travel to the United States easier and more comfortable.

Hoping that our letter may be of help to you in getting the Secretary of the Army's orders put aside, we remain, dear Mr. Trimmer.

Yours very sincerely,

ROGER LADOR,  
Supervisor.

MEYER & DIETEL TOURS, INC.,  
Milwaukee, Wis., November 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President,  
D.C. Transit System, Inc.  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: It is with great misgiving I have heard of proposed restrictions of vehicular traffic at Arlington Cemetery. The restriction of bus traffic which carries and controls approximately 5,000 students which my company brings to Washington and Arlington Cemetery would seriously affect our tour operation as well as those responsible for the decorum of the cemetery.

1. Time is critical with each tour as we attempt to give our students a well rounded look at their Nation's Capital at the most economical means. Walking the students round-trip from the parking area or the use of a commercial system with a cost involved would defeat both aims. It would waste time and add to the hourly cost per bus plus the fare required on the commercial system if such system were used. We have already submitted our tour package cost to about 100 schools to travel next spring and if additional cost is to be incurred it will be necessary to pass this on to the school with an explanation as to why the cost increase.

2. Lecturing on the history and meaning of the cemetery would be done in the parking lot rather than en route to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. During this route the somber atmosphere pervades each bus and we have the students' attention. This would not be the case parked in the parking lot prior to discharge of the groups.

3. Students would become lost on the grounds which would greatly inconvenience all concerned. Even now an occasional student goes astray when only half the walking is involved.

4. Precision timing is common when we bring our bus directly to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and this brings our visit to a minimum time. Such precision could not be achieved if they were to walk from the parking lot to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers.

5. Crowd control on the grounds itself would be a serious problem. We discharge our responsibility diligently, however, to be realistic, turning 40 to 50 youngsters loose at the parking lot and walking them to the Kennedy grave-sites, hence the Tomb of the Unknowns and return to the bus without incident is asking a great deal of any adult.

6. Space. Bus length and width is approximately 40'x8'. In this area 51 people can be accommodated. The same 51 on foot will consume the entire width of the road and create a line of 200 feet or more.

To best serve those responsible for the cemetery as well as visitors we suggest: Curtail private car sightseeing traffic, restrict

bus traffic to a specific route to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, discharge passengers and the bus proceed empty to the parking lot. Passengers then walk to the Kennedy grave-sites and to their bus in the lot.

This should provide a smooth flow of traffic easily controlled by sponsors and cemetery personnel, help maintain the dignity of the cemetery and help to keep costs down so we may continue to bring young people to make them a part of our capital rather than a nuisance to those very people whose purpose is to serve their fellow citizens.

Our primary concern is to give the student the most knowledge for his money and to return him to his city or town with a stronger feeling of national ties. Anything we can do to further this aim should be the duty of all. Please emphasize this to whom you come in contact. Let us not fall victim to Washington's occasional insulation to the country and people which created it.

Sincerely,

V. K. DIETEL.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD CO.,  
Miami Beach, Fla., November 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: It has come to our attention that the Secretary of the Army has proposed to close Arlington Cemetery to all vehicle traffic except official cars or funerals on November 1st.

It is our understanding that buses would park outside the cemetery and another mode of transportation will be required to enter the grounds which could affect the over-all cost to the hundreds of visitors we send to Washington each year.

We are very much opposed to this order and it is hoped that the D.C. Transit System, Inc. as a member of the National Association of Motor Bus Owners, can prevent this order from being carried out.

With very best wishes always, I am,

Sincerely,

J. L. LEWIS,  
District Manager Passenger Sales.

NOVEMBER 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: I am greatly concerned of the pending proposal which would ban buses from entering Arlington Cemetery. I can only visualize chaos with groups of 300 or more students that I send to Washington changing to another bus at the gate. Multiply this by several such groups and it is anything but a pretty picture.

The cost would also be a factor. At the present time the cost has ruled out many groups, and each added fee helps to bring an end of high school groups in Washington.

Very truly yours,

WARREN I. WATSON.

WM. A. GROUX TOURS, INC.,  
Clifton, N.J., November 12, 1970.

Mr. HAROLD M. CURTIS,  
D.C. Transit Systems, Inc.,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CURTIS: I have, for kind acknowledgement, your letter of November 9, 1970 in regard to the Secretary of the Army of the United States Government prohibiting vehicular traffic in Arlington Cemetery on a date which will be decided upon after the hearing scheduled for November 17, 1970.

When we first heard through grapevine sources, since we are never notified as a broker and a tour company, that the Secretary of the Army had formulated plans for prohibiting vehicular traffic, we found it difficult to believe. In checking with various sources, we found that the plans had indeed been completed whereby those who wished



to pay their respects to our departed heroes in Arlington would walk or be forced to pay for using a sightseeing bus, which we understand would be \$.75 for children or \$1.50 for adults. It is beyond comprehension that the United States Government would force people who wish to pay respect to those in Arlington to pay a fee since many of the students whom we handle arrangements for would find it most difficult to pay for transportation around the grounds of Arlington.

It would, in our opinion, tend in the not-too-distant future to put Arlington into a sightseeing class, whereas Arlington has always held a spot close to the heart of the people of America, and it would seem a shame to me that the people would not only have to pay to visit the various points in Arlington, but would ride around on buses which would make another "World's Fair" or Coney Island out of Arlington.

I think the Secretary of the Army, in making arrangements of this kind, should certainly take into consideration there are many who just cannot afford to pay for this service in Arlington and since the only traffic congestion in Arlington is that brought about by private cars where they have inexperienced drivers behind the wheel, as opposed to the buses operated by those taking tour groups to Arlington who well know every square inch of Arlington, know exactly where they are going as to the Tombs of the Unknowns, the Graves of the two beloved Kennedys and to the very impressive Changing of the Guards and the Lee Mansion. I am sure that there is no problem insofar as them causing traffic congestion. It is my personal opinion that the reason behind this order of the Secretary of the Army has absolutely nothing to do with traffic congestion.

We feel that the thousands upon thousands of students whom it is our pleasure to take to Arlington will find it a hardship in that they would be financially unable to use the sightseeing buses in Arlington and would be forced to walk to the three real points of interest mentioned above. This would take several hours and it would also create a problem in that the students, many of whom are even in the elementary grades, would not be able to find their way around Arlington. In addition to becoming lost, they would find that it would still take a considerable amount of time to walk to those points of interest.

No consideration has been given by the Secretary of the Army as to what effect this will have upon those who would like to pay their respects other than children, and I personally feel that it is a national disgrace that the Secretary of the Army should give thought to having sightseeing buses travel the length and width of Arlington. To me, the disgrace is magnified many times by his official order closing the gates to Arlington and insisting you either pay for the transportation or walk, regardless of whether you can afford to pay or regardless of the fact that upon arrival at Arlington, it may be that there is inclement weather. From now until early Spring, I think it would be found that weather conditions in Arlington will be very bad and it is going to be a hardship to walk to points where they could not afford to ride.

If the Secretary of the Army really instituted this because of what they call "traffic jams", then this order, in my opinion, should only be in effect during the period from Good Friday until Labor Day, at which times the records will show there is peak traffic in Arlington. Again, I would like to point out that the buses do not cause traffic jams and there is no reason why they could not continue to go to the Tombs of the Unknowns and from there to the Lee Mansion where there is ample parking and, if anything, it would expedite traffic in Arlington and never, in my opinion, create a traffic problem.

Respectfully submitted.

W. A. GROUX.

DeCAMP BUS LINES,  
Clifton, N.J., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President,  
D.C. Transit,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: I appreciate, very much, your letter dated November 9, 1970 in reference to the proposed changes to be made at Arlington Cemetery.

As you know, due to the mileage between New York City and the North Jersey area to Washington, D.C., we are now required to hire D.C. Transit to do our sightseeing in Washington, D.C. so that we can remain within our I.C.C. requirements pertaining to our drivers hours. This expense, of course, we must pass on to our customers, however, when we explain to them that this is necessary for their own safety most people are only too happy to pay the additional charge.

One of the main reasons for our groups going to Washington, D.C. would be to visit Arlington Cemetery. Should the proposed closing of a National Shrine, to buses, be passed it would further penalize these people. It would also be impossible for us to explain that they cannot visit the John F. Kennedy Gravesite or that there will be an additional charge for the transportation from the gate to the gravesite.

I realize the Secretary of the Army is requesting this proposal for what he believes to be very good reasons, however, should the proposal pass it would certainly add an additional burden on all of our customers coming to your city.

Therefore, anything you can do to prevent this proposed closing would be greatly appreciated.

Very truly yours,

WILLIAM H. EDMONDS,  
Manager-Charter Department.

THE E. F. MACDONALD TRAVEL Co.,  
New York, N.Y., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: We have just heard of the proposal of the Secretary of the Army to close Arlington National Cemetery to all vehicular traffic, except for official cars and funerals.

As you well know the numerous visit U.S.A. tours which we arrange for foreign delegations from all over the world, include Washington, D.C. in their itineraries, and Arlington National Cemetery is one of their most interesting visiting points in the Capital of the United States. The proposal of the Secretary of the Army could affect our overall tour programs for foreign visitors. If the buses should be obliged to park outside the cemetery and another mode of transportation required to enter the grounds, this would greatly inconvenience the visitors and increase the cost of the tour packages.

Please present our view in this matter in the hearing on November 17, 1970. We do hope that the Secretary of the Army will reverse his decision as to the proposal.

Sincerely yours,

GEORGE J. ZENATY,  
Manager.

GERMAN TOURISTS SERVICE,  
Brooklyn, N.Y., November 15, 1970.

T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit System,  
Washington, D.C.:

Protest proposed closing Arlington Cemetery to tour buses. This will increase cost of operating tourist to Washington, inconvenience passengers who will have to walk long distance in heat of summer. Arlington Cemetery is a national shrine to Americans and people from all over the world who go there to pay their respects to J.F.K. and R.F.K. and wish to visit tomb of unknown soldier.

BERNARD MEYER.

BETHESDA, MD.,  
November 16, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: We understand that a hearing will be held on November 17, 1970, regarding the closing of Arlington National Cemetery to all vehicle traffic; and that another mode of transportation would have to be utilized on a "paid per person basis" to complete the tour of Arlington Cemetery, once inside the grounds.

For the past ten years our organization has been making special arrangements for national and international conventions coming to Washington, D.C.—most of these arrangements to include historical tours which involve chartered group transportation. Part of our job is to keep the cost for these tours as reasonable as today's economy will permit. The continual rising costs in all areas (hotel rates, food, and beverage, etc.) have already "put a dent" into convention budgets—and tours are usually part of that budget.

Tours are a natural incentive for groups to come to our nation's capital, and should be made and kept reasonably priced in order to encourage groups to hold their national meetings in Washington, D.C. Most of our clients are middle-aged and elderly adults, and our group tour arrangements are, for the most part, geared to wives of convention delegates. These people naturally require transportation inside the grounds of Arlington National Cemetery—and Arlington National Cemetery is one of the most popular and most often requested stops for visits.

Should this order to stop our chartered tour vehicles from entering Arlington National Cemetery be approved, it will be necessary for us to raise the cost of our tours in order to cover the additional transportation to accommodate our convention guests. This will definitely affect the number of people who will participate in our programs—particularly those low-budgeted groups and individuals who make up the majority, rather than the minority, coming to Washington, D.C.

For as many years as we can remember, our chartered tour vehicles have been permitted entrance to Arlington National Cemetery with no real problem involved. We cannot see the necessity for this proposed new ruling. The only benefit will be to the facility which will be appointed to provide the transportation inside the Arlington National Cemetery grounds. It will definitely be an inconvenience and additional expense for the tourists taking group and individual tours—both physically (the need to transfer from their own chartered vehicle to another vehicle) and financially (the additional charge which will be made).

In addition, our particular group arrangements are geared to a "red carpet" type of service—a service geared to offer our groups the most relaxing, convenient, and informative, as well as reasonably priced tour programs. Many times our tours must be arranged to cover the maximum in the least amount of time, in order to be included in busy convention schedules. The change from one vehicle to another will alter our close, efficient scheduling; and will probably necessitate the elimination of another highlight usually included in our shorter tours.

This proposed order to close Arlington National Cemetery to our chartered vehicles will be a hindrance in every respect. Whatever can be done to prevent this ABSOLUTELY UNNECESSARY order from being approved will be appreciated by everyone concerned—those like ourselves, who attempt to increase the tourist business for Washington, D.C., as well as the national convention groups meeting in Washington, D.C. on limited budgets, "where every penny counts."

As a closing but logical thought—if the Secretary of the Army has good and legiti-

mate reason to propose the order to close Arlington Cemetery to all vehicle traffic with exception of official cars or funerals, let it be to ALL VEHICLE TRAFFIC. For what reason would he then have one commercial company singled out to provide paid transportation inside the grounds?

Sincerely,

PHYLLIS HERSON,  
President, VIP Services.

CORONET TRAVEL BUREAU, INC.,  
Niles, Ill., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
D.C. Transit,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: The report that Arlington Cemetery may be closed to all vehicle traffic is shocking news. We are engaged in Educational Tours to the various National Shrines, etc. Arlington National Cemetery is one of the highlights of our Washington tours. This would mean that students would be deprived of the opportunity of visiting our greatest National Cemetery. It certainly would not be feasible to use other than bus transportation to transport large groups into the Cemetery. Besides, the cost of such an endeavor would be prohibitive.

We, in the travel industry, will appreciate anything you can do on our behalf.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. EVELYN HORNEY.

AMERICAN EXPRESS Co.,  
New York, N.Y., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit System,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: We would like to express our grave concern at the proposal by the Secretary of the Army that Arlington Cemetery be closed to all vehicular traffic, except official cars and funerals.

As you know, we are responsible for bringing several thousand visitors to Washington every year. Most of these people make a special point of visiting the cemetery to see, among other things, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the grave of John F. Kennedy. This proposal by the Secretary of the Army, will certainly cause great inconvenience to those wishing to visit the cemetery; what is even more to the point however, is that any alternative arrangement using another mode of transportation within the grounds will necessarily add to the cost. This is an important consideration when one is dealing with groups from overseas.

We would like to assure you of our support in this matter, and remain sincerely yours.

ARISTIDES J. DBAL,  
Manager, Visit U.S.A. Unit.

TENHOLDER TRAVEL, INC.,  
St. Louis, Mo., November 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President,  
D.C. Transit System,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: We annually bring over 2000 persons to Washington, D.C., on our student and adult tour programs. Included in our sightseeing is always Arlington National Cemetery.

In the past few years conditions for sightseeing in our National Cemetery have continually gotten worse. First came the restrictions due to President Kennedy's Gravesite which I can understand. But, for a few years past that year we were still forced to park and walk in for sightseeing.

On and off for the past years the parking and sightseeing situation has been changed so often that we hardly know what or where or when anymore.

I will say that it is not me or you or the bus driver that suffers, as we still get paid, but it is the customer or tour member that continually gets to see less and less of our Nation's National Cemetery.

I suggest that you have these people in the office of the Secretary of the Army's Office take the grand tour of the Cemetery by sightseeing motorcoach and then try to have them take it by foot. Then, too—ask them to take a three day city tour with the same driver/guide and then ask them to be handed over to another guide for only the Cemetery portion and they'll see how much is lost in the transportation.

Please do all you can to fight the Secretary's planned changes.

Sincerely,

T. TENHOLDER.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD Co.,  
West Palm Beach, Fla., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit System,  
Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: We understand that the Secretary of the Army has proposed that Arlington Cemetery be closed to all vehicular traffic save official cars and funeral traffic in the near future.

We would like to very strongly voice our objection to such action in view of the numerous school groups we bring to Washington that are dependent on charter buses for their sightseeing. Needless to say a visit to Arlington Cemetery is one of the high points of the trip, and we feel that it would be an injustice to deprive these students of a free visit to one of our greatest national shrines. It would not be feasible for these groups to walk from the bus parking area to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and the Kennedy grave sites and return. The present practice of discharging the students in the area of the Tomb, and then, after the Changing of the Guard, have them walk back to the bus parking area via the Kennedy grave sites has worked out very well.

Our largest group to Washington is the Palm Beach County School patrol consisting of 1,400 students and chaperones in two groups of 700 each. I cannot conceive of there being sufficient transportation to efficiently and adequately move such large groups from bus parking areas to the Tomb and return, and even if this were possible, the charges involved could very well preclude our groups from using such service. Due to various increased costs, we have had to adjust our "package" costs upward steadily the last few years, and do not feel that we could justify an additional charge at Arlington Cemetery. We sincerely hope that consideration will be given to these factors before a final decision is reached. It seems to us that everyone will agree that the youth of our Nation are entitled to visit our National Shrines with a minimum of inconvenience and, most certainly, without charge.

Very truly yours,

R. H. RHODES,  
District Manager, Passenger Sales.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD Co.,  
Charleston, S.C., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: It has come to our attention that the Secretary of the Army proposes to close Arlington Cemetery to tour buses and other vehicles not on official business. As a matter of record in your files, we have brought about 500 school students from this part of South Carolina to Washington in the last 12 months, and every one of them have visited Arlington Cemetery.

The Arlington Cemetery visit is a requested part of educational trips to Washington, and goes deeper into patriotic feeling and appreciation for those who have given their lives for their country, than any other part of the Washington tour. The Washington Monument, and the Lincoln and Jefferson Memorials are impressive reminders, but a cemetery is a vivid manifestation of departed life. The basic purpose of student tours to Washing-

ton would be diminished if Arlington Cemetery was excluded from the itinerary.

We do not know just what problem has arisen that closing the gates to tours would solve, but we sincerely hope that a thorough study is given to some alternate solution. Perhaps some revision of the staging of the changing of the guard ceremony to make it visible to a larger, but more controllable audience, out in front of the Tomb, or an adjustment in the handling of the crowds could be developed. It would be a shame to cut off this part of the Washington scene from tour members.

Cordially,

B. C. MILLER,  
General Passenger Agent.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD Co.,  
Miami, Fla., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit System,  
Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: It is understood that the Secretary of the Army has proposed to close Arlington National Cemetery to all vehicular traffic except official cars or funeral processions. While this order was designated to be effective November 1, information has been received that it will be postponed until after a public hearing set for November 17.

As you know, over the years we have arranged tours for literally thousands of school children at our Nation's Capital ranging from Elementary to High School grades. One of the most solemn and impressive sights is Arlington National Cemetery where they witness the "Change of the Guard" at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers, as well as a visit to the Kennedy Gravesites. If it becomes necessary to close the Cemetery to vehicular traffic, thereby eliminating the convenience of traveling by bus to the Tomb, it could have an adverse bearing on the number of tours we bring to Washington.

Anything you can do to oppose the proposal made by the Secretary of the Army in regard to the above will, in my opinion, be beneficial to all concerned.

Sincerely,

E. C. CHANEY,  
District Passenger Agent.

TENHOLDER TRAVEL, INC.,  
St. Louis, Mo., November 13, 1970.  
Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: As you know, we make arrangements for approximately 3,000 private and public high school and college students as well as adult groups from the midwestern United States to visit Washington. During the stay in Washington they, of course, visit Arlington Cemetery.

We are truly amazed to learn that there is a movement directed to eliminating transportation by bus from outside the Cemetery to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers. You can readily see that this will work no end of hardships on all groups we are involved with. Should it be necessary to provide some form of transportation to get inside the cemetery it seems almost an impossibility since we are involved with some groups of up to 500 persons.

We hope the above does not come to pass; in discussing this with some President's of colleges and Principals of schools in this area, have gotten the impression they are really outraged.

Cordially,

EDWARD M. TENHOLDER,  
President.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD Co.,  
Jacksonville, Fla., November 13, 1970.  
Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit System, Inc., Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: We are distressed to learn that the Secretary of the Army has



proposed the closing of the Arlington National Cemetery to all vehicle traffic effective November 1st.

In our opinion, this will be a further stumbling block in arranging tours in the Washington area. We are faced with so many problems in our Nation's Capital today and this will be just another problem. We want to do everything possible to continue with our tours of the Arlington National Cemetery and have the buses parked in the Change of Guard area. Secondly, we do not wish to go to the additional expense for transportation inside the Cemetery.

With best wishes, I am,

Cordially,

H. J. BURNS,  
Passenger Sales Representative.

WAGENAAR TRAVEL BUREAU, INC.,  
Grand Rapids, Mich., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: With regard to the proposed closing of Arlington Cemetery to all vehicle traffic, we as one of the principal producers of tourism to the nation's capital protest this action.

A visit to Arlington Cemetery has always been one of the high points in any of the group tours which we promote and handle, and the closing of Arlington could definitely have an effect on Washington tour promotion, however, the one most important point is the historical significance of Arlington to our people here in the Midwest.

We respectfully ask that you exert all possible influence to have the closing order set aside and should you require any additional affidavits from this office, please feel free to contact me.

Very truly yours,

RALPH B. LEONARD.

MOORMAN'S TRAVEL,  
Detroit, Mich., November 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: I am greatly concerned of the pending proposal which would ban buses from entering Arlington Cemetery. I can only visualize chaos with groups of 300 or more students that I send to Washington changing to another bus at the gate. Multiply this by several such groups and it is anything but a pretty picture.

The cost would also be a factor. At the present time the cost has ruled out many groups, and each added fee helps to bring an end of high school groups in Washington.

Very truly yours,

WARREN L. WATSON.

CHURCHILL TOURS,  
Portland, Oreg., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: We should like to voice our disapproval of the Secretary of the Army's proposal to close Arlington Cemetery to all but special vehicular traffic.

We are of the opinion that this would be a mistake.

Aside from the strictly business outlook, in which, of course, we are very interested, there would be a tremendous loss historically to the public in general. Our nation has a great deal in which to be proud and we feel that Arlington Cemetery plays an important part in this history.

Business-wise we would be affected twofold. We send a substantial number of visitors to Washington, D.C. and arrange sightseeing for them. . . . Arlington Cemetery is always included. Our Group Division would be seriously affected, since, here again, our group tours visiting Washington, D.C. visit Arlington Cemetery. Even assuming that inner-cemetery transportation might be avail-

able (other than the tour buses which we normally use), the price of such a tour certainly would increase our costs.

It is our sincere hope that the Secretary of the Army will reconsider his proposal.

Yours very truly,

DICK RANIAN,  
Manager, Group Travel Division.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD CO.,  
Columbia, S.C., November 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: I have received notification that the Secretary of the Army proposes to close Arlington National Cemetery to all vehicle traffic with the exception of official cars or funerals. Also, I understand that there is a hearing scheduled for November 17, 1970, regarding this action.

Arlington National Cemetery, the changing of the guard at the tomb of the unknown soldier, and the Kennedy's grave sites have been highlights of both student and adult tours to Washington conducted by this office. Public transportation within the cemetery would add to the overall cost of a tour and inclement weather would present hardships to tour members if required to vacate modes of transportation outside the cemetery.

I have always felt that Arlington National Cemetery belonged to all Americans, and I feel that anything that is done to cause difficulty for visitors to the cemetery is unquestionably out of line.

I wish you good luck with your presentation against this proposal at the hearing on November 17.

Yours very truly,

C. E. WATTS,  
City Passenger and Ticket Agent.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD CO.,  
Fort Lauderdale, Fla., November 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
D.C. Transit System,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: It has come to my attention that the Secretary of the Army has proposed the closing of Arlington Cemetery to all vehicular traffic, except official cars. This could adversely affect our group tour visitors to Washington and increase our overall package cost if we are required to use separate transportation within the Cemetery grounds.

If you are in a position to influence this move in any way, I will appreciate your voicing my opposition to the proper authorities.

Thank you very much for your assistance in this matter.

Yours very truly,

JOHN L. ALLEN,  
District Manager Passenger Sales.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD CO.,  
Richmond, Va., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President,  
D.C. Transit System,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: For many years it has been our pleasure to arrange tours for school and adult groups from the Southeast who have used our streamliner service to Washington, D.C. In that connection we are extremely grateful to D.C. Transit System and other Washington companies affording charter bus service for the effective services that have been performed during the periods the groups remained in Washington.

Through school principals, faculty members and sponsors of groups we have recognized that one of the highlights of the Washington trip is Arlington National Cemetery and the observance of the changing of the guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers, together with visits to gravesites of our na-

tion's leaders. Should Arlington National Cemetery grounds be closed to all vehicular traffic, as we understand it has been proposed by the Secretary of the Army, this would have an adverse effect upon the aforementioned groups. It is hoped that those in authority will continue to allow Washington area buses to accommodate all groups within the cemetery as near as possible to points of interest they wish to visit without these groups having to incur inconvenience or additional expense.

Sincerely,

R. L. PROGNER,  
Assistant Vice President,  
Passenger Traffic.

ORIENT PACIFIC TOURS, INC.,  
North Hollywood, Calif., November 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: We are aware that the Secretary of the Army has proposed to close Arlington Cemetery to all vehicle traffic except official cars or funerals by November 1, 1970.

I am writing to you to voice my protest in this action. If this proposal does go through my business will be greatly affected.

The many hundreds of visitors to Washington, D.C. would have the additional cost of another method of transportation required to enter the grounds and therefore this would be an important factor in the overall tour price.

This proposal, if passed, would probably result in our redirecting our tours to other areas and thereby passing the chance for our tour members to stop and enjoy the Washington, D.C. area. Certainly there has been mutual benefit between our tour groups and your local businesses.

Please enter my protest along with the others against this proposed action.

Truly yours,

TAMIO KATAYAMA,  
President.

MAGIC CARPET TRAVEL, INC.,  
Fort Lauderdale, Fla., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President,  
D.C. Transit System, Inc.,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: The proposal by the Secretary of the Army to close Arlington Cemetery to sightseeing buses could seriously affect my student tour schedules. As you know, we are always on a tight schedule, and having to find another mode of transportation to enter the cemetery would not only disrupt the tour timing, but cost more money. Anything you can do to have this order rescinded will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROD DIXON,  
Vice President.

SEABOARD COASTLINE RAILROAD CO.,  
Richmond, Va., November 11, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President,  
D.C. Transit System,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: It has come to our attention that the Secretary of the Army is considering the closing, in the near future, of Arlington National Cemetery grounds to all vehicular traffic except official cars and those required for funeral transportation purposes.

As you may readily verify through your traffic and sales departments, a number of educational tours to our nation's capital are arranged annually by the Seaboard Coast Line Railroad for schools in the Southeastern states, using the charter bus services of your company for local area movement. One of the highlights with deepest significance of their trip to Washington for the students

participating has been the tour within the National Cemetery, during which the ceremony of the changing of the guard at the Tomb of the Unknowns is witnessed and gravesites of our nation's great leaders are visited.

It is certainly hoped that some provision will be made to allow at least Washington area buses, whose operators are familiar with routes within the Cemetery, to discharge such groups conveniently near the points to be visited, at no additional cost to them.

Sincerely,

R. A. PERKIN,  
General Passenger Agent.

SHORTLINE TOURS,  
New York, N.Y., November 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: We have just been made aware of the fact that a hearing has been scheduled for November 17, 1970 with regard to the proposed closing of Arlington Cemetery to all vehicle traffic except official cars or funerals.

Since your company handles thousands of visitors that we direct to Washington, D.C., we ask that you represent us at this hearing in expressing our deep concern over this proposal.

Since Arlington Cemetery is a prime tourist attraction, the closing would seriously affect our tours to Washington, and if the visitors must use another form of transportation into the cemetery, the additional cost would be a serious factor in our packaging.

In view of these problems that the proposed closing would cause, we sincerely hope that this order will be rescinded.

Very truly yours,

ARTHUR LAWRENCE,  
General Manager.

ALLIED TOURS, INC.,  
New York, N.Y., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: We have been informed that the Secretary of the Army proposes to close Arlington Cemetery to all vehicle traffic with the exception of official cars or funerals.

We are very disturbed about this proposal as it will definitely hinder our movements of thousands of visitors each year to Washington, D.C. Our clientele consists of domestic as well as international groups that always request a visit to Arlington Cemetery to pay their respects at the Tomb of the Unknowns and the gravesite of President John F. Kennedy and Senator Robert Kennedy. We are certain that this major interest on the part of our tour participants will be greatly affected by this proposal.

Furthermore, if our buses are forced to park outside the Cemetery and another mode of transportation is required to enter the grounds, the over-all cost of our packages will also be affected. Being one of the largest Visit USA tour operators in the U.S., we can anticipate the negative reaction we would receive from our overseas clients.

We must ask you to do everything in your power to see that this order will not go into effect.

Thanking you for your kind attention, I am,

Sincerely yours,

ERIK B. PAULSSON,  
General Manager.

CONTINENTAL TRAILWAYS TOURS, INC.,  
Dallas, Tex., November 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit, Wash-  
ington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: I understand that there is a current proposal to close Arlington

Cemetery to all vehicular traffic except official cars or funerals.

I most certainly agree with the reaction that this could have an adverse effect on the tour operations and tour sales of our company. We sell and operate tours involving a total of thousands of passengers per year, which include sightseeing in the Washington D.C. area and as a part of that include a visit to Arlington Cemetery. This traffic is both domestic-originated and foreign-originated. A portion of it involves individual travelers for whom we book the services of a commercial sightseeing company such as yours. A very substantial part of the traffic consists of group movements on which we operate our own motorbuses in the Washington, D.C. area, under appropriate permits.

I am not clear about all details of the proposal to prohibit vehicular traffic, but it seems obvious that the effects will be bad from our standpoint, and actually in the over-all picture from the standpoint of the ability to adequately handle the "Discover America" tour traffic, originated domestically and overseas, which is so important to all of us.

If the tour bus must park outside the cemetery, presumably one of the possibilities would be that another mode of transportation would be required to enter the grounds. If so, this could of course have an effect (not previously anticipated) on the costs of package tour arrangements we have already been promoting for 1971, in addition to the factor of inconvenience for the passengers themselves.

Very truly yours,

D. A. SCOTT,  
President and General Manager.

TRIANGLE TRAVEL SERVICE, INC.,  
Chicago, Ill.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President,  
D.C. Transit Co.  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: I was quite shocked to hear of what is taking place at the Arlington National Cemetery.

Of the thousands of school children we bring to the Washington area every year this proposal of not allowing buses within the cemetery would be a catastrophe. It would add to the cost of the tour but most important is the time element. Each tour is operated on a set schedule and the idea is to see as much of Washington as possible in a given time.

Another important factor is having control of your group at all times. Using buses within the cemetery gives us this control but to break them loose it could mean the loss of a half day.

As you know buses are not the problem in the cemetery. They carry up to 51 persons and do not clog up the roadways. It is the private cars which carry a few people.

We hope you will do everything in your power to prevent such a thing taking place. If money is to be made let the politicians make their money doing something practical.

Sincerely,

C. HARRY JONES,  
President.

SEARIGHT TRAVEL SERVICE,  
November 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President,  
D.C. Transit System,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: It has come to my attention that Arlington National Cemetery will be closed to all vehicular traffic, except official cars or funerals, sometime after November 17th, 1970.

I understand that you will attend a hearing on November 17th, at which time you will endeavor to have the order set aside. As your company knows, I have brought over

10,000 high school students from the mid-western states to Washington, D.C. on American Heritage and educational tours, since 1962. An important part of each tour is the visit to Arlington National Cemetery to witness the Changing of the Guard at the Tomb of The Unknown Soldiers. If the proposal by the Secretary of the Army, prohibiting vehicular traffic in the cemetery, is approved, it can seriously affect the tours that I operate for the several thousand students in the future, as well as those tours operated by numerous other tour companies for our visiting citizens.

The order would seriously inconvenience tourists by causing them to walk several miles, if they wished to visit our national cemetery. Hiring another mode of transportation, approved by the authorities, would greatly increase the over-all package price of these educational tours. Recent inflationary increases have already made the tour prices out of reaches of many students, who would have made a trip to our nation's capital, and additional increases will cause more to remain home.

Sincerely,

R. D. SEARIGHT.

TRAVELTIME,  
Chicago Ill., November 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
D.C. Transit,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: It has come to my attention that the Secretary of the Army has proposed the closing of Arlington Cemetery to all vehicle traffic.

This proposal would effect the thousands of visitors that I annually direct to the United States Capital city. Since I bring so many visitors to the cemetery, if my tour bus were forced to park outside the cemetery and use another form of transportation to visit the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, this would foolishly increase the cost of my over-all package tours and cause serious delay, inconvenience, confusion and chaos in getting to and from the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.

Therefore, I would appreciate your having as much pressure as possible brought to bear in the form of lobbying against this absurd proposal.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM D. BUCKMAN.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD Co.,  
Columbia, S.C., November 13, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: Information reaching me indicates that the Secretary of the Army intends to close Arlington National Cemetery to all vehicle traffic except for official cars or funerals and that a hearing is scheduled for November 17, 1970.

For many years this office has promoted both student and adult tours to Washington and one of the highlights has been a visit to Arlington National Cemetery and the changing of the guard at the tomb of the unknown soldier and the Kennedy's grave sites. If buses are required to park outside of the cemetery, this will work a hardship on future tour members, particularly during inclement weather. If public transportation within the cemetery is provided, this would add to the cost of the overall tour.

I feel that Arlington National Cemetery is a public shrine and belongs to all Americans. Anything that is done which may prohibit or make it difficult for visitors to the cemetery should be out of the question.

I hope you will vigorously protest the closing of Arlington National Cemetery to charter buses at the November 17 hearing.

Your very truly,

B. P. BEARD,  
District Manager, Passenger Sales.



November 18, 1970

KEARNEY TRAVEL SERVICE, INC.,  
 Detroit, Mich., November 12, 1970.

Mr. T. S. TRIMMER,  
 Assistant Vice President, D.C. Transit,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. TRIMMER: This has reference to the proposed closing of Arlington Cemetery to all vehicular traffic in the near future by the Secretary of the Army.

Our agency brings thousands of young people to Washington, D.C., each year, primarily school groups whose budgets are limited. If tour buses would have to park outside the Cemetery and another mode of transportation be required to enter the grounds, this would not only be a great inconvenience, but would result in a higher tour cost, causing many groups to avoid such a visit in the interest of economy and definitely decreasing the number of people visiting Arlington. A visit to the Cemetery should not be denied anyone for monetary reasons.

We feel it is important that all people visiting our Nation's Capital be permitted free access to Arlington Cemetery. Anything you can do to have this directive put aside will be sincerely appreciated, not only by travel agencies such as ourselves, but by every United States citizen as well as foreign visitors who wish to pay tribute to the honored dead in Arlington National Cemetery.

Cordially,

FRANK WARREN,  
 Manager.

TOURS AND CHARTERS DEPARTMENT,  
 GREYHOUND CHARTERS,  
 November 14, 1970.

Congressman CHARLES W. WHALEN, Jr.,  
 Dayton, Ohio.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN WHALEN: We want to oppose the proposal submitted by the Secretary of the Army, suggesting Arlington Cemetery be closed to all vehicle traffic, except official cars.

This proposal would directly affect our Arlington tour over-all cost to us and our customers.

We are asking for reconsideration on this proposal.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Mrs. VIRGINIA ADAMS.

NOVEMBER 15, 1970.

Hon. JAMES A. HALEY,  
 House of Representatives Office Building,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. HALEY: I understand that the Secretary of the Army has proposed that our National Cemetery of Arlington be closed to vehicle traffic, except official cars, and funerals. If this be so, I need to have your help to oppose this move, on the grounds that this ground belongs to all of us in America. To prevent bus tours of students and adults from seeing this area, is indeed against the interests of those of us who feel the past heroes of our country belong to us all, and we should all have the opportunity of visiting their resting place.

As you know each year hundreds of young students are sent to Washington to learn more of the history of our glorious nation. Arlington has always been an integral part of that trip. If they are forced to walk around the entire area, or use an entirely different mode of transportation, after the bus is forced to stop at the gate, will they be as interested as before, or balk at even going there. Or at best, the price of the tour will be so increased as to possibly put it beyond the means of these youngsters many of whom save all year for their trip.

We are in enough trouble as it is to teach our youngsters to honor and respect our country, flag and its heroes, without having this sort of deed come along and possibly materially affect the visit to the Nation's Capitol and the learning of future students.

Please look into this, sir, and do what you can to oppose any such move on the part of the Secretary of the Army, or any other bureaucrat who tries to take away from us the right to visit our own shrines.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

FRANK S. BOYCE.

NOVEMBER 14, 1970.

Senator ROBERT GRIFFIN,  
 Senate Office Building,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This has reference to the order from the government to close Arlington National Cemetery to all vehicle traffic except official cars or funerals.

For over 35 years I have been taking groups of all ages to Washington but in the last 18 years most of the groups have been high school groups. Always a high point of these visits has been the changing of the guard at the Tomb of the Unknowns, and more recently the Kennedy grave has been of unique interest.

If this order is not rescinded or modified to permit local Washington Sightseeing operators in Arlington the schedule of many tour operators handling high school or elementary school groups, or any groups, will be seriously impaired. It may even reach the point where the visit to these two outstanding American shrines will have to be eliminated.

Please use all your influence to have the government rescind or modify their order.

Sincerely,

EDWIN D. PHILLIPS, Sr.

MEYER & DIETEL TOURS, INC.,  
 Butler, Wis., November 13, 1970.

Hon. GAYLORD NELSON,  
 U.S. Senate Office Building,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR NELSON: Word has reached my office that vehicular traffic, other than official cars and funerals, is to be banned from Arlington National Cemetery. As my company brings thousands of Wisconsin students to Washington every year, which includes a stop at Arlington Cemetery, I have given much thought to this anticipated new procedure and can find nothing to justify the banning of tour buses from a prescribed route in the Cemetery.

To require the buses to park in the lot below the cemetery and discharge their passengers from that point will create more chaos than it will solve.

Currently licensed driver/guides follow a prescribed route to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldiers. They discharge their group and we send them to the parking lot empty. The group witnesses the change-of-guard ceremony and then proceed to the Kennedy grave sites on foot and thence to the parking lot to board their bus.

Under the proposed rule the group would be discharged to walk to the grave sites, then the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and then back again to retrace their steps to the bus. This roundtrip traffic doubles the amount of foot traffic in the cemetery, wastes valuable time with the roundtrip walk, reduces the control of the adults over the students and greatly jeopardizes the timing necessary to make the on-the-hour change of guard.

The new proposal in addition to adding to the burden of cemetery personnel and perhaps an increase in cost for additional personnel, adds to the cost of the tour sold to the student. We have already quoted tour package rates to over 100 schools for tours moving next Spring and if we are charged extra for the shuttle service we will have to notify the schools of the increased cost and the reasons therefor. A greater length of time will be required of each bus which we charter on an hourly basis plus as mentioned previously the cost of the shuttle service. A

shuttle system would accomplish nothing more than what is already being taken care of so efficiently by the our bus.

Being responsible to the thousands of students my company brings to the Capitol, I am opposed to a system which would bar tour buses from the cemetery. As a representative of our Wisconsin citizens we request your voice in our opposition to this change in procedure which in no way assists the visitor to Washington, especially groups using chartered buses.

Sincerely,

MEYER & DIETEL TOURS, INC.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD CO.,  
 Columbia, S.C., November 13, 1970.

Senator ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,  
 U.S. Senate,  
 Senate Office Building,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HOLLINGS: The Arlington National Cemetery is a point of interest to both young and old, and that is the reason it has always been included on our student and adult tours to Washington.

The biggest mistake that could possibly be made would be to prohibit vehicle traffic such as sightseeing buses within Arlington National Cemetery. Each and every visit to Arlington National Cemetery is an experience never to be forgotten.

It would be greatly appreciated if you would use your influence to see that visitors to the Arlington National Cemetery are not required to walk from the gates and are not required to pay extra for transportation within the gates of the cemetery.

Yours very truly,

B. P. BEARD,  
 District Manager Passenger Sales.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD CO.,  
 Columbia, S.C., November 13, 1970.

Hon. ALBERT WATSON,  
 U.S. House of Representatives,  
 House Office Building,  
 Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. WATSON: The Arlington National Cemetery has always been a point of interest on both our student and adult tours in Washington.

Any law prohibiting vehicle traffic sightseeing buses within the cemetery would be a mistake. Each time I conduct a tour to Arlington National Cemetery I experience something new and different. All of the experiences leave a lasting impression.

Your influence in seeing that visitors to the Arlington National Cemetery are not inconvenienced by having to walk from the gate or having to pay extra for transportation within the gate would be greatly appreciated.

Yours very truly,

B. P. BEARD,  
 District Manager Passenger Sales.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD CO.,  
 Columbia, S.C., November 13, 1970.  
 Senator STROM THURMOND,  
 U.S. Senate, Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR THURMOND: For many years I have escorted student and adult tours to Washington and the vicinity with Arlington National Cemetery always included in the tour.

I am convinced that to prohibit vehicle traffic such as sightseeing buses from the cemetery would be a mistake. To experience a visit to Arlington National Cemetery leaves a lasting impression.

I hope that you will use your influence to see that visitors to the Arlington National Cemetery are not required to walk or to pay extra to ride the great distance from outside the cemetery to the tomb of the unknown soldier and other sites in the cemetery.

Yours very truly,

B. P. BEARD,  
 District Manager Passenger Sales.

SEABOARD COAST LINE RAILROAD CO.,  
Charleston, S.C., November 12, 1970.  
Congressman L. MENDEL RIVERS,  
Federal Building,  
Charleston, S.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: It has been brought to our attention that the Secretary of the Army proposes to close Arlington Cemetery to all vehicular traffic except official cars or funerals, in the near future. This would eliminate a very standard part of our educational tour itineraries for students visiting Washington.

We have handled arrangements for about 500 students from Lower South Carolina to Washington in the past 12 months, and every one of them visited the Cemetery to see the ceremonial Changing of the Guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, as well as the Kennedy grave sites and the Marine Iwo Jima Monument. These are, in my opinion, basic links in our patriotism between those who have given their lives in active defense of country, and the school student of today.

I have heard the Tour Guides description of Sgt. Younger's selection of the body to be honored as the Unknown Soldier of World War I dozens of times, and never fail to have an emotional stirring by this drama. It would be a shame for our young people to be denied this for anything less than some very major obstacle. We do not know what problem faces the Secretary of the Army, but sincerely hope that he will search out every alternative before closing the gates of the Cemetery to tours.

Your influence in keeping the Cemetery open would be appreciated by many people, including me.

Cordially,

General Passenger Agent.

TENHOLDER TRAVEL, INC.,  
St. Louis, Mo., November 13, 1970.

HON. STUART SYMINGTON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has come to our attention that the Secretary of the Army has proposed closing Arlington Cemetery to all vehicle traffic except official cars and funerals.

We make arrangements for about 3,000 high school and college students along with faculty members to tour Washington every year. They, of course, include a visit to Arlington Cemetery to view the changing of the guard at the tombs of the unknown soldiers. You can see, that should there be no transportation to the parking lots at the tombs, this would pose quite a problem.

We would appreciate very much anything you can do.

Thanks and regards.

Cordially,

President.

TENHOLDERS TRAVEL, INC.,  
St. Louis, Mo., November 13, 1970.

HON. THOMAS EAGLETON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: It has just come to our attention that the Secretary of the Army has proposed closing Arlington Cemetery to all vehicular traffic except official cars and funerals.

We make arrangements for about 3,000 high school and college students along with faculty members to tour Washington every year. They, of course, include a visit to Arlington Cemetery to view the changing of the guard at the tombs of the unknown soldiers. You can see, that should there be no transportation to the parking lots at the tombs, this would pose quite a problem.

We would appreciate very much anything you can do.

Cordially,

President.

MEYER & DIETEL TOURS, INC.,  
Milwaukee, Wis.

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DAVIS: For the past six years I have with great pride earned my livelihood bringing high school students to Washington, D.C. Although it is a commercial enterprise this in no way detracts from my personal devotion to my work and the hope that in my own way I am able to contribute to the mutual understanding of youth and country.

Recently I was told of a situation which I feel would hamper the effectiveness of my efforts and to my way of thinking not solve an existing problem. This is the possibility of banning tour bus traffic from Arlington Cemetery with the requirement that all buses park in the parking lot outside the cemetery and the passengers proceed on foot to their goals within the cemetery.

Currently our licensed driver/guides follow a prescribed route to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier. As they do so they lecture about the cemetery and about the things the students will soon see. At the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier the students are discharged several minutes before the hourly change of guard and the driver takes his bus to the parking lot outside the cemetery. The students witness the change of guard and are led to the Kennedy grave-sites by myself with the assistance of the chaperons. From the grave-sites we continue directly to the buses in the parking lot.

The proposed change to which I object would apparently require the buses to park in the assigned lot, lecture to the group in the parking lot, discharge the group to be led to the Kennedy grave-sites, then to the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and then back down again to the parking lot. As an alternate it is possible a shuttle arrangement may be provided for the groups.

The proposed change would: detract from the lecture given to the students regarding the cemetery (parking lot versus the cemetery route), jeopardize the timing required to make the hourly change of guard, hamper the control of the group by the adults in the cemetery grounds, increase the cost of the tour program as the buses are chartered on an hourly rate and additional time would be required for a round-trip walk and further increase the price if cemetery shuttle service were provided.

The decorum which we strive for at the cemetery would be virtually lost and our visit rather than creating an emotional understanding would deteriorate to another "sightseeing stop," similar to the Washington Monument. Few students see the significance of the structure, only if they can run up the 898 steps in seven minutes or less.

As a Wisconsin representative I hope your voice will assist our cause at a hearing scheduled for November 17 by the Secretary of the Army.

Sincerely,

JULES E. NOVAK.

WAGENAAR TRAVEL BUREAU, INC.,  
Grand Rapids, Mich., November 12, 1970.  
Re Proposal to close Arlington Cemetery to nonofficial vehicle traffic.

MR. GERALD R. FORD,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR GERRY: I am sure you are aware that the Secretary of the Army has proposed to close Arlington Cemetery to all vehicle traf-

fic with the exception of official or funeral cars and we at this time enlist your help in having this proposal set aside.

We feel very strongly that our midwest people have strong ties with Washington, many of their sons and daughters are buried there and not withstanding this our young people should be allowed convenient access to Arlington to have first hand information on the more than unusual events which have occurred in the past 15 years.

May we personally thank you for your efforts in advance.

Very truly yours,

RALPH B. LEONARD.

MAGIC CARPET TRAVEL INC.,  
November 12, 1970.

Senator ED GURNEY,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GURNEY: The proposal by the Secretary of the Army to close Arlington Cemetery to sightseeing buses could seriously affect my student tour schedules. As you know, we are always on a tight schedule, and having to find another mode of transportation to enter the cemetery would not only disrupt the tour timing, but cost more money. Anything you can do to have this order rescinded will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

ROD DIXON,  
Vice President.

TRIANGLE TRAVEL SERVICE, INC.,  
Chicago, Ill., November 10, 1970.

HON. CHARLES PERCY,  
U.S. Senate,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR: I would appreciate a couple of minutes of your time to read the enclosed notice which I recently received.

Each year we handle approximately 2,000 students plus numerous groups of Senior Citizens to the Washington D.C. area on an Educational Basis so we are quite concerned over this change. In the first place, this service is unacceptable in handling large groups. Secondly, the valuable time consumed walking up could be utilized visiting another historical monument. Thirdly, we pride ourselves on control of the group to their best advantage, this control would be lost in the two hours it would take to visit our National Cemetery. In respect to our Senior Citizens, most likely we would have to cut this out of the tour.

Agreed, there is a problem regarding the influx of Tourist to the Washington area, but now more than ever it is important that our students have the opportunity to visit Washington, D.C., and to see as much as possible in the time allotted, to waste this time needlessly and on a political whim as the enclosed notice indicates is very foolish.

I do hope you will look into this, keeping in mind that our students should have this opportunity and having it, should not have to waste their time. Most of the students work hard for this trip and we want to give them the best tour possible.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

R. K. JONES.

SEARIGHT TRAVEL SERVICE,  
St. Louis, Mo., November 14, 1970.

Congressman RICHARD ICHORD,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN ICHORD: We have just been informed that the Secretary of the Army has proposed that Arlington National Cemetery be closed to all vehicular traffic, except official cars and funeral processions. All tour buses would have to park outside of the cemetery and visitors would be forced to walk over a mile in each direction to witness the Changing of the Guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier.



During the past eight years I have brought over 10,000 high school students to Washington, D.C. on American Heritage and Student Educational Tours. All of these students visit the Arlington National Cemetery on their three and four day tours to our country's shrines. If the order proposed by the Secretary of the Army is approved it will cause unnecessary hardship on visitors in the future, either by causing them to walk this distance, or foregoing the visit if the weather is inclement. Older adults and Golden Age Club members would not be able to make the trip.

It has been suggested that a few special buses be operated by a department of the government at a charge of a dollar or two. These could not accommodate the thousands of high school students who visit our nation's capital in the spring and summer months. Any additional charge to the already high cost of a tour due to inflation, would cause more patriotic students to cancel their plans.

I will appreciate your assistance in having this order put aside. The original order for November 1st has been postponed until sometime after a hearing scheduled for November 17, 1970.

Sincerely,

R. D. SEARIGHT.

SEARIGHT TRAVEL SERVICE,

St. Louis, Mo., November 14, 1970.

Senator THOMAS EAGLETON,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR EAGLETON: We have just been informed that the Secretary of the Army has proposed that Arlington National Cemetery be closed to all vehicular traffic except official cars and funeral processions. All tour buses would have to park outside of the cemetery and visitors who wish to witness the Changing of the Guard at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier would be forced to walk over a mile in each direction.

During the past eight years I have brought over 10,000 high school students to Washington, D.C. on American Heritage and Student Educational Tours. All of these students visit the Arlington National Cemetery on their three and four day tours to our country's shrines. If the order proposed by the Secretary is approved it will cause unnecessary hardship on visitors in the future, either by causing them to walk this distance, or foregoing the visit if the weather is inclement. Older adult tours and Golden Age Club members would not be able to make the trip.

It has been suggested that a few special buses be operated by a department of the government at a charge of a dollar or two. These could not accommodate the thousands of high school students who visit our nation's capital in the spring and summer months. Any additional charge to the already high cost of a tour due to inflation, would cause more patriotic students to cancel their plans.

I will appreciate your assistance in having this order put aside. The original order for November 1st has been postponed until sometime after a hearing scheduled for November 17.

Sincerely,

R. D. SEARIGHT.

KEARNEY TRAVEL SERVICE, INC.,

Detroit, Mich., November 12, 1970.

Senator ROBERT GRIFFIN,  
Old Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR GRIFFIN: This has reference to the proposed closing of Arlington Cemetery to all vehicular traffic in the near future by the Secretary of the Army.

Our agency brings thousands of young people to Washington, D.C. each year, primarily school groups whose budgets are limited. If tour buses would have to park

outside the Cemetery and another mode of transportation be required to enter the grounds, this would not only be a great inconvenience, but could result in a higher tour cost, causing many groups to avoid such a visit in the interest of economy and definitely decreasing the number of people visiting Arlington. A visit to the Cemetery should not be denied anyone for monetary reasons.

We feel it is important that all people visiting our Nation's Capital be permitted free access to Arlington Cemetery. Anything you can do to have this directive put aside will be sincerely appreciated, not only by travel agencies such as ourselves, but by every United States citizen as well as foreign visitors who wish to pay tribute to the honored dead in Arlington National Cemetery.

Cordially,

FRANK WARREN,  
Manager.

KEARNEY TRAVEL SERVICE, INC.,

Detroit, Mich., November 12, 1970.

Congressman CHARLES DIGGS, JR.,  
Rayburn Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN DIGGS: This has reference to the proposed closing of Arlington Cemetery to all vehicular traffic in the near future by the Secretary of the Army.

Our agency brings thousands of young people to Washington, D.C. each year, primarily school groups whose budgets are limited. If tour buses would have to park outside the Cemetery and another mode of transportation be required to enter the grounds, this would not only be a great inconvenience, but could result in a higher tour cost, causing many groups to avoid such a visit in the interest of economy and definitely decreasing the number of people visiting Arlington. A visit to the Cemetery should not be denied anyone for monetary reasons.

We feel it is important that all people visiting our Nation's Capital be permitted free access to Arlington Cemetery. Anything you can do to have this directive put aside will be sincerely appreciated, not only by travel agencies such as ourselves, but by every United States citizen as well as foreign visitors who wish to pay tribute to the honored dead in Arlington National Cemetery.

Cordially,

FRANK WARREN,  
Manager.

TRAVEL SERVICE, INC.,

Detroit, Mich., November 12, 1970.

Hon. PHILIP HART,  
Senate Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR HART: This has reference to the proposed closing of Arlington Cemetery to all vehicular traffic in the near future by the Secretary of the Army.

Our agency brings thousands of young people to Washington, D.C. each year, primarily school groups whose budgets are limited. If tour buses would have to park outside the Cemetery and another mode of transportation be required to enter the grounds, this would not only be a great inconvenience, but could result in a higher tour cost, causing many groups to avoid such a visit in the interest of economy and definitely decreasing the number of people visiting Arlington. A visit to the Cemetery should not be denied for monetary reasons.

We feel it is important that all people visiting our Nation's Capital be permitted free access to Arlington Cemetery. Anything you can do to have this directive put aside will be sincerely appreciated, not only by travel agencies such as ourselves, but by every United States citizen as well as foreign visitors who wish to pay tribute to the honored dead in Arlington National Cemetery.

Cordially,

FRANK WARREN,  
Manager.

#### STATEMENT OF RAYMOND WARREN, BLUE LINES SIGHTSEEING, INC.

Raymond Warrenner says:

1. That I am President of Blue Lines Sightseeing, Inc., 2001 New York Avenue, N.E., Washington, D.C. 20002.

2. That Blue Lines Sightseeing, Inc. has been conducting tours in and around the greater Washington area since 1955. Of the various sightseeing packages and tours that are sold by Blue Lines, almost all include Arlington National Cemetery as a major point of interest. The Arlington National Cemetery is, and has been one of the most popular, if not the most popular, sightseeing attraction sold by Blue Lines.

3. That gross revenue of Blue Lines during the first nine months of 1970 was \$248,416.25; of this figure, 75 per cent or \$187,456.25 is the direct result of tours conducted through Arlington National Cemetery.

4. That Blue Lines Sightseeing, Inc. employs 15 drivers, 6 office personnel and 35 to 40 full-time and part-time sales people within the greater Washington area. This does not include tours that are sold by travel agencies throughout the United States. Further, Blue Lines has a total of 10 vehicles which it uses for sightseeing purposes.

5. That Blue Lines has provided economical, responsible and efficient services to the public who have visited Washington and Arlington National Cemetery. In the last 15 years Blue Lines has served the sightseer by providing direct service into the center of the Arlington Cemetery behind the Custis-Lee Mansion. All of Blue Lines drivers are fully licensed and have had extensive experience in tour bus operation. All Blue Lines tour vehicles are inspected and properly maintained.

6. That if the Army is allowed to put into effect an order that would close Arlington National Cemetery to commercial vehicular tour bus service, of the kind as provided by Blue Lines, Blue Lines will suffer great and irreparable damage in that it will be barred from doing business as it has for the past 15 years and that such loss of business will lead to a substantial financial loss and eventual bankruptcy on its part.

7. That not only will Blue Lines be forced to cease operations if such an order is executed but service to the many Americans and foreigners who will visit Washington and Arlington National Cemetery will be greatly curtailed, become inefficient, and much more costly in that taxes will be lost by Virginia and the District of Columbia and that visitors will have to pay an increased rate for service.

#### STATEMENT OF VINARD L. PARIS, WHITE HOUSE SIGHTSEEING CORP.

Vinard L. Paris says,

1. That I am President of White House Sightseeing Corp., 519 6th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20001.

2. That White House Sightseeing Corp. has been conducting tours in and around the greater Washington area since 1940. Among the various national monuments that are served by White House is Arlington National Cemetery. Of the various sightseeing packages and tours that are sold by White House, almost all include the National Cemetery as a stop of major importance. The Arlington National Cemetery is, and has been, one of the most popular, if not the most popular, sightseeing attraction in the area of Washington, D.C.

3. That in the past year White House has grossed approximately \$500,000. Of that figure, 80 percent, or \$400,000 comes directly as a result of a tour which includes Arlington National Cemetery.

4. That White House has on its staff 22 drivers, 8 office employees and because it publishes an international tariff, 8,000 travel agents which sell White House tours. The corporation has 14 motor vehicles including 10

big buses, 2 twelve-passenger vehicles and 2 automobiles.

5. That White House has always provided economical, responsible, and efficient service to the visiting public. During the past 30 years White House has served the sightseer by providing direct service into the center of Arlington Cemetery.

6. That all of White House's drivers and personnel are fully licensed, schooled, and all have had extensive experience in tour bus operation, and tour management. All White House tour vehicles are inspected and properly maintained.

7. That if the Army is allowed to put into effect an order that would close Arlington National Cemetery to commercial vehicular tour bus service, of the kind provided by White House for the past 30 years, White House would suffer great and irreparable damage in that it would be barred from doing business as it has and that such loss of business would lead to a substantial financial loss, and eventual bankruptcy on its part.

8. That not only will White House be forced to cease operations if such an order is executed but service to the many Americans and foreigners who will visit Washington and Arlington National Cemetery will be greatly curtailed, become inefficient, and much more costly in that taxes will be lost by Virginia and the District of Columbia and that visitors will have to pay an increased rate for service.

Mr. Chairman, I have a letter to Congressman Broyhill I would like to read at this time:

HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, D.C.

SIR: In 1946 after leaving the military, I drove a taxicab where I had an opportunity to encounter many visitors to our Nation's Capital and to become familiar with the sightseeing industry. Being proud of our Nation's Capital and having a zealous desire for others to share this emotion, I found an opportunity in the sightseeing industry to fulfill this desire as well as an opportunity to meet personal economic needs. I later became employed by one of the Interstate Commerce Commission certificated carriers in the Metropolitan Area where I operated limousines then busses as a tour guide. I was later employed by the same carrier in a managerial capacity.

After several years an opportunity became available to several other guides and myself to purchase an Interstate Commerce Commission and a Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission certificate from an existing carrier to engage in sightseeing and pleasure tours in the Metropolitan Area. By straining our personal economic resources to their fullest capacity, we managed to purchase these rights with full knowledge that we were entering into a highly competitive industry. Since that time we have welcomed competition from free enterprise competitors as an incentive to improve our services, but have found competition with a governmental agency through their concessioner and their ultimate expansion to be self-evident of our ultimate destruction in business.

The Memorandum signed by the Secretary of the Army and the Department of the Interior on March 6, 1970 will jeopardize the very existence of the sightseeing industry because of the following monopolistic injustices being practiced by the Department of the Interior in behalf of Landmark Tours, Inc., their concessioner.

Landmark Tours, Inc. is not certificated as a carrier by the Interstate Commerce Commission or the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, whereas, private enterprise must secure a certificate of public convenience and necessity by proving necessity and demand exists through public hearing or purchase a certificate from an existing carrier with the approval of Inter-

state Commerce Commission and/or the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission, the Governmental bodies authorized by Congress as the expertise for the Federal Government in the field of transportation.

Vehicles being operated by Landmark Tours, Inc. do not meet the safety requirements of the District of Columbia, the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Commission or the Interstate Commerce Commission as required by their existing contract with the Department of the Interior, whereas, private enterprise must comply with these requirements. These vehicles almost double the seating capacity of those being utilized by private enterprise and cost considerably less. Private enterprise cannot utilize these same vehicles as they do not meet the safety requirements of the regulatory agencies and we are required to comply with all jurisdictions.

Vehicles used by Landmark Tours, Inc. are operated without license tags or Public Service Commission licenses, whereas, private enterprise must bear the additional expense of both. Landmark Tours, Inc. does not pay District of Columbia or Virginia State fuel taxes, whereas, private enterprise is required to bear the additional expense of both.

Guides utilized by Landmark Tours, Inc. are not required to obtain a guide license and their drivers are not required to obtain a license to drive a public vehicle for hire. Private enterprise must pass the examination and meet the requirements set forth by the regulatory agencies and bear the expense of both.

Department of the Interior personnel are recommending and selling Landmark Tours from governmental kiosk and on the sidewalks in front of public buildings, whereas, we are refused the same privilege from the Department of the Interior and we must bear the additional expense of hiring licensed personnel as street salesmen.

Landmark Tours, Inc. is permitted to place signs advertising their sightseeing tours in Federal Buildings, including the Lobby of the United States Court of Appeals; private enterprise is refused this monopolistic privilege and must bear the cost of trying to overcome an impossible advertising media: Our Federal Government.

Landmark Tours, Inc. also is receiving free radio and television time as a public service and these are misleading the public into believing that this service is being operated by the Federal Government and their employees and not by a private corporation. Private enterprise must incur the high cost of advertising to try to compete with the fraudulent impression.

Landmark Tours, Inc. has been given large loading and unloading areas at points of interest in the Mall area, whereas, private enterprise has been allocated little or no space for loading or unloading. Private enterprise is being harassed by Landmark Tours, Inc., Department of the Interior and the Park Police personnel at The Washington Monument, White House and Lincoln Memorial.

Landmark Tours, Inc. is not abiding by their contract with the Department of the Interior in regards to the following: (A) Safety requirements for vehicles. (B) Embarking and debarking in route. (C) Still using housing and facilities which were given on a temporary basis. (D) Expansion out of the Mall area in the District of Columbia and Arlington National Cemetery into the Commonwealth of Virginia. (E) By gain of an exclusive or monopolistic right. (F) Obtained numerous economic privileges and advantages not contemplated in the original contract. These plus many other injustices not listed and the Memorandum signed by the Secretary of the Army and the Department of the Interior on March 6, 1970 are forming a monopoly and making it impossible for licensed and certificated carriers to perform a

service for the public after necessity and demand has been established.

Diamond Tours, Inc. employs approximately 25 persons and our brochure lists nine different itineraries of which seven include Arlington National Cemetery as a major attraction. Approximately 75% of our gross revenue was derived from tours including Arlington National Cemetery, thus, exclusion of Arlington National Cemetery would leave our brochure noncompetitive and loss of this revenue would leave many people without jobs and result in bankruptcy for Diamond Tours, Inc.

Arlington National Cemetery is an international shrine loved by many foreigners as well as Americans and needs a variety of services and vehicles, large and small in order to accommodate the public in the dignified manner that they are entitled to. Many foreign groups and individuals require multi-lingual guides and special transportation. In addition there are many Golden Age groups that do not need the inconvenience of being needlessly moved from one vehicle to another. Many groups and individuals are limited on time and need special attention. The variety of services required to serve our citizens in Arlington National Cemetery far exceed the few mentioned here.

To assume that the introduction of a carnival type tandem pulled vehicle into Arlington National Cemetery would be in the public interest or cure the traffic problem in Arlington National Cemetery would be a fallacy. The end result of such an act would degenerate our sacred shrines, the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier and demoralize the public image of the military. It would waste many hours of visiting time reuniting students, foreigners and elderly persons separated from their groups. It would also cause hazardous traffic congestion on the Memorial Bridge, the approach roads and the gates of Arlington National Cemetery. It would lower the quality of service while needlessly increasing the cost to the public. While the additional suggested cost to the public for Arlington National Cemetery is \$1.25 per person, it should be noted the cost of this same service in the Mall area has increased 800% in three years.

Since tourism is the largest industry in our Nation's Capital creation of this private enterprise monopoly without government control as a public utility would not only destroy all competition and leave thousands of persons jobless, but would have a devastating economic effect on the entire community.

Therefore Congressman Broyhill, we respectfully request your help in asking the Secretary of the Army to retain the authority invested in him by Congress and to rescind the Memorandum signed on March 6, 1970 with the Department of the Interior. We also respectfully request your help in asking the Secretary of the Interior to correct the injustices in behalf of Landmark Tours, Inc., by his subordinates and by compelling his concessioner to comply with the requirements set forth in their original contract executed on May 29, 1967.

Very truly yours,

JIMMIE LEE FAOUR,  
President, Diamond Tours, Inc.

#### A WARNING AGAINST MAO

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, an excellent article on Red China appeared in the New York Times of November 13. The author is a Mr. Bruno Shaw, who, according to the Times, for many years



was a correspondent in China and edited the "Selected Works of Mao Tse-tung."

Mr. Shaw makes several points that we should weigh in considering the "de-isolation" of Communist China. We must avoid policy decisions in regard to Red China predicated on the basis of wishful thinking about an emerging new leadership and our possibilities of influencing this leadership in directions we would prefer.

Attempts of the United States to influence the Communist bloc nations always seem to translate into scientific, technical, and other material assistance which provides the leadership, new or old, with materials which help them to accomplish their objectives. It does not change their objectives but simply allows them to divert resources to projects they consider more important, for instance, the manufacture of nuclear weapons, and to benefit from Western technological advances.

Free trade between free nations is to our advantage. It prevents conflicts due to various protectionist measures from arising. Trade between free nations and Communist nations, however, does nothing but increase their strength while in no way alleviating the source of conflict since that conflict is ideological.

We must discard the outworn notions of economic determinism. We cannot buy the Communists off nor quell the spirit of conquest with washing machines. Trading with the various national contingents of Bolshevism is an exercise in national masochism.

The article follows:

A WARNING AGAINST MAO

(By Bruno Shaw)

In the Soviet Union under Josef Stalin, at least 700,000 members of the Soviet Communist party were murdered or perished in labor camps, in addition to millions of peasants who were deliberately starved to death.

In Germany, Hitler and his accomplices murdered more than six million men, women and children, and plunged the world into the catastrophe of World War II.

Mao Tse-tung, in his betrayal of the Chinese people, has already slaughtered, exiled and imprisoned more than the total number of people killed and mutilated by Stalin and Hitler combined. And under Mao's chosen successor, Lin Piao, by Lin's own testimony, the worst is yet to come.

Stalin, Hitler and Mao each proclaimed his intention to remold the world by genocide on a vast scale, for racial or economic reasons—Stalin in his *Problems of Leninism*, Hitler in his *Mein Kampf*, and Mao Tse-tung in his *Selected Works*. It was only after Stalin and Hitler were dead that the press of the world, including our own, acknowledged that both had been schizophrenic paranoiacs.

Will we have to wait until Mao Tse-tung, too, leaves our mundane sphere before it will be acknowledged that this murderer of millions of his own people for "harboring wrong thoughts" is as paranoid as were Stalin and Hitler? And that his chosen successor, Marshal Lin Piao, is equally so?

Mao Tse-tung, in his swindle of the Chinese people, invoked the name of Dr. Sun Yat-sen, the revered founder of the Chinese revolution of this century. It gained for him the devoted following of tens of millions of landless Chinese tenant-farmer peasants who constituted 90 per cent of all the people of China.

Dr. Sun advocated the *Minsheng* principle—"each tiller of the soil will possess his

own fields—that is to be the final fruit of our efforts."

Far from being the "final fruit" of the Mao Tse-tung's efforts, however, this was to be only the "first stage" of his revolution. In the "second stage" Mao took away from the tiller the land for which the peasant had been tricked into allegiance to the Communist Party of China.

In his *Selected Works*, Mao Tse-tung discloses his plans for the non-Communist world. It will have to "play a role in the world counter-revolution, or on the anti-imperialist front play a role in the world revolution." There can be no escape, says Mao, "There is not a third road."

Between July 7, 1937, when Japan attacked China, and December 7, 1941, when Japan bombed Pearl Harbor, American businessmen made huge profits selling to Japan such "non-strategic materials" as cotton for gun-cotton, copper for cannon shells, steel for bullets, and toil to make the Japanese war machine wheels spin.

In the 1930's our industrialists did even more business in these "non-strategic materials" with Hitler. And from him we got World War II, with its harvest of American dead.

Now we are being urged to take the initiative to "de-isolate" Red China by entering into "scientific and technical cooperation" with Peking. We did that with the Soviet Union. We built their first great hydroelectric project, their great Cooper Dam, in 1934. We did it with Japan. We did it with Nazi Germany. And with what disastrous results! Do we now have to do it all over again with Red China?

It is also suggested that the United States should recognize Red China and lead the way to seating the Peking regime in the United Nations on the theory, it seems to me, that if you put a fox in a hen coop (even a hen coop which already has some pretty noisome creatures in it) it will turn into a chicken.

A century and a half ago a German philosopher, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, wrote: "Peoples and governments never have learned anything from history, or acted on principles deduced from it." I wonder if what he wrote so long ago holds as good now as it did then. If it does, heaven help us all.

## TOM WICKER ON PROTECTIONISM

### HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the distinguished columnist for the New York Times, Tom Wicker, discussed the trade bill which will come before the full House tomorrow, Wednesday, November 18, in today's edition of the paper.

I am opposed to the protectionist aspects of the legislation which I sincerely believe will do more harm than good to our Nation in the long run.

Mr. Wicker addresses this point in his well-written piece. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, and herewith insert it at this point in the RECORD.

[From the New York Times, Nov. 17, 1970]

THE PROTECTIONIST SNOWBALL

(By Tom Wicker)

Nothing seems more paradoxical, at first glance, than that Congress should in 1970 revert to the kind of protectionist legislation

that has not been enacted since Secretary of State Cordell Hull made free trade the cornerstone of his policy in the 1930's. In fact, there are good reasons why it should be so, but even better reasons why President Nixon and Congressional leaders of both parties should combine to frustrate the impulse.

Politically, the thing seems simply to have gotten out of hand. Mr. Nixon pledged in his campaign to do something to assist textile manufacturers, who traditionally plead themselves hard-pressed by low-cost imports. When Secretary of Commerce Maurice Stans opened negotiations for voluntary restraints by the Japanese, the Administration apparently asked Representative Wilbur Mills of Arkansas, the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, to prepare a bill that would impose textile import quotas, in the hope that such a bill lurking in the background would push the Japanese to a voluntary agreement.

Given that much encouragement, the Ways and Means Committee actually wrote a bill that would impose quotas not only on textiles but on shoes and on a wide range of other goods when and if imports reach certain levels. But no voluntary textile agreement has yet been reached with the Japanese—although negotiations continue—and at this moment there appears a good chance that some form of the Mills bill will pass both houses.

The protectionist fever may not be quite so illogical as it seems. In a venturesome paper prepared for the recent Atlantic Conference in Puerto Rico, economist Lawrence Krause argued that the United States did not have much to gain by devoting its efforts to the further freeing of world trade, because its economy was moving so rapidly ahead with the production of services rather than the production of exportable goods; he cited a Department of Labor projection that forecasts an American labor force more than two-thirds employed, by 1980, in service production (government, education, health, finance, etc.).

Mr. Krause also suggested that American private investment abroad, based on current trends, would be yielding such dividend and interest returns by 1980 that the nation would no longer need to run a big trade surplus to maintain balance-of-payments equilibrium. For both reasons, the traditional argument against protectionist policies—that they invite retaliation against the export of American goods—is politically less cogent as its direct economic validity declines.

The economist was by no means arguing for the Mills bill. Indeed, his paper made clear one particularly ironic fact, it was that agriculture, because its comparative advantage is based on land, climate and technology rather than on labor, is, and would continue to be, vitally dependent on exports. Hence, to the extent that the Mills bill would provoke retaliation abroad, that retaliation probably would fall most severely on American agricultural exports, although American farmers gain no compensating benefits.

Moreover, even if the United States has little to gain from further free-trade initiatives, that is not a justification for reverting to protectionism. Mr. Krause's point was that in the 1970's the United States could take unilateral steps to export services and reduce domestic prices (by lowering its own import barriers); but that further initiatives for reciprocal trade liberalization probably should come from goods exporters, notably the European Common Market.

A new round of American protectionism unquestionably would impede such initiatives for years to come. Moreover, in addition to damaging agricultural interests—a point that farm-state members of Congress ought to bear in mind when they vote on the Mills bill—protectionist legislation inevitably will

increase American prices, thus sacrificing consumer interests for those of textile and footwear interests. Mr. Nixon's so-called silent majority will pay more for its shirts, blouses, underwear and shoes if he and Congressional leaders fail now to stop the protectionist snowball that they first started down the hill.

If a last-minute voluntary agreement with the Japanese to obviate the bill, Mr. Nixon could again threaten a veto and relieve Mr. Mills of the necessity to push his committee's bill; the President could truthfully claim to have done his best to keep his pledge to the textile men. And when will there be a better time, or a better issue, for the prospective new Speaker of the House, Carl Albert of Oklahoma, and for those who want to succeed him as majority leader, to show the kind of leadership they aim to exercise?

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN J. ROONEY  
OF NEW YORK, UPON RECEIPT OF  
FIRST DISTINGUISHED SERVICE  
AWARD, ST. FRANCIS COLLEGE,  
JANUARY 24, 1969

HON. JOHN J. ROONEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. ROONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, I seek to rectify an error on my part. St. Francis College in Brooklyn, N.Y., of which I am proud to be an alumnus, presents annually a Distinguished Service Award. I was extremely gratified to be the first recipient of this award. It was presented to me at a luncheon on January 24, 1969. At the luncheon I promised Rev. Brother Urban Gononoud, O.S.F., president, St. Francis College, to insert my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for distribution to the alumni. Having failed to do so at the time, I now include them.

I must confess that it was indeed a pleasure at that time to visit a college where values and a desire for an education were still intact. I salute the faculty, the students, and graduates of St. Francis. My remarks follow:

Reverend Brother Urban, members of the Council of Regents, distinguished alumni and guests, gentlemen:

It is a real pleasure to join so many old friends. That pleasure is intensified because of the signal honor you are bestowing upon me today. To have one's public service recognized by an institution of higher learning is always a welcome happening. To have one's own alma mater confer an honor upon you is an even more gratifying experience. Somehow it refutes the long accepted premise "that a prophet is without honor among his own people." I am truly proud to have my beloved St. Francis College extend this Award to me today.

Over the years I have maintained great admiration for this College. I have been proud of its traditions and its own long history of public service.

It has been gratifying to see that year after year for these many years, St. Francis has not deviated from its objective to seek the maximum development of the student for responsible citizenship and moral integrity. St. Francis has achieved that objective by an unswerving program for training every student's intellect and by disciplining his will.

St. Francis can well be proud of its distinguished alumni, so many of whom have followed careers of public service. The facul-

ty members of St. Francis can be proud of their relationship with their students which has been such as to inspire 70 percent of the graduates to continue their education in graduate or professional schools. The fact that almost three-fourths of the graduates of St. Francis could be and are accepted by the leading institutions in America offering graduate courses is in itself a tribute to the high academic standards which Brother Urban and his fine faculty and staff have maintained.

I am proud too of my Alma Mater that it has not been the scene of violence and mass misbehavior of its almost 2,000 students. This lack of sit-ins, demonstrations, strikes and other disruptive practices becoming so widespread among our colleges and universities is not entirely the result of the lack of resident facilities on our campus. It results primarily from the fact that our students and their parents appreciate both the need for the best possible education attainable and the quality of training which St. Francis affords the students fortunate enough to be accepted.

My friends, I am both saddened and resentful over the irresponsible actions of a small but very articulate minority of our American college students who succeed in disrupting college and university programs and activities. I regret that serious young Americans, ambitious to learn and improve themselves are thwarted in their efforts to acquire all that faculties and academic fellowship can offer—thwarted because of a small group of immature and irresponsible trouble-makers. I resent the situation that tolerates the ridicule and humiliation of some of our foremost and world renowned educational leaders and public servants by a small disruptive group led by equally irresponsible individuals many of whom possess questionable character and motives.

My friends, I am so concerned about the adverse effect these minority groups are having upon our institutions of higher learning that I am seriously contemplating proposing the establishment of a Select Committee of the United States Congress to give careful attention to what is taking place on so many campuses today.

We in the Congress have an unquestioned right to study this cancerous growth not only because of our stewardship responsibilities related to the broad federal subsidies to higher education, but from the standpoint of safeguarding our American institutions and the American public from what appears to be the implementation of a sinister plan for increased civil disobedience and to engender mass revolt. I am convinced that government at all levels, federal, state and municipal, as well as the governing process of college and universities themselves must be strengthened at once to assure that every student who wants to study and learn has an unrestricted opportunity to do so. Students who along with their parents have saved and scrimped, even to sacrificing to finance a college education, should not have their financial investment imperiled by a small disruptive element of misguided campus agitators.

I fully sympathize with students desiring to have greater voice in the rules which govern them. Students deserve to be heard as to curriculum changes or additions. All of this can be achieved through established procedures which are predicated upon mutual respect and dignity of purpose. A college administration which denies the students such privileges and the rights of petition merits the articulate wrath of its students. Fortunately there are few of such undemocratic institutions in our great land today.

I would comment upon another great change which has been taking place throughout our colleges and universities over the past decade or so. I am delighted that our young people, men and women, alike are

injecting themselves into the study of and personal participation in politics.

For far too long our students were lethargic, complacent and almost totally insulated from the political scene and the great issues which faced the voters of America. For far too long our faculties and educators generally considered it improper or even unethical to engage in any activities of a political nature. Pedagogues and students alike stood aloof and even looked down upon the political process and abhorred the people known as politicians. A professor who ran for public office was a "maverick." One who invited political discussions in his classroom was labeled a radical or a "Red."

Today this picture has had a vast change and faculty members and students alike are in the vanguard of our thinking, "doing citizens" who want to see our precious democratic rights and privileges achieve the utmost for our nation.

The President of St. Francis College, our respected and beloved Brother Urban, is one who has long responded to the demands of civic participation. He has shunned the limelight of the political arena but has nevertheless exerted a telling influence both among political candidates and voters. His interests have not been confined to the local scene but he has seen fit to have his voice heard on a much broader scale.

I was personally thrilled with Brother Urban's appearance in the Nation's Capital where in a dignified ceremony at the White House, he presented our great retired President Lyndon Baines Johnson with an Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws.

My friends, in closing I want to say again how very proud I am to be a Regent of St. Francis College; I want to say how very privileged I am to have had the friendship of Brother Urban, many members of this faculty and so many fine alumni; and I want to say once more how truly honored I feel to have been chosen for this award. I shall cherish it always.

EMPLOYMENT OF SENIOR CITIZENS  
ON PUBLIC PROJECTS

HON. BEN REIFEL

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. REIFEL. Mr. Speaker, through programs that have employed senior citizens on public projects we have seen that public service employment can be efficient and constructive. We have also seen that older people urgently desire the opportunity to work. I support this bill in the belief that such programs could be continued or expanded to give more senior citizens a rewarding way in which to increase their incomes. Programs like Green Thumb, which operates in my State, should be continued or expanded.

Include the following:

GREEN THUMB, INC., NATIONAL FARMERS  
UNION

Provides older, retired low income farmers with: Useful work, extra income, a new start.

Twenty million persons in America today are 65 or older. A great number of them live on incomes that are too low to keep body and soul together. Through no fault of their own, they find themselves in situations where job prospects are rare. Most are unable to find work. They feel useless and rejected, abandoned and forgotten. Under these conditions, their health declines, their bills pile up, and their situation worsens. Green Thumb provides employment for older, retired people



with rural background; it helps them not with a handout but with an opportunity to work their way out of poverty.

#### WHAT IS GREEN THUMB?

Green Thumb is an employment program sponsored by the National Farmers Union under a grant from the U.S. Department of Labor as part of the Nelson-Laird Mainstream programs. It now employs over 2,000 in 14 states. They are Arkansas, Indiana, Kentucky, Minnesota, Nebraska, New Jersey, New York, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, South Dakota, Utah, Virginia, and Wisconsin.

#### WHAT IS ITS PURPOSE?

Its purpose is to employ older, retired, low income persons to beautify highways, build parks, and carry out conservation and community betterment projects.

#### WHO IS ELIGIBLE?

To qualify, a person must be at least 55 years old, must have a farming or rural community background, and be below the poverty level. He must pass a physical examination.

#### HOW MUCH CAN A WORKER EARN?

Each worker works 3 days a week at \$1.60 an hour. This working arrangement brings him a yearly income of \$1500. The average family income of Green Thumb workers before joining the program was \$900.00 per year. Therefore, the \$1500 he earns under the Green Thumb program provides the added income that he needs, to enable him to work his way out of poverty.

#### HOW ARE WORKERS SELECTED?

Local community action agencies and organizations assist in recruiting prospective workers. These agencies refer the applicants to the employment service office in the state. The employment service office screens them for age, income and background. Green Thumb hires the oldest in the group and those with the lowest income.

#### WHAT KIND OF TRAINING DO WORKERS RECEIVE?

After they are hired, the workers spend their first day on the job attending a day of classroom-type instruction on safety and efficiency. A continuous attempt is made to orient them in the things they need to know about the job during the year they are on the job.

#### DO WORKERS WORK IN GROUPS?

Green Thumb workers work in crews of about 7, one of whom is designated as crew foreman. The foreman earns \$1.85 per hour and can earn up to \$1,700 per year.

#### WHAT ABOUT TRANSPORTATION TO JOB SITES?

Crews are organized into car pools, and the drivers of these car pools are reimbursed at the rate of 8¢ per mile from the first pick-up point, to the job site and back to the first pick-up point.

#### ARE WORKERS COVERED BY INSURANCE?

While on a job, each worker is protected by Workmen's Compensation and Disability Insurance. He also has a general liability protection.

#### WHAT IF A WORKER HAS A GRIEVANCE?

Any worker who has a grievance or a complaint may discuss it with his foreman, his field supervisor, or state Green Thumb director. If he fails to get satisfaction from such discussions, he has a right for a hearing by the National Green Thumb Grievance Committee.

#### HOW DO AGENCIES GET TO PARTICIPATE?

Local government agencies may request to participate in a Green Thumb project in a Green Thumb state by writing the state Green Thumb office describing the proposed project in detail.

#### WHAT DO LOCAL AGENCIES PROVIDE?

Local agencies must provide all materials, including plantings, lumber, heavy equipment, cement and other necessary materials.

While GT provides supervision, the local agency should oversee the project.

#### WHAT TYPE OF PROJECTS ARE THERE TO DO?

Any type of beautification projects, conservation or community betterment projects, on any publicly owned land, or land owned by a non-profit organization.

#### HOW MUCH OF THE FUNDS GO TO WORKERS?

A good 83% of the program funds go to the workers.

#### SOME OF THE AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS NOW WORKING WITH GREEN THUMB

Department of highways.  
State Parks and Conservation Dept.  
State Forests.  
County Commissioner's Office.  
County Park Dept.  
City Park Dept.  
Local Historical Societies.  
Senior Citizen and Community Centers.

#### GREEN THUMB FIELD OFFICES

P.O. Box 4241, Asher Avenue Station, Little Rock, Arkansas 72204—(501) 663-1771.  
Vehslage Bldg., 3rd & Chestnut Sts., Seymour, Indiana 47274—(812) 522-7930.  
P.O. Box A, Main Street, Beattyville, Ky. 41311—(606) 464-8611.  
P.O. Box 310, Wadena, Minn. 56482—(218) 631-3483.  
640 N. 48th Street, Lincoln, Nebraska 68504—(402) 466-2206.  
Trenton Trust Bldg., Rm. 702, Trenton, N.J. 08608—(609) 393-8958.  
23 Main St., Cobleskill, N.Y. 12043—(518) 234-3581.  
1141 West Sheridan, Okla. City, Okla. 73106—(405) 232-2044.  
215 Front St. N.E., Salem, Oregon 97301—(503) 585-2433.  
Post Office Bldg., Sandy Lake, Pa., 16145—(412) 376-5461.  
513 South Main Ave., Room 404, Sioux Falls, S.D. 57104—(605) 332-7991.  
2520 S. State Street, Room 170, Salt Lake City, Utah 84115—(801) 484-2724.  
Marshall Bldg., Main Street, Blackstone, Va. 23824—(703) 292-3698.  
Clark County Courthouse, Room 209, Neillsville, Wis., 54456—(715) 743-3036.  
For more information on Green Thumb or Green Light, contact your local Green Thumb office.

#### TRAINED TO DO EVERYTHING BUT FIGHT

### HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, November 17, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert in the *Record* a very interesting article which appeared in the February edition of the United States Naval Institute Proceedings. The author is Maj. John Alger, retired, who has an excellent background in the field of military history.

The article deals with the previous attempt to bring about an all volunteer Army in 1947. Major Alger relates the findings of the "Doolittle Commission" and the results which were achieved by following the recommendations of this study group. It was found at the beginning of the Korean war that the revision of the training procedures which had taken place in order to make the Armed Forces more attractive to potential recruits had resulted in soldiers who were trained to do everything but fight.

Since we do not want to repeat this error, I would advise all who are considering the possibility of a volunteer Armed Forces, to carefully study Major Alger's findings. We must not sacrifice the quality of our Armed Forces in an attempt to recruit. This is especially true of changes in training which adversely effect the discipline of the troops. As George Washington so rightly pointed out about discipline—

It is the soul of an army. It makes small numbers formidable; procures success to the weak, and esteem to all.

If our forces are going to be reduced in number it is apparent that the discipline of the smaller forces must be all the higher to compensate for the reduction in numbers.

Many feel that ending the draft will go a long way toward restoring harmony in our Nation. This is questionable since the draft has been in continuous existence since 1940, with the exception of 1947-48, while the strife we witness today is of a more recent vintage. Whatever the case, let us not allow our desire for internal peace to replace a sober analysis of what training procedures are necessary to produce forces that can adequately defend the Nation.

The article follows:

#### THE OBJECTIVE WAS A VOLUNTEER ARMY

(By Maj. John Alger)

In 1946, the U.S. armed forces were receiving the full blast of the anti-military criticism that has followed the ending of every American war.

In response to the clamor to "bring the boys home," more than six million men had been discharged in the nine months following VJ-day, but criticism of the military was increasing in the press and on the radio. In the past, the complaints had ended as wartime forces were demobilized and the country returned to its normal isolationism with professional volunteer forces reduced to a minimum.

The post-World War II situation was entirely new and disturbingly different. It was obvious that there could be no return to isolationism and that an army of at least a million men would be needed to provide occupation forces in Germany and Japan. It was also apparent that, with the prevailing mood of the American people, any attempt to put the Selective Service Act of 1945 into effect would be political suicide.

People wanted to forget the draft and the war. A volunteer army was the only answer. And so, with the tide of anti-military complaints still rising, Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson appointed a six-member board, in a memorandum dated 18 March 1946, instructed to study officer/enlisted man relationships and to make recommendations for changes in existing practices, laws, and regulations to the Secretary of War.

The Board was instructed to concern itself with an examination of complaints of lack of democracy in the Army, instances of incompetent leadership, and the abuse of privileges. Information was to be obtained from former soldiers' written statements, from recorded interviews of witnesses appearing before the Board, magazine and newspaper articles and letters received by the Board, and radio commentary. In addition, the War Department furnished the Board detailed information on the differential treatment accorded officers and enlisted men.

All six members of the Board were former enlisted men, including Lieutenant General James H. ("Jimmy") Doolittle, the Chairman, and hero of the first bomber raid over Tokyo, and Lieutenant General (Retired) Troy H. Middleton, former commander of the Army's

45th Division and VIII Corps. It was noted by the skeptical that no graduate of the U.S. Military Academy was included. Other members were:

Robert Neville, former lieutenant colonel, who had been on the staff of *Yank* magazine as an enlisted man and later served as editor of *Stars and Stripes* in Italy.

Adna H. Underhill, a former platoon sergeant and captain, who had been commissioned from Officer Candidate School, and had been awarded the Silver Star for combat at Anzio.

Jake W. Lindsey, former technical sergeant, who was the hundredth infantryman to win the Medal of Honor in World War II.

Meryl M. Frost, former sergeant, who had been seriously wounded in Italy. After 18 months recuperating in Army hospitals, he returned to Dartmouth College to win the Philadelphia Sportswriters' Award as the most courageous athlete of 1945.

The report begins with a statement of the Board's purpose, followed by a historical note to the effect that, although the American military system is derived from the Prussian and the British armies, the phrase "caste system" cannot be appropriately applied to it, since the selection of individuals for commissioned rank is based on democratic principles. Nevertheless, the Board cited instances of strained relationships during the Revolutionary War, Civil War, and World War I. The causes were alleged to be resentment of "aristocratic" rank and privileges that had no significance or value, and the officers' lack of interest in the welfare of enlisted men.

After World War II, the complaints reflected the higher educational levels of the enlisted men, which made them much more critical of both their officers and noncommissioned officers. This attitude had also been commented upon after World War I, in a report by the Secretary of War and, in the wake of World War II, the Board's report stated, "similar reaction to the military establishment is appearing. Concurrently with widespread discussions of demobilization, enlistment and re-enlistment in the armed services, the extension of the Draft Act, universal military training, unification of the military services, and a host of other problems, involving both Army and Navy and their relation to international issues, much is being written and spoken on the subject of officer/enlisted man relationships."

Commenting on complaints of lack of democracy in the Army, the report explained and to some extent defended, rank and privilege.

"Those . . . who understood the mission or objective of an Army whether in peacetime or in an emergency, did not argue for the abolition of rank or privileges in the military service."

"A review of the Russian experience with their own military system during and after the Revolution in the winter of 1917-1918, when the Red Army abolished rank and privileges, brings to light the fact recognition was not given by the Russians at that time to the essentials referred to in the preceding paragraph. In subsequent revamping of their military system in terms of these basic principles, the pendulum swung in the other direction and the Russian officer corps now has greater prestige and privileges than before the reorganization was attempted and far more than is accorded officers in our Army."

Having considered the testimony of the 61 witnesses who appeared in person and the more than a thousand letters received, the Board reported that the official gap, established by regulations and tradition, between officers and enlisted men was the basis of the majority of complaints and unfavorable criticism. In this connection, a report of the American Institute of Public Opinion, published 3 May 1946, was quoted, stating that

72 per cent of a cross-section of the nation said "good idea" in answer to the question, "Do you think it would be a good idea if Army officers and enlisted men had the same food, clubs and social privileges?" Officers were reported to be about equally divided on the question, but 80 per cent of former enlisted men favored eliminating special privileges for officers. Also quoted was an Army survey, made after VJ-day, which had reported that 79 per cent of the enlisted men questioned agreed with the following statement: "An officer will not lose the respect of his men if he pals around with them off duty."

With such evidence at hand, and apparently accepted without question, the Doolittle Board set about the task of planning a new type of democratic army, attractive to volunteers and in some respect similar to the proletarian Red army criticized in its own report.

Under the heading, "An Advanced Concept," it was stated that both the testimony of witnesses and letters received recommended a new system of personnel organization that would erase the line between officers and enlisted men. The new plan called for a gradual rise from the lowest to the highest rank in the Army, with each step up the scale involving an increase in duties, responsibilities, and authority. Selection of individuals for any position in the scale would be made only by competitive examinations. Promotions would also depend on the passing of examinations.

Under the proposed plan, it was stated, "the pay scale would correspond to that which now prevails in the most advanced personnel management systems in the field of business and industry. Monetary allowances would be on a graduated basis but factors other than rank will govern the amounts granted at each level in the scale."

This new pay-as-you-grow plan would not only provide incentive for advancement, and motivation to follow the military service as a career, it would also prevent any possibility of incompetents getting into positions of responsibility. It was admitted that the new approach would require a complete revision of Army regulations, "and a breakdown of many customs and traditions."

In its conclusions the Board admitted that there had been complaints against the military establishment after other American wars, and attributed them to the "distaste of citizens in our democracy for a regimented life in which an individual to some extent loses his identity." And, because the majority who served were drafted—many against their will—much of the general criticism could have been expected.

"Americans look with disfavor," the report continued, "upon any system which grants unearned privileges to a particular class of individuals and find distasteful any tendency to make arbitrary social distinctions between two parts of the Army." To the skeptical, this seemed a curiously illogical statement in view of such highly prized American status symbols as membership in exclusive college fraternities, residence in an exclusive and expensive community, and membership in an exclusive country club. However, the Doolittle Board's all-out aim to please was indicated in its recommendations. After two paragraphs, of one sentence each, stating that we must have an Army "modern, economical, efficient and effective" maintaining "the control and discipline, which are essential to the success of any military institution;" the first objective mentioned was maintenance of morale so that "people returning from combat duty or service in the military establishment return in the best possible mental, moral, physical, and spiritual condition. Conditions must be such as to create in the mind of the soldier a favorable impression of the military service and of

the government." It was further stated that the Army of the future should provide "improvement of the character, the knowledge, and the competence of its members."

And, what, if any, would be the role of the officer in this new and improved Army? Repeating the vague phrase, "conditions must be such," the Board stated that the officer corps must be improved so that it would merit the respect of soldiers and civilians alike. To achieve this goal, emphasis was again placed on competitive examinations, much closer supervision by commanders, and "measures to assure freedom from individual prejudice, favoritism and political pressure."

The democratic nature of the New Army was indicated in paragraph 12 of the recommendations which provided that:

"The hand salute be abandoned off all Army installations and off duty, except in occupied territories and under conditions where the procedure might be deemed necessary to properly convey military dignity to local populations, but be employed in all official greetings in the line of duty and continue to be manifest at ceremonial occasions and when the national anthem is played or the colors pass by. That necessary steps be taken to eliminate the terms and concepts, 'enlisted men' and 'officers,' that suitable substitutes be employed—e.g., members of the commissioned corps, members of the noncommissioned corps, etc.—and that all military personnel be referred to as 'soldiers'."

Warning that length of military service seems to divorce military personnel from the civilian outlook, and that close contact and association with civilians must be maintained, paragraph 13 states that a maximum of military personnel living in civilian communities, rather than on Army posts, would aid in maintaining "the mutual exchange of information necessary in a citizens' Army."

The report also called for the abolishment of all statutes, regulations, customs, and traditions which discourage or forbid social associations of soldiers of similar likes and tastes because of military rank.

The Doolittle Board's report concluded with the suggestion that further study be made of accumulated materials for the purpose of extracting additional ideas worthy of acceptance.

Following the War Department's publication of the report of the Doolittle Board, an intensive recruiting campaign for the "New Army" was launched with the slogan "Make It A Million." One unforgettable poster showed a young man smiling happily and bore the message "In the New Army your son's personality will be respected." Other posters stressed pleasures of free travel overseas and the chance to learn a trade.

The Board having directed that the soldier's morale was to be maintained by improving him mentally, morally, physically, and spiritually, training schedules soon indicated that more time was being spent at lectures and in class rooms than on the drill field.

For mental improvement there were troop information and education lectures on prescribed subjects such as "The Soviet Constitution," "The New England States," and "Mexico, Our Southern Neighbor." The value of this information to riflemen was not explained.

As this was to be an Army of specialists, there was increased emphasis on special schools to which soldiers were sent to learn skills previously learned by on-the-job training in their own units. Instead of reporting to the company supply sergeant to learn to be a supply clerk, the New Army soldier would attend a six weeks course in Administration and Supply at the Quartermaster School. Upon completion of the course, he



would return to his unit with an official document verifying his new status and—if he was an eager beaver—notes on the latest theories on supply procedure for the edification of his supply sergeant.

There were schools for clerk-typists, bakers, cooks, warehouse clerks, and chaplains' assistants, to name only a few. Soon there were soldiers who had a number of schools on their record, some because they found classroom life more attractive than winter maneuvers in Germany and others because their company commanders could get rid of them for from four to eight weeks by sending them to school.

The Articles of War defining military offenses and the penalties for them, formerly read to the troops, were completely revised and superseded by The Uniform Code of Military Justice. The new code provided for enlisted men on a court-martial board when the accused was an enlisted man and requested them. This seemingly democratic gesture backfired as it soon became apparent that professional noncommissioned officers on court-martial boards were frequently more severe than the officers. It was also soon apparent that the standards of conduct of the code are not as high as those of the Old Articles of War. Among officers, there was discussion of the old A. W. 95, reading: "Any officer, cadet or midshipman who is convicted of conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman shall be dismissed from the service." This was now modified to "... shall be punished as a court-martial shall direct." No longer would a false official statement or his signature on a false report result in inevitable dismissal. Nor would the officer's word of honor, in the form of a certificate, be accepted without question as it had been in the past.

For officers and noncommissioned officers long accustomed to accepting a way of life in which every individual's status was clearly defined, adjustment to the new democratic Army was difficult and, for many, impossible. Disciplinary authority was taken away from junior officers and company commanders. No longer was the "Old Man," the company commander, the unchallenged leader with the right to promote and demote, and to reward and punish. Such matters now had to be approved by higher authority. At some posts company commanders were required to provide a suggestion box in the orderly room for the convenience of soldiers who had ideas for the improvement of the unit. There were also forms to be signed stating that the individual accepted company punishment and waived his right to demand a court-martial instead.

Hardest hit of all by the new concept of lecture-oriented training and relaxed standards of discipline were the older noncommissioned officers who, in the past, had been known as the backbone of the Regular Army. In order to create a favorable impression of the Army, as prescribed by the Doolittle Board, the traditional tough sergeant must now learn how to deal with the new type of soldiers whose personalities were to be respected. The sergeant must be a kindly father image who never used harsh or profane language. In refusing his company commander's plea to re-enlist, one old Army sergeant expressed the opinion of many of his kind: "No Sir! Uncle Sam can have my 18 years. I've been a sergeant too damn long to learn how to be a den mother."

At higher command levels attitudes towards the new doctrine of closer command supervision varied considerably. Some troop commanders still followed the old Army custom of not interfering with company, troop, and battery commanders whose units met required standards of performance. Others, anxious to show their enthusiasm for the "new approach," held company commanders' meetings at which recommendations ranged from advocating the democratic practice of calling cadre noncom-

missioned officers by their first names to holding regular "bull sessions," with noncommissioned officers not present, so that the men would feel free to make complaints and offer suggestions to the company commander.

No Army in history had ever been as well fed or as lavishly provided with recreational facilities and equipment. Feeding the troops was no longer entrusted to mess sergeants who now received detailed instructions for preparing the menus created by professional civilian nutrition experts. Special Service Officers procured and distributed athletic equipment of all kinds and supervised athletic activities. Overseas, young American ladies, recruited by Special Services, operated hobby shops offering instruction in leather working ("Make Mom a pocket-book"), guitar-playing, table tennis, and sponsoring bingo tournaments. If the young soldier did not return stateside a worthy bridegroom for the girl next door, it would not be for want of effort by Special Services. In spite of an intensive recruiting campaign and the best efforts of teachers, preachers, sociologists and psychologists to build an all-volunteer Army, there were less than 200,000 volunteers.

There had been very few draft calls in 1946, and in some months none at all. In March 1947, President Harry S. Truman, in his message to Congress stated that he thoroughly desired to see the armed forces on an all-volunteer basis at the earliest possible moment and he did not recommend an extension of the Selective Training and Service Act expiring on March 31 of that year. The draft law was not renewed and volunteer enlistments declined sharply. The era of postwar prosperity had arrived. Wages were high and jobs plentiful. Because of reductions in their authorized strength, the Navy and the Marine Corps had the advantage of being able to depend on voluntary enlistments, but the Army was in trouble.

A year after his recommendation that the draft law be allowed to expire, President Truman addressed a joint session of Congress requesting restoration of the draft and, in addition, the establishment of a system of "universal military training." All youth, at the age of 18, would serve a year on active duty in the armed forces followed by a period in the reserve forces. Congress turned down this proposal, but restored the draft. Volunteer enlistments increased immediately.

Although the Army had failed in its recruiting campaign for volunteers, the inducements offered to make Army life pleasant and comfortable remained in force. The relaxed standards of discipline, resulting from the "new approach" recommended by the Doolittle Board, together with the new emphasis on the rights and privileges of enlisted personnel produced results far different from those predicted by the Board. Inspector General officers were now available to hear all complaints and they were kept busy. With resumption of the draft a new type of complaint had to be dealt with. Instead of going to the Inspector General with their grievances, the disgruntled soldier soon discovered that a letter from a Congressman could be depended upon to get quick action. This was particularly effective when written by "Mom" on information furnished by her boy. The Congressman's letter, demanding an explanation, would be promptly answered by the commanding officer of the post where the complaining soldier was serving.

Restoration of the draft also resulted in a marked increase in the number of college students enrolled in the Reserve Officers Training Corps. Upon graduation from college they would be commissioned as second lieutenants in the Reserve and required to serve either six months or two years, on active duty, depending on the existing need for officers. But ROTC cadets were not subject to the draft. It was not long before the vast majority of lieutenants came from the ROTC,

and their status as temporary officers was not always enviable. Career NCOs regarded them skeptically as amateurs who would complete their required service before they learned how to be officers. Understandably, they were not popular with college graduates who had been drafted.

For four years the Army seemed to be functioning effectively with many, but not all, of the Doolittle Board's recommendations in effect. Never before had so many soldiers been trained as cooks, bakers, clerk-typists, radio repair men, stock clerks, and chaplains' assistants.

The effort to recruit volunteers for the Regular Army was now concentrated on draftees who were urged to "Go R.A." for a guaranteed choice of assignment and increased opportunities for specialized training.

Public information and troop information activities were increased at the same time that tactical formations were being reduced for reasons of economy. Infantry regiments were reduced from three battalions to two, with one rifle company dropped from each regiment and one battery eliminated from each unit of division artillery. Worn-out World War II equipment was not being replaced. There were many field radios that would not work, vehicles that would have to be towed to the LSTs when the time came to move out to Pusan, mortars for which there was no ammunition and bazooka missiles that would splatter harmlessly against the armor of Russian-built tanks.

When, on 25 June 1950, the North Korean People's Army attacked across the 38th Parallel, routing the American trained South Korean Army, hastily assembled American units could not stop them. By the end of August, U.S. forces had retreated to the "Pusan Perimeter" at the southeast tip of the Korean peninsula.

Ejected suddenly from the soft life of the occupation army in Japan the troops had not been adequately prepared mentally or physically for war in Korea or anywhere else. They were not to blame when they did not live up to the combat traditions of the Regular Army. As one skeptic remarked, "They were trained for everything but war." There were many instances of individual bravery which were play up by the press, with less frequent references to a new term, "bug out."

While the Army had been experimenting with troop information lectures and the new psychological approach to disciplinary problems, the Marines continued to maintain their traditional standards based on strict discipline and rigorous combat training. The reduction in their authorized strength had proved to be a blessing in disguise, for they were again an all-volunteer force with a simple message for the recruit: "Shape up or ship out. We didn't ask you to join us."

After Korea, the pendulum of Army policy began to swing back in the direction of traditional concepts of discipline and leadership. In due time, there appeared a new type of "Specialist" who wore a campaign hat as the distinctive insignia of the group of experts to which he belonged. The first members of the group had been trained by Marines, who wore the same hat and had been known for years as Drill Instructors. They were all volunteers.

## THE VETERANS OF FOREIGN WARS

HON. JOHN N. ERLBORN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. ERLBORN. Mr. Speaker, a most extraordinary record of service to the United States and of encouragement to

the young men who must represent us in the military services around the world is being made by the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Department of Illinois, Fifth District.

The commander of the Fifth District is Richard K. Anderson, and the Americanism chairman, under whose guidance much of this fine record has been made, is James C. Alsbrook.

In 1967, the Fifth District won the Freedom Foundation gold medal—the George Washington Honor Medal for its community programs. It was awarded the Freedom Foundation's certificate in 1968. In 1969, the Fifth District won the National VFW silver plaque for its service; and the Community Activities Award of Excellence was presented by the VFW national office this year.

Mr. Speaker, these veterans are doing what they can to foster love of country, and to encourage loyalty to our Nation's institutions and its lofty ideals. Some citizens are discouraged, declaring that we do not live up to our Nation's ideals.

These veterans, however, have served the United States on foreign fields, have known adversity, and some have known an imminence of death. They are not discouraged. They know that man can best live for himself if he also lives for his country.

H.R. 18970—TRADE ACT OF 1970

**HON. CHARLES M. TEAGUE**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Speaker, I call to the attention of my colleagues the following telegram I received from my constituent, Lt. Col. George S. Smith, retired, of Lompoc, Calif.:

Reference: Mills House Bill 18970, Trade Act of 1970.

As a retired USAF officer and now small businessman I wish to state my opposition to this bill which has been attached as a rider to social security legislation.

1. If the bill is to be given proper consideration and debate it should be handled separately and not deceptively included in unrelated legislation that could otherwise pass on its own merit.

2. The democratic and economic principles of this country have found one of their greatest strengths in a free enterprise system with a minimum of government regulation. These principles are not the sole possession of the United States. It is as wrong today to build trade barriers between the world community as it was when the original thirteen states attempted to do the like between themselves. The problems that stemmed from this action by the original states is a matter of history; strife, discontent, polarization of interest, and armed skirmishes. History has proven that nations that have a strong mutual interest in economic intercourse only face each other across the market square and never across the battlefield. Would Japan have gone to war with us in 1941 if they had enjoyed the trade relationship with us then that they have now? Protectionism of the market place now just to maintain the spiral of wages and profits could well be paid for with the blood of our sons in the future.

3. Protective tariffs and quotas on imports are actions that create reactions that create divisions in the world community. They are also a poor substitute for a product that competes on the basis of quality, workmanship and price. When protection is included in by a government the consumer suffers in shoddy goods and products. Both management and labor have a mutual responsibility to produce a competitively priced quality product that is available for the consumer on the world market. If they can't bake a better cake, they should either get out of the kitchen or reevaluate their demands for profits and wages that continuously widen the gap between foreign and domestic labor and capital return.

4. Myself and many of my colleagues strongly urge opposition to this dangerous proposed legislation.

GEORGE S. SMITH,

Lieutenant Colonel, USAF, Retired.

LOMPOC, CALIF.

## THE HUMAN COST OF COMMUNISM

**HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, an unsuspecting public, to whom most antagonistic reports concerning communism are suppressed, has never been told the staggering costs inflicted upon the human race by Communist leaders in their mad obsession to force their system to work.

To date, an estimated 21.5 million people have been executed or otherwise killed by Soviet Communists since their revolution. This estimate does not include the millions who continue to live in slavery, denied every vestige of human rights and dignity as an individual under an oligarchic collective state. Nor do these casualties include the Communist victims of Red China, Cuba, Vietnam, and Korea.

In fact, it is suggested by some that a minimum estimate of human lives lost in Communist aggression for world conquest is between 35 and 45 million to date.

Those who know communism have seen its false promises and repeated failures and know firsthand that it is a distortion and perversion of humanity under which no free society can survive.

Juanita Castro, sister of the dictator, Fidel, has said that "Fidel broke all ties with the family. He declared that family ties came only from animal instincts."

Communism can never work until all individuals are denuded of man's God-given intelligence and aspiration to be free and reduced to the state of subservient animals.

No American who knows the truth about communism could ever choose communism over our present system of government.

Several related news stories follow:

### STATISTICS OF COMMUNIST KILLINGS

CHRISTIAN ANTI-COMMUNISM CRUSADE,  
Long Beach, Calif., November 15, 1970.

Under the title "The Human Cost of Soviet Communism" the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has produced a documented record of the number of human lives

exterminated by the communists during the consolidation of their conquest of Russia.

The report has been compiled by Robert Conquest who is the leading British authority on the communist world. His academic qualifications are impeccable. He has held fellowships in Soviet politics at the London School of Economics and Columbia University. Recently he wrote the book "The Great Terror" which is a definitive account of the purge trials and mass executions carried out by Joseph Stalin. Concerning this book, Bernard Levin in the Daily Mail writes:

"... A passionate objectivity, a deadly sense of justice... an ability to marshal and present facts... I know of no modern history with which it can be compared... Robert Conquest deserves the thanks of humanity."

He concludes that at least 21.5 million persons have been executed or otherwise killed by Soviet Communism since the revolution. He classifies the deaths under Soviet rule as follows:

"Executed or died in prison camps during the postrevolution period (1919-23)-----	500,000
Executed during the Stalin terror-----	2,000,000
Died in camps during the pre-Yehov period of Stalin's rule (1930-36)-----	3,500,000
Died in forced labor camps during the Stalin-Yehov terror (1936-38)-----	12,000,000
Died in the politically organized famine during the forced collectivization of the thirties-----	3,500,000
Total-----	21,500,000"

Mr. Conquest points out that this is a conservative estimate which is almost certainly too low and that the real figure might very well be 50 per cent greater than this.

He does not include in this tabulation the deaths caused by the civil war, 1919-1921. During this war 9 million lives were lost from military action, executions, typhus, and famine while the great famine of 1921, which followed the civil war, cost another 5 million lives.

If these figures were added, a minimum estimate of human lives lost is 35 million while 45 million is more probable.

The principal source of information used by Mr. Conquest are reports published by the Russian authorities and eye-witness accounts written by survivors of prison camps.

The net result of this incredible slaughter is the Soviet Union today. Instead of being the promised paradise, it is a totalitarian state where a ruthless political elite seeks to perpetuate itself in power and to order every aspect of the people's lives.

The original communist conquerors of Russia promised abundance. The reality they have created is a state-owned system of agriculture which, by destroying human motivation, has saddled the Soviet Union with the most backward and unproductive agriculture in any major nation.

The communist conquerors promised that they would produce a new superior man. This new man would produce artistic and cultural works of transcendent value. The reality is an artistic wasteland where literature and art are reduced to instruments of communist propaganda and where those brave individuals who seek to express their true artistic identity are sentenced to prison or forced labor or the insane asylum.

Mr. Conquest points out that the great majority of the murders were not forced on the communists by the opposition of their opponents or committed in the heat of battle. They are the direct consequences of communist philosophy and doctrine. Long before the communists seized Russia, they had con-



vinced themselves that a large segment of the bourgeoisie was intrinsically and incurably evil and should be eliminated. They had extolled mass terror and praised those who had used it. Consequently the record of merciless brutality is not a perversion of communism but its fulfillment.

[From VFW magazine, November 1970]

#### ALONG THE RED FRONT

(By Donald L. Miller)

KYOTO, JAPAN.—Mists clung in the notches and fringed the ridges of the mountains at the edge of this ancient city. Inside the famous Miyako Hotel, looking out at this typical Japanese scene, I talked with Juanita Castro about her brother, Fidel.

"Fidel broke all ties with the family," she was saying. "He declared that family ties came only from animal instincts. He said his only brothers and sisters were Communists."

"Fidel may be a hero to misguided radical youth in America and here in Japan, but the young people are wrong about him. No one has the right to hold the destinies of other people in his hands, least of all Fidel."

"He causes disruption. He attracts violence. He deceives people with promises of good things and produces only failures and human tragedies."

"The goal of the Cuban people is to get rid of Fidel and of Fidelismo. This is a Cuban problem. We know it. But we also need the moral and financial help of other people. They, too, will benefit if Cuba gets rid of Communists."

Miss Castro talked about the missiles in Cuba and the training camps for guerrilla fighters from many countries in Asia and America. "No country in the Western Hemisphere can feel secure while Communists are in Cuba," she said.

What kind of man is Fidel? His parents were well-to-do, good citizens like the parents of many of today's student radicals. But Fidel disrupted nearly everything he touched. He was destructive and ambitious. So he became a guerilla and sold his soul to Moscow secretly in exchange for Soviet support. Now Cuba is nothing but a military vassal of the Soviet Union.

Fidel gained power at the start by promising a change from Batista, land to the people, an end to corruption and support for small business. Those who were deceived by such promises into supporting Fidel were the first to be liquidated once he gained power. He wanted no obstacles to limit his total rule.

His appeal was to two kinds of people. First, those who believe promises and shut their eyes to facts. Second, Fidel drew to himself those who like violence and seek to impose their own total power over others.

Young people who look up to such a man are either confused or spiritually sick. Miss Castro said, "Such young people do not know Fidel as I do. They do not know Communism as only one who has lived under it can know it. Their confusion and sickness must be cured or they will bring tragedy to themselves as Fidel brought tragedy to the Cuban people."

Miss Castro had come to Japan to speak at the fourth conference of the World Anti-Communist League which this year received messages of encouragement from Japan's Prime Minister Eisaku Sato, Korea's President Chung Hee Park and U.S. Vice President Spiro T. Agnew. Sen. Strom Thurmond delivered the principal address.

[From Human Events, Nov. 21, 1970]

#### THE BALTIC FLIGHT

(By Russell Kirk)

Now and again I wonder why certain Americans, who accuse the Greek military junta of brutality and lament our roughness with the Viet Cong, seem to have forgotten altogether the dreadful plight of the Estonians, Latvians and Lithuanians. The in-

dependence de jure of those countries still is recognized by Washington, but the very survival of the Baltic peoples is menaced by Soviet Russian tyranny.

In America, all three Baltic national groups maintain vigorous cultural and political associations; and I hear often from readers, escaped from Russian domination or destruction, who keep alive in this country the hope of national freedom. Recently I received a copy of the proceedings of the First Conference on Baltic Studies (obtainable from the Association for the Advancement of Baltic Studies, Pacific Lutheran University, Tacoma, Wash.).

This volume contains some 50 interesting papers, divided into groups: communism and nationalism in the Baltic republics; the Baltic people and the Soviet Union; modern Baltic history; the contemporary religious situation in the Baltic states; postwar Baltic literature; problems in Baltic linguistics; postwar economic developments; scientific developments in the Baltics; proposals for the advancement of Baltic studies—even of a Baltic university, perhaps at Chicago.

The Rev. Joseph Prunskis' succinct essay on "The Religious Situation in Soviet Occupied Lithuania" may suffice to suggest the ghastly misrule inflicted by the Russian Communists upon those submerged republics. During the era of Stalin, Dr. Prunskis records, some 30,000 Lithuanians were either killed or exiled. One bishop was shot, a hundred priests were imprisoned, and 180 priests deported. About 145,000 Lithuanians still are kept in Siberia, a quarter of a century after the Soviet conquest.

"The Soviet war against religion was continued during the Khrushchev era," Father Prunski writes. "The occupational regime closed 424 churches and chapels. Children and young people under 18 were strictly forbidden to study religion. At the beginning of 1967, students in the secondary schools had to fill out a 16-item questionnaire."

"Some of the questions were: 'Are there any religious-minded people in your family?' 'Do the members of your family attend church?' etc. The Bolsheviks are thus forcing students to denounce their own parents, brothers, and sisters—to be spies for the occupiers."

Between 1940 and 1968, four bishops and about 170 priests were martyred in Lithuania. Communist persecution of Christians is equally ferocious in predominantly Lutheran Estonia and Latvia. Lutheran churches destroyed or badly damaged during World War II have not been replaced; the Lutheran cathedral in Riga has been converted into a concert hall.

Yet the Baltic cultures are not totally crushed. Discussing Soviet Latvian literature, Dr. Rolf Ekmanis remarks that "nationalist loyalties have survived more than two decades of intense Sovietization. Latvian literature, like every non-Russian Soviet literature, has become an arena for the struggle over national self-preservation against censorship and victimization. It also reveals . . . that Moscow's policy of colonization of the national republics has led not to friendship but to hostility."

As Jonah—the symbol of Jewish endurance in captivity—survived in the whale, so the Baltic peoples may yet outlive the merciless crew of ideologues in the Kremlin. They deserve the prayers of all of us.

HON. G. ROBERT WATKINS

HON. DAN ROSTENKOWSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. ROSTENKOWSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very great and good man passed away

last summer, a man who was truly a man of the people he represented. I believe that is how Bob Watkins will be remembered, as one who gave of himself, heart and soul, all of his life following the Gospel's plea to "love thy neighbor." He will be remembered not only for what he was—a kind man, beloved by all who knew him for his warmth, and loyalty, and for his sensitivity to the needs and feelings of others.

Bob Watkins' sense of humor, his directness, his friendship for one and all, were capacities that few of us in this body have, and certainly none of us have exceeded.

Bob Watkins' sudden passing leaves us with a void that will not be easily filled. The people of the Ninth District of Pennsylvania have lost a great leader and we all have lost a fine friend. Mr. Speaker, for my wife La Verne and myself, I would like to offer my deepest sympathy to Congressman Watkins' wife and two sons.

#### RESPONSIBILITY CLEAR

HON. JAMES HARVEY

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. HARVEY. Mr. Speaker, at a time when House and Senate conferees are meeting to resolve differences between the legislation enacted as the 1970 amendments to the Clean Air Act, H.R. 17255, a comprehensive speech by Edward N. Cole, president, General Motors Corp., just delivered yesterday to the American Petroleum Institute in New York City, is particularly timely.

Mr. Cole addressed himself to efforts that have been, are being, and will be made to minimize automotive pollution. Because I believe his speech was most informative, I intend to include it at the close of my remarks.

First, however, I would like to single out a few of his comments. For example, Mr. Cole emphasized at the outset, and permit me to quote him, that—

Our responsibility is clear. We want to remove the automobile as a significant factor in the nation's air pollution problem as soon as possible.

Mr. Cole then mentioned that it was "extremely vital that government and industry cooperate more closely in establishing sound, long-range objectives toward which we can work with maximum effectiveness and efficiency."

I would also mention the concern expressed by Mr. Cole relative to what he terms the "shifting of goals by the Federal Government" on auto emission which he maintains has created serious problems for the industry and could have a detrimental effect on the degree of progress.

In Michigan we are very familiar with "lead time" in the auto industry. Unfortunately, as Mr. Cole points out, it is a factor that our Federal Government may be overlooking or minimizing when deadlines, such as for the 1975 models, are firmly set.

Let me quote Mr. Cole on this all-important aspect:

As this audience is well aware, the 1975 models—which will be introduced in the fall of 1974—are not four years away in terms of decisions which must be made on such major matters as designing and testing of new hardware, and construction or modification of facilities. In fact, our plans to begin phasing these systems into our cars within two years means that we have already had to make some final decisions and are on deadline for most of the rest. Yet, even at this late date, federal standards for 1975 models are still in the process of being formulated.

Mr. Cole's complete address follows:

REMARKS BY EDWARD N. COLE, PRESIDENT,  
GENERAL MOTORS CORP.

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity of discussing with you today the challenge of automotive pollution. This is an extremely important subject to us both as citizens and as members of the petroleum and automobile industries.

In my comments, I would like to review recent progress in reducing auto pollution and to outline current programs aimed at still further advances. I also want to discuss government actions which have increased the urgency of the challenge facing our two industries in this field.

Since 1960, significant progress has been made in reducing automotive pollution through engine modifications and control systems. Emissions of hydrocarbons (HC) on current models have been reduced more than 80 percent and carbon monoxide (CO) more than 65 percent, compared to cars with no controls. These percentages are based on test procedures of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare (HEW) applicable to 1971 models.

During the past year, a number of developments have accelerated the efforts of both the automotive and petroleum industries in this field.

In January, 1970, at a meeting of the Society of Automotive Engineers in Detroit, General Motors suggested a comprehensive systems approach to automotive pollution control through changes in engine design, control systems and fuels—including consideration of the effect of the removal of lead additives upon emissions. Reduction of lead content will result in decreases in emissions of lead particulates and hydrocarbons in both old and new cars. Lead-free gasoline also makes advanced emission control systems technically feasible.

On February 15, General Motors announced that all of its cars beginning with 1971 models would be designed to operate on fuel of about 91 Research Octane Number (RON)—leaded or non-leaded. This was accomplished mainly by lowering the compression ratios of many engines—a modification which further reduced emissions of both hydrocarbons and oxides of nitrogen. Many of the other U.S.-produced 1971 models also can operate on fuel of about 91 RON. In addition, most pre-1971 model cars designed to use regular grade gasoline can satisfactorily use 91 octane low-lead gasoline even though some may require minor engine adjustments.

On March 4 and 5, representatives of the automobile and petroleum industries testified before the California Air Resources Board in Sacramento. It was pointed out in these hearings that lead-free regular grade gasoline should be generally available across the country by the fall of 1974 when all cars are expected to have control systems which will require this fuel—with low-lead fuel being made available during the interim period.

Since that time, General Motors has accelerated its program for installing new emission control systems. We plan to begin

phasing these systems into our production on a limited basis in the fall of 1972, more heavily in the fall of 1973 and across the board for all 1975 models to be introduced in the fall of 1974. Maximum benefits would be obtained from these systems only if lead-free fuel were generally available by the fall of 1972.

Our basic experimental emission control system includes a catalytic converter for changing exhaust hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide into harmless water vapor and carbon dioxide. To provide more precise air-fuel mixtures, we are testing new carburetor designs and electronic fuel injection. To help control oxides of nitrogen ( $\text{NO}_x$ ), the system recirculates a small amount of exhaust gas to lower combustion temperatures. This requires a richer air-fuel mixture which reduces efficiency and fuel economy.  $\text{NO}_x$  is produced in significant quantities when flame temperatures reach about 3000 degrees Fahrenheit.

We are pleased with the results being obtained with these experimental systems. I want to emphasize, however, that—based on our research—these advanced control systems will not operate effectively with leaded gasoline. We have found no catalyst which has demonstrated satisfactory performance for any significant period with even a half-gram of lead per gallon. Unless lead is removed, we also know of no practical means of removing two-thirds of exhaust particulates—a requirement included in previous HEW proposed standards for 1975.

At the present time, lead-free fuel is being marketed by a number of companies, while many others are offering low-leaded fuels.

Despite our outstanding progress and current programs in pollution reduction, there is increasing pressure to eliminate the piston-type internal combustion engine. Over the years, we have done extensive research on alternative power sources. We have built and tested various types of power plant hardware—including steam, electric, gas turbine and Stirling engines.

General Motors would not hesitate to move to an alternative power source if a satisfactory one becomes available. At the same time, it would be fool-hardy to discard the highly effective gasoline engine in favor of a different power source of unsatisfactory emission levels, questionable performance, unproven qualities and with higher selling prices to the consumer.

Our tests clearly demonstrate that alternative power plants have little potential for passenger car use at least in this decade. Also, all of these power plants produce significant emissions—either directly or indirectly—from the combustion of fossil fuel. Their use for automobiles would create pollution problems equal to or greater than those expected from the internal combustion engine with advanced control systems.

At the present state of the art, the most practical avenue for progress in vehicle emission in this decade is to finish cleaning up the gasoline internal combustion engine. Our industry is currently engaged in a massive development program designed to achieve even further emission reductions in the next few years. At the same time, however, the Federal Government is changing the targets and shortening the timetables for compliance.

On February 10, 1970, HEW issued a proposal calling for reductions—compared with uncontrolled 1960 models—of 95 percent in HC, 86 percent in CO, 83 percent in  $\text{NO}_x$  and 67 percent in particulates by 1975. GM expressed confidence at that time that it could meet these standards using existing test procedures, and this proposal was the basis for our 1975 model program.

Since then, however, HEW has issued two new documents, each of which has caused a major change in direction. A July 15 proposal significantly tightened test procedures and

standards for 1972 through 1975 model years. On November 10, HEW published the final regulations which resulted from the July 15 proposal. These established revised test procedures for the 1972-1975 period but eliminated any numerical standards for 1975.

Still further confusion has resulted from Congressional action on a 1970 amendment to the Clean Air Act. The Senate version calls for even more stringent requirements for 1975 models. It requires reductions up to 98 percent in both hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide. And once test procedures are established for  $\text{NO}_x$  and particulates—reductions of 90 percent in these pollutants are expected to be required for 1975 or later models.

This shifting of goals by the Federal Government is creating serious problems for our industry and, in fact, could have detrimental effects on the degree of progress which we will be able to achieve by 1975 models.

As this audience is well aware, the 1975 models—which will be introduced in the fall of 1974—are not four years away in terms of decisions which must be made on such major matters as designing and testing of new hardware, and construction or modification of facilities. In fact, our plans to begin phasing these systems into our cars within two years means that we have already had to make some final decisions and are on deadline for most of the rest. Yet, even at this late date, federal standards for 1975 models are still in the process of being formulated.

A Joint Conference Committee is scheduled to begin meetings tomorrow to reconcile differences between Senate and House versions of the 1970 amendment to the Clean Air Act. While we agree with the basic intent of the proposed legislation for cleaner air, there are a number of specific requirements of the Senate bill which are either impractical or technologically impossible.

First, although the legislation deals with an extremely complex subject, it was drafted without public hearings on key technical issues. The technology does not exist at this time—inside or outside the automobile industry—to meet these stringent emission levels in the specified time frame. Such complex, technical matters should be decided by people who have the background and training to make sound decisions in areas of such great importance to the nation. We believe that a technically competent review should be required, involving leading scientists and engineers. Such organizations as the National Academy of Sciences and the National Academy of Engineering have the required expertise. They could be given the responsibility for establishing what levels of pollution control are necessary to provide required air quality and also for determining whether proposed standards are technologically feasible, and at what point in time. Such decisions, it is assumed, would be made after consultation with experts in the field—including government and industry.

Second, the proposed legislation requires that every car must meet the standard. Because of variations in test procedures and manufacturing tolerances, this means in effect that manufacturers must test every car—an impractical and costly procedure. Statistical sampling—as used in most industry and government procurement—is a more realistic method which should produce exactly the same final results.

Third, the Senate bill requires a manufacturer's warranty which provides that the stringent levels of control called for in the legislation be maintained for the first 50,000 miles of operation. A related recall provision also gives us great concern. There are more than 60 different operational parameters of a car which can affect emissions. It is practically impossible to maintain such extremely low levels of emissions for every car during 50,000 miles of operation. Compulsory periodic inspection and maintenance would be important, but by no means a guarantee that the 50,000-mile objective could be achieved.



And fourth, the Senate legislation would permit each state and locality, with HEW approval, to set their own automotive pollution standards. If the current principle of federal preemption is eliminated, the result could be a confused patchwork of requirements extremely difficult for automobile manufacturers to meet and probably incapable of producing any real improvements in air quality.

We are hopeful that members of the joint Senate-House Conference Committee will give serious consideration to recommendations made by the automobile companies. These suggestions could contribute to the effectiveness of the proposed legislation in achieving air quality objectives but with minimum disruptive effects on our two industries and at lower selling prices to the public.

Despite these current uncertainties about future federal emission standards, General Motors is moving ahead aggressively in its anti-pollution programs. Let me tell you about some of the progress we have made.

We are encouraged by the results of tests conducted with our experimental 1975 emission control systems. Our work with catalytic converters showed that very low HC and CO emissions could be obtained once the system was warmed up. Our current experimental system warms up in about two minutes. During the warmup period, CO and HC emissions are not oxidized in the catalytic converter and therefore are relatively high due to the rich air-fuel mixture needed for satisfactory starting and driveability.

The new 23-minute test cycle scheduled to go into effect with 1972 models places heavier emphasis on cold starts than the previous cycle. As a result, most vehicles fail to meet the anticipated 1975 standards for the entire 23-minute cycle because of emissions which occur within the first two minutes of the test.

We are now devoting extensive efforts to finding ways of reducing these warmup emissions. In our early approaches, we used both electricity and propane to preheat the catalyst. We have tried several configurations of catalyst beds. We also have worked with a dual-fuel system, using liquified petroleum gases (LPG) during the start and warmup phase.

Another concept under study involves storing of HC start and warmup pollutants and then recycling them back over the catalyst after it is operational. We are currently using a charcoal canister which has shown some success in storing cold-start hydrocarbon emissions. However, we have not yet found a satisfactory means of controlling CO and NO<sub>x</sub> during the warmup period.

We have devoted substantial efforts to the cold-start problem, and it is not yet resolved. Frankly, we believe that the new HEW test procedures give a distorted picture of the relative importance of cold-start emissions as a part of total emissions. This is particularly true in our cities where car density and automotive pollution are the highest but where cold-start emissions as defined by HEW are expected to be a very small part of the total pollution from our vehicles with 1975 controls. Unless the government modifies its present stand on cold-start emission control, changes in fuel composition will probably be necessary. In addition, we could be designing the wrong hardware to produce the best overall emission reductions.

In the final analysis, the confusion and uncertainty concerning federal emission standards is academic. Problems of such technical complexity as air pollution cannot be legislated out of existence any more than the laws of nature can be overruled. Consequently, there are limits to what can be accomplished in terms of current technology

and the practical realities of the mass-production system.

Basically, we have to recognize that combustion of fossil fuels has never been perfect and never will be; as a result, some pollution will occur—whether we are talking automobiles or other energy sources. So, let's examine briefly where we stand with respect to the control of the major auto pollutants—hydrocarbons, carbon monoxides and oxides of nitrogen.

First, hydrocarbons. Utilizing catalyst treatment plus storage during the warmup cycle, we believe we can attain extremely low levels of hydrocarbon emissions.

With respect to carbon monoxide, the catalytic converter produces good results except during the warmup cycle. We have found no way to store CO. One alternative might be a change in the distillation characteristics of gasoline to allow the use of leaner air-fuel ratios while also providing acceptable driveability during this period.

Our most serious problem in attempting to meet emission levels proposed for 1975 models concerns oxides of nitrogen. Difficulty in minimizing NO<sub>x</sub> is not peculiar to the internal combustion engine. It is equally as critical—and in some cases more so—with alternative automotive power plants and stationary power sources. As we attempt to control NO<sub>x</sub> beyond certain levels, we are forced to accept not only lower levels of driveability but also higher fuel consumption and thus increased use of natural resources. If we attempt to use a catalytic converter to control oxides of nitrogen, all of the catalysts we are aware of convert some of the NO<sub>x</sub> to ammonia—which is another and perhaps more obnoxious type of pollutant.

Thus, as desirable as their objectives may be, the standards now being considered by HEW and the U.S. Congresses simply are not attainable with existing technology.

For example, as I mentioned before, there are more than 60 operational parameters of the automobile which can affect emissions. In addition, we have variables relating to fuels, lubricants, testing procedures, measuring techniques and manufacturing processes. With the interaction of literally hundreds of variables, standards requiring every single vehicle to meet near-zero emission levels are completely unrealistic. We can custom-make one car to virtually perfect specifications, but this is not possible in attempting to mass-produce millions of vehicles a year.

The current level of standards being considered by the Federal Government are so low that they must be viewed as laboratory goals rather than levels that could be realistically achieved in the field. The Senate version of the National Clean Air Act, for example, could require hydrocarbon emissions as low as 0.22 grams per mile of urban-type driving. If this quantity of emissions were condensed from its gaseous form to a liquid, the total would constitute only about six drops for each mile driven. While such minute measurements may be achieved under ideal laboratory conditions, it would be impossible to conduct such tests with any degree of confidence as a part of mass-production operations.

Certainly, we do not oppose national clean air objectives. But the goals to which we target our work should be based on scientifically-established health and air quality standards. We have an obligation to oppose technically unsound standards which impose necessary cost burdens on the public with no appreciable benefits in terms of air quality. For this reason, we seriously question whether near-zero emission levels of control in automobiles are necessary to achieve federal air quality goals.

Let me make one additional point about the impracticality of 1975 standards now under consideration. Major changes in vehicle hardware require sufficient lead time

for design, testing, tooling and construction or modification of production facilities. Also, because of the magnitude of our 1975 program, introduction of this equipment cannot be done in one year but must be phased in over more than one model year. These time requirements, generally speaking, mean that current control technology must be the basis for automobiles to be produced beginning in the fall of 1974.

Based on test results of our experimental control systems, and using the new 23-minute HEW test procedure, we have arrived at emission levels which we believe represent the most stringent which we could realistically be expected to meet for 1975 models. Our figures are based on the assumption that every car will be required to meet the standards—as contrasted with the averaging concept previously used. Because of the hundreds of variables inherent in volume production and the normal range in performance which results, this means that all vehicles—even those at the extreme of the normal distribution pattern—would have to meet these most stringent standards.

Here are the most stringent levels of emission which we can achieve based on current technology and experience:

Hydrocarbons—1.0 gram per mile.

Carbon monoxide—11.0 grams per mile.

Oxides of nitrogen—3.0 grams per mile.

The average emission level of motor vehicles, however, would be significantly lower—at about half this level.

Let me emphasize that achievement of these levels would represent substantial gains over 1971 model requirements which—on the new test procedure—are equivalent to 4.6 grams per mile for HC and 47 grams per mile for CO. Thus our maximum 1975 level of HC and CO emissions would be about one-fourth of the 1971 level. And the average improvement factor would be even greater. There is no 1971 national standard for NO<sub>x</sub>. However, our attainment of 3.0 grams of NO<sub>x</sub> per mile maximum levels would represent a substantial improvement over current levels. Achievement of these low levels for these three pollutants will require the use of the most advanced, sophisticated control equipment available based on our own research and that available to us. I want to make our position absolutely clear: Even if we take maximum advantage of the most advanced control systems available and the best fuel which can be produced, we see no way of meeting 1975 standards which are more stringent than the levels outlined above.

On the basis of these substantially further reductions, it is obvious that the automotive contribution to the total air pollution problem will be dramatically reduced. This is an extremely important factor as our nation moves to establish long-range goals to improve the air around us.

Even if it were possible to eliminate 100 percent of pollution from all motor vehicles in the U.S. by 1975, we would still be faced with by far the major share of today's air pollution problem. It is therefore important that sound technical priorities be established by government so that available funds can be utilized for the greatest overall progress. National efforts to reduce overall air pollution must involve all major sources of pollution—not only motor vehicles, but also industrial and electric generating plants, home and business heating facilities and refuse disposal operations.

Nothing I have said today, however, detracts one iota from the responsibilities which we—in both the automotive and petroleum industries—should assume in minimizing automotive pollution. In working toward this common goal, we should seek every possible avenue of future improvement—in engine design, control systems, fuels and lubricants.

Let me make it clear that we do not pretend to have all the answers. However, our research and test programs have raised certain questions and pointed to several areas which we believe offer potential for further reductions in automotive pollution that can be achieved by changes in some of the characteristics of gasoline. I would like to suggest that the petroleum industry consider directing major research toward seven areas:

#### I. CATALYST DEPRECIATORS

At the present time, the catalyst approach seems to be the most effective system for controlling HC and CO emissions in the exhaust stream. For this reason, it is highly critical that ways be found to eliminate from automotive fuels all lead, and any other additives which are found to function as catalyst deprecators. It is also important to establish a means of insuring that cars equipped with catalysts receive only lead-free fuel.

#### II. FUEL VOLATILITY

What can be done to improve cold starting and warmup characteristics of automobiles through changes in distillation characteristics of gasoline? Engine choking, which is vital to satisfactory performance during start and warmup, also produces high CO and HC levels during this period. With the use of propane gas, the choke can be eliminated. However, the supply of LPG is very limited, and its use by the general public could constitute a safety problem. What would be desirable then are changes in distillation characteristics to provide liquid fuel which approaches the warmup performance and emission characteristics of propane but is not so volatile as to cause fuel handling and evaporative problems. Preliminary tests with experimental fuels of this type have shown emission reductions as high as 75 percent in CO, 45 in HC and 20 in NO<sub>x</sub> during the warmup period of the new HEW test cycle. To effectively adapt this fuel to the engine requires recalibration of the fuel system, including the choke.

#### III. UNIFORMITY OF FUEL COMPOSITION

Emission control systems using either carburetion or fuel injection will require very precise fuel metering. Current variations in such fuel parameters as volatility, density, viscosity and others could seriously impair consistent reliability in meeting standards. Greater uniformity in basic characteristics of gasoline could contribute to the solution of the emission problem.

#### IV. SULFUR IN FUEL

Almost all of the sulfur content is refined out of gasoline in the refining process and thus the present gasoline automobile engine has only minimal emissions of sulfur oxides. Industrial and electric power plants are the major source of this pollutant. However, now that automobiles are beginning to reach very low levels of HC, CO and NO<sub>x</sub> emissions, sulfur oxides will represent a larger portion of the remaining auto pollution by 1975. Therefore, consideration should be given to reducing the sulfur content of motor fuels.

#### V. AROMATIC CONTENT

High levels of aromatic materials present two problems. The first is their detrimental effect on elastomers in the fuel-metering systems. The second is that aromatics which end up in the exhaust may result in more potential carcinogens and eye irritants. For these reasons, any possible reduction in aromatic content of fuel would be very desirable.

#### VI. BENZO (A) PYRENE CONTENT

Some fuels today contain small amounts of benzo(a)pyrene—a potential carcinogen. This material serves no useful purpose and much of it ends up in the exhaust as particulate matter. It should be eliminated at the refinery if at all possible.

#### VII. EVAPORATIVE LOSSES

As advance control systems minimize exhaust emissions, evaporative losses from the entire gasoline distribution system will represent an increasingly significant source of hydrocarbons. Both the petroleum and automotive companies should seek to find more effective means of handling fuel between the gas station and the motor vehicle. For example, our findings suggest that the hydrocarbons emitted into the atmosphere because of vapor displaced during an average gas tank fill, together with normal spillage and nozzle drips, can exceed 100 grams. This is more HC emissions than would be allowed during a trip of over 200 miles based on a 1975 standard of 1.0 gram per mile and assuming average emissions of 0.5 grams per mile. In other words, unless this can be controlled, more unburned hydrocarbons could be released into the atmosphere during each "normal filling" of a gas tank than that allowed by such a standard during the entire period of driving required to consume the tank of gas.

These improvements in gasoline composition and distribution systems could make a significant contribution to minimizing automotive pollution in the years ahead. We must have a known fuel specification in order to insure the proper performance of key vehicle components which affect automotive emissions. The fuel system also must be designed to prevent inadvertent filling of the gas tank with improper fuel.

I want to emphasize that solutions to automotive pollution problems rest with both the petroleum companies and vehicle manufacturers. Here are four challenges relating to the vehicle which I believe to be extremely important.

One is the need to continue improvements in engine design which will develop even more effective control of emissions.

Two is the need to maximize long-term durability and reliability of emission control systems and major vehicle components which can affect emissions.

A third challenge is to find a method to monitor major operational components and emission control equipment. Its purpose would be to detect and signal a driver when his car is emitting pollutants above acceptable levels or when major components affecting emissions were not operating satisfactorily.

Our fourth and extremely important priority—as we seek every avenue for minimizing automotive pollution—is to find ways of insuring acceptable driveability, good fuel economy and, hopefully, a reduction in overall operating costs.

In conclusion, let me say this. Our responsibility is clear. We want to remove the automobile as a significant factor in the nation's air pollution problem as soon as possible.

From our current high level of accomplishment, each new step forward will be more difficult. At the current state of technology, there is no suitable alternative to the gasoline internal combustion engine—and we cannot see one emerging as a mass-production reality during this decade. Thus, we can achieve our goal more quickly and at lower costs with the internal combustion engine, using advanced control systems and improved gasolines and oils. And this is being done as rapidly as possible. However, it is extremely vital that government and industry cooperate more closely in establishing sound, long-range objectives toward which we can work with maximum effectiveness and efficiency.

This is a critical requirement for the future of both the automobile and petroleum industries. It is equally important for the continued vitality of the nation's economy and for achievement of ever-increasing standards of progress for the nation as a whole.

This is a formidable challenge. But it is one which I am confident will be met successfully by these two great industries.

### WE HAVE NOT HEARD THE LAST OF WOMEN'S LIB

HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, while it now appears that the "women's lib" amendment to the United States Constitution has been defeated for the time being in the Senate, in a welcome—and nowadays all too rare—exercise of that body's traditional responsibility of putting on the brakes when this House is stampeded into rash, ill-considered action, we certainly have not heard the last of women's lib. The enclosed editorial from the October issue of *Triumph* magazine assesses this entire movement in the perspective of Christian belief, morality and historical experience, demonstrating its essential errors with acuity and wisdom.

#### MEN'S LIB

Women's lib: It has got to be the sickest, most dangerous fad or movement—whatever these things are called that suddenly bewitch the public conversation and make our social consciences go pit-a-pat—that has come along to date. The sickest because it thrives on a perversion aimed directly at the apogee of Creation. The most dangerous because woman is the central pillar of any social order, and especially any Christian order: if woman is brought down, the order has been brought down, and the chances of building a new one indefinitely postponed.

The women of our country, let it be noted, do not appear principally to blame for this development. Relatively few of them have flocked to the banner of Miss Kate Millett and other Lib leaders. Many more have taken up active opposition. The vast majority of women seem to be merely watching from the sidelines, partly in amusement, partly in contempt—of men.

American men, in the circumstances, are proper objects of scorn. Significant male reaction to the Lib has taken roughly three forms. One group—fellow militants on assorted kicks, desperate politicians like Senator Goodell, publicists and entertainers of various sorts—has actively endorsed the Lib's program and its general approach to life. Of these men it may be said safely that they are either opportunists or queer.

A second group has bravely defied the Lib on such key points of male interest as the sexual exclusiveness of McSorley's tavern and the preservation of separate bathroom facilities. Of these let us say simply that they deserve to lose.

Finally, there is the great mass of American males whose behavior in politics is a direct extension of their behavior in the home: Don't get in the little lady's way when she seems to be on a rampage; but at the same time don't bother to understand, let alone defend her worth, her role, her self. These men are faithfully represented by the members of the House who voted 350-15 in favor of the equal rights constitutional amendment; and by the President who dutifully endorsed the Lib's "day" by proclaiming a national celebration of the 19th Amendment anniversary. These men are, for all practical purposes, anti-woman.



Any talk of sexual equality, besides being phenomenologically absurd, is an insult to women. More so than to men. Women is obviously the favored sex, the vessel on which God has principally relied to unfold the mystery of human freedom and redemption, and the analogous mystery of love and life. It was Eve who boldly instigated the Happy Sin that called God into the world. It was Mary the Virgin who was given the power to admit or refuse to admit eternity into time. It was Mary who held God Himself in the confinement of a human body. It was Mary, alone among merely human beings, who was granted birth without sin and death without separation from her body. It was Mary Magdalene, the holy whore, who alone foretold the Lord's death. It was Mary Magdalene again who was first greeted by the Risen Lord, in the most sublime love scene of all time. It was the women of Jerusalem whose faith and love in the persecuted Lord never wavered, who stood by his side while all the men of the place, save one, took flight. It was Veronica whose love earned the image of The Face.

So it has been ever since. Man has his role: to lead, to govern—above all in the family. But he is less king there than she is Queen. How, in any healthy human relationship, could it be otherwise? The most profound human experiences are expressions, in one way or another, of the great unity of love and life: of sex. If sex is anything, it is the meeting place of love and life. And who, on that ground, is in command? Both take love, but who gives love better? Who gives life? He plants a seed which she nests into life; she joins the new life to her own life, and guides it into the world. Where he gives it a house and she gives it a home.

Christianity is chiefly blamed by the Lib crowd for woman's status. It is a valid accusation. All societies are patriarchal, for perfectly plain practical reasons. But only Christian societies—only Christian men—have given women first rank in the patriarchy. Only Christian men have honored women; only they have respected the pedestal which, since the Incarnation, is woman's birthright.

True, Christian societies, like others, have often tolerated in practice a double standard of sexual morality. But this hardly damages the point; it is not an honor to men to recognize greater expectations of virtue in women. The double standard is not an affirmation of man's moral superiority, it is a proof of woman's. And so in our time the Church not surprisingly has responded to the Lib's poison by creating a new order of lay Virgins: female virgins, that is.

Let men honor them. Let men honor all women by freeing them—to be women. In short, let men be men.

#### HOW MANY AMERICANS READ WELL ENOUGH TO SURVIVE?

#### HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, a recently completed study has revealed a grim fact of American life: One out of every eight adult Americans may have great difficulty in obtaining Government Medicaid or public assistance, a bank loan, or even a social security number—simply because he cannot read well enough to fill out the application form. This is a shocking revelation for a Nation which prides itself in making quality education avail-

able to the greatest possible number of its citizens.

In the words of Walter W. Straley, chairman of the new National Reading Council, which commissioned the special study:

The study shows that as many as 18.5 million Americans—or 13 percent of the U.S. population 16 years and older—lack the reading ability necessary for survival in the United States today.

I believe that the findings of this significant study, called the "Survival Literacy Study," should be of concern to every American. I am pleased to insert it in the RECORD. The study was conducted for the National Reading Council by Louis Harris and Associates, Inc.

This study may be the first to attempt to measure reading ability as a survival technique rather than as an academic pursuit. It is especially disturbing to consider how very many Americans may be deprived of necessary services because they lack reading ability. In presenting the results of the 6-week study at the inaugural meeting of the National Reading Council on September 10, 1970, in Washington, Mr. Harris said that 1,685 persons were interviewed. They were chosen to represent a cross section of the overall population. Those interviewed were asked to fill out five common application forms, with this result:

Thirty-four percent had trouble reading a simplified Medicaid application form; 8-percent could not complete a typical driver's license form; 7 percent were unable to handle an application for a social security number and 3-percent failed to fill out a public assistance form.

The "Survival Literacy Study" evaluates literacy levels according to factors including regional differences, rural-urban differences, age, race, income, and education. I found it particularly disheartening—which this conclusion could be anticipated—to note that "the old and the poor each have serious reading problems," as the Harris study states, "but the elderly poor must struggle most for 'survival.'"

I think that Mr. Harris, appearing before the council, summarized very expressively the purpose for which the study was undertaken:

We want to find out how a person's behavior—his whole life-style—is affected by reading trouble; what mainstream experiences he misses because of it.

In an effort to combat illiteracy and to develop a national reading program, the National Reading Council was appointed by President Nixon on July 31, 1970. It is operating with a first-year budget of \$1.5 million. Its members include prominent representatives of the fields of education, business, labor, entertainment, communications, science, and government. Its chairman, Mr. Straley, is vice president in charge of environmental affairs of the American Telephone & Telegraph Co.

The council recently established a National Reading Center in Washington, under the direction of Dr. Donald G. Emery, superintendent of schools of Scarsdale, N.Y., to serve as its working and

research arm and, as Mr. Straley emphasized, as "a center of innovation."

Innovation will be vital if the Nation is to meet the challenge to curb illiteracy. I commend the National Reading Council for this initial effort to define the dimensions of the problem which confronts us.

The full text of this important document, the "Survival Literacy Study," September, 1970, follows:

#### SURVIVAL LITERACY STUDY

(Conducted for the National Reading Council by Louis Harris and Associates, Inc.)

#### PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

On July 31, 1970, President Nixon announced the appointment of 40 men and women (including businessmen, teachers, Congressmen, civic leaders and entertainers) to serve on the National Reading Council, a supervisory board to a new national reading program. The Council's most immediate and urgent task was to measure the extent of reading deficiencies in the United States. To undertake this task, the National Council commissioned Louis Harris and Associates, Inc. This study, a ground-breaker in its attempt to measure scientifically the literacy rate among all sectors of the United States population, was to be completed in time for the Council's first annual meeting in Washington, D.C., on September 10th.

From its inception, the study was planned to measure the "survival" literacy rate in the United States. It would determine the percentage of Americans lacking the functional or practical reading skills necessary to "survive" in this country. How many Americans were prevented by reading deficiencies, we asked ourselves, from filling out application forms for such common needs as a Social Security number, a personal bank loan, Public Assistance, Medicaid, a driver's license? Fundamentally, this is a study of functional rather than by rote literacy.

The purpose of this study was to measure reading ability and not application forms. In order to avoid a defensive reaction on the part of the respondent, however, he was told, "we are doing a survey on the subject of different application forms people have to fill out. It seems these days that nearly everyone has to fill out application forms for many of the things they do."

Included in the questionnaire were five application forms similar to the ones mentioned above. The five forms were selected both on the basis of their common utility and frequent appearance in the lives of many Americans and according to the degree of difficulty of the reading material included in each. The forms were, however, simplified significantly to assure that the study evaluated reading ability and not the lay-out of the form itself.

Each respondent was presented the five forms in the same order. The interviewer was instructed under no conditions to read to the respondent any information printed on the forms. If the respondent was unable to write because of physical handicap or problems with penmanship, the interviewer was then instructed to write in the answers provided by the respondent. The study did not seek to measure writing ability, only reading. If the respondent was unwilling to supply any information requested on the form, he was instructed on the bottom of each application to draw a line through the space provided. These were counted as correct answers, since the respondent's ability to read and follow the instructions indicated his literacy. The respondents were also assured that these forms were unofficial and to be used only for purposes of public opinion research.

Interviewing on the study took place between August 17th and 24th, 1970.

#### SCORING METHODS

Performance on each individual application form and overall performance on the five forms together were measured according to a simple percentile scoring system. The Harris firm first counted the number of correct answers and compared them to the number of possible answers on each form. On Form I (Identification Form), for example, 15 answers were required and should have been supplied by the literate respondent. Fifteen, therefore, was used as a base for scoring purposes. If only three appropriate answers were supplied, the raw score was 3/15.

The base for each of four of the five forms varied according to the nature of the questions asked. Some questions were to be answered only by those respondents who had answered the previously question negatively. (For example, one form asked: "Are you able to work now? —. If unable to work now, why are you not able to work now? —.") In cases where the respondent correctly skipped a question, the scoring base was reduced.

In tabulating the scores recorded by the coding department, our computer operators followed the percentile reference code shown below:

Percentage correct:	Punch
0	1
1 to 9	2
10 to 19	3
20 to 29	4
30 to 39	5
40 to 49	6
50 to 59	7
60 to 69	8
70 to 79	9
80 to 89	0
90 to 100	x
Refusals	y

If on Form I with a base of 15 possible answers, for example, the respondent supplied only three correct answers (20% correct), this score was recorded in Punch 4 of the computer column. Refusals to fill out an individual form also were recorded. After scoring each form separately, the computer arrived at an overall percentile score for each respondent.

#### "RANGE OF ILLITERACY"

Respondents who completed correctly 90-100% of the five forms averaged together are considered fully literate for the purposes of this study. Incorrect answers up to ten percent are overlooked in the scoring and attributed to carelessness, difficulty of the form structure and content, but not to reading deficiencies.

The basic approach in analyzing this study has been to order people on a continuum which reflects four types of "literacy groups":

1. "Low Survival Threshold"—Respondents who average more than 30% incorrect, that is, less than 70% correct on all five forms. The survival probability of this group must be assumed to be low. Relatively, they are therefore considered functionally illiterate in modern American society. Despite the fact that these respondents may show anywhere up to 70% correct answers, they are still considered relatively illiterate. This pattern was followed in order to include in the functionally illiterate group those Americans who might recognize certain familiar words (i.e., "age", "name", "address"), but have serious reading and comprehension problems.

2. "Questionable Survival Threshold"—Respondents who average more than 20% incorrect answers, that is, less than 80% correct answers. Since the groups are figured cumulatively, this group includes respondents in the more-than-30% group also. Members of this literacy group filled out the forms with considerable difficulty and belong therefore in a questionable survival group.

3. "Marginal Survival Threshold"—Respondents who answer more than ten percent incorrect answers, that is, any number of correct answers below 90%. Generally, this group lacks total survival reading ability and includes members of the above two groups.

4. "Likely Survival Threshold"—Respondents who answer less than ten percent incorrect answers, that is, between 90-100% correct answers. This group is considered functionally literate.

The term "range of illiteracy" will appear throughout the report. It refers to the range between the "Low Survival" and "Marginal Survival" groups. This range includes members of groups 1, 2, and 3 above.

Chart I lists the application forms in the order of difficulty indicated by the results of the survey. Form IV (Application for Public Assistance) proves overall the easiest to read: only three percent of the people answered incorrectly more than ten percent of the form. Form V (Application for Medicaid) proved most difficult: nine percent of the people read incorrectly more than 30% of the form and 34% read incorrectly more than ten percent. The average range of illiteracy was from three percent (the percentage of people who averaged more than 30% incorrect) to 13% (the percentage who averaged more than ten percent incorrect). Converted into population, this represents a range of 4.3 million to 18.5 million. A total of 4.3 million Americans fall into the "Low Survival Threshold" group, 7.1 million into the "Questionable Survival Threshold" group, and 18.5 million into the "Marginal Survival Threshold" group.

The results of the study show, therefore, that, due to reading deficiencies, three percent of all Americans had difficulty filling out an application for Public Assistance, seven percent had difficulty completing a simple identification form (the equivalent of an application for a Social Security number), eight percent had trouble with an application for a drivers license, 11% with an application for a personal bank loan, and 34% with an application for Medicaid.

CHART I

[In percent]

	More than 30 percent incorrect	More than 20 percent incorrect	More than 10 percent incorrect
Total:			
Form IV	(0)	1	3
Form I	1	2	7
Form III	1	3	8
Form II	2	4	11
Form V	9	17	34
Average	3	5	13
Projected to population (in millions)	4.3	7.1	18.5

#### II

Charts II, III, IV and V break down the results of the study into the four locations where respondents live: Rural Areas, Cities, Towns and Suburbs. The average range of functional illiteracy for rural inhabitants (see Chart II) was 4-16%; that is, four percent of the rural population interviewed missed more than 30% of the answers, seven percent missed more than 20% of the answers, and 16% missed more than ten percent.

#### III

City dwellers had similar difficulty in filling out the forms. Their average range of functional illiteracy (see Chart III) was 4-13%; that is, four percent of the city population interviewed missed more than 30% of the answers, six percent missed more than 20%, and 13% missed more than ten percent.

#### IV

Fewer people who live in small towns and cities had difficulty reading the forms. Only

an average of two percent read incorrectly more than 30% of the forms, a total of five percent failed on more than 20%, and 12% left more than ten percent unanswered.

#### V

Suburban residents filled out the forms most easily of these four groups. Their average range of functional illiteracy was a low 2-9%. Only Form V (Application for Medicaid) was difficult for some suburban residents: on this form six percent missed more than 30% of the answers, 11% missed more than 20%, and 28% missed more than ten percent.

CHART I'-V

[In percent]

	More than 30 percent incorrect	More than 20 percent incorrect	More than 10 percent incorrect
Rural:			
Form I	1	2	9
Form II	1	3	12
Form III	2	4	11
Form IV	2	3	4
Form V	13	25	42
Average	4	7	16
Cities:			
Form I	1	3	9
Form II	4	6	13
Form III	2	5	9
Form IV	1	1	3
Form V	10	17	32
Average	4	6	13
Towns:			
Form I	1	1	5
Form II	1	3	12
Form III	1	3	7
Form IV	2	2	3
Form V	7	15	33
Average	2	4	12
Suburbs:			
Form I		(0)	2
Form II	2	3	6
Form III	1	2	7
Form IV	(0)	(0)	3
Form V	6	11	28
Average	2	3	9

<sup>1</sup> Less than 0.5 percent.

NOTE: Forms ranked according to difficulty with least difficult from first.

#### VI

The results of the study also were looked at in terms of regional areas: the South, the East, the Midwest and the West. The South had the highest average range of functional illiteracy—a range of 4-15%. Four percent answered incorrectly more than 30% of all forms averaged together; seven percent answered incorrectly more than 20% and 15% answered incorrectly more than ten percent.

#### VII

Among the regional groups, the East had the second highest range of functional illiteracy. Four percent of all Easterners interviewed missed more than 30% of the answers, six percent missed more than 20% and 14% missed more than ten percent.

#### VIII

The functional illiteracy rate of Midwesterners ranged from 3 to 13%. These figures suggest that the Midwest has an average illiteracy rate only slightly higher than that of the East and the South.

#### IX

People in the West tend to have fewer reading deficiencies than inhabitants of the other three regions, the study showed. A small average of one percent of all westerners interviewed answered incorrectly more than 30% of the five forms. Four percent missed more than 20% and ten percent missed more than ten percent.



CHART VI-IX

[In percent]

	More than 30 percent incorrect	More than 20 percent incorrect	More than 10 percent incorrect
<b>South:</b>			
Form I.....	2	4	9
Form II.....	3	5	15
Form III.....	2	5	10
Form IV.....	2	2	3
Form V.....	11	21	37
Average.....	4	7	15
<b>East:</b>			
Form I.....	2	3	7
Form II.....	3	5	12
Form III.....	3	5	11
Form IV.....	1	2	5
Form V.....	10	16	34
Average.....	4	6	14

	More than 30 percent incorrect	More than 20 percent incorrect	More than 10 percent incorrect
<b>Midwest:</b>			
Form I.....	1	2	7
Form II.....	3	5	10
Form III.....	2	4	9
Form IV.....	1	1	3
Form V.....	9	17	34
Average.....	3	6	13
<b>West:</b>			
Form I.....	(0)	1	5
Form II.....	1	3	9
Form III.....	(0)	1	5
Form IV.....	(0)	(0)	2
Form V.....	5	14	28
Average.....	1	4	10

† Less than 0.5 percent.

Note: Forms ranked according to difficulty with least difficult form first.

CHART X

## INCOME

[In percent]

	More than 30 percent incorrect				More than 20 percent incorrect				More than 10 percent incorrect			
	Under \$5,000	\$5,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over	Under \$5,000	\$5,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over	Under \$5,000	\$5,000 to \$9,999	\$10,000 to \$14,999	\$15,000 and over
Form I.....	2	1			4	3	1		12	8	3	2
Form II.....	4	2	1	1	8	4	2	1	19	13	5	3
Form III.....	2	(0)	1	1	6	2	3	2	13	7	9	3
Form IV.....	3	(0)	(0)		3	1	(0)	1	6	3	1	3
Form V.....	16	9	7	5	25	17	14	10	40	35	30	24
Average.....	5	2	2	1	9	5	4	3	18	13	10	7

† Less than 0.5 percent.

## XI

When reading deficiencies were correlated with race, the study revealed some striking figures. While the range of illiteracy for white respondents was a low 2-12%, the range for black respondents was a high 8-22%. Only two percent of all whites missed more than

30% of the answers, compared to eight percent of the blacks. While only five percent of the whites missed more than 20%, 13% of the blacks missed the same number. While only 12% of all whites answered incorrectly more than ten percent of the forms, a high 22% of all blacks interviewed answered incorrectly the same number.

CHART XI

## RACE

[In percent]

	More than 30 percent incorrect		More than 20 percent incorrect		More than 10 percent incorrect	
	White	Black	White	Black	White	Black
Form I.....	1	3	2	6	6	15
Form II.....	2	6	3	11	10	21
Form III.....	(0)	4	2	9	7	18
Form IV.....	1	4	1	5	3	8
Form V.....	8	23	16	32	32	50
Average.....	2	8	5	13	12	22

† Less than 0.5 percent.

CHART XII

## INCOME UNDER \$5,000 BY RACE

[In percent]

	More than 30 percent incorrect		More than 20 percent incorrect		More than 10 percent incorrect	
	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite	White	Nonwhite
Form I.....	1	3	2	7	10	18
Form II.....	4	6	7	13	18	23
Form III.....	2	4	5	11	10	22
Form IV.....	2	6	2	6	5	9
Form V.....	12	21	21	31	35	52
Average.....	4	8	7	14	16	25

## X

Chart X illustrates that practical literacy decreases in direct proportion to income in the United States. A large five percent of the people with an annual income under \$5,000 missed over 30% of the answers, compared to only two percent with an income from \$5,000 to \$9,999, two percent with an income of \$10,000 to \$14,999, and a small one percent with an income of \$15,000 or more. While nine percent of those earning under \$5,000 missed 20% or more, only three percent of those earning \$15,000 or more missed the same number of answers. Likewise, 18% of those earning under \$5,000 missed more than ten percent, compared to seven percent who earn \$15,000 or more.

For the income group under \$5,000, the range of illiteracy was 5-18%, compared to 2-13% for the \$5,000-\$9,999 group, 2-10% for the \$10,000-\$14,999 group, and 1-7% for the \$15,000-and-over group.

## XII

In comparing race with literacy the study focused particularly on one limited sector of both racial groups—those respondents earning less than \$5,000 annually. Even among members of this low income group, the illiteracy range of non-whites\* (8-25%) was much higher than that of whites (4-16%). While only four percent of whites in this income group missed more than 30% of the answers, eight percent of non-whites missed the same amount. While only seven percent of whites in this group answered incorrectly more than 20%, 14% of non-whites answered incorrectly the same number. Finally, while 16% of whites here missed more than ten percent, an enormous 25% of all non-whites earning less than \$5,000 a year missed more than ten percent of the answers on the forms.

## XIII

For the purposes of this study, the U.S. population was divided into four age groups: people 16-24 years old, 25-29 years, 30-49 years and 50 and over years of age. The youngest group proved to be the most literate; their illiteracy range was a low 1-9%. The oldest (50 and over) group proved most deficient in reading ability, with an illiteracy range of 5-17%. Both the 25-29 year olds and the 30-49 year olds had an identical illiteracy range of 2-11%.

While only one percent of the youngest group missed over 30% of the answers on all forms averaged together, two percent of the 25-49 year olds missed over 30%, and five percent of the 50 plus group missed the same number. While only four percent of the under-25 year olds averaged more than 20% incorrect, five percent of the 25-49 year olds and eight percent of the 50 and over group missed more than 20%. Only nine percent of the 16-24 year olds answered incorrectly more than ten percent of the forms, while 11% of the 25-49 group and a large 17% of those 50 and over answered incorrectly more than ten percent.

\* Non-white here includes blacks (Negroes), orientals, Puerto Ricans, and Mexican Americans.

CHART XIII.—AGE

[In percent]

	More than 30 percent incorrect				More than 20 percent incorrect				More than 10 percent incorrect			
	16 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 49	50 and over	16 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 49	50 and over	16 to 24	25 to 29	30 to 49	50 and over
Form I.....	(1)	1	(1)	2	1	2	1	4	3	5	5	12
Form II.....	1	1	2	4	2	4	3	7	5	9	9	19
Form III.....	(1)	1	1	1	2	3	3	4	9	7	8	9
Form IV.....	(1)	1	(1)	2	1	2	(1)	2	2	5	2	4
Form V.....	6	9	8	15	12	14	16	25	27	29	33	43
Average.....	1	2	2	5	4	5	5	8	9	11	11	17

1 Less than 0.5 percent.

## XIV

In comparing age with literacy, the study focused particularly on a limited sector of all age groups—those with an income of less than \$5,000 annually. For this low income group, the illiteracy range for all age groups is noticeably higher than the range for age

groups regardless of income. The illiteracy range for people under 30 years under \$5,000 is 2-13% (compared to a 2-10% range for all income groups together). The range for 30-49 years olders under \$5,000 is 4-16 (compared to the 2-11% range for all income groups). The range for 50 year olds and older

earning less than \$5,000 is 7-21% (compared to the 5-17% range for all income groups in that age category). The old and the poor each have serious reading problems, but the elderly poor must struggle most for "survival".

CHART XIV.—INCOME UNDER \$5,000 BY AGE

[In percent]

	More than 30 percent incorrect			More than 20 percent incorrect			More than 10 percent incorrect		
	Under 30	30 to 49	50 and over	Under 30	30 to 49	50 and over	Under 30	30 to 49	50 and over
Form I.....	1	2	4	3	8	12	13	24	15
Form II.....	1	3	7	5	11	17	24	15	8
Form III.....	4	4	4	7	8	13	10	3	45
Form IV.....	5	5	5	5	4	3	8	15	21
Form V.....	7	12	19	13	20	30	28	36	21
Average.....	2	4	7	5	7	11	13	16	21

## XV

In their fight for equality, women have managed to surpass men slightly in reading ability. While only two percent of all women interviewed missed more than 30% of the answers, three percent of the men missed the same number. Only five percent of the women compared to six percent of the men incorrectly answered more than 20% of the forms. Only 11% of the women missed more than ten percent of the answers, while a larger 14% of the men missed the same number. Thus, the illiteracy range for the men were three to 14%, compared to a lower two to 11% for the women.

CHART XV.—SEX

[In percent]

	More than 30 percent incorrect		More than 20 percent incorrect		More than 10 percent incorrect	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Form I.....	1	(1)	3	1	10	4
Form II.....	2	1	4	2	12	9
Form III.....	1	1	4	3	9	8
Form IV.....	1	1	1	2	4	3
Form V.....	9	9	18	17	36	33
Average.....	3	2	6	5	14	11

1 Less than 0.5 percent.

## XVI

Americans born outside the United States have assimilated relatively well into the literate population of this country. Their illiteracy range is only seven to 16%, compared with the three to 13% range among the total population. Seven percent of these

immigrants (compared to three percent of all Americans) missed more than 30% of the answers. Nine percent missed more than 20% (compared to five percent of all Americans). Finally, 16% missed more than ten percent of all answers (compared to 13% of all Americans).

CHART XVI.—BORN OUTSIDE OF UNITED STATES

[In percent]

	More than 30 percent incorrect		More than 20 percent incorrect		More than 10 percent incorrect	
	Respondents born outside of United States	Total respondents	Respondents born outside of United States	Total respondents	Respondents born outside of United States	Total respondents
Form I.....	3	1	5	2	9	7
Form II.....	8	2	9	4	19	11
Form III.....	5	1	6	3	10	8
Form IV.....	5	*	5	1	5	3
Form V.....	13	9	19	17	37	34
Average.....	7	3	9	5	16	13

## XVII

The final dimension was educational background. Not surprisingly, reading ability increased in direct proportion to years of education. The illiteracy range of people who completed eighth grade or less was seven to 23%, compared to a two to 12% range for those who completed some high school, and a one to eight percent range for people

with some college education. It is striking, however, that 26% of the people with some college education missed more than ten percent of Form V. These figures suggest that the practical reading ability needed to complete the forms essential for "survival" may differ somewhat from the achievement-oriented or theoretical reading skills stressed in many of our schools and colleges.

CHART XVII.—EDUCATION

[In percent]

	More than 30 percent incorrect			More than 20 percent incorrect			More than 10 percent incorrect		
	8th grade or less	High school	College	8th grade or less	High school	College	8th grade or less	High school	College
Form I.....	2	1	(1)	5	2	1	17	6	3
Form II.....	6	1	1	9	3	2	27	9	5
Form III.....	4	1	1	8	3	2	17	8	4
Form IV.....	4	(1)	1	5	1	1	8	3	2
Form V.....	20	8	4	29	17	10	46	34	26
Average.....	7	2	1	11	5	3	23	12	8

1 Less than 0.5 percent.



## SAMPLING METHOD

The Harris study for the National Reading Council was based on a national sample survey of the civilian non-institutional population of the United States. (Alaska and Hawaii, however, are not represented in the sample.) Interviews were conducted with randomly designated respondents in 100 different locations throughout the country. The schedules (completed questionnaires) and forms were edited and coded in New York. The coded questionnaires were key punched and the data tabulated by standard computer equipment. Analysis of the data was done by Louis Harris and Associates, Inc.

The national sample used for this study is based on intercensal estimates of the population of each state in the country, and of the population resident in standard metropolitan areas and in the rest of the country. These population estimates are produced annually by the Bureau of the Census. The sample locations are selected biennially to reflect the cumulative changes in the country's demographic profile.

The national sample is stratified in two dimensions—geographic region and metropolitan (and non-metropolitan) residence. Stratification insures that the sample will reflect, within one percent, the national proportions of the constituent strata.

Within each stratum the selection of the ultimate sampling unit (a cluster of adjacent households) was achieved in a series of steps, technically called multi-stage cluster sampling. First states, then counties and then minor civil divisions (cities, towns, townships) were selected with probability proportional to census estimates of their respective household populations.

Maps of the selected civil division were obtained and partitioned by segments containing approximately the same number of households. This was generally done in New York, but for the smaller civil divisions, segmenting was generally performed in the field. One of the segments in each civil division was included in the literary survey.

Interviewers contact 16 households within each segment. At each household the respondent was chosen by means of a random selection pattern, geared to the number of adults sixteen years or older of each sex who live in the household. On the average a segment produced one dozen respondents who met the age, sex and voting requirements of the survey.

When the completed interviews were received in New York a subsample of the respondents were re-contacted to verify that the data had been accurately recorded. Occupation, industry, and "open-ended" public opinion questions were coded. The information contained in the coded questionnaires was then transferred to punch cards to permit computer processing and tabulation of the data.

Attempted interviews.....	1685
	Percent
Interviews completed.....	88
Interviews not completed.....	12
Communication barrier (language, deafness).....	8
Refused to fill out forms.....	3
Continuation prevented by blindness, visual defect.....	1

## THE 52D ANNIVERSARY OF LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

## HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, this past July 19 there was much pomp and cere-

mony in the little Nation of Latvia. Top Government officials hailed this day as the 30th anniversary of the restoration of Soviet power in Latvia. But the individual Latvian did not share the joy of his "elected leaders." Instead, he will silently commemorate today as that day when 52 years ago Latvia enjoyed for a moment the freedom we in this country so frequently take for granted.

The people of this Baltic nation had such high hopes when they embarked on their adventure 52 years ago. That was in 1918 when they joined Lithuania and Estonia in seceding from Russia. For several years it was necessary for them to defend their freedom against both Germany and Russia, but by May 1, 1920, the provisional Latvian Government had called a constituent assembly. This assembly in 1922 adopted a democratic constitution which provided for a universal, equal, direct, and secret vote. It also allowed equal rights and cultural autonomy to national minorities. At this time an agrarian reform plan was also put into effect, and the Latvian people were finally given an opportunity to till their own land—and even more important—to own their own land.

Then came 1940, and the invasion by Soviet Armed Forces. Now the Latvians can only remember freedom and democracy in their most private thoughts.

Mr. Speaker, I have many constituents of Latvian descent in my congressional district, and I have heard from them the truth about the takeover of their nation. These people are wonderful. They are so industrious and hard working. You would love them, and you would mourn with them over the loss of their beloved homeland.

So, to all my Latvian friends I want to say that my heart and thoughts are with you today. Please know that I will not cease my efforts until your homeland is once more free.

## GET THE DRUG PEDDLERS

## HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is certainly essential that a truly coordinated attack be sustained against all forms of drug traffic and use. Evidence of the tragedy of drug abuse is so obvious that dabbling with drugs cannot be encouraged or even tolerated.

A very timely and effective editorial in the Saturday, November 14, Chicago Tribune came to my attention as it effectively emphasized the international complications and developments in drug control. The item follows:

## GET THE DRUG PEDDLERS

The battle against the "drug culture" requires both defensive and offensive strategy. The defensive strategy, as we noted yesterday, means recognizing the extent of our drug problem and the fact that it is being spawned mainly on the campuses of our colleges, high schools, and even grade schools.

It means conditioning children, parents and teachers so that they will not be tempted

to use drugs, will not condone the use of drugs, will fight back with the honest and cruel facts about drug addiction, and will never try to dodge the issue.

On the offensive side, the battle must be carried to the campus "pushers" [who may pose as parking lot attendants or stadium guards so that they can carry on their trade beyond observation]; and to the narcotics rings from which they obtain their supply; and to the smugglers who bring drugs into the country; and even to those foreign countries which are lax about enforcing their own laws against producing drugs and selling them.

It is worth noting that while countries like Mexico and Turkey, where some farmers depend on drugs for a livelihood, may wink at the sale of drugs for export, few countries if any are as tolerant of drug use within their own boundaries as the United States.

While our Supreme Court reversed the conviction of Timothy Leary and pulled the props out from under our antimarijuana laws, Europeans in particular have been tightening up on drugs. In France a cabinet member scoffed at the notion that drugs should be excused as a reaction against "society."

"A fine rationalization," the minister of the interior said, "to hide character weakness. Drug users . . . are sheep without personal motivation."

The French people are not going to fall for the drug culture, he said. And, just to make sure, he has added dozens of agents to the drug squad in the area of Marseilles, where drugs usually enter France [and where tons of them are illicitly transshipped to the United States].

Just this week, the West German government announced plans to put marijuana on the same footing as harder drugs. It recognized that both are part of the same problem and that it is unrealistic to try to fight them under different rules.

These are the same Europeans whose "sophistication" and "tolerance" some Americans admire when it comes to pornography, sexual matters, or alcohol. These Americans use the same logic in arguing for easier rules on marijuana, while in fact the Europeans are getting tougher. More than 400 young Americans, who went abroad under the misapprehension that they would find greener pastures, are languishing in foreign jails because they were caught with drugs [sometimes only marijuana] in their possession.

It's time for us to catch up with Europe. Peddlers of narcotics must no longer be allowed to pose as heroes for outwitting the "establishment," or as persecuted entrepreneurs or psychedelic travel agents. In a sense they are murderers, because they are leading hundreds of youngsters each year to their deaths.

It won't be easy to reverse years of inaction and tolerance. The drug traffic is too widespread to be stifled overnight. Cutting off one supply route may simply raise prices and increase the pressure on peddlers and addicts to find other sources. But no program is going to work unless we go after the peddlers, from the 9th grade pusher in the boys' washroom to the international racketeer. The stakes are too great to accept excuses.

## MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

## HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 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?

#### THE QUESTION OF TELEPHONE RATES

**HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, this morning's newspapers tell us that the American Telephone & Telegraph Co. will, on Friday, file a petition with the Federal Communications Commission asking for long-distance—interstate—rate increases totalling \$385 million. This increase, if granted, will go into effect on January 19, 1971, and will increase interstate toll calls an average of 6 percent.

Of course, this request should be carefully studied by the Federal Communications Commission, as I am sure it will be. But I would like to stress three points.

First, A.T. & T. has asked not only for an increase in their rates but also in their rate of return to a record 9½ percent. In 1967, after extensive consideration of what would constitute a reasonable profit for the phone company, the FCC set 7½ percent as a guideline. Earlier this year, after finding that A.T. & T. was earning considerably in excess of their expected return, the FCC approved new rates which would sustain a rate of return around 8 percent. Now A.T. & T. wants 9½ percent.

Second, I believe that local rates, particularly the basic monthly rates, should be reduced and that if it is necessary to increase interstate long-distance rates to do this, so be it. But not only does it appear that this will not be the case, I understand that the reverse in fact is likely to occur. Approval of higher interstate rates are likely to be used by A.T. & T. to support their requests for higher local rates. "If the FCC sees the need for us to increase our rate of return, State regulatory agencies can do no less," the company argument will be.

Third, A.T. & T. is justifying, in large part, its request for rate increases on the urgent need to improve services around the country. But should higher rates not come only after they have improved services? A.T. & T. has, at long last, recognized that telephone service is deteriorating in many places. But even their substantial efforts to correct service deficiencies in New York do not show positive results. In fact, the most recent report to Governor Rockefeller from the State Public Service Commission states that in many respects, service is getting still worse, if that is possible. The telephone company acknowledges that the service problems are their own fault; they failed to predict the increase in demand that has occurred in recent years, stimulated at least in part by their own advertising.

Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I am sure that the FCC will carefully examine

A.T. & T.'s requests for higher rates. But I would hope that, in arriving at their decision, the FCC will consider the impact that a decision to increase the interstate rate of return is likely to have on State regulatory commissions. I would further hope that they will consider whether it is proper to guarantee a public monopoly a higher profit in the face of declining service.

#### THE SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

**HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, Alexander Hamilton said:

Those, therefore, who preach doctrines, or set examples which undermine or subvert the authority of the laws, lead us from freedom to slavery. They incapacitate us from a government of laws, and consequently prepare the way for one of force, for mankind must have government of one sort or another.

In the Alice-in-Wonderland world of Washington there are occasionally sane and sober occurrences. One such event which occurred recently was President Nixon's renomination of Mr. Otto Otepka to the Subversive Activities Control Board, SACB.

For those not familiar with the story of Otto Otepka's struggle against the entire "liberal" establishment, I would recommend the excellent book by William Gill aptly entitled "The Ordeal of Otto Otepka." Briefly told, the story starts in 1961 when the New Frontiersmen came swarming into Washington. They found that Mr. Otepka was deputy director of the State Department's Office of Security. They also found that he was loath to issue many of them security clearances. This put such a cramp in the style of the New Frontier that Otepka found himself the target of incredible harassment, ranging from having his job abolished, himself declared persona non grata and his fellow employees forbidden to speak to him, to a not so clever frame-up and a make-work job which assured that his talents in the security field would not be used. Finally he was fired.

Otepka, however, was not the quitting type. He fought back with every legal remedy available. After years of persecution, including smears by newspapers which attempt to picture themselves as the champions of the persecuted, Otepka was finally vindicated. In 1969 he was appointed to the SACB to serve out a deceased member's unexpired term, over the objections of several far-left Senators and allegedly of the man who is now Secretary of State. Several Senators are attempting to block Otepka's confirmation.

The fact that Otepka has been renominated for a full 5-year term on the Board is a double victory. In the first place, it shows that it is possible to "fight city hall" and win. If a man has enough courage and determination, victory is possible. The will to win, the will to seek

justice is a real factor in the battle which roars around our heads. Without it, nothing is possible. With it, the possibilities are endless.

In the second place, this appointment continues a knowledgeable and courageous man in a position from which much can be done to stifle the subversive movement within the United States—the movement which would, in Hamilton's words, "lead us from freedom to slavery." The SACB was created by the Subversive Activities Control Act of 1950. At the request of the Attorney General, the Board holds hearings to determine whether a group is a Communist-action, Communist-front, or Communist-infiltrated organization. The SACB is the only governmental organization we have which was created solely for the purpose of hindering Communist operations in the United States.

The SACB is best thought of as a "truth in political packaging" device, designed to protect the citizen consumer from swallowing political poison dished up in various attractive guises. It was reasoned that if the American people knew that an organization was controlled by agents of a foreign and hostile government, then that organization would not be able to manipulate people by rallying them to its program through the use of apparently worthy causes.

The nonarmed aspect of Communist revolutionary warfare in Vietnam and the United States is basically the same: the manipulation of front groups through the use of popular issues or appeals to gather large numbers of non-Communists and guide them in directions consonant with Communist goals. A large number are manipulated by a small tightly organized Communist nucleus, known rightly as a fraction.

The idea behind the SACB was that if the fraction could be exposed—the arsenic camouflaged as intellectual sweetmeats—then non-Communist support would fall away and the party would be isolated and powerless. The act recognized that it was not the motives of the individuals, who became affiliated with the fraction-controlled mass organizations, which was truly important to our security, but rather the purpose for which these people were actually being organized.

The concept behind the SACB was so sound that it immediately became the main target of the Communist Party and its legal section. During the sixties a succession of Attorneys General, such as Ramsey Clark, participated in the effort to vitiate the SACB by refusing to submit organizational cases to it. Coupled with several unintelligible court decisions, this suppression of our most important organ for controlling the Communists has in no small way contributed to the success of the enemy campaign here at home against our war effort in Vietnam. Poison not identified has been consumed in large doses by many people.

To find the enemy fractions, we need the SACB. Senate bill No. 12—see my newsletter of September 23—cosponsored by Senator MURPHY, which seems to have found a permanent home in the



Senate Judiciary Committee, strengthens the SACB. Even the most courageous men need legal authority to do their jobs correctly. It is important to let the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator EASTLAND, and the Attorney General, John N. Mitchell, know that there is a pressing need for this legislation.

#### DYNAMIC DEVELOPMENT

### HON. G. ELLIOTT HAGAN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. HAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the First Congressional District of Georgia, which I have the honor to represent in this body, has long been known as the Coastal Empire region of our State. As the name implies, this section of Georgia is an empire of resources—human and physical—which together are bringing about a great thrust of economic progress for the people of the coastal area.

On October 4, the story of the economic progress and the potential future growth of this section was told in detail in a special edition of the Savannah Morning News & Evening Press. Called the Golden Seventies edition, the paper told of the many fine industries and institutions that are contributing to the economic well-being of the Coastal Empire.

One of these industries is Interstate Paper Corp. of Riceboro, Ga., in Liberty County, the heart of the Coastal Empire. It was my great pleasure, Mr. Speaker, to participate in the dedication of Interstate's modern, new mill in May 1968. The event was the culmination of a long effort on the part of many people to bring this new industry to our section to provide a source of new jobs, to stimulate new economic activity, and to create a new market for the south Georgia pine which abounds in the coastal area.

Today, 3½ years later, I would like to summarize some of the principal economic benefits that have occurred as a result of Interstate Paper's location in our area:

Total, area-wide economic impact, annual.....	\$50,000,000
Jobs created directly.....	295
Annual payroll and fringe benefits.....	3,000,000
Counties of employee residence.....	8
Pulpwood purchases (current year).....cords.....	285,000
Counties in which pulpwood purchased.....	40
Number landowners supplying pulpwood.....	1,100
Forest land improved (current year).....acres.....	8,000
Counties of forest land improvement.....	5
Supplies and services purchased, annual.....	\$3,200,000
Jobs created indirectly.....	250

Mr. Speaker, I think this is an impressive record of economic benefits in a relatively brief period of time, and I am pleased to share them with my colleagues from all parts of the country. I also wish

to share with them the article from the Savannah Morning News & Evening Press about Interstate Paper Corp.:

#### INTERSTATE EXPECTS DYNAMIC DEVELOPMENT

RICEBORO, GA.—If the past two and one half years are any guide, the decade of the seventies will be a period of dynamic development for Interstate Paper Corp.—already a valuable contributor to the Coastal Empire economy.

Interstate, a producer of kraft linerboard for the corrugated box industry, has scored an impressive string of "firsts" in the paper industry at its modern, \$27 million Liberty County facility. Among them:

The first mill in the United States to develop and operate a process for removing color from paper mill waste water.

The first mill to employ a comprehensive three-stage system to prevent water pollution, utilizing color removal, primary and secondary treatment.

The first mill in Georgia to be selected as a demonstration model in water pollution control by the Federal Water Quality Administration under its matching grant program.

The first mill in the United States to participate in a study by government research agencies on the effect of treated pulp mill effluent on estuarine waters.

The first mill of its kind in Georgia—and one of the few anywhere—to rely totally on independent sources for its pulpwood needs instead of buying up its own woodlands.

The first mill to offer complete reforestation services, including heavy clearing equipment and technical advice, exclusively to private timberland owners.

The first mill to develop a process for using aged yellow pine stumps as a source of wood fiber for conversion into paper.

Interstate management and research brought forward two significant new industry developments during the past year—both with far-reaching implications for conservation.

#### STUMPWOOD PAPER

First, Interstate researchers have discovered that wood from old yellow pine stumps could be used as a fiber source for making linerboard.

As a result, starting Jan. 1, almost a third of Interstate's pulpwood needs will be met by stumpwood supplied by Hercules Incorporated of Brunswick. Hercules buys yellow pine stumps from throughout the Southeast and extracts resins and pine chemicals from them at Brunswick, afterwards burning the residue stumpwood for fuel.

The stumpwood Interstate will use each year will replace 86,000 cords of green pulpwood from the living forest. This is equivalent to the annual growth from 175,000 acres of average Georgia timberland.

Thus, use of stumpwood for making linerboard not only represents a technological breakthrough in the pulp and paper industry, but is a significant step in the conservation and fuller utilization of the forest resources of Coastal Georgia and the Southeast.

#### REFORESTATION OFFERED

The second recent development was the decision by Interstate to offer a full-range of reforestation services exclusively for private landowners within a 50-county area of the Coastal Empire.

The decision involved the investment of some \$250,000 of company funds in heavy equipment for clearing, site preparing, and replanting of cutover woodlands under the supervision of trained foresters. Through this reforestation program, productivity of thousands of acres of privately-held timberlands will be improved each year, resulting in increased land values for owners and in greater forest resources for the state.

Looking toward the future William J. Verross, vice president and general manager, said Interstate currently is researching some additional avenues for expanding the wood fiber potential of this area.

"We also are investigating some ideas that could result in the establishment of one or more additional satellite industries to augment the 295 jobs we have created directly," he said.

One field in which Interstate engineers and researchers remain active is pollution control. The company's efforts thus far have focused national and international attention on Riceboro, including visits by approximately 250 scientists and technicians from 60 companies and six countries to inspect and study Interstate's waste treatment system.

At the request of the Federal Water Quality Administration, Verross in August described Interstate's color removal work to a group of Russian scientists who visited Georgia as part of a State Department-sponsored tour to observe water pollution control methods in the United States. Interstate was one of only three industrial pollution control examples included in the Russian tour.

Secretary of Interior Walter J. Hickel also included Interstate among three U.S. companies singled out for favorable comment in a report submitted to Congress last June on the status of the nation's water pollution control program. Said the report:

"The color of pulp and paper mill wastes has long been an aesthetic nuisance, difficult to control. Interstate Paper Corp. at Riceboro, Ga., has demonstrated the lime coagulation process for the removal of color from kraft pulping effluents."

#### SUSTAINING THE PRISONERS OF WAR

### HON. ROBERT P. GRIFFIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, the glories of fall have begun to fade. The dull and dismal November-December days have begun. Yet we in America have always taken cheer and hope during this time with our great Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays.

Not so with nearly 1,400 Americans who we believe are held in Communist prison camps. They are still hostages, used for whatever propaganda purposes their captors choose.

Let us bend every effort to persuade the North Vietnamese regime to actually allow messages and packages to reach American prisoners at least during this season. And, parenthetically, what a meager concession this will be on the part of Hanoi. How far removed from the minimum requirements of decent treatment as laid down in the Geneva Convention on Treatment of Prisoners of War.

Nor can we forget the families of these prisoners who have lived on the knife edge of anxiety for so long. Anything any one of us can do to help to alleviate this sorrow is certainly owed these gallant people.

## OUR FUTURE IN VIETNAM

## HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, the author of the following article has spent the last 18 months in Vietnam and emerged with some cogent observations on what choices lie ahead for us in Southeast Asia.

I recommend his dispatch in Newsweek as an eloquent exposition of the view that the United States can—indeed must—withdraw entirely from Vietnam in the next 2 or 3 years. The author also points out how our present disengagement procedure cannot possibly culminate in total withdrawal.

The text of the article follows:

## VIETNAMIZATION IS NOT PEACE

(By Maynard Parker)

Until recently, when he was reassigned to Hong Kong, Maynard Parker was Newsweek's bureau chief in Saigon. After eighteen months of reporting both the political and military aspects of the Vietnamese war, Parker filed this personal assessment on the prospects for peace in Indochina:

Last year, when I stopped in Paris en route to Saigon, the talk was not whether there would be peace, but how soon it would come. Even in Saigon, there was a feeling that peace was a few months away. South Vietnamese politicians gossiped about who might be included in a coalition peace Cabinet, and in the countryside, U.S. advisers discussed which villages would hoist the NLF flag on cease-fire day. But today, no one in Vietnam thinks there will be peace this year or even this decade.

Personally, I am convinced that hundreds—perhaps several thousand—more Americans will die before the U.S. has extricated itself from this war. For in retrospect, it is questionable whether either side went to Paris prepared to negotiate anything but a veiled surrender by the other side. The essential question of the war has always been who will emerge with power in Saigon, and on that question neither side has been willing to make significant concessions. Certainly, the Communists have not. Neither has President Nixon—for fear of placing the Thieu government in an impossible position of military and political inferiority. As President Thieu himself told a group of visitors a few months ago: "I'm too weak to cooperate in an accommodation with the Communists."

Now after a string of military successes, Thieu is telling his countrymen just the opposite—that South Vietnam is too strong to compromise with the other side. Only President Nixon could have broken this impasse by forcing Thieu to make peace. In choosing not to do that in the first days of his term, Mr. Nixon almost by default has opted for a long war and a continued American involvement under his Vietnamization policy. A diplomat whom I know in Saigon is now offering to bet a case of champagne that there will be 50,000 U.S. troops in Vietnam in 1980. I would not bet against him.

For far from staging a great retreat from Vietnam or Asia, I think Mr. Nixon is in Vietnam to stay. Vietnamization will permit substantial American withdrawals, but it is not a withdrawal strategy. The basic American objective of winning the war has remained unchanged. Deputy Ambassador

Samuel Berger, holding forth at a Saigon dinner party, once told me: "The American people are not like the French. They aren't losers; they don't want to go out of here defeated and we're not going to." And that kind of thinking prevails among U.S. officials in Vietnam. While paying lip service to the Paris talks, these officials are rosily predicting that the war will simply die out—in a way which will amount to a U.S. victory. The enemy, in this view, will eventually fade away, except for what Deputy Ambassador William Colby, one of the architects of the extraordinarily successful U.S. pacification program, calls "a residual level of violence." What is always left out of these predictions, however, is the fact that such a level will require a million-man South Vietnamese army and thousands of American troops.

American officials in Washington hint that the President will have all U.S. troops out of a combat role by next summer. But U.S. military commanders in Saigon are planning to keep at least two U.S. divisions plus supporting units in enclaves—one in the Saigon-Long Binh area and another in the Da Nung-Hue area—for the indefinite future. Mr. Nixon will no doubt call these men security forces instead of combat troops, but whatever the semantics, they will be employed in a combat role as a reaction force to bail the ARVN out of any possible trouble.

It seems to me that this policy entails enormous risks. It is not just that there will be an undeniable physical danger to the U.S. troops left behind in the enclaves. The Vietnamese Communists are not simply going to fade away—not as long as they are respected in the south as the heirs of Vietnam's nationalistic traditions and not as long as the Chinese continue to supply them. And as the war drags on, it will become more dangerous for the United States in certain respects. Not only do we risk an ever-higher penalty in terms of lost prestige for any eventual defeat, but there is the danger of the war spreading even further. Cambodia has already been drawn into the general conflagration. And further escalation—a thrust across the Laotian panhandle or even limited bombing of North Vietnam—should not be ruled out, particularly if Mr. Nixon wins a second term and feels freer than he does now of the constraints of public opinion.

What then is an alternative solution? The only answer possible at this late date seems to be for the U.S. to announce a deadline for the withdrawal of all U.S. troops. I do not suggest that the U.S. should accept the NLF's timetable or even those put forth by various Congressional critics of the Administration. Rather the Administration should choose a deadline such as Christmas 1972 or even Christmas 1973—a deadline which would shock the South Vietnamese into the realization that the Americans really are leaving the country.

I do not think it fair to suggest, as Ambassador Bunker has often done, that by pulling out in such a fashion the United States would be winking on its commitment to the Vietnamese and that Washington's word would no longer be worth anything to its allies. The U.S. commitment to Vietnam was never meant to be open-ended. The United States has stopped the enemy from taking over; it has introduced Vietnamization to enable the South Vietnamese to defend themselves; and it has introduced a semi-democratic, constitutional government in the process.

Nor do I agree that setting such a deadline would mean abandoning the South Vietnamese to disaster. The military situation in South Vietnam has now progressed to the point where a military take-over by

the Communists is no longer a real possibility—not at least in the next two or three years. If the South Vietnamese, with a million-man army and with one of the world's largest air forces, cannot defend themselves within a year or two years' time, then there is very little reason to think they ever will be ready to stand alone.

## FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

## HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, I believe that the following article about the Federal Power Commission will be of interest to my colleagues and I insert it in the RECORD:

## FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION

(By Keith Roberts)

Electricity shocks in more ways than one these days. Consider: the generation and transmission of electricity destroys more wild or scenic areas than almost any other activity. Witness the Grand Canyon, Hells Canyon, Nipomo Dunes, Storm King, and Ramparts Dam proposals, to say nothing of transmission line routing.

Power plants contribute nearly 50 per cent of all sulfur dioxide and 20 per cent of nitrogen oxide emissions in the nation, which are estimated to cause billions of dollars in crop and property damage and wreak untold injury on human health.

Thermal pollution is an increasingly recognized hazard; and the extraction and transportation of fossil fuels spread drilling rigs, strip mine scars, and oil slicks over the earth's face. In short, while we are reeling from the present impact of electric power, the electric utility industry happily predicts that power output will quadruple in the next twenty years. This juggernaut will require at least 150 new sites for major generating installations; transmission lines, which presently cover three million acres, will devour four million more.

In the absence of a coherent and persuasive case for slowing the increase in power consumption, indiscriminate opposition to all specific proposals for power generation, be they hydroelectric, conventional steam-generating plants, or nuclear reactors, appears increasingly short-sighted. To be fair, articulating a sound energy policy is a task of extreme difficulty. In attacking electric power, environmentalists encounter an array of political and economic muscle. The electric utility industry is the nation's largest. Its monopoly position and guaranteed rate of return on expenses (usually including political, legal and public relations outlays) multiply the impact of its size. Attacks on electric power also meet opposition from coal, gas, oil, railroad, and electric equipment interests.

Under these circumstances, environmentalists might consider courting the governmental agencies with the power, expertise, and duty to shape energy policy. Chief among these is the Federal Power Commission, created in 1920 to ensure that hydroelectric projects and other uses of the nation's water resources would be "best adapted to a comprehensive plan for improving or developing a waterway or waterways" for the public benefit, and in 1935 given broad planning authority "for the purpose of assuring an



abundant supply of electric energy . . . with the greatest possible economy and with regard to the proper utilization and conservation of natural resources."

Far from hosting a flock of environmental suitors, however, the FPC finds itself largely abandoned to the advances of the electric power industry. For all the public interest this powerful agency attracts, it might as well be the Fountains and Playgrounds Commission. Unfortunately, public inattention, and the irresponsibility of too many Commissioners, have wrought their effect. Originally a conservationist triumph over exploiters, the Commission now protects the very practices it should prevent. Of most immediate environmental concern are its failures in planning and licensing.

The Commission does no ongoing power planning. Its major planning effort has been concentrated in the 1964 National Power Survey and its forthcoming 1970 version. Unfortunately the Commission has chosen to undertake these surveys by creating industry task forces and stitching together the work they produce. It does little or no staff work; the result is basically an industry concoction. Neither the public concerned about the environment, nor consumers, receive any representation on these task forces whatsoever, with the token exception of a recently appointed task force on environment. This pillar of public participation not only comes so late in the planning process as to be virtually powerless, it also contains a most unrepresentative membership. Seven members represent government agencies. Of the other three, one represents Commonwealth Edison; one is an engineering professor; and one is a conservationist.

Not surprisingly, the power surveys merely sanctify the industry's predictions of enormous consumption increases although the predictions themselves are based on purely passive projections of historical trends, as computed and assembled by utility staffs. Nor has the Commission itself studied such questions as how efficiently we use power, the effect of rates on power use patterns, or the effect on unemployment of substituting electrical for mechanical power. Instead, it churns out speech after speech attacking those who oppose increased power consumption, chanting the industry's litany that such ideas are impractical, and piously proclaiming the goal of "serving the utility needs of the nation's consumers while preserving our environmental quality of life," in the words of Chairman Nassikas at hearings of U.S. Senate, Committee on Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy, Natural Resources and the Environment.

Turning from planning to the actual licensing of hydroelectric facilities, the FPC's present performance seems even worse. In the absence of informed public participation, licensing has come to encompass a multitude of sins. The most serious, from an environmental point of view, is that the formal licensing procedures come so late in the planning process that denial, substantial modification, or any other delay-causing move by the FPC with respect to a major project would be highly disruptive to power reliability, and therefore virtually out of the question. This circumstance has made intervention in these proceedings—the only good opportunity for public participation—mainly a prescription for costly frustration.

The one apparent exception, the Storm King case, merely illustrates the point. In 1963, Consolidated Edison sought to license a huge hydroelectric facility at Storm King mountain, on a scenic portion of the Hudson River. Since it planned the facility to be operational by 1968, its own planning procedures required it to know the site, design,

and major engineering details of the project by 1958 at the latest. Yet, by delaying the application until 1963, Con Edison virtually assured a favorable FPC decision since, at that late date, alternative power sources to meet the 1968 demand could not readily be found. Thus, unless the FPC wanted to risk power blackouts, it had to grant the license.

The conservationists who intervened to seek denial of the license therefore played against a stacked deck from the start. Despite a battle which has lasted for over seven years, expenditures of nearly \$1 million, and donated services worth several million more, there is no serious prospect that the license will be denied. To be sure, the intervenors have won substantial modifications in the project design, but even this partial victory illustrates less the efficacy of intervening in licensing procedures than the enormous effort required to obtain any success whatsoever. Unfortunately, Storm King, while spectacular, represents the normal approach to licensing of electric utility installations on both the federal and state level.

Despite the sorry state of the Federal Power Commission (exacerbated by the present Chairman's apparent belief that all problems can be solved by leaving them to state regulation and utility company benevolence), conservationists could not make a worse mistake than to turn away from it. It is the agency with both the power and responsibility to resolve many of the environmental problems of electric power. Indeed, the present failure of its planning and licensing procedures is partly attributable to conservationist neglect, and will change only when environmentalists pay it some attention.

Environmentalists might question the Commission's present planning efforts, publicize its incestuous parentage, and remain skeptical of its "findings." They could seek thorough reform of Commission planning; let the Commission engage in continuous planning efforts, including a search for answers to some of the basic questions that have been raised about the effects of electric power. Any such planning should permit adequate input from all interested parties. With respect to the National Power Survey, the Commission should insure adequate public representation on the advisory committees and task forces.

Environmentalists should also seek reform of the licensing procedures. Indeed, by permitting utilities to file applications so late in the planning stage, the FPC arguably violates the Federal Power Act which, according to the Supreme Court in *Udall v. FPC*, 387 US 428, requires it to fully consider all reasonable alternatives before licensing a hydroelectric project as "best adapted to a comprehensive plan" for the waterway. It seems clear that the Commission can hardly give full consideration to alternatives if, in fact, the application has been filed so late as to preclude their existence. One possible reform would be to require two license hearings on a project, one at an early point in the planning stage. It would impose no great burden on utilities to submit their projects ten or more years in advance for siting and design consideration and early submission would permit effective examination of utility planning, project choice, and facility design. Intricate safety and engineering details of the project could be left to a later proceeding.

There are various ways to exert pressure for such structural reforms (other than picketing and the like). One of those most overlooked is talking with the people responsible—in this case, FPC Commissioners, high officials, and Congressmen on the Senate and House Commerce Committees. Invite them to events, write them letters, petition for rulemaking to remedy the problems. Another approach is to marshal Congressional pressure

by getting Congressmen to make inquiries, hold hearings, or introduce legislation. A third lever of pressure, probably the most important, is publicity. Officials neglecting their job or doing it badly prove allergic to publicity and react quickly, for adverse attention bruises egos, damages careers, and embarrasses superiors. Lawsuits, where feasible, can of course provide the most effective pressure.

Structural reform takes time. Meanwhile, intervention can be highly useful, as the Club has learned in the cases to which it has been a party: Storm King, Grand Canyon, Hells Canyon, and others. While present procedures make successful opposition to important new projects exceedingly difficult, intervention can obtain modifications, and may even stop some projects. But the relicensing cases now arising provide a major opportunity for useful intervention. Many major hydroelectric licenses are expiring. Under the Federal Power Act, the government may "recapture" these projects, or the Commission may award the project license to the applicant or anyone else. Under the conditions of the law, the fair cost of take-over should be little or nothing in most cases, even though continued possession of the hydroelectric facility would be extremely valuable to the utility involved. These circumstances give the intervenor tremendous leverage to obtain modifications, promises, or other advantages from the vulnerable licensee. Intervention also provides an opportunity for communicating with the Commission in a persuasive way and changing its present outlook.

Notice of forthcoming proceedings appears in the *Federal Register* and local newspapers in affected areas. The easiest way to learn of them, however, is to subscribe to the free FPC News, published weekly by the Commission's Office of Communication. The public generally has 30 days to respond to license applications. But the only effective response, practically speaking, is a formal petition to intervene.

While intervention can prove time-consuming and expensive, it automatically provides several benefits. First, it alerts the Commission staff to the application as requiring special attention. Second, the intervenor gains a chance to persuade the FPC staff of his position. The staff prepares its own position in each case, and obviously has resources and expertise which conservationists could use. Even if the intervenor doesn't persuade the staff, he may receive assistance. Third, intervention forces the Commission to play fair. For example, the courts have ordered the Commission to consider a project's environmental impact. But the staff, however pure its heart or convincing its case, cannot appeal Commission decisions; consequently, unless an intervenor stands ready to appeal, the Commission can ignore environmental impact with impunity.

The FPC responsibilities discussed here merely scratch the surface of electric power regulation. Under the Johnson Administration, the Commission made some tentative beginnings at exercising its long dormant ratemaking powers, antitrust responsibilities, authority to require interconnection between power systems (meaning fewer, more efficient power plants), and accounting duties. These powers give the Commission considerable leverage over electric power expansion and use. While the present Commission has relaxed into inactivity, state regulation of this powerful interstate business is so weak that environmentalists have no real alternative but to turn the present Commission from its cynically irresponsible retreat.

Finally, environmentalists must press Chairman Nassikas to follow his predecessor's lead in seeking additional authority. For all its powers, the Commission lacks any con-

trol whatsoever over most steam-generating plants and transmission lines. Nor do many states have authority. Thus, incredibly, private utilities often choose plant sitings and transmission line routes with as much freedom as landowners have to locate their fenceposts. The Commission under Chairman Lee White introduced legislation to remedy this gap, and various Congressmen have proposed other legislation: such as S. 1071 by Senator Edward Kennedy, S. 2752 by Senator Edmund Muskie, and H.R. 7186 by Congressmen Richard Ottinger, John Moss and others. S. 1071 and H.R. 7186 particularly stress environmental concerns. While the Sierra Club has been supporting these measures, and indeed its Executive Director Michael McCloskey was asked to speak for conservationists at the hearing held early this year by Senator Muskie, it is crucial that more environmentalists emphatically support such measures. The public must be given an effective voice in these vital decisions.

#### DAVENPORT AUTHOR PORTRAYS TURN OF THE CENTURY LIFE IN DENMARK AND IOWA

#### HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, a prominent author in my district has recently published a new book which will be of interest not only to many of my colleagues here in the Congress but of great interest to the reading public. The author is Julie McDonald, and the book is "Amalie's Story." It is a heartwarming story of the life of a young Danish girl, who after her marriage, moves to Iowa where she spends the remainder of her life. The book cannot help but capture your intense interest as it moves through Amalie's childhood and marriage in Denmark and finally to Harlan, Iowa. The description of the life of the young couple on the Iowa prairie has tremendous charm, and to me, as a son of immigrant parents is very real. The following reviews further testify to the literary value of Mrs. McDonald's work:

[From the Davenport-Bettendorf (Iowa)  
Sunday Times-Democrat, Sept. 20, 1970]  
DAVENPORTER'S NEW NOVEL: "SUPERBLY DONE"  
(By Murray Hicky Ley)

("Amalie's Story." By Julie McDonald. 249 pp. New York: Simon and Schuster, \$6.50.)

Here is a writer, here is a story teller, here is a poet! And the evidence glows everywhere in Julie McDonald's book. Part pastoral, part small city saga, this superbly done novel chronicles life in the late 19th century in Denmark and in the American Midwest specifically in and around Harlan, Iowa.

Mrs. McDonald prefaces her book with a dedication to "...my mother, Myrtle Faur-schou Jensen Petersen, and in memory of her mother, who inspired the story of Amalie Jorgen." It is Amalie's story, told by her, of the first 35 years of her life, and, like any good story, it is also the story of others.

As a very young child, just starting to walk, Amalie is given by her parents to her mother's brother, a prosperous ship owner. With him

and his wife she makes her home. Karsten, the uncle, an able businessman, is an apparently conventional figure, but somewhere in him wild trolls run, and have their being. He brutally discharges Arne, the long time hired man, who, after a week of hiding in barns, hangs himself. Mor, his wife, wavers between Lutheranism and a sect known as the Holy Ones. Her ambivalence takes other forms: Amalie reflects that "Mor's constant talk of the love of Christ was strangely coupled with cruelty. At least it seemed cruel to me that she would pour cold water into the soup to prevent our 'worldly enjoyment' of it."

Into the materially well furnished world of these three comes young Peter Jorgen, the son of prosperous, manor owning parents. A case of love at first sight for both, marriage follows, and the business of making a living becomes paramount. The young couple buy an inn, part of which is the town jail. Just before disposing of this perhaps symbolically coupled property, they visit Copenhagen: "I (began) to feel what I had expected to experience the moment I saw Copenhagen—that 'hyggelig' or sense of well-being that would strip away an accumulation of sorrows."

Peter buys a general merchandise store in Ribe, though he longs to go to America. Amalie, loving her native Denmark refuses to go, in spite of her husband's pleas and impassioned references: "...there is a place called Shelby County in Iowa where we might go. So many of our people are in Iowa." And "his eyes blazed as he read the words of the poet Christian Winther describing America as a place where it hailed candy and rained lemonade, where roasted squabs flew straight into your mouth, and where country estates were given for the asking."

During the periods of inn and general store ownership, two children, both boys, are born to them. Both die. Then a girl is born.

And then comes America, the land of the lemonade rain, their destination Harlan, in Shelby County, Iowa. Peter, going on ahead to establish himself in business in Harlan, purchases a half interest in the Beehive, a thriving general merchandise store. Amalie and Laura, the new daughter, follow. "New York City seemed to rise from the sea like Atlantis reappearing. Glinting gold, mauve, and pink in the morning sun, the panorama of the city was a diamond point etching. It was hard and male in its power; nothing like the feminine cities of Denmark."

The young couple and their child (more come later) settle in the town of their choice, living side by side with those of their fellow countrymen who have made the same choice.

Subtly perceptive and deft is the author's handling of that which makes the remainder of this book—the always suspenseful interplay between strangers come to live in a new country and the growings, and regrowings, demanded by their wholly new environment.

In the course of a recent interview Julie McDonald, commenting on her family roots in Denmark (her mother's parents came to America in 1880), remarked, "We're obscurely related to Henrik Ibsen." I find her remark both relevant and suggestive.

For me, there are in Amalie's story certain darkly clear echoes of the great Norwegian master's myth making. In an age whose chief pillars include Auschwitz and the hydrogen bomb and the 1960s, the beings encountered by Henrik Ibsen's Peer Gynt may have a special significance. The button moulder would have something to say to the brilliant young violinist Andreas Christensen, who, after delivering Amalie's child when no doctor is available, is so deeply shocked by the sight of human birth that he emasculates himself. "He would never cause a woman such pain." And the Great

Boyg, another of Ibsen's mythed presences, would surely have certain things to say to Pastor Madsen and Peter Jorgen... While Amalie might have two things to say to him...

The only fault I have to find with this book is that it isn't long enough. Very clearly, it should have a sequel. And soon!

REVIEW FROM PUBLISHER'S WEEKLY, JULY 20, 1970

("Amalie's Story," by Julie McDonald, Simon & Schuster, \$6.50)

This likeable, winning chronicle of a Danish-American community in 19th century Iowa could be dubbed an "old-fashioned" novel; at least it has the old-fashioned virtues of a clear story line, without pretensions, without stylistic gimmicks. Details of Danish betrothal, marriage, birthing and child-rearing form the stuff of the flowing narrative, along with the difficulties of adjusting to an intimidating new land. Amalie's story is a rich tapestry of the joys and sorrows and familiar turbulence of living and dying and contentedly loving. Hers is a solid and stable life that makes a solid and appealing story.

REVIEW FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH,  
OCTOBER 4, 1970

Gently, lovingly, "Amalie's Story" recreates the simpler world of the nineteenth century when it was virtue to have an abiding sense of duty and responsibility fulfilled.

Amalie grows up in Denmark knowing she is adopted but not knowing the secret behind the adoption. This mystery is the threat which encloses the tale of her childhood, her marriage to an exciting young nobleman and her eventual migration to America.

Although a great deal has been written about the trek of other nationalities to this country, there has never been enough about the solid, almost invisibly silent, Scandinavian. They were the plodders who filled the vast midwestern plains—if they were farmers—or ran the old reliable store on the waterfront.

Behind the stolid facade, however, was a wealth of delightful tradition. Mrs. McDonald does an excellent job of bringing her grandmother's world to life, with all its superstitions and habits.

America was golden opportunity. Rumor had it that it "rained lemonade" in America and when Amalie arrived to find her new home unpainted and poor, her husband explained that a poor home in America is no disgrace. "For the first five years you belong to the freemasonry of the poor with possibilities. If you are still poor after that time, you are considered shiftless."

So be it! Readers tired of a surfeit of self-analysis and social criticism will find it cozy and relaxing to bask in the warmer atmosphere of Amalie's clearly defined world.

REVIEW FROM THE NEW YORK TIMES BOOK  
REVIEW, SEPTEMBER 27, 1970

("Amalie's Story," by Julie McDonald, 249 pp., New York, Simon & Schuster, \$6.50)

This is an old-fashioned immigrant saga in the tradition founded by Ruth Suckow, another Iowan. Mrs. McDonald begins her novel with the grim fairy tale that is told Amalie Ibsen about her adoption in 19th-century Denmark. (At age 2, Amalie had been acquired by a childless aunt and uncle.) The girl grows up to marry an impetuous Danish prince charming, to learn the true particulars of her parentage, and to suffer bravely in the Iowa hamlet where husband Peter eventually runs a general store. Mrs. McDonald writes with ingenuous charm of her heroine's battles with disaster and with her hot Danish blood.



## A RARE OPPORTUNITY IS GIVEN TO NIXON

**HON. DONALD W. RIEGLE, JR.**

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. RIEGLE. Mr. Speaker, in yesterday's Flint Journal there appeared an excellent editorial entitled "A Rare Opportunity Is Given to Nixon." This article stresses the need for greater Presidential leadership to heal the bitter wounds opened during the election struggle, and to lessen confrontation and polarization. I insert this editorial at this point in the RECORD so that all Americans can read it and work with the President to fulfill his pledge to bring us together:

### A RARE OPPORTUNITY IS GIVEN TO NIXON

At rare intervals there occurs the exactly right moment to take a decisive step which might prove useless if taken at the wrong time.

It is our opinion that this is just such a moment for President Richard M. Nixon to return to his inaugural pledge and move actively toward his announced goal to "bring us together."

The hard-fought, sometimes bitter, election struggle for party power is over and the results cannot be changed by all the analyzing and theorizing by all shades of political commentators.

It is apparent that during the contest some of the promises of unifying the nation were forgotten by both sides and some of the momentum toward that goal which came naturally with the advent of a new administration was lost.

Without attempting to judge what was gained and what was lost by the campaign tactics of Nixon, as typified by the speeches of Vice President Spiro T. Agnew, it is apparent today that the best hope for either party in 1972 lies in answering the cry of almost all Americans for an easing of the abrasiveness of our time, a lessening of the policy of confrontation and a moving away from polarization.

President Nixon stands uniquely in a strong position to further just such hopes, not merely because he is the president (although that is a dominant factor) but because he holds a position where he can afford to so act and will benefit greatly from doing so.

There can be little doubt that one of Nixon's greatest political assets at this time is the fact that his program to "wind down" the war is succeeding even beyond his own expectations. Despite the demands by some for an even faster withdrawal, the great majority of Americans are at least willing to "go along" with his present policies, and this constitutes a large reservoir of good will upon which he can draw.

With much of the explosive power of the war issue defused, Nixon is free to concentrate upon lessening the other divisive influences within our society.

The time to start on that project is now and the place is with the first lame duck Congress since 1950. The way to start is to accept at face value the pledge by Democratic Sen. Mike Mansfield, Senate majority leader, that the Democratic members of Congress will carry on no "vendetta" with the White House because of the election.

President Nixon is in an enviable position to cement whatever gains he may see in the election and to ease whatever losses he may have suffered by stepping forward now, not as the party leader but as the nation's president searching for practical solutions to the

many problems facing Congress and the nation.

To do so, however, he must risk some disfavor among one faction within his party by moving positively to dispel certain doubts which have shadowed his administration.

To do so he must put a renewed emphasis on "justice" as a major ingredient in his law and order campaign, declaring his firm intention to fight crime within the confines of preserving personal privacy and the Constitutional restrictions we have imposed upon ourselves to protect the rights of individuals.

He must declare himself unequivocally in support of existing civil rights laws, not merely by a willingness to prosecute violators but in implementing programs which will bring those laws to fruition.

It is necessary for him to show his readiness to listen with sympathy and understanding to the complaints of the young, the spokesmen for minority races and the others who feel left out of society.

If he can ease these points of conflict, he will be free to address himself to such problems as urban distress, growing inflation and the failures of our welfare and health care systems.

A clear call for unity in these fields could be the best medicine possible for our present malaise.

## LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE—NOVEMBER 18, 1918

**HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI**

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, with the collapse of the Russian empire during World War I, many nations were provided with an historic opportunity to proclaim their independence and set up democratic republics within their ethnic boundaries.

The Baltic Republic of Latvia did so on November 18, 1918, after fighting a bitter war of liberation against both the Russian and the German armies. In 1920, Latvia and the Soviet Union signed a peace treaty, the latter solemnly pledging to respect the sovereignty of Latvia "forever."

As is typical of Soviet treaties, the "forever" lasted less than twenty years. Following the infamous Molotov-Ribbentrop pact in June, 1940, Soviet armed forces occupied the Baltic states and incorporated them into the Soviet Union. Today, the Latvian republic and the other Baltic nations remain under Soviet occupation.

The history of civilization is replete with man's inhumanity to man, of freedom-loving people struggling against foreign oppressors. And so it is with the courageous Latvians. Since they cannot commemorate the anniversary of this historic occasion, it is up to the people and governments of the free world to remind people everywhere of the plight and cause of the Latvians behind the Iron Curtain.

The Russian imperialists contain the seeds of their own destruction, and let us serve notice on these tyrants that at the earliest opportunity Latvia and the other captive nations will again proclaim their freedom and independence, and take their rightful place in the community of

nations as masters of their own destiny. A truly free and independent Latvia is a goal toward which we strive unceasingly, whose hope and cause is also ours.

I should like to place in the RECORD today a short summary of Latvia's subjugation by the Soviets, put out by the Latvian Legation in Washington.

The excellent article follows:

### THE BALTIC PLEBISCITE

(By Robert G. Silins)

(NOTE.—This is a slightly abbreviated transcript of the original, published by the New Leader, New York, October 27, 1945, No. 43.)

V. Lenin, Collected Works, Vol. XXII, page 13: "If a small or weak nation is not accorded the right to decide the form of its political existence by a free vote—implying the complete withdrawal of the troops of the incorporating or merely strong nation—then the incorporation is an annexation, i.e., an arbitrary appropriation of a foreign country, an act of violence."

The Soviet sponsored elections which were held in Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania in July 1940, and led to the immediate incorporation of these independent republics into the Soviet Union, have set the style for future "democratic" elections in all Soviet dominated countries. Declarations of Latvian Communists prove that the Baltic peoples never had a chance to express their free will, and did not join the Soviet Union voluntarily. All quotations in this article are authentic translations from Latvian press reports of July 1940.

In 1918 Latvia, Lithuania and Estonia seceded from Russia. They defended their independence against both Germany and Russia. In 1920, peace treaties were signed with the Soviet Union. Russia recognized their independence and right of self-determination, including secession from the former Russian Empire. (The principle of self-determination is also embodied in the Stalin Constitution of the USSR.)

The provisional Latvian Government, formed on November 18, 1918, and headed by K. Ulmanis, called a Constituent Assembly on May 1, 1920, which adopted a democratic Constitution in 1922. This constitution provided for universal, equal, direct and secret vote. The national minorities were accorded equal rights and cultural autonomy. On May 15, 1934, this Constitution was temporarily suspended by Ulmanis in favor of a government on the pattern of the Dollfus regime in Austria—authoritarian but anti-Nazi—in the hope of safeguarding national independence in anticipation of an approaching world crisis.

An outstanding achievement of the Latvian Constituent Assembly was the enactment of a radical agrarian reform in 1920. About 1,330 estates comprising 50 percent of all land held by nobles of German origin, were divided into small holdings of 55 acres or less, and were granted to workers and farmhands. In 1938, about 80 percent of Latvia's 238,000 farms were cultivated by the owners and their families without hired help. The agrarian reform did away, once and forever, with the power of the landed nobility of Latvia. By converting a majority of landless workers into landowners, it rendered Communist activity ineffective.

The Baltic peoples fell victim to unprovoked aggression by their powerful neighbors, Russia and Germany, after the Nazi-Bolshevik treaty of August 1939, giving Hitler the green light for his attack on Poland, had opened the gates for a world catastrophe.

After Hitler and Stalin had divided Poland among themselves, Moscow imposed treaties "of mutual assistance" on Estonia, Latvia and Lithuania. The Baltic countries were forced to grant Russia military bases on their territories, but the USSR, in return,

pledged not to interfere in their political, economic and social affairs. Stalin gave his personal word of honor to Latvia's Foreign Minister, V. Munters, who negotiated the treaty for Latvia.

Until the end of the Finnish war, Russia did not intervene further in the Baltic countries. But after Dunkirk, they were suddenly accused by Molotov of conspiracy and aggressive acts against the Soviet Union. On June 15 and 16, 1940, the Baltic countries were served with ultimatums, and were immediately occupied by overwhelming Red forces. Assistant Foreign Commissar Vishinsky appeared in Riga, capital of Latvia. Zhdanov was sent to Tallinn, Estonia, and Dekanosov to Kaunas, Lithuania. They established their headquarters in the Soviet legations, and started the Sovietization of the Baltic countries.

A so-called people's cabinet was imposed on the Latvian nation, every member of which was hand-picked by the Soviet emissary. It is interesting to note that none, save the Minister of the Interior, was known to be a Communist. Most of them had belonged to various democratic groups or were affiliated with the Association of Latvian-Soviet Friendship. Probably they did not know they were selected to play the part of pro-Soviet quislings. But they learned quickly to listen to "the master's voice," and soon did not finish a single speech without eulogizing Stalin as "liberator."

Declarations about preservation of Latvia's independence prevailed at first in the speeches of the members of the Cabinet. Saluting the restoration of Art. 6 of the democratic Constitution of Latvia, which provides for universal elections, and proclaiming July 14 and 15 elections days, Prime Minister A. Kirchensteins declared on July 6, 1940:

"We are able to give you this ballot so soon only thanks to the friendly support of our mighty neighbor, the Soviet Union. The Red Army is assisting us in the defense of our freedom, and the preservation of our State. Let us, therefore, be grateful to the Soviet Union, and pledge to help defend her frontiers against the enemy. Once again I salute the freedom and independence of the Latvian Republic. *We are, and will remain free, for we believe in the promises of Stalin, the highest authority of the Soviet Union.*"

The Latvian Prime Minister, as well as his Estonian and Lithuanian colleagues, was at that time obviously ignorant of Moscow's intention to absorb the Baltic countries, for their declarations strongly imply that Stalin had renewed promises to preserve some measure of Baltic independence. But, whatever the puppet ministers believed, the leading Latvian Communists who had arrived from Moscow after the Red occupation, knew better. The organ of the Komsomol, *Latvju Jaunatne*, predicted as early as the first of July, 1940:

"What will be the nature of the democratic republic we are going to create? Will it be the democracy which existed until 1934, the child of which is Fascism? No! That kind of democracy is buried forever. The new democracy will be a revolutionary democracy of the people. The power will be in the hands of the *real* representatives of the people."

Who are these *real* representatives of the people? We find a clue in Art. 126 of the Constitution of the USSR, according to which "the Communist party . . . is the vanguard of the working people . . . and represents the leading nucleus of all organizations of the working people, both social and state."

*Cina*, the official organ of the Latvian Communist party, expressed itself even more clearly: "The arrival and presence of the Soviet Red Army on Latvian soil has suddenly unleashed such a strong and far-reaching revolutionary movement among our people that the mere thought of returning to the

conditions under the former regime becomes ridiculous and childish . . . Together, and hand-in-hand with the USSR, utilizing her rich experience in fostering revolutionary movements, we will create a socialist state for the working people."

The Sovietization of Latvia started as soon as the Red forces were in full control. While Ulmanis was still nominally President of the Republic, dismissal of state officials was in full swing. Private property was not yet abolished, but all banking accounts were closed. Latvia was flooded with Red propaganda, and with agents of the NKVD. The iron ring of subjugation, forged by Vishinsky, was closing its grip. Remnants of the "plutocracy" spent their last hours of freedom in hiding at home. Soon they were to vanish in prison camps.

The electoral law of Latvia, restored on July 5, provided, in addition to free and universal ballot, that groups of at least a hundred voters could nominate their own candidates. But the wire-pullers in the Soviet Legation were not anxious to let the people choose candidates of their own. They were, on the contrary, determined to force on the Latvian nation an assembly of pro-Soviet yes-men. There was a catch to it: The Supreme Soviet was to assemble in August in Moscow to receive the Baltic Republics into the Soviet Union. The Baltic peoples, including most of the local collaborationists, had no idea of such a plot. On the contrary, allusions to joining the Soviet Union were branded during the election campaign, as "inventions of the enemies of the people."

On July 6, the day following the announcement of the elections, a list of candidates sponsored by a newly created "Working People's League" was proclaimed. The press, now completely under Communist control, explained in unison: "Attentive observers will not fail to notice that the Working People's League comprises all the honest representatives of all classes of the population. There can be no other real list of candidates besides the League, in which all the positive and creative elements of the nation are represented."

This was meant to be a warning to the "reactionaries" not to nominate their own candidates. Yet, some patriots, defying intimidation and insisting upon their constitutional rights, had decided to run a list of candidates of their own. The way in which this venture was liquidated is reflected in the following announcement of the Communist-controlled press:

"Some representatives of the class of wealthy citizens, calling themselves Latvian democrats, have organized their own list of candidates, in spite of the fact that all *really* democratic citizens have already joined the Working People's League. They have collected signatures among their fellow-citizens. Our security organs, having disclosed this political adventure just in time, turned them over to the attorney general for investigation and liquidation."

This announcement was not followed by further information about the plight of the "culprits," guilty of exercising their constitutional rights. They were not summoned before a court of justice, because their actions were legal. They were, instead, arrested and deported.

After the liquidation of this venture, the Electoral Committee could announce: "The preliminary work for the elections has been completed. Only one list of candidates was approved for each district, namely the Working People's League. All other lists were rejected. None of them was of any political importance." Thus all voters were compelled to vote for the ticket sponsored by the Communist party, or else!

The means by which the victory of "Soviet democracy" was assured were as simple as they were brutal and illegal. Yet the Red planners were not satisfied. Since the vote

was later to serve as a "plebiscite" in favor of joining the Soviet Union, it was essential to make it unanimous. Red propagandists, and agents of the NKVD, continued to spread terror and threats.

A decree was issued on the eve of election day, providing for capital punishment for treason and sabotage, which was defined as "shunning to fulfill one's citizen's duties with intent to injure the interests of state and society." Bearing in mind that participation in Soviet elections is a "sacred duty" of every citizen, absentees were threatened with most severe punishment.

On the eve of the elections, the following appeal was broadcast and published in all papers: "In order that those who are still in doubt whether to vote, or not, should have no reason to be ashamed of themselves, their fellow-citizens, fellow-workers all of patriots of the Latvian republic, and of their personal documents (Passports are compulsory in Latvia—Ed.) in which the stamp of participation will be missing, everyone must go to the polls."

On election day the urban voters were assembled at their working places, to be led to the polls in a crowd. Voters were told not to erase candidates, nor to put empty envelopes into the ballot-box, because that would render their vote invalid. Many were provided with envelopes already sealed for them, and all were closely watched by the secret police.

The returns were supposedly 97.8 percent in favor of the League. But it must be borne in mind that the vote was compulsory, that there was no chance to vote for an opposition party, and that the returns were never impartially checked. Many voters obstructed the ballot by absenteeism, especially in the rural districts. But nothing could influence the count, which was predetermined by the Soviet Regime.

Although the question of joining the Soviet Union was hushed down during the election campaign, the first act of the new Assembly was to ask for annexation. Kalnberzins, first secretary of the Latvian Communist Party, declared even on the eve of the convocation of the newly elected Saeima: "The Latvian people have clearly expressed their desire for close and inseparable bonds with the peoples of the Soviet Union."

The election farce in Lithuania and Estonia was in every respect identical with the procedure in Latvia: The same date, identical declarations and campaign slogans, and similar results. All three Baltic republics were "admitted" into the Soviet Union during the August session of the Moscow Supreme Soviet.

## WARMMAKING POWERS OF CONGRESS AND THE PRESIDENT

HON. ROBERT L. LEGGETT

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. LEGGETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I voted against House Joint Resolution 1355, concerning the warmaking powers of Congress and the President. Considering that I found myself in a small minority—the resolution passed 288 to 39—and that the resolution was supported by a number of highly esteemed colleagues with whom I usually agree on matters of foreign policy, I feel an explanation of my vote is in order.

Basically, I object to the resolution on the grounds that it gives the illusion of reasserting and sharply defining the



power and responsibilities of Congress, without in substance accomplishing anything in this direction. Illusion is one thing we cannot afford in these troubled times.

Section 1 reaffirms the power of Congress to declare war, but specifies that in "extraordinary and emergency circumstances" the President can go ahead and take military action on his own. The gentleman from Illinois (Mr. PUCINSKI) made a laudable attempt to create legislative history, emphasizing that when we say "extraordinary and emergency circumstances" we really mean it. He went so far as to warn that a President who attempts to stretch the definition of "extraordinary and emergency" will be subject to impeachment.

In my view, the gentleman's efforts cannot meet with success. The nature of the resolution is such that a President can stretch the definition as much as he likes, legislative history to the contrary notwithstanding. Consider, for example, the Tonkin Gulf incident, in which we were told our ships were attacked while peacefully observing in international waters. Or consider the Dominican intervention, when the President talked of American lives being lost, and of the American Ambassador hiding under his desk while bullets whizzed through his office. Or consider the Cambodian invasion, when the President talked of the "enemy headquarters for all of South Vietnam" sitting right across the border, and enemy troops massing to attack our men.

In each case, the rationale given by the President might have constituted "extraordinary and emergency circumstances" had it been factually correct, but in each case it was factually incorrect. But in such a time of international crisis, who is going to stand up on the floor of Congress and say the President is a liar and should be impeached? For that matter, who is to know when the President is deliberately misleading the public and when he himself is the victim of misinformation?

Thus, section 1 is toothless because it assumes a willingness on the part of Congress to repudiate and impeach under ambiguous circumstances during a time of international crisis.

Similarly, section 2 calls for "appropriate consultation with Congress whenever feasible." The President can and will determine that consultation is not feasible when it would prove embarrassing. To this day, the administration has refused to tell us exactly what we are doing in Laos. There is no question of keeping it secret from the various Asian Communist forces or from the Laotians; they have their men on the scene and are well aware of our actions. Purely and simply, the administration does not want the Congress and the American people to know about our military activity in Laos because we would not like it and would try to stop it. Resolution 1355 would do nothing about this type of situation.

Section 3, which requires the President to report to Congress under various circumstances, also has holes big enough to drive a truck through. The President can simply send over an incomplete, equivocal, or misleading report.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to circumscribe our military activities, there is only one way to do it. We must say "No funds shall be used for military activities in such-and-such countries after such-and-such a date." This was the approach of the Cambodia amendment I introduced at the time of that incursion, and of the subsequent Cooper-Church and McGovern-Hatfield amendments. If we want to prevent bank robberies, we do not pass a law saying, "You can not rob a bank unless you really need the money." We say, "You can not rob a bank, period." In my view, if we want to limit our military involvement around the world, the only way we are going to do it is to say, "Money is not to be used to send troops in there, period."

#### YALE'S TALENTED MICHEL BROTHERS

#### HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, being a graduate of Yale University, I was most interested to read recently in the program for the annual Yale-Princeton football game of the considerable contribution being made to Yale's athletic program by the two sons of our distinguished colleague from Illinois, the Honorable ROBERT MICHEL.

As the article points out, it is very unusual for two brothers to achieve success in different sports, but Scott and Bruce Michel are accomplishing this feat. To those of us who know their father, it is not surprising that BOB MICHEL's sons are hard working, talented young men.

I am including the aforementioned article so that we can share in Congressman MICHEL's justifiable pride in his sons' accomplishments.

IT RUNS IN THE FAMILY: YALE'S TALENTED MICHEL BROTHERS  
(By Peter Easton)

It isn't often that two brothers achieve success in two different sports. Oh, it happens. Former Southern California football ace Willie Brown and slugging outfielder Ollie Brown of the San Diego Padres are brothers. So are Alex Johnson, the California Angel outfielder who was the 1970 American League batting champion, and Ron Johnson, ace running back of the New York Giants.

Scott and Bruce Michel, however, are a really unusual pair. Not only did both start as sophomores at Yale (Scott as a basketball forward last year, Bruce as a defensive end on the football squad this year), but their father is a U.S. congressman.

Says Rep. Robert Michel (R-Ill.), "If you had told me I'd have two boys starting in different sports as Yale sophomores, I would have been pretty surprised. It's quite a coincidence."

Actually, this was one coincidence that didn't just happen. Both of the Michels worked hard to get where they are, although the road was admittedly easier for 20-year-old Martin Scott Michel than it was for Bruce Woodruff Michel, who will be 19 next month.

Scott, a sandy-haired 6-4, 200-pounder, came to Yale as an All-State performer at

Peoria (Ill.) High School. He captained the freshman team and established himself immediately as the varsity's leading rebounder last winter. Scott arrived on campus with excellent credentials and has more than lived up to them.

"Nobody wanted me for football," admits Bruce, whose top honor at Peoria H.S. was a second team All-Conference berth. "I was surprised he became a starter this year," says head football coach Carm Cozza.

Bruce, a 6-2, 190-pound former zookeeper at the Peoria Zoo (he worked there during the summer several years ago), weighed a muscular 120 as a high school freshman. He never dressed for a varsity game as a sophomore.

During two-a-day sessions prior to his junior year, he worked hard and wound up as a starting rover back. "I started three games, then shared the position with another guy the rest of the year," Bruce remembers. "I only weighed 160 as a junior. That's pretty small."

Bruce, whom Scott calls "a health nut," added 20 pounds as a senior and earned his second football letter as an end and line-backer. Peoria H.S. had a successful, although hardly exceptional, 6-3 season.

As a freshman, Bruce tried wrestling ("I always got beaten, so I gave it up"), before turning to track. He won two letters in that sport, along with a conference high jumping title, and earned freshman numerals for Bob Giegengack last year.

In track, Bruce is one of the strangest athletes around. He may be the only high jumper-weight thrower-hurdler in existence. It's easy to understand why. "Bill Toomey was my idol," says Bruce of the U.S. decathlon great.

As a Yale freshman football player, Bruce split his time between defensive end and monster back. He played well, if not spectacularly. No one would have thought that he would wind up as one of just three sophomores to crack Yale's opening day lineup (Bob Perschel and Dick Jauron were the others).

Last summer, Bruce, an accomplished artist, worked hard, knowing that he would have to beat out a returning letterman, among others. He kept improving and, says defensive coordinator Bill Narduzzi, "We noticed him. He was wiry, like Jim Gallagher; he had good movement and he learned quickly."

Bruce is prone to sophomore mistakes, but makes up for it with his toughness. After the first six games of the season, he ranked eighth on the team in total tackles and had recovered two fumbles. A year or two from now he could well be an All-Ivy candidate.

The younger of the two brothers is proud to play on the vaunted Yale defense ("You have a lot of confidence playing with these guys").

"I wish the defense was on the field all the time," says Scott with brotherly pride. "I love to watch him play."

While Bruce is just coming into his own, Scott is a legitimate star, one of the hubs of the basketball team. "I don't know where we'd be without him," says veteran Eli basketball coach Joe Vancisin. "Scott has excellent offensive moves, a good shot and is our best rebounder. He really fights for position underneath and gets a lot more rebounds than he has any right to at his size."

Scott dabbled in football as a high school freshman, but gave it up when he found that he was more suited to basketball. He didn't make the varsity basketball squad until he was a junior and then he was the sixth man. It was as a senior that he blossomed, averaging 19 points a game and leading his team to the regional title with a 25-3 record.

He was captain of the squad and the most valuable player. He was also voted the "most improved," and earned All-Conference and All-State honors. Despite the fact that he

grew up just eight houses from Bradley University, a long-time basketball powerhouse in the rugged Missouri Valley Conference, the Braves never showed an interest in him.

"I was disappointed at the time," recalls Scott. "I had always wanted to play there. Now I'll get my wish anyway, since we'll be playing there on December 26."

If Bradley ignored him, other schools, especially Dartmouth, Princeton and Yale, didn't. "I liked Yale right away. Princeton was too much like a big prep school and Dartmouth was up in the woods. I felt like I would fit in more at Yale. A friend of mine who was going there recommended it and I was impressed with Coach Vancisin's system of basketball," says Scott. "We had played disciplined ball in high school, so there wasn't too much of an adjustment."

As the freshman captain, Michel had an outstanding year. He led the Bullpups in rebounding and field goal percentage, scoring 14.9 points a game, second best on the squad.

The smooth cornerman won a starting job immediately as a sophomore and, though he had sophomoric for the first few weeks ("People like Jim McMillian awed me"), he adjusted well. McMillian, who awed a good number of people as a Columbia All-America, is now with the Los Angeles Lakers.

Michel went on to lead Yale in rebounding with 9.4 a game and finish second on the team in scoring (12.3). Boosting his weight from 180 as a freshman to 200 as a sophomore helped, but so did his all-around consistency, his persistence on the offensive boards and his crunching baseline drives. Scott was Yale's top rebounder in more than half of the games and scored in double figures 16 times. His best all-around effort was a 26-point, 15-rebound performance against Holy Cross. He was a key figure against Hawaii, too, getting 16 caroms against the host team in the Rainbow Classic that Yale won last December.

While Scott is always assured of good support from Bruce in the Payne Whitney Gym, the Michel rooting section will be even more impressive in Peoria next month. In addition to Bruce and his mother, there's sister Laurie, a high school senior; brother Robbie, a junior in high school and a fine all-around athlete; and his father, an eight-term representative from Illinois' 18th Congressional District. The Michels are hoping it will be a winning combination.

#### SENIOR CITIZENS BENEFIT FROM MANPOWER ACT

### HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, senior citizens have reason to be pleased with the House approval yesterday of the Comprehensive Manpower Act.

Although small in size, the community service programs, for the elderly and others, that will be continued by the act have demonstrated considerable impact. A good example is found in my own city of San Diego, where 60 low-income elderly are employed by the Senior AIDES program operated by the local Community Welfare Council under contract with the Labor Department and the National Council of Senior Citizens.

The senior citizens work 20 hours a week for an average wage of \$2.15 per hour. In the 14 months since the San Diego project was established, these em-

ployees have been given renewed hope that their lives are yet meaningful while they have been contributing to the well-being of both themselves and the community. Typically, their work and involvement far exceeds the 20 hours for which they are paid.

What are they accomplishing? Besides, achieving a more stable and dignified life, they are working through some 19 different local service agencies in serving the hungry, finding homes for the homeless, teaching the uneducated, minding children in day-care centers, and serving their fellow elderly as well.

This legislation will provide the springboard in continuing and expanding the current concept of needed services being performed by the Senior AIDES in San Diego.

#### CONGRESSMAN COWGER'S OCTOBER NEWSLETTER

### HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to submit a copy of my October newsletter for the RECORD. I believe my colleagues would be interested in this newsletter which goes to all of my constituents, and which, incidentally, makes mention of your retirement.

The newsletter follows:

REPORT FROM CONGRESS BY CONGRESSMAN  
BILL COWGER

#### ADJOURNMENT AND A LOGJAM

These are hectic days in the Congress. The election of your 92nd Congress is upon us and time is running out on the second session of the 91st Congress. A post-election session is a certainty. It's the first time in about twenty years that a "lame duck" session has had to be called to finish up the Nation's business.

The leadership in both Houses of Congress has delayed action on bills for nearly two years. This has not only included the legislative requests of the President but also routine matters such as appropriations required to run the machinery of government.

I am particularly concerned about the delays in anti-crime, environmental, consumer and drug abuse control legislation.

The Senate is presently sitting on House-passed appropriation bills, electoral reform, amendments to the Social Security System, welfare reform, equal rights for women and air pollution control.

Many proposals dealing with inflation, draft reform, revenue sharing, manpower training reform and other administration proposals will be left for the attention of the next Congress.

There have been some important accomplishments in this Congress however. Postal reform, a tax reform act which closed some of the tax loopholes, the phase-out of the surtax, extension of the Voting Rights Act and lowering the voting age to eighteen were among this major action.

The House also passed the first Congressional reform measure in twenty-four years.

#### SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS

I have had the pleasure of speaking to many groups in Louisville over the past several months. Some groups have expressed an interest in my recent trip to Southeast Asia and the Middle East. Others have requested

my views on specific areas of legislative or congressional activity.

#### CONGRESSIONAL REFORM

The House passed the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1970 on September 17 and the Senate voted favorably, with amendments, on October 6. All the changes made by the Senate, with one exception, involve Senate procedures only.

The bill modernizes the legislative machinery of Congress—some of which dates back to colonial days and the convening of the first Congress. It will revise operations in committees and on the floor, equip Congress with a better means of evaluating the Federal budget and provide Congress with improved sources of information.

The specific provisions of the bill could fill this newsletter many times over. For the present I will simply say while it failed to include a number of other reforms which I think are urgent, we have at least taken the first critical step in the right direction.

#### COMMISSION'S REPORT SHOCKING

The report of the Presidential Commission on Obscenity and Pornography is not only disappointing but shocking.

The Commission was appointed by President Johnson and its purpose was to find ways to halt the spread of pornographic and obscene materials particularly concentrating on keeping such materials from the hands of children. The recommendations indicate that pornography is OK and no new laws are needed.

Since the report has been released a subcommittee of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee has opened hearings on the Commission. I am sure that the results of these hearings will make certain none of the Commission's recommendations are put into operation.

Secretary of Defense, Melvin R. Laird, is shown receiving a prized commission as a Kentucky Colonel.

The Secretary and I not only served together in the 90th Congress, but were classmates in college and both served in the Navy at approximately the same time during World War II.

#### HOUSE LEADER RETIRING

Speaker of the House, John W. McCormack, and I had an opportunity to discuss his plans following the adjournment of this session of Congress.

Congressman McCormack has been the presiding officer of the House of Representatives since 1962 and a Member of Congress for forty-two years. His tenure as Speaker is second only to the late Sam Rayburn and as of May 24 of this year exceeds that of the famous Kentuckian, Henry Clay, in the 1800's.

Many tributes have been, and will be made, to John McCormack regarding his abilities, leadership and statesmanship. But I feel the highest tribute of all is that he is a fair man and a gentleman.

#### THE DELTA QUEEN

A Senate amendment to the Merchant Marine Act of 1970 to save the Delta Queen failed to survive the House-Senate Conference on the bill. A compromise which will not save the Queen in its original form was reached however which provides a construction subsidy to build a replacement vessel.

The Queen will continue to operate in limited service for a period of one to two years during the construction of her replacement.

After that time we are hoping to find a way to keep the famed sternwheeler preserved so the public may enjoy this beautiful example of a bygone era for many years to come.

#### ROTC PROGRAM

Dr. William T. Simpson, President of the Kentucky Military Institute, and I are shown greeting General William C. Westmoreland at



a meeting of the Association of Military Colleges and Schools which was held in Washington. General Westmoreland was the featured speaker.

The General, now Chief of Staff of the United States Army, noted in his address that contrary to what you read in your newspapers about some eastern colleges dropping their ROTC programs there are more schools applying for the program than dropping out.

Dr. Simpson is currently serving as president of the fifty-four year old association.

#### VISITORS IN WASHINGTON

This has been an especially busy year in the Washington office. The group above is typical of the estimated 1,200 visitors who came to discuss legislation, government business, or who were vacationing in the area.

In addition we have received a tremendous number of constituents in the Louisville District Office during the same period.

#### TELEPHONE SERVICES

You can receive my regular recorded messages on Congressional activities, important government and other news of interest from Washington by calling 585-5444 at any hour.

I would also like to remind you of the night and weekend answering service which extends for your convenience the hours of the District Office to twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. The number is 584-4010.

#### THANK YOU

The paper and printing of this newsletter are not paid for at the expense of the government. Personal funds and contributions from those who wish to be kept informed make this possible.

### THE 52D ANNIVERSARY OF LATVIAN INDEPENDENCE

#### HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 52d anniversary of Latvian Independence Day. Unfortunately, this event was commemorated only in the free world areas with a necessary feeling of sadness, as Latvian refugees keeping alive the historic nature of the occasion, could not truly celebrate.

The people of Latvia itself are not permitted to celebrate their true Independence Day which, incidentally, was achieved at the expense of the original Russian Communist Government.

At the present time the Soviet Union, in its deliberate policy of suppressing the nationalistic spirit is continuing to eliminate the structure of the fictitious independence of the Soviet Socialist Republics, and create regional governmental structures rather than the historic nationality lines. The Latvian people have been deliberately scattered about the Soviet Union in order to lessen their nationalistic effectiveness.

I earnestly appeal to all Americans of Latvian origin and to Latvian emigre groups throughout the free world to maintain their spirit and determination to work for the restoration of freedom to their homeland. The most important point to emphasize is that freedom will not be achieved for Latvia or any other captive nation of communism if the Western World adopts a policy of co-

existence with the Soviet Union. We must defy those who would surrender all of Eastern Europe to permanent Communist domination.

The brave people of Latvia suffered under centuries of czarist tyranny and were rapidly developing their little land when treacherously engulfed by the Reds in 1940.

Certainly justice will triumph. In commemorating the 52d anniversary of Latvian independence, we look forward to the ultimate restoration of freedom to that brave little nation, when its people will once again control their own democratic form of government and regain their freedom from the Russian-imposed Communist rule.

### TECHNOLOGY—AND A TIME OF CRISIS

#### HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on October 28, 1970, the Director of the NASA Langley Research Center, Edgar M. Cortright, reviewed our Nation's posture in technology and science with emphasis on the contributions of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. His penetrating, thoughtful, and in many cases profound, comments are of particular significance at this time with our declining emphasis on our national space program. I commend this to the reading of my colleagues and the general public:

#### TECHNOLOGY—AND A TIME OF CRISIS

(By Edgar M. Cortright)

Several years ago I read an article with the provocative subtitle, "I'm 45 Years Old and Trying to Decide What to be When I Grow Up." I also read a book titled, "The Revolt of the Middle-Aged Man," which, by the way, my teenaged daughter picked up for me. Both dealt with the concerns of men who have reached the middle years with some level of achievement—at some personal cost—and who begin to wonder, as Peggy Lee would vocalize, "Is That All There Is?" Perhaps some of you have been there?

Have you ever tried to draw an analogy between nations and individuals? It's quite revealing.

Nations are, of course, comprised of many individuals. National attitudes are reflected in the news media by relatively few; and national policy set by still fewer. So the psychology of individuals and the psychology of nations do relate in both an apparent and a real sense.

Suppose those titles had read, "I'm 200 Years Old and Trying to Decide What to Be When I Grow Up," and "The Revolt of the Middle-Aged Land." Would that ring a bell?

What are some of the symptoms of the middle-aged man in either quandry or revolt? According to these sources:

(1) He questions the value of the goals he has tried so hard to achieve;

(2) He feels guilty about the cost to his family and his personal life;

(3) He searches frantically for a new way of life in order to:

(a) Make up for past neglects;

(b) Renew himself with new goals;

(4) He worries about being "over the hill";

(5) He may become timid, indecisive, and ineffectual;

(6) He fears the future.

Now how about the middle-aged land?

(1) Are we not questioning most of our national goals of the past two generations?

(2) Do we not feel guilty about the cost of these goals to some of our "family"?

(3) Are we not searching frantically for a new way of life to right all past ways and to challenge the coming generations?

(4) Are we not starting to worry about being "over the hill"?

(5) Do we not show signs of becoming timid, indecisive, and ineffectual?

(6) And how many of us fear the future rather than looking forward to it?

Am I being too dramatic? A year ago I would have thought so. Today I'm not so sure.

My hypothesis is, of course, very simple. At the peak of our national manhood, in our middle years as a nation, we are showing signs of coming unglued. And if we don't do something about it we could be in for a lot of trouble in the future.

To press the analogy just one step further—what do we do about the middle-age neurosis? Most importantly, we must come to terms with reality; we must make some positive decisions for the future. Facing reality means answering these questions—among others:

(1) What are we?

(2) What would we like to be?

(3) What are our practical constraints?

(4) What legacy should we leave our youth?

These are not simple questions, but some oversimplified answers might be these:

(1) We are a rich and powerful country, with the highest standard of living, the most advanced technology, and the greatest capacity to do good works of any nation in the world.

We are also a nation with some egg on our face. We have many problems that need solving—and many people who need help.

But our strengths overshadow our weaknesses, and our successes overshadow our failures; and this is the base we build on.

(2) I think the vast majority of people want to be what we have been the vocal minority notwithstanding: energetic and industrious, progressive, innovative, inquisitive, courageous, compassionate, and generous. Free people. Leaders.

At the same time we want our country to be better than it has been. The problem of our poor, our cities, our air, and our water must be attended to. But need we become "dropouts" from the world society in which we live in order to work these problems?

(3) And what about the practical constraints? Even if we want to drop out of technological competition and become completely preoccupied with what we have come to call "social problems," could we really do so? Our global environment is competitive and belligerent. We must remain preeminent in technology in order to be competitive both commercially and militarily. Without preeminence in both areas we could become the victims of power blocs of one type or another. We could lose the standard of living we have attained, let alone improve it. The survival of the fittest is a natural law which still applies.

(4) I think we should feel less guilty about the fact that this country has some serious domestic problems to solve. Our legacy to our children must necessarily include many such unsolved problems. But, more importantly, it must provide a basically strong system from which to operate, and as many of the tools to do so as we can provide. Then with challenging long-range goals and a can-do attitude the next generation can take care of its own future. And I, for one, think they can do it.

Now if these answers really constitute "facing reality" by this country, we are then

led to the last step in the process—decision making. It is here that we can make or break ourselves. And because of the perilous and controversial nature of the decisions which face us today, there is a natural reluctance to face up to them. But make them we must—because failure to make a decision for one reason or another is usually tantamount to a negative decision. All of us in positions of leadership should expect to be measured by the timeliness and effectiveness of our decisions.

As I read the mood of the country, the majority favor evolution not revolution. But we may expect the great debate over national priorities to rage on for some years. This calls for what I term "interim" or "holding" decisions, decisions which tentatively direct our national energies into those channels which seem best for the future but which do not attempt radical surgery. They do not constitute final positions on our priorities forevermore. But they let us build on the past—for the future—in a way that the country can adjust to. While this may not be the most daring approach to our problems, it is an eminently practical one.

Now each element of the Federal Government has its role to play in this process. And while my assessment of the situation has been very broad, to say the least, as a member of NASA management I feel qualified to be specific about aeronautical and space matters. It so happens that this is an extremely important and sensitive area at this time. For, unfortunately, some have chosen to create a false issue over technology in general and aerospace technology in particular. Let's call the issue, "Technology vs. Mankind." Let's call it false because, despite some unwanted side effects, technology remains our servant and not our master.

We in NASA recognize that our program no longer enjoys the number one priority but is now but one of a number of priority areas competing for scarce funds. But we also recognize that our program, in addition to its intrinsic value, sets the pace for much of the technological development of this country and promises to do so for the foreseeable future. (What other candidates are there?) We do not believe that we could long survive and prosper without this preeminent technological position.

Therefore, we have to stand and fight off the stampede by other groups to acquire funds now being channeled into our national technology through NASA and the Department of Defense. It is a veritable "run on the bank." The withdrawal slips carry such terms as relevancy, poverty, pollution, and housing, and are designed to shame us into sacrificing our space program and national technology in the name of "humanity."

Like most thinking Americans I have worried a lot about humanity. My first reaction was to retrench as gracefully as possible and to make do with less. But I don't feel obliged to sit passively by and see progress of a decade of dedicated national effort squandered for some worthy but nebulous goals which are yet to be translated into hard programs. It amazes me to see the casual detachment of some who would do just that. I would reverse the logic and say—in the name of humanity we should maintain our national technology.

We in NASA are paid to advise the Administration as to what future opportunities lie before us in aeronautics and space—and what these opportunities mean to the technological strength of this Nation in the decade ahead. We are doing just that. After careful deliberation NASA has developed a sound and progressive program for the 1970's, but one which is restrained to the realities of our fiscal posture. You may be sure that we are doing our best to persuade the Administration as to its worth. We think the chances of support are good. The President has al-

ready evidenced his understanding of the importance of the space program to our national technology, and the majority of congressmen have been providing solid support for many years. This takes just as much vision and guts these days as it did in 1958—perhaps more—but I think it's there. We'll soon know.

Let me say a few words about the program we have developed. The program calls for:

1. *The continued exploration of the moon.* Four more Apollo flights are scheduled, two in 1971 and two in 1972. The last three of these will have an expanded capability to allow access to more difficult landing sites, longer durations on the lunar surface, a larger payload, and the use of a roving vehicle to aid in the exploration of the lunar surface.

Two additional missions in 1974, were recently deleted. We came to the decision to cancel these missions reluctantly because it curtails by two the number of scientifically important regions of the moon that we will be able to explore in the Apollo program, and means that manned exploration of the moon by the United States will be suspended in 1972. Resumption of lunar exploration in the 1980's will depend on and be one of the principal uses of space nuclear propulsion using the NERVA engine now under development. This engine, of course, will also provide us with the capability to conduct other high-energy missions and is an important element in the integrated long-term plan for the future.

2. *The exploration of the planets.* Programs now underway include the Mariner Mars 1971 orbiter missions, the 1973 Venus-Mercury mission, launches of small Pioneer spacecraft to Jupiter in 1972 and 1973, and the major Viking project for unmanned landing missions to Mars to be launched in 1975. Under current planning, work will soon begin on "Grand Tour" missions to explore the outer planets to take advantage of the rare launch opportunities for such missions that will occur later in the 1970's. These will include missions to Jupiter, Saturn, and Pluto launched in 1976 and 1977 and missions launched in 1979 to Jupiter, Uranus, and Neptune.

... and the universe. The principal new feature of our space science programs during the 1970's will be the development of a new High-Energy Astronomy Observatory (HEAO) to obtain high-quality data on X-ray, gamma-ray, and cosmic-ray sources in space. In addition, studies will begin on future HEAO satellites and large space telescopes to be carried into space by the space shuttle in the last half of the decade. The HEAO and large space telescope projects have a top priority for the exploration of the universe beyond the planets.

3. *A substantial reduction in the cost of space operations.* Because it is reusable, the space shuttle will have an operating cost substantially lower than the cost of current systems. I think the shuttle will revolutionize our use of space in ways that we cannot even imagine today. Because it will be cheaper to carry payloads into orbit, because it will be possible to bring them back, because it will be possible to try out some experiments without the absolute assurance that they will work, we will do things in space that we would not even consider doing today. The space shuttle will be used for manned and man-tended experiments and to place unmanned scientific, weather, earth resources, and other satellites in earth orbit and bring them back to earth for repair and reuse. In the future, the space shuttle will also transport men, supplies, and scientific equipment to and from space stations.

In addition, the space shuttle may well be the precursor of very high-speed transportation from place to place on earth.

4. *An extension in man's capability to live and work in space.* The Skylab project, now

in advanced stages of development, is directed at this goal. Skylab will extend man's exposure to the space environment to 56 days, will perform an important manned solar astronomy experiment, and will extend our earth resources experiments beyond those carried out in the unmanned ERTS program. After its launch in late 1972 and three revisit missions through the first half of 1973, no further manned missions using Apollo hardware are planned. The space shuttle/space station will be our next steps to extend further man's capability to live and work in space. The space station, working with the shuttle, will be our next project for long-duration utilization of man's capabilities in space. However, we will not proceed with the space station development as quickly as with the space shuttle.

5. *A speedup of the practical applications of our space technology.* This is the area where we can make a direct contribution to our domestic problems, where we are making use of space and space techniques to help us directly here on earth. In *earth resources*, we are developing a capability to make ecological surveys from space. Surveys can be made in geography and cartography, in agriculture and forestry, geology, hydrology, and oceanography. We can update maps and provide information for land use planning; we can take an inventory of wheat or corn or cotton, and at the same time determine the health of our crops; we can help locate our natural resources; can predict floods, and help locate good commercial fishing grounds. All of these things have been done experimentally, and hold great promise for the future. The ERTS A and B program will move ahead in concert with aircraft-borne and ground research, and manned experiments in Skylab, to provide a sound experimental basis for future decisions on possible operational systems optimizing the use of space, aircraft, and ground-based sensors. We will continue to work closely with the other interested agencies. In *communications*, the ATS F and G programs will proceed as planned with the wide range of communications and other applications technology experiments. We are planning a cooperative experimental applications satellite with Canada (CAS-C), with important experiments at very high frequencies whose use may help space communications avoid or reduce serious frequency congestion in the future.

In *meteorology*, programs underway include the Nimbus experimental satellites and the two synchronous meteorological satellites which are planned for launch in 1972 and 1973 to permit continuous observation of major weather systems. Future steps include the development of a third-generation operational weather satellite system, the TIROS N, to provide improved methods of obtaining quantitative environment data to improve the capability of ESSA's National Operational Meteorological Research Program (GARP), an international cooperative research program designed to increase the understanding of the general circulation of the atmosphere.

6. *Greater international cooperation.* In each of the areas discussed before we have given special attention to the identification and pursuit of opportunities for international cooperation in space. The Space Shuttle project is of special importance for future international cooperations. With the approval of the President, and working closely with the State Department, NASA has launched a major effort during the past year to escalate substantially the level of international participation in the major space programs of the 1970's. The focus of this effort, and the area in which foreign countries, particularly in Europe, have expressed the greatest interest is the space station/shuttle system. At the present time, after the first formal Government-level discussions in Washington in September 1970, Europe is



considering the nature and degree of participation, including financial participation, they wish to propose.

7. *An expanded aeronautics program.* During the past decade aeronautical research and development in this country has not received adequate attention. This situation must change rapidly if we are to retain our position as master builders of the world's aircraft.

Civil aviation has aggressively capitalized on the existing research bank, and by out-engineering the competition has led the world in high-speed long-range transportation. About 75 percent of the world's jet transports are made in the U.S.A. This has become a major factor in our balance of trade and its importance is destined to grow as explosively as the world's population itself. But the research bank needs replenishing, and at least three major opportunities cry for attention.

- a. V/STOL transports
- b. Sonic transports
- c. SST's

And beyond these the hypersonic transport is a possibility for opening up Asia to rapid and efficient transportation.

NASA, in concert with the Department of Transportation and the Department of Defense, is preparing an experimental airplane program to facilitate the early introduction of practical V/STOL aircraft into the commercial system. We have chosen the externally blown flap and augmentor wing jet STOL airplanes for initial attention. Jet VTOL aircraft will come later. These machines will require advanced avionics and ground facilities to make them economically viable. They offer real promise for alleviating the inconvenience and hazards of airport congestion. We envision a combination of V/STOL and high-speed ground transportation as offering the best hope for continued mobility as the megalopolis continues to spread.

We are also preparing to develop an advanced Technology Experimental Transport using Whitcomb's supercritical aerodynamic concepts to explore the problems of efficient cruise at Mach numbers approaching one. We feel that this will be the next step beyond the current jumbo jets for transcontinental flight, but that the concept is sufficiently risky to require a research airplane. These aircraft would cruise about 100 mph faster than current jets and, if they are successfully developed, will no doubt dominate the market for the 1980's.

We are convinced that a return to the experimental airplane concept is in the national interest and we will try to convince our bosses of this.

A NASA research airplane in the SST category is not required since a prototype SST is already under development. I feel strongly that a commercial SST is a certainty. What is uncertain is who will build and sell it. I feel equally certain that most of us will one day fly in it at competitive fares and will rejoice in its speed and comfort. By 1980 30 million people will fly the Atlantic each year. Many should be flying on SST's. Because we had the courage to pioneer new aircraft types in the past, we now can travel cheaper by air than we could 20 years ago—despite inflation. By 1980 nearly half a billion Americans will buy airline tickets each year—and most of them will be ordinary people enjoying their new-found freedom to see the world. Modern aircraft are not "rich men's toys" as some would hold, but the way everyone travels over long distances.

And what about military aircraft? I would personally strongly support a return to the prototype of "fly-before-buy" concept as producing the best aircraft. And in this field, to be second is to be last. We at Langley have carried out extensive studies of foreign military aircraft configurations. They are good. They are very good. The Soviets, for example,

have aeronautical facilities that probably exceed ours, according to General Ferguson. Their aircraft show a skillful use of these facilities by design teams that are kept sharp by a steady stream of prototype aircraft. NASA will continue to dedicate about half its aeronautical effort to assisting the Armed Services in holding their own against such formidable competition.

Time is running short, for this talk, and for some of the national decisions I have addressed. I think that the fields of aeronautics and space have a case, a compelling case, even in these days of relevancy. They are in fact very relevant, indeed. It's our job to speak up and say so. For, after all, it's our country too.

## THE THOUGHTS BEHIND SENATOR MUSKIE'S ELECTION EVE SPEECH

### HON. PETER N. KYROS

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. KYROS. Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable discussion, and justly so, of the remarks which Maine's Senator EDMUND MUSKIE delivered to our Nation on November 2, 1970. Senator MUSKIE's concern for the quality of public discussion has been a very basic element in his own activities in Maine during the past two decades, as our State's citizens know. His desire to maintain decency and dignity in the debate of public issues and the choice of candidates is essential to his intellectual character. Ed MUSKIE's relationship with the residents and voters of Maine has always been based upon mutual trust and we are grateful that our Senator has had the opportunity to speak to all Americans on this subject.

Expressing his concern for proper public debate throughout the election campaign in Maine, Senator MUSKIE was especially articulate before the Jefferson-Jackson dinner in Lewiston on November 1. In order that my colleagues might better appreciate and understand the thoughts behind Ed MUSKIE's remarks on election eve, I would like to share with them the Senator's speech of the preceding evening.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS BY SENATOR EDMUND S. MUSKIE

I feel, and I know that Jane does as well, that these weeks of traveling among all of you—and there's so many from all sections of the State here tonight—that this traveling has been in the nature of a pilgrimage, a pilgrimage home. We've had an opportunity to renew our energies, our faith in our people and in our hope for the future of our State and of our country.

And to be able to end a campaign in a sense with this audience is very appropriate. This place where we stand and where we sit is close to the place of my origins. I went to school here in this city in a sense I began my political apprenticeship with many in this room. The political campaign of 1954 which resulted in our first great victory of the modern era began on this stage.

Some memories come flooding in upon all of us who have been privileged to move down that 16 year old road. But this is not a time for memories. It's a time for looking ahead—and looking ahead beyond November 3.

This is my ninth successive statewide campaign beginning with that first one for

Governor. And I've been a candidate in six of those campaigns. As I think about them, I'm conscious of the fact that the Democratic Party has always regarded a political campaign as an opportunity to talk about and deal with the people's business. I can't recall ever regarding a campaign as an opportunity to destroy somebody else's reputation.

Or to destroy his character. Or to misrepresent his life's work. Reinhold Niebuhr once said this, "There is just enough bad in human beings to make democracy necessary, and there is just enough good in them to make it possible." The challenge of leadership and of citizenship in our country is to try to make the good rather than the bad prevail.

What do people look for in candidates in a country like ours? Do they look for complete wisdom? Do they look for all of the answers instantly to all of the problems which press upon them? Do they look for gifts?

I think what they look for is men of character, men of judgment, men of intelligence, men capable from time to time of summing up the understanding and the wisdom to deal with the complex problems that can afflict a complex country such as ours.

They don't expect and certainly never get perfection. They don't expect and never get men and women who never make mistakes. But in every campaign in which men and women seek public office, they've got a right to the opportunity to measure those who seek their support in accordance with the reasonable standards we would expect others to judge ourselves by.

They have a right to a reasonable opportunity to know the truth about candidates. And they've got a right, I think, to expect candidates to stick pretty close to the truth about each other.

I was born in this State. I grew up in a town. Not far from here. I was the son of parents who were deeply concerned that I learn the difference between right and wrong. And I was privileged to have a father who knew how to define in words understandable to his children what that difference was.

I grew up in an environment where it was relatively easy to face life at a pace that made it possible to grow up in good health, with a good opportunity to get an education, with chances to enjoy the woods and the lakes and the streams of Oxford County.

I was fortunate enough to have teachers who took an interest in their students as children and who were interested in doing more than simply teaching them reading and writing and arithmetic, who were interested in doing more than simply teaching them in addition to helping their young charges to become good citizens, healthy adults, with a respect for each other and to understand each other.

The other day I read an advertisement in several Maine papers I never expected to see in a Maine political campaign. It began with a question, "What kind of a man is Edmund S. Muskie?" And then it offered an answer.

I expect to get bruises in political life. I'm not a child. I've been in politics a long time. But I know also that Maine people, including my opponent, have had an opportunity for a quarter of a century to study me, to read or hear the thousands upon thousands of words that I've spoken, to evaluate all of the things that I've done in and out of political life.

And I know that they've done so with greater care than with most political figures in this State because of the peculiar circumstances of my political career. They had a chance for a quarter of a century to know what kind of a man I am.

Why did they wait until less than a week before election day to tell the people of Maine that I was the kind of monster that they describe in that advertisement the other day?

If I am as evil as they painted me to be, they had a responsibility to say so before.

I was under the impression that we in America had a capacity to grow up. That ought to apply to politicians as well.

Don't they know how to deal in a direct, honest man-to-man fashion with their oppositions?

Don't they know how to go to a man and say to his face if they believe what they said about me in that advertisement last week?

Don't they have the backbone to rely on the facts of a man's life—what he actually says?

Do they have to distort what he says to try to defeat him?

Do they have to distort what he's done in order to defeat him?

What kind of people are these who would use the American political process to abuse the truth to which the American people are entitled in a political campaign? They challenge us to a debate. To debate what? Their falsehoods. To debate what? Their assassinations of the characters of honorable Americans.

We live in a divided time in our country. If there is ever a time when we needed from leaders or potential leaders or would-be leaders a capacity to draw out the best of our people, now is such a time.

The Presidency and the Vice Presidency of the United States are more than political jobs. They are the most eminent places of leadership within the gift of this country to bestow.

If any political office has the capacity to call out greatness in a man, history tells us, those do. And we've got the right to expect of a man who occupies the Presidency, on the Saturday and Sunday before an American election day an appeal to the best that we can do for our country in the years ahead, the best of what we are for our country in the years ahead.

This is a time to ask the American people to make our country great, not small. This is a time when we ought to be reaching out to each other not simply to destroy each other. This is a time when political parties and political opponents ought to be testing their ideas against each other, testing their wisdom against each other, testing their capacity to think and to innovate against each other.

This is no time to be competing to see which Party is best suited to Halloween and the witches, the goblins, and the trick-or-treating and the pranks and the games that children play on that holiday.

Don't they understand that the fabric of a people's understanding, capacity for sympathy and compassion is a fragile thing. And it is that kind of a delicate, intangible thing that has great strength to bind us together, not withstanding our great differences in our hostilities and our suspicions and our distrust.

Oh, I wish I could see a President in such a time appealing to his people to trust each other, to have faith in the perfect ability of other Americans, to believe that whoever we are wherever we live we can, if given a chance, overcome our weaknesses and our shortcomings . . . that we can be as we have been a great people.

Presidents have done that in the past—great presidents. And they have led their people through difficult and perilous times—to higher plateaus and achievements in peace and justice for our people.

Why can't this President try that role? Why?

Is victory so important? Is a few more seats in the Congress so important? What kind of a country does he want to lead? A country made up of people who have a capacity of believing in each other? Or a country made up of people who are learning to hate each other?

What kind of a country does he want to lead? If he wants a whole country, if he wants a healthy country, if he wants a great country, if he wants a growing country, then why won't he treat us like that. He might be amazed how the American people would respond to that kind of leadership. These past two years have taken me more away from you and the people of Maine than has ever been the case—more than I like. And I suspect this will be true in the months ahead.

Before the election separates us again, I hope you always believe what is true—that I am one of you, I couldn't be anything else if I tried.

I can't expect that you will always know fully why I say what I do or what I do, because you won't always have all the facts. But I want you to believe that whatever I say or do, I'll always measure against the people of Maine in my home town, in my State, have taught me of the fundamental values that ought to govern a man's life.

We have an election coming. I'd like to urge you to give all of your support to this young man who has served you well as a governor and who has acquired the ability to give you great service in the next four years.

I hate to make this next point but Peter and Bill don't really need it that badly. But they've earned it as well and I know you're going to give them your support.

#### THE UNITED ITALIAN-AMERICAN SOCIETIES AND CLUBS OF GREATER SPRINGFIELD, MASS., COLUMBUS DAY 1970

#### HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, one of the most impressive Columbus Day celebrations in the country is held in Springfield, Mass. Annually the United Italian-American Societies and Clubs of Greater Springfield sponsor a series of events that combine to make Columbus Day a fitting and magnificent tribute to Christopher Columbus.

The courage, daring, and fearlessness of the Great Discoverer and his brilliance of knowledge and intellect are remembered by a spectacular parade, and crowned by a stimulating dinner that honors Columbus through song, dance, and tribute.

For the past many years, I have been privileged to be a guest of the United Italian-American Societies and Clubs of Greater Springfield at their annual Columbus Day dinner. One of the finest talks that I have ever heard at these banquet was delivered this year by Mr. John F. Labigalini, president of the organization. President Labigalini gave a moving talk on the meaning of Italian cultural heritage. I am pleased to insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

COLUMBUS DAY 1970

(By John F. Labigalini)

I was talking to a young friend the other day, who asked me when I was going to get off this Italian "kick" of mine. He told me that since the world was shrinking at such a rapid rate, that since our younger generation was so broad in its outlook toward people, regardless of their origin and nationality,

that being Italian or French or Polish was passé these days, and we should all start thinking of ourselves as citizens of the world.

I didn't have a ready answer for him then, but I've thought about it and I have one now. I'm happy that he and his contemporaries can think of other people as just plain people without worrying about their national origin, or religion or color. This kind of attitude may go a long way in wiping out the racial and ethnic prejudice that we've all experienced in our lifetime. That's well and good. But there's another side to the coin. It's a side that many of today's youngsters overlook. An evolving, growing culture, an ongoing civilization has to be based on a foundation of past experiences. To wipe out our past, our traditions and cultural heritage would be to cut the foundation of our existence out from under us. Borrowing from the past to build for the future is a sign of wisdom, not of being narrow or old fashioned. I think our attempt to preserve the best of our traditions and culture is something that we must foster and perpetuate. Let's go on being good Italian-Americans and pass along the best of what we are to our children. They can use some of the old—some of the Italian—some of the old fashioned—and combine it with the new, and be better than we!

Let's affirm our faith in our past and in our future. Let's resolve that this year's successful Columbus Day Program will be an incentive to make next year's better. We look forward to more cooperation and hard work, greater unity of purpose and greater accomplishment in the future.

We won't forget that we are indeed citizens of the world, but let's not forget that we are Italians, and we are unique and good and proud because of it!

#### ANNUAL SCHOLARSHIP AWARDS

Mr. Speaker, seven college freshmen were awarded scholarships at the 12th Annual Scholarship Awards Dinner of the United Italian-American Societies and Clubs of Greater Springfield, Mass. The dinner, an event attended by hundreds from throughout the Italian-American community in the Greater Springfield area, was part of the organization's Columbus Day celebration. Each year the clubs that form the organization select deserving college students for scholarship grants, recognizing and encouraging academic achievement in students of Italian background. I am sure my colleagues join me in commending the organization for this service, just one of many it performs for its communities.

This year's scholarship winners are:

Leonore Benedetti, a graduate of Classical High School, now a freshman at Westfield State College.

Michael Chiarvalle, Technical High School, University of Massachusetts.

Mary Ann Ficoni, Cathedral High School, North Adams State College.

Elizabeth Grasso, Agawan High School, Springfield Technical Community College.

Alicia Lamagna, West Springfield High School, Westfield State College.

The Anthony and Sylvia Forastiere Scholarship went to Christine Gatti, Technical High School, University of Massachusetts.

The George B. and Rose Tazzini Scholarship went to Katherine Grimaldi, Cathedral High School, Westfield State College.

The program for the dinner, dedicated to "those who dare to teach, lead and never cease to learn," was as follows:



## COLUMBUS DAY BANQUET PROGRAM

National Anthem: Miss Theresa Siciliano, Soloist; Mrs. Albert Mastroianni, Accompanist.

Invocation: The Rev. Carlo Bevilacqua, C.S.S.

Chairman's Welcome and Introduction of Toastmaster: Miss Rosemary Pedulla, General Chairman; Thomas Coppola.

Presentation of Honored Guests: The Honorable Frank H. Freedman, Mayor of Springfield; Manlio Giupponi, Italian Consulate; the Honorable Edward P. Boland, Congressman, U.S. House of Representatives.

Introduction of Columbus Day Queen and Her Court: Her Royal Highness, Miss Gina Gozzi, Columbus Day Queen, 1970. Her Court: Miss Lou Ann Pantuosco, Miss Anne Marie Nunziato, Miss Elena Carnevale, Miss Margie Santaniello.

Scholarship Presentation: Mr. Pasquale Romano, Chairman, Scholarship Committee. Presidents' Welcome: John F. Labigalini, President, United Italian American Societies and Clubs.

Benediction: The Rev. Carlo Bevilacqua, C.S.S.

# PASSAGE OF H.R. 16785 MATTER OF LIFE AND DEATH

## HON. DOMINICK V. DANIELS

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. DANIELS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, recently I called to my colleagues' attention a newspaper accounting of a press conference held by a leading group of environmentalists in support of H.R. 16785 and S. 2193, the Occupational Safety and Health Act. Before the Members of this body vote on the vital question of job safety and health, I hope they will give consideration to the issues raised by the environmentalists in their statement addressed to Congressmen urging their support of H.R. 16785.

The statement points out that the problem of safety in the workplace is not one that concerns solely labor and management:

Although the burden of hazardous work places falls most heavily upon the blue collar workers, the problem of occupational safety and health affects all Americans. The in-plant environment is merely a concentrated microcosm of the outside environment to a lesser degree. For example, the toxic effects of carbon monoxide were first discovered when two workers in a chemical plant died of over-exposure. Now carbon monoxide is recognized as a danger to the entire population and some few steps are being taken to regulate it.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is not merely a question of labor-management relations, nor of Federal versus States rights. It is a serious matter of life and death, of health and well-being to millions of American workers and their families and to the community at large. I urge my colleagues to give this statement their close attention before voting on the provisions of H.R. 16785.

The text of the environmentalists' letter follows:

### ENVIRONMENTAL ACTION,

Washington, D.C., November 14, 1970.

As concerned citizens, environmentalists and members of the academic and profes-

sional communities, we feel that the Williams and Daniels Bills (S. 2193 and H.R. 16785) are the most important pieces of legislation presently before the Congress. The bills will have crucial significance not only for the blue-collar work force, but for all Americans.

America's eighty million working people spend an average of forty hours a week in some of the most polluted, physically hazardous and psychically devastating environments found anywhere. Eighty per cent of these citizens work in places where no type of health service is provided, and the protection given the remaining twenty per cent varies from excellent to minimal.

According to the government's raw and probably vastly understated figures, nearly 400,000 workers have died, and 50,000,000 have been disabled from work-related diseases and injuries in the twenty-five years since the end of the Second World War. The annual figures amount to over 15,000 deaths and 7,000,000 injuries of which 2,500,000 are disabling. The figures, as appalling as they are, can never adequately convey the agony of the injured and the anguish of the family, much less the worry, the discomfort and the boredom that arise from the unhealthy, unsafe working conditions under which the health of millions of workers is being regularly eroded and under which many workers simply wait for the inevitable "accident" to happen.

As in other areas of environmental concern, our commitment to a technology of life and to the wise use of our most precious resources appears to have fallen behind our commitment to a technology of uncontrolled growth. A technological genie has unlocked thousands of more efficient and productive, but often more hazardous, processes. For example, while there are approximately 6,000 toxic chemicals now in industrial use, and more than 600 being added every year, recommended national safety standards exist for only about 450.

Although the burden of hazardous work places falls most heavily upon the blue-collar workers, the problem of occupational safety and health affect all Americans. The in-plant environment is merely a concentrated microcosm of the outside environment. The environmental health hazards that workers face affect the entire population to a lesser degree. For example, the toxic effects of carbon monoxide were first discovered when two workers in a chemical plant died of over-exposure. Now carbon monoxide is recognized as a danger to the entire population and some few steps are being taken to regulate it. Dermatitis from enzyme detergents, lead and mercury poisoning, and many other health perils were first discovered in the plant by the workers who worked with those substances. If industrial chemicals and processes were properly researched and monitored before they were put into use, the entire population would be spared.

Most industrial diseases and accidents are preventable. Modern technological and medical sciences are capable of solving the problems of noise, dust, heat, fumes, and toxic substances in the plants. However, existing legislation in this area does not begin to meet the problems. Except for the woefully inadequate and unenforced Walsh-Healy Act, Mine Safety Act, and Construction Safety Act, the entire field of occupational safety and health is left to the individual states. The states have been loathe to develop and enforce standards for the protection of their workers. In the states today there are a total of 1,600 health and safety inspectors, and 2,800 game wardens. Elk and deer are better protected than working men and women.

Clearly, in the field of occupational health and safety the patch-work approach by the states has failed. There is a positive role that

the Federal Government now must play. In a bold departure from previous legislation in this area, the Daniels' Bill in the House and the Williams' Bill in the Senate would:

Impose on industry the "general duty" of furnishing workers "a place of employment which is safe and healthful."

Empower the Secretary of Labor to set nation-wide health and safety standards for working environments.

Call for unannounced federal inspections of workplaces and prompt disclosure of the findings to workers.

Authorize the Secretary of Labor to impose fines and seek court action against employers who violate the "general duty" or specific standards.

Permit the Secretary of Labor to close down all or part of any plant where workers are in "imminent danger" of injury or disease.

Direct the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare to publish a list of all known or potentially toxic substances including those whose analysis is specifically requested by workers.

Allow employees to refuse work, without loss of pay, in areas where toxic substances are found at dangerous concentrations.

Though long overdue, this legislation represents an important first step toward solving the problem of occupational health and safety. Of particular importance, are the strong enforcement provisions granted the Secretary of Labor coupled with the absence of the sort of administrative fragmentation which plagues alternative drafts of the Occupational Health and Safety Bill. Thus we strongly urge the immediate passage of the Williams and Daniels Bills in their present form.

Sincerely yours,

Mr. Stuart Udall, Former Secretary of Interior; Mr. Willard Wirtz, Former Secretary of Labor; Dr. Samuel S. Epstein, Chief, Laboratories of Environmental Toxicology and Carcinogenesis, Children's Cancer Research Foundation; Dr. Paul Cornely, President, American Public Health Association; Prof. George Wald, Biology Department, Harvard University; Mr. Gary Soucie, Friends of the Earth.

Dr. Edward Martell, National Center for Atmospheric Research; Prof. Garret Hardin, Biology Department, University of California (at Santa Barbara); Prof. Rene Dubos, Department of Environmental Medicine, Rockefeller University; Dr. Mary Bunting, President, Radcliffe College; Barry Commoner, Chairman, Department of Botany and Director of the Center for the Biology of the National Systems, Washington University, St. Louis, Mo.; Roger Revelle, Director, Center for Population Studies, Harvard University; Duncan Holoday (Ret.), Director, Occupational Health Field Station, U.S. Public Health Service, Salt Lake City, Utah;

Prof. Lynton K. Caldwell, Indiana University; Dr. Robert Ebert, Harvard Medical School; Prof. J. D. Watson, Biology Department, Harvard University; Prof. Paul Ehrlich, Chairman, Graduate Division, Department of Biology, Stanford University; Jerome B. Gordon, Author, "Life Stealers"; Peter Peacock, M.D., Chairman, Department of Health, Graduate School, University of Alabama, Birmingham, Ala.; Denis Hayes, National Coordinator, Environmental Action; Michael McCloskey, Executive Director, Sierra Club; Ralph Nader, Center for the Study of Responsive Law.

MAYOR F. EDWARD BIERTUEMPFEL:  
MAYOR EXTRAORDINARY

## HON. FLORENCE P. DWYER

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mrs. DWYER. Mr. Speaker, at its annual fall meeting in Atlantic City, tomorrow, the New Jersey Conference of Mayors will honor two mayors of New Jersey communities who are believed to hold national records for the longest tenure in office—Mayor Biertuempfel of Union Township and Mayor Jack L. Eckhardt of Folsom.

As a part of my remarks in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I include the text issued by the New Jersey Conference of Mayors:

NEW JERSEY CONFERENCE OF MAYORS TO BESTOW HONORS ON TWO STATE MAYORS BELIEVED TO HOLD LONGEST RECORDS OF TENURE IN UNITED STATES

ATLANTIC CITY, N.J.—The New Jersey Conference of Mayors will honor two veteran State Mayors, who are "believed to hold the longest records for tenure in the United States."

The organization will pay homage to the two Mayors when it gathers for its Annual Fall Luncheon Meeting at the Traymore Hotel here, Thursday, November 19th.

Mayor Jack L. Eckhardt of Folsom in Atlantic County and Mayor F. Edward Biertuempfel of Union in Union County, each of whom has served approximately 32 years continuously in the office of Mayor of their Municipalities, will receive Citations of Merit.

The Conference of Mayors, which represents most of the 567 Mayors in New Jersey, in a statement issued today by Mayor Lawrence F. Kramer of Paterson, President of the organization, said "as far as can be determined, Mayor Eckhardt and Mayor Biertuempfel hold the records for the longest continuous tenure in office in New Jersey and each has probably been reelected more times than any Mayor in the United States."

George Zuckerman of Asbury Park, Executive Director of the Mayors Conference, said that "citations will also be presented to the two Mayors from the state and national governments."

"More than 600 Mayors and their Guests, including State and National leaders, will attend the Atlantic City Meeting," Mr. Zuckerman said.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to claim Mayor Biertuempfel not only as a valued constituent, but as a good friend and political associate over a period of many years. But more important, together with thousands of my fellow New Jerseyites, I am honored to recognize Mayor Biertuempfel as a distinguished public servant who has contributed immeasurably to his fellow citizens, his community, his country, and his State.

Mayor Biertuempfel, Mr. Speaker, is known, among other things, as the "architect of Union." And the designation is an apt one. Not only has his foresight and leadership guided the healthy and progressive development of his rapidly growing suburban community, but has given his people quality government for more than a generation. The physical monuments to his leadership, alone, are most impressive in the form of many modern public buildings, but the

indication of his greatness is his responsiveness to those whom he serves, and his people have recognized the outstanding quality of his service in many ways and in the regularity with which they have continued their mayor in office.

Mayor Biertuempfel was first elected by the Union township committee in June 1930, and he has served as mayor since 1939. But these are just the highlights of his extensive career. In the interim he served for 18 years, eight of them as president, as a member of the Union County Board of Taxation. He has also served on the Union County governing body, the board of chosen freeholders, and the joint sewer commission. For 15 years, he was a member of the Union Township Board of Health, and has also served on the township's library board.

A longtime member of the Union Township Chamber of Commerce, Mayor Biertuempfel has also been a member of the advisory board of the New Jersey League of Municipalities and the board of managers of the Bonnie Burn Sanatorium.

The mayor's political career includes the organization of the Regular Republican Club of Union, the vice chairmanship of the Union County Republican Committee, and election twice as delegate to the Republican National Convention.

He is an honorary member of many organizations, including the New Jersey State Firemen's Mutual Benefit Association, the Union Volunteer Fire Department, the International Association of Police, and the Union Junior Police.

Mayor Biertuempfel has received many honors and tributes during his career, among them a formal tribute from the New Jersey State Legislature. Among the honors which will be paid him at the annual meeting of the New Jersey Conference of Mayors will be the presentation of an enrolled resolution signed by every member of the New Jersey congressional delegation, signifying his long and distinguished service as mayor of Union.

Mr. Speaker, Mayor Ed Biertuempfel is an extraordinary public official and human being. Devoted to his people, unselfish in the giving of himself to public service, understanding, a forceful and imaginative leader, and a warm and loyal friend, he is, above all, an outstanding example of the quality of man the American people sometimes choose to lead them.

PFC. JOHN H. THOMAS, JR.

## HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, it is with deep regret that I announce the death of another of our brave fighting men. Marine Pfc. John H. Thomas, Jr., of Pittsburgh, Pa., who was killed in Vietnam.

We owe a profound debt of gratitude and appreciation to our dedicated serv-

icemen who sacrificed their lives for this great country. In tribute to Private, First Class, Thomas for his heroic actions, I wish to honor his memory and commend his courage and valor, by placing in the RECORD the following article:

Marine Pfc. John H. Thomas Jr., 20, grandson of Mrs. Emma Brown of 416 Freeland St., Beltzhoover.

Pfc. Thomas was killed in Quang Nam province when he was hit by an enemy mortar. He enlisted in the Marine Corps in February and was sent to Vietnam in July as a machine gunner.

Before enlisting, Pfc. Thomas lived with his grandmother on New Arlington Avenue, South Side.

## JUDICIAL REVIEW FOR DETERMINATIONS OF THE TARIFF COMMISSION—H.R. 875

## HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise once again to dramatize the importance to the American Nation of the pending legislation on foreign trade. I have been disturbed by the administration's lack of direction in this important field of economic activity, but I am particularly troubled by President Nixon's position that he is going to veto any legislation dealing with tariffs and quotas unless they meet his sole specifications. Moreover, into all this enters the responsibility of the highly difficult work performed by the U.S. Tariff Commission which, among other duties, is called upon to determine the eligibility for adjustment assistance of firms and workers.

The past history of the Tariff Commission has not been without blemish; and we can foresee an ever-increasing role by the Commission in this area of activities, as segments of our economy deteriorate and our markets remain open to the onslaught of foreign goods imported into the United States while American industries and workers suffer from reduced earnings, underemployment, and outright unemployment.

Delays in the Tariff Commission's work are bad enough in these trying times for the American workers who are hit by joblessness or who are forced to work short weeks because of cheap foreign imports. I believe that this is the most appropriate time to bring a degree of judicial review into the process of the Tariff Commission's work. My bill, H.R. 875, proposes the introduction of such judicial review in that aspect of the Commission which concerns the immediate welfare of thousands of American workers who need some relief from the unfairness of foreign competition. This approach is sound. It is fair. It is essential. All our governmental agencies, to the extent that they make determinations, generally without recourse, should be subject to judicial review. The principle of the right of appeal is as American as apple pie. It embodies the spirit of allowing everybody the opportunity to



correct an error; it has a universal prophylactic effect on those that hold power; and most of all it tends to curb the abuses of unlimited power.

I believe that those thousands of workers who are now seeking badly needed help should have the protection of judicial review in their quest to rectify the longstanding wrongs of international commerce which is concentrated against the openness of our national markets. The positive contribution of these workers to the well-being of our Nation in general and our economy in particular is often lost not through their fault but because of unfortunate circumstances likely to be aggravated by bureaucratic callousness.

Virtually every citizen, and every community, stands to be affected by the work of the Tariff Commission. A review of law and fact is the least that Congress can provide for the execution of what promises to become an ever-increasing task for the Tariff Commission in light of the past developments and foreseeable trends in relation to our trade with other nations of the world. Some of these nations do not disdain using inequitable and unfair practices to the detriment of our workers. To urge support for this bill is not only my heartfelt duty, but the patriotic duty of every Member of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that upon deep reflection this House will consider my legislation, not as an added burden of a governmental agency but a long-needed protection for the American workers' rights to their jobs and the pursuit of happiness.

For the convenience of my colleagues, I should like to include in the RECORD today a copy of my bill, H.R. 875.

The bill follows:

H.R. 875

A bill, to amend the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 to provide judicial review of certain determinations of the Tariff Commission, and for other purposes

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) section 301(c) of the Trade Expansion Act of 1962 (19 U.S.C. 1901(c)) is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:*

*"(4) For the purposes of paragraphs (1) and (2) the determination of the Tariff Commission shall be made on the record and shall be made at the earliest practicable time, but not later than sixty days after the date on which the petition is filed."*

*(b) Section 301(e) of such Act (19 U.S.C. 1901(e)) is amended by inserting "(1)" immediately after "(e)", and by adding at the end thereof the following new paragraph:*

*"(2) Should the Tariff Commission make an affirmative determination under subsection (c) (1) or (c) (2) with respect to any firm or group of workers, it shall certify that such firm or group of workers is eligible to apply for adjustment assistance."*

*(c) Section 301(f) of such Act (19 U.S.C. 1901(f)) is amended by striking out in paragraph (1) "section" and inserting in lieu thereof "subsection (b)", and by striking out paragraph (3).*

*(d) Section 302 of such Act (19 U.S.C. 1902) is amended by striking out subsection (c) and redesignating subsections (d) and (e) as subsections (c) and (d), respectively.*

*(e) Chapter 1 of title III of such Act is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new section:*

*"Sec. 303. JUDICIAL REVIEW.—(a) Any interested party aggrieved by any determination*

*of the Tariff Commission under section 301 (c) (1) or 301(c) (2) may appeal to the United States court of appeals for the circuit in which such party resides or has his principal place of business by filing a petition with such court within sixty days after such determination. A copy of the petition shall be forthwith transmitted by the clerk of the court to the Tariff Commission. The Tariff Commission thereupon shall file in the court the record of the proceedings on which it based its action, as provided in section 2112 of title 28, United States Code.*

*"(b) Upon the filing of a petition referred to in subsection (a), the court shall have jurisdiction to affirm the determination of the Tariff Commission or reverse it and remand the case to the Tariff Commission for proceedings consistent with its decision. The findings of the Tariff Commission as to the facts, if supported by substantial evidence, shall be conclusive, but the court, for good cause shown, may remand the case to the Tariff Commission to take further evidence, and the Tariff Commission may thereupon make new or modified findings of fact and may modify its previous determination, and shall file in the court the record of the further proceedings. Such new or modified findings of fact shall likewise be conclusive if supported by substantial evidence.*

*"(2) The judgment of the court affirming or reversing any determination of the Tariff Commission shall be final, subject to review by the Supreme Court of the United States upon certiorari or certification as provided in section 1254 of title 28, United States Code."*

*(f) Section 311(a) of such Act (19 U.S.C. 1911(a)) is amended by inserting "301(e) (2) or" immediately after "section".*

*(g) Section 322 of such Act (19 U.S.C. 1941) is amended by striking out in subsections (a) and (b) "302(d)" each place it appears therein and inserting in lieu thereof "302(c)", and by striking out in subsection (b) "302(e)" and inserting in lieu thereof "302(d)".*

*SEC. 2. The amendments made by this Act shall become effective with respect to determinations made by the Tariff Commission in the case of petitions filed under section 301 (a) (2) of such Act (19 U.S.C. 1901(a) (2)) after the date of enactment of this Act.*

#### "DUMPING" BY FOREIGN PRODUCERS

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, during the just-completed recess I came across two newspaper articles dealing with other examples of "dumping" by foreign producers. One appeared October 20, in the Daily News of McKeesport, Pa., and concerned an interview with Edwin H. Gott, chairman of United States Steel Corp. Mr. Gott declared Japanese steel producers are underselling the domestic industry \$20 to \$40 per ton. However, proving the dumping charges are difficult, Mr. Gott contends, because Japanese firms use trading companies as their overseas outlets.

The second article was in the October 13 issue of the Pittsburgh Post-Gazette and concerned sheet, plate, and float glass being dumped on to our domestic market. Again, the finger of guilt was pointed at Japan. The newspaper reported our Treasury Department has found "there are reasonable grounds to

believe" Japan is guilty of such activities. Although a final determination must yet be made, the Department's findings constitute a warning to importers that higher customs duties could be imposed.

I submit both articles for inclusion in the RECORD:

[From the Daily News, McKeesport, Pa., Oct. 20, 1970]

GOTT SAYS JAPANESE USE TRADING FIRMS TO DUMP STEEL—PRICE CUTS SET AT \$20 TO \$40 TON—EXPORT VIOLATIONS VIEWED AS HARD TO DETECT

WASHINGTON.—Japanese firms dump cut-rate steel products on the United States through trading companies, making it hard to detect, according to Edwin H. Gott, chairman of U.S. Steel Corp.

"We know there is dumping," Gott said in a copyrighted interview with U.S. News & World Report. "But the Treasury Department investigated Japan . . . and came back and said they couldn't find any."

The price violations are difficult to uncover because the Japanese firms use trading companies as their overseas outlets, he said.

At the same time, Gott said the world's steel industry has a "fantastic" future. There are ample supplies of iron ore and coal and the demand for steel will remain high, he said.

Gott said Japanese steel manufacturers receive far more help from their government than U.S. counterparts.

"You can see in many of their publications that prices are higher for Japanese users at home than they are for Japanese steel in this country. They come to our West Coast and even into the Great Lakes and undersell us by \$20 to \$40 a ton," Gott said.

U.S. Steel, according to Gott, has sought tariff protection and help under anti-dumping laws.

He claimed European common market countries also shave prices when their products are not moving fast enough. "They price them to make certain they move," he said.

If a country is discovered pricing its exports at less than what they sell for at home, a violation of American anti-dumping laws, the U.S. government can impose a special tariff to bring the price in this country up to the level of the producing country's domestic level.

Japanese television sets are currently at the center of such an anti-dumping law dispute.

Asked why U.S. Steel firms don't combine American know-how with lower Japanese labor costs and produce steel in Japan, Gott replied:

"In the first place industries such as ours couldn't get into Japan with that kind of arrangement. The automotive industry is trying now, and they haven't succeeded in getting in. Steel is the last thing you could get in there, because, to the Japanese, their steel industry is a national symbol."

Gott said the demand for steel in the United States has expanded at a rate of about 2.5 per cent a year recently. "Worldwide, it's about 6 per cent. The greatest growth will be in those countries that are just learning to use steel," he said.

TREASURY SUSPICIOUS: JAPANESE ARE POSSIBLY "DUMPING" FLOAT GLASS

WASHINGTON.—The Treasury today published a finding that "there are reasonable grounds to believe" that sheet, plate, and float glass from Japan are being "dumped" in the United States.

This notice constitutes a warning to importers of such glass that additional higher customs duties may be imposed.

In brief, the treasury reported the probability that the purchase price offered in sales to the U.S. is lower than the comparable home market price in Japan.

**DUMPING "ANTIDOTE"**

Under the "anti-dumping" act, if there's a final determination that a product is being sold here at less than the fair market value, additional "countervailing" customs duties may be levied against such imports by action of the U.S. tariff commission.

Under the Treasury's finding, the Bureau of Customs has been ordered to withhold final appraisals of imports from Japan in these classifications of glass. Although this action doesn't halt such imports, anyone buying such imports is warned that they may cost more than he originally bargained for.

The treasury's notice states that this situation will expire in six months unless revoked earlier.

**PREVIOUS CASE FIZZLED**

In the last round of "anti-dumping" inquiries into glass imports, the tariff commission ruled six years ago that imports of window glass from Soviet Russia and Czechoslovakia weren't injuring American industry, even though the treasury had issued a final finding that these nations were "dumping" the glass in this country.

**GUN REGISTRATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA A FAILURE****HON. JOHN R. RARICK**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, no "prosecutive merit," said a U.S. attorney in the District, and the charges against a Black Panther for possession of an M-1 carbine with a 30-round magazine were dropped.

Since the District of Columbia has laws prohibiting possession of machine-guns and has gun-registration laws, the Government attorney's action must be considered as a great setback to the gun-registration lobby. Especially is this so since the firearms registration pushers have sought to sell their program by assuring the innocent public that with gun-registration laws the general public would be safe from the threat of firearms.

Judging from this interpretation of the law in the District, the firearms laws do not apply to Black Panthers. Perhaps the U.S. attorney feels the Black Panthers fall under the exception to firearms possession granted "to members of the Army" under title 22-3205 of the District of Columbia Code.

Strangely, there has not been one objection or protest heard from the firearms registration lobby.

If nothing else, the action by the U.S. attorney in the District of Columbia but proves that peaceful law-abiding citizens will never be protected by any laws that go unenforced.

Several related clippings follow:

[From the Evening Star, Nov. 16, 1970]

**DISTRICT DROPS CHARGES AGAINST 18 PANTHERS**

Disorderly conduct charges against 18 persons arrested in July during a raid on a Black Panther headquarters here, and a charge of possessing a prohibited weapon lodged against another man seized in the raid were dropped today.

Charles Brunson, 26, had been charged with possessing an M-1 carbine with a 30-round magazine, thus qualifying as a machinegun under the law, after the raid and

clash between police and persons at the Panther headquarters in the 1900 block of 17th Street NW, on July 4.

Luke Moore, chief assistant U.S. attorney in charge of the criminal division, said today that the charge against Brunson had been dropped after a "thorough review" of the evidence when it was decided that there was no "prosecutive merit."

Brunson also had been charged with assault on a policeman. That case was presented to a grand jury which did not indict him.

Disorderly conduct charges against some 18 persons stemming from the raid also were dropped today in the Court of General Sessions.

Robert Campbell, chief assistant corporation counsel at CGS, said they were dropped after Acting Corporation Counsel Francis Murphy, informed him of the U.S. Attorney's action. Campbell said he had been ready to go to trial with those cases today.

Campbell said he was called at home yesterday by Murphy, who informed him that the grand jury had not returned an indictment and the U.S. Attorney's office was dropping the charge against Brunson.

Campbell said Murphy then told him that "in his judgment there was no reason to go further" with the disorderly conduct charges.

Earlier this month, the American Civil Liberties Union filed a \$1.3 million suit on behalf of the local Panthers, seeking damages against the city police and District government. Also sought was an injunction against alleged police harassment of the black radical group.

The July 4 raid, which came after the Honor America Day ceremonies at the Washington Monument, was precipitated when policemen in a cruiser ordered several persons outside the Panther headquarters to stop singing and they refused.

Police reinforcements were called for. A scuffle broke out and the singers ran inside, locking the door. During the clash, one policeman was struck in the face with a brick and seriously injured.

Police broke open the door and arrested those inside, confiscating some weapons and ammunition.

In the suit, the Panthers charged that police had no cause to halt the singing, that they illegally broke into the Panther office, beat some of the occupants, and "ransacked the premises and damaged or destroyed personal property of the plaintiffs."

[From the Evening Star, Nov. 16, 1970]

**VIETCONG THANKS BLACK PANTHERS**

HONG KONG—The Viet Cong today thanked the Black Panthers for what it said was "the beautiful gesture of offering to send fighting troops to aid us in fighting U.S. imperialism."

"When necessary, we will invite you to come over to fight by our side," the Viet Cong added in a letter from Nguyen Thi Dinh, a deputy leader of the Viet Cong's Liberation Armed Forces to Huey P. Newton, defense minister of the Panthers.

Mrs. Dinh said the Panther offer represented a "great and important contribution from the peace and democratic movement in the U.S.A. which so positively supports our cause."

Excerpts from the letter were in a Viet Cong broadcast monitored in Hong Kong.

**A CONSTITUTIONAL SHOWDOWN****HON. JOHN G. SCHMITZ**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. SCHMITZ. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Supreme Court recently began hearing

argument on several conjoined cases involving the compulsory busing of school children to achieve racial balance. The decision handed down in these cases will be one of the most important in the history of the Supreme Court and of this Republic: a true constitutional showdown.

When the Court ruled public school segregation unconstitutional in the famous Brown decision of 1954, those who warned that this would mean the beginning of sociological engineering of school children on a grand scale were scoffed at. The North self-righteously believed that the South had simply been taught a lesson and would now mend its "wicked ways" and everything would be fine.

In 1964 Congress passed the Civil Rights Act, which included provisions to advance the desegregation of public schools in accordance with the Brown decision. However, a clause in that act originally introduced by Congressman WILLIAM CRAMER of Florida explicitly forbade "any official or court of the United States to issue any order seeking to achieve a racial balance in any school by requiring the transportation of pupils or students from one school to another in order to achieve such racial balance."

It is hard to see how anything could be clearer. But the first major Federal court review of the Civil Rights Act, the Jefferson case, produced the fantastic judgment that Congressman CRAMER, who was from the South, had not intended his amendment to apply to any schools once racially segregated by law—namely, schools in the South. And so, year after year since then, Federal courts have been drawing and redrawing the lines of school attendance districts in the South, until finally this year the school systems of Charlotte, N.C., and Mobile, Ala., were thrown into chaos by court orders to bus children all over the city.

During September, Congressman CRAMER, an attorney who has been admitted to the bar of the Supreme Court, prepared an amicus curiae brief on the occasion of the forthcoming Supreme Court hearing of the Charlotte and Mobile cases, explaining—which should have been obvious from the start—that his own intent and that of Congress in 1964 had been to prohibit busing anywhere in the country for purposes of eliminating racial imbalance. Eighty-three Members of Congress joined Mr. CRAMER in that brief. I was one of them. But on October 12, the Supreme Court, though it had under consideration the intent of that specific provision of law, summarily refused to hear its author tell them what he and his colleagues had meant by it. The refusal was stated in just two words: "Motion denied."

As most of us in California are well aware by now, this issue has long since ceased to be confined to the South. Children in Los Angeles County today face court-ordered busing to achieve racial balance, very similar to that which was ordered in Charlotte and Mobile. Orange and San Diego Counties could be next.

The Supreme Court's rejection of the brief from Congressman CRAMER and his 83 colleagues is a far from promising in-



dication of the manner in which the Court is approaching this great decision. It clearly suggests that once again the Justices are going to decide an issue of the most fundamental importance to our Republic, not on the basis of the actual words of the Constitution, nor according to the actual intent of elected lawmakers, nor according to the clearly expressed will of the people, but primarily, if not solely, on the basis of their own personal feelings about what kind of social engineering is best for other people's children.

I hope I am wrong about what their decision will be. But if this is what the Court does, I for one will not be content to wait for "better judicial appointments," as my colleagues from the South have patiently said. I will introduce, or join with others in introducing legislation to deprive the Federal courts of jur-

isdiction over any case involving the compulsory assignment of public school children to schools outside their own neighborhood.

#### THE LATE MRS. ROSE McCONNELL LONG

#### HON. SPEEDY O. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, November 18, 1970

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, Louisiana, and indeed the Nation, lost one of its most illustrious daughters with the passing of Mrs. Rose McConnell Long. A former First Lady of Louisiana as wife of the late distinguished Governor and U.S. Senator Huey P. Long; as a

Member of the Senate of the United States following the untimely death of her husband, and as mother of the dynamic and illustrious U.S. Senator Russell B. Long of Louisiana, the late Mrs. Long occupied a very special place in the minds and hearts of her fellow citizens, exhibiting a quiet strength and an indefatigable spirit through all the vicissitudes of a long and fruitful life. We recognize that her loss must be still more heavy to bear for Mrs. Long's children and her own family and friends, and our hearts go out in prayer to them. Still it is not enough to sorrow at the passing of this great lady of such supreme dignity, but we must also affirm that all the people of Louisiana share their heartache and personal loss, for we shall not soon discover another with such warm grace and quiet power dedicated to the service of mankind.

## SENATE—Thursday, November 19, 1970

The Senate met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts.

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

Eternal Father, we would come before Thee with clean hands and pure hearts that fit us for Thy service. Cast out all that obstructs our knowledge of Thee and of Thy purposes for our Nation in this age. Help us here to perceive the needs of the hour and to strive earnestly in private office, in committee room, and public forum for the better world when each is mindful of the many and the many are concerned for the least of their brethren.

Grant to our national leaders purity of motives, soundness of judgment, the faith of their fathers, and to all our people fidelity, integrity, industry, and pure religion, that there may be concord within our borders and peace among the nations.

Through Him who is the Prince of Peace. Amen.

#### DESIGNATION OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. RUSSELL).

The assistant legislative clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,  
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,  
Washington, D.C., November 19, 1970.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. EDWARD M. KENNEDY, a Senator from the State of Massachusetts, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL,  
President pro tempore.

Mr. KENNEDY thereupon took the chair as Acting President pro tempore.

#### THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, November 18, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to limit statements to 3 minutes in relation to the transaction of routine morning business, at the conclusion of the remarks of the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL).

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ORDER OF BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. GOODELL) is now recognized for 20 minutes.

#### THE CAMPAIGN SPENDING BILL

Mr. GOODELL. Mr. President, on April 14, the Senate passed the Political Broadcasting Act of 1970 by a vote of more than two-thirds of the Members present.

On September 23, the Senate passed the conference report on the act, again by a vote of more than two-thirds of the Members present.

Next week, the bill will come before us again for reconsideration after the President's veto. If those who voted for it then, vote for it now, it will become law.

The bill should become law.

Since the Senate last acted on the bill, a nationwide political campaign has tak-

en place—one that has confirmed the need for a legislative limitation on TV campaign spending in the most dramatic terms. The public has been gorged with a gargantuan diet of paid political advertising. The political television ad has taken on a life of its own, too often displacing the real issues and the real qualifications of the candidates. TV advertising budgets mount into millions and, as this occurs, the electoral process becomes a matter of money, not merit.

The vote to override the veto on this bill will be the first test for the Senate after the election. It will determine whether the Members of this body are prepared to stand up for what they think is right and already have declared to be right; or whether they will buckle under to political pressures.

To my Republican colleagues who voted for this bill and believe in it, I say: the country will carefully observe whether we stand on principle, or bend. By continuing to support the bill, we will protect the electoral process and, at the same time, vindicate the independence of the Senate. By abandoning our support, we will serve neither cause.

It is the President's prerogative to veto this or any other legislation passed by the Congress, and I respect his right to exercise this power of his office. A Presidential veto affords the Congress an opportunity to reassess a bill, in the light of the objections set forth by the President in his veto message.

However, I find no new substantive reasons in the President's message which convince me that the Congress should not enact this bill into law.

The President states in his veto message that a limitation of radio and television spending will discourage qualified persons from becoming candidates and favor incumbent officeholders. In fact, the reverse is true. Unless we pass this legislation, qualified individuals will continue to be discouraged from challenging incumbents unless they have or have ac-