

By Mr. GALLAGHER:

H.R. 16266. A bill to prohibit creditors from reporting disputed accounts to credit bureaus as delinquent; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H.R. 16267. A bill to provide that the willful and persistent refusal of a creditor to make corrections in the account of a consumer shall relieve the consumer of liability thereon; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GIBBONS:

H.R. 16268. A bill declaring a public interest in the open beaches of the Nation, providing for the protection of such interest, for the acquisition of easements pertaining to such seaward beaches and for the orderly management and control thereof; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HOGAN:

H.R. 16269. A bill to amend the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase the salaries of teachers, school officers, and other employees of the Board of Education of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LUJAN (for himself, Mr. McCloskey, Mr. Pollock, Mr. Vander Jagt, Mr. Harrington, Mr. Halpern, Mr. Mann, Mr. Burton of Utah, Mr. Reifel, Mr. Quie, Mr. Nelsen, Mr. Haley, Mr. Lukens, and Mr. Burke of Florida):

H.R. 16270. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to make Indian hospital facilities available to non-Indians under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MONAGAN:

H.R. 16271. A bill to reorganize the executive branch of the Government by transferring to the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare and the Secretary of the Interior certain functions of the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. Springer):

H.R. 16272. A bill to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes involving the transportation industry and for other pur-

poses; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin:

H.R. 16273. A bill to provide more effective means for protecting the public interest in national emergency disputes involving the transportation industry and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MORSE:

H.R. 16274. A bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1964, to increase the authorization for water resources research and institutes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. FRASER:

H.J. Res. 1108. Joint resolution to amend the Constitution to provide for representation of the District of Columbia in the Congress; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAGAN:

H.J. Res. 1109. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to the freedom of choice; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ZION:

H.J. Res. 1110. Joint resolution authorizing the President to proclaim the fourth week of April of each year as "National Coin Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

H.J. Res. 1111. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing that citizens of the United States who are 18 years of age or older and are members of the Armed Forces of the United States shall not be prevented from voting in certain election on grounds of their age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. STAGGERS (for himself and Mr. Springer):

H.J. Res. 1112. Joint resolution to provide for the settlement of the labor dispute between certain carriers by railroad and certain of their employees; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DIGGS:

H. Con. Res. 520. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of an additional 1,000 copies of House Report 91-610, 91st Congress, first session, entitled "Report of Special Study Mission to Southern Africa" for the use of the Committee on Foreign Affairs

of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PODELL:

H. Con. Res. 521. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the United States should sell Israel aircraft necessary for Israel's defense; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. DENT:

H. Res. 863. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to abolish joint sponsorship of bills, memorials or resolutions; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. O'HARA:

H. Res. 864. Resolution to amend the rules of the House to abolish joint sponsorship of bills, memorials or resolutions; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BURTON of California:

H.R. 16275. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Serafa R. Impang; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GIAIMO:

H.R. 16276. A bill for the relief of William E. Carroll; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia:

H.R. 16277. A bill for the relief of John R. Hammond and the Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

409. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the council of the city of Burbank, Calif., relative to repealing the Emergency Detention Act of 1950; to the Committee on Internal Security.

410. Also, petition of the city council of Boston, Mass., relative to an increase in social security benefits; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

### FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, JANUARY 1970

#### HON. GEORGE H. MAHON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I include a release highlighting the January 1970 civilian personnel report of the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures:

#### FEDERAL CIVILIAN EMPLOYMENT, JANUARY 1970

Total civilian employment in the Executive, Legislative and Judicial Branches of the Federal Government in the month of January was 2,929,564.

It should be noted that the Legislative and Judicial Branches are included for the first time in this series of reports on Federal personnel and pay beginning with this report for January 1970.

These figures are from reports certified by the agencies as compiled by the Joint Committee on Reduction of Federal Expenditures.

#### EXECUTIVE BRANCH

Civilian employment in the Executive Branch in the month of January totaled

2,893,748. This was a net decrease of 18,913 as compared with employment reported in the preceding month of December. Employment by months in fiscal year 1970, which began July 1, 1969, follows:

Month	Employment	Increase	Decrease
July 1969.....	3,049,502	+9,140	
August.....	3,015,864		-33,638
September.....	2,945,752		-70,112
October.....	2,927,741		-18,011
November.....	2,913,598		-14,143
December.....	2,912,661		-937
January 1970..	2,893,748		-18,913

Total employment in civilian agencies of the Executive Branch for the month of January was 1,641,667, a decrease of 8,120 as compared with the December total of 1,649,787. Total civilian employment in the military agencies in January was 1,252,061, a decrease of 10,793 as compared with 1,262,874 in December.

Civilian agencies of the Executive Branch reporting the largest decreases were Post Office Department with 13,816, and Agriculture Department with 2,152. The largest increase was reported by Treasury Department with 6,502. These changes were largely seasonal.

In the Department of Defense the largest decreases in civilian employment were re-

ported by the Army with 4,379, Navy with 3,270 and Air Force with 2,521.

Total Executive Branch employment inside the United States in January was 2,654,372, a decrease of 16,200 as compared with December. Total employment outside the United States in January was 239,376, a decrease of 2,713 as compared with December.

The total of 2,893,748 civilian employees of the Executive Branch reported for the month of January 1970 includes 2,589,645 full time employees in permanent positions. This represents a decrease of 5,515 in such employment from the preceding month of December. These figures are shown in Table 2 of the accompanying report.

The total of 2,893,748 civilian employees certified to the Committee by the Executive Branch agencies in their regular monthly personnel reports includes some foreign nationals employed in U.S. Government activities abroad, but in addition to these there were 107,181 foreign nationals working for U.S. agencies overseas during January who were not counted in the usual personnel reports. The number in December was 108,516.

#### LEGISLATIVE AND JUDICIAL BRANCHES

Employment in the Legislative Branch in the month of January totaled 29,020. Employment in the Judicial Branch in the month of January totaled 6,796. (The Leg-

islative and Judicial Branches are included for the first time.)

In addition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to include a tabulation, excerpted from the joint committee report, on personnel employed full-time in permanent positions by executive branch agencies during January 1970, showing comparisons with June 1969 and the budget estimates for June 1970:

FULL-TIME PERMANENT EMPLOYMENT

Major agencies	June 1969	January 1970	Estimated June 30, 1970 <sup>1</sup>
Agriculture.....	83,425	81,946	83,000
Commerce.....	25,364	25,166	25,600
Defense:			
Civil functions.....	31,214	30,368	30,700
Military functions..	1,225,877	1,182,908	1,165,900
Health, Education, and Welfare.....	102,941	100,515	102,500
Housing and Urban Development.....	14,307	14,244	14,900
Interior.....	58,156	59,085	59,300
Justice.....	35,106	36,090	37,600
Labor.....	9,723	9,795	10,300
Post Office.....	562,381	562,981	567,000
State.....	24,658	24,103	23,900
Agency for International Development.....	15,753	14,838	15,000
Transportation.....	60,386	60,819	63,600
Treasury.....	79,982	84,820	86,700
Atomic Energy Commission.....	7,047	6,983	7,000
Civil Service Commission.....	4,970	4,957	5,300
General Services Administration.....	36,176	35,979	36,400
National Aeronautics and Space Administration.....	31,733	31,533	31,400
Office of Economic Opportunity.....	2,856	2,057	2,400
Panama Canal.....	14,731	14,679	14,700
Small Business Administration.....	4,099	4,032	4,100
Selective Service System.....	6,584	6,583	6,600
Tennessee Valley Authority.....	11,987	12,281	12,300
U.S. Information Agency.....	10,500	10,249	10,200
Veterans' Administration.....	147,606	146,337	148,500
All other agencies.....	26,200	26,297	27,800
Contingencies.....			10,000
<b>Total.....</b>	<b>2,633,762</b>	<b>2,589,645</b>	<b>2,602,800</b>

<sup>1</sup> Source: 1971 Budget Document; figures rounded to nearest hundred.

ALLENTOWN EVENING CHRONICLE'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RICHARD S. SCHWEIKER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. SCHWEIKER. Mr. President, today marks the 100th anniversary of the first printing of the Allentown, Pa., Evening Chronicle. During the past century, this fine newspaper has provided its readers, and the Allentown community, with valuable information and public services.

Founded by Robert Iredell, a man from my home county of Montgomery, the Evening Chronicle is to be commended for its long life and tireless efforts in the field of newspaper journalism. I have extended my congratulations to the paper in a telegram to its publisher, Mr. Donald P. Miller, and I ask unanimous consent that my message be printed in the Extensions of Remarks:

CXVI—364—Part 5

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

Congratulations on the Evening Chronicle's Anniversary. Your newspaper served the Allentown area with distinction the past 100 years, and has upheld the standards of its founder, Robert Iredell, who was from my home county. He would be proud of your efforts today. My sincere best wishes for another successful 100 years.

EDITORIAL CALLS FOR AN "OPEN RULE" FOR AN OPEN FORUM

HON. R. LAWRENCE COUGHLIN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. COUGHLIN. Mr. Speaker, the subject of reforming the rules and procedures of the Congress is receiving more and more attention in my congressional district and the adjoining city of Philadelphia.

Editorials and comments on the needs for congressional reform are appearing in newspapers and are being aired by radio and television stations.

The heightened interest by the communications media in the way we, as Congressmen, operate is indicative of the growing concern with the role of the Congress as an institution of Government.

Many of my constituents write me, puzzled about the operations of the Congress, questioning why certain things cannot be done and expressing their doubts about our ability to deal with the pressing issues of our times. They are, in fact, questioning the credibility of the Congress itself. Regardless of how each of us feels about the particular aspects of congressional reform, I think we all must acknowledge that we must establish the Congress as a credible instrument of Government—capable of furnishing the responsibility and responsiveness our constituents want and expect.

I believe that the question of congressional reform must be discussed thoroughly on the floor of the House. We cannot afford to restrict severely or, perhaps, even choke off an open discussion by the Members of the House.

The following editorial was written and presented by Peter W. Duncan, editorial director of WCAU-TV in Philadelphia. I feel it is a fair and honest appraisal of how we must approach the issue of congressional reform in the House.

The editorial follows:

AN "OPEN RULE" FOR AN OPEN FORUM

The Congress of the United States is, in many ways, a closed shop. Legislators are elected by many, but the real power in Congress is held by relatively few.

For example, committee chairman can have what is essentially dictatorial powers over a piece of legislation. If a committee chairman doesn't want to let a bill out onto the floor of the House, he just doesn't let it out.

This is just one area where Congressional

reform is being urged. It should become accepted procedure for the committee members to vote on whether to let a bill out onto the floor for discussion. The majority would decide.

That's just one example, but there is a great deal which should be openly discussed when the reform legislation comes to the floor. But, here again, the system now in use might close off that discussion. If the House Rules Committee sends the reform legislation out under what is called a Closed Rule, then there'll be no discussion. Congressmen either take it or leave it.

An Open Rule would open the bill up for discussion on the floor of the House. There could be amendments and open debate.

When the Congressional reform legislation comes out of committee, WCAU-TV urges the Rules Committee to send it out under the Open Rule so discussion can take place.

Because of the importance of Congressional reform legislation, it deserves an open forum.

WRC EDITORIAL IN OPPOSITION TO PRE-TRIAL DETENTION AND RESPONSE OF REPRESENTATIVE HUNGATE

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, with regard to the District of Columbia crime bill package, I hope my colleagues will find interesting WRC-TV's-NBC-editorial in opposition to pretrial detention and my remarks in response thereto:

The Washington community and indeed the entire nation is faced with a crime problem of staggering proportions. In the search for a solution there is nothing that can justify infringing on the personal freedom and constitutional rights of the individual.

That is exactly the thrust of proposals now being put forward to keep alleged criminals off the streets by pre-trial or preventive detention.

The time to repudiate such procedure is now.

Pre-trial detention would permit a judge to hold a person accused of a serious crime in jail without bond for a fixed period of time—if after a hearing the accused is deemed a danger to the community. It would apply particularly to those who are released for one alleged offense and are accused of committing another crime before their original trial takes place.

Proponents declare such a measure is absolutely necessary to cut down on crime and get the habitual offender off the street.

Opponents of pre-trial detention say it cannot be done under the constitution.

WRC-TV agrees with that position and believes that the answer lies not in diminishing the rights of the individual but in improving the whole spectrum of law enforcement. Speedy and certain justice, not repressive law, is the fundamental solution to the crime problem. And along with it must go a correctional system that rehabilitates rather than destroys.

It will take money and know-how—and a great deal of both.

But it is the only way for a free society to accomplish the task.

(This editorial was broadcast at various times throughout the day on February 16 and February 17, 1970.)



REMARKS BY THE HONORABLE WILLIAM L. HUN-GATE IN RESPONSE TO WRC-TV EDITORIAL ON PRETRIAL DETENTION

To say that pre-trial detention is constitutionally prohibited is to worship form and ignore facts and the practices now existing in most States which detain not only defendants charged with serious crime, but even some material witnesses.

To quote a typical State constitution: "All persons shall be bailable by sufficient sureties, except for capital offenses, when the proof is evident or the presumption great."

Typical State statutes provide that material witnesses may be taken into custody and required to give bond to be released.

It is urged that an alternative to preventive detention is speedier trials, however, a defendant charged by strong evidence with a serious crime probably has no interest in a speedy trial, if free without bond. Delaying trial delays probable confinement and increases chances prosecution witnesses will be unavailable.

Legally, bail guarantees appearance for trial; historically it's used "de facto" by courts to consider the seriousness of the crime, defendant's past record and available evidence connecting him with the crime's commission, and community climate regarding crime.

Under present D.C. bail provisions, our principle options are two:

Release all defendants prior to trial, no matter how clearly dangerous or how serious the crime.

Or, detain the most dangerous defendants charged with the most serious crimes in the most crime-ridden areas, based on the insight and experience of trial judges applying appropriate relevant historical guidelines.

The preventive detention proposal would improve on actual practice in many States, since the judge would now have to give reasons for holding the defendant.

ALLENTOWN EVENING CHRONICLE'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, today officially marks the celebration of the 100th anniversary of the Allentown Evening Chronicle, a fine publication that has served Pennsylvania readers for so long.

I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues the congratulatory letter I sent to the Pennsylvanians who have worked long and hard to make the Allentown Evening Chronicle the monument to journalistic excellence that it represents today and has represented for a hundred years.

Mr. PRESIDENT, I ask unanimous consent that the letter be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

U. S. SENATE,

Washington, D.C., February 16, 1970.

DEAR FRIENDS AT THE ALLENTOWN EVENING CHRONICLE: On the hundredth anniversary of the Allentown Evening Chronicle, I extend my sincerest congratulations and best wishes to those who have carried on the fine tradition of its founding. This institution which has weathered the effects of passing

years, continues to serve as a tribute to the community of Allentown, the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania and the entire nation.

The great historical tradition of the Iredell family that has been carried on proves the importance of quality and high standards in the rush of time and waves of change. I hope that good fortune will stay with you and allow you to continue your most commendable efforts to improve information and communication processes for the people of the Commonwealth.

Sincerely,

HUGH SCOTT,

U.S. Senator.

REPRESENTATIVE COWGER REPORTS FROM CONGRESS

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, the February issue of my monthly newsletter has just been mailed to my constituents. I would like to have my colleagues have an opportunity to read my report:

REPORT FROM CONGRESS

(B) BILL COWGER)

PRESIDENTIAL VETO

On October 1, 1968, Richard M. Nixon, in his campaign for the Presidency, stated, "When we talk about cutting the expenses of government, either Federal, State or local, the one area we can't shortchange is education". Last year Congress labored long and hard on the appropriation bill for the Department of Labor, and Health, Education and Welfare. The total appropriation was \$19.7 billion, which was \$1.2 billion in excess of the White House request. I voted to increase the appropriation for education for I felt as did the President in his speech in 1968 that "the one area we can't shortchange is education". President Nixon vetoed the HEW bill as being "inflationary". A motion to override the President's veto failed to receive the necessary two-thirds majority (226-191). I voted to override the President's veto because of the funds needed in education and health. The additional educational money would provide for more elementary and secondary education (not teacher's salaries), vocational education, libraries, loans for nurses training, student loans, public health grants and hospital construction. Incidentally, health research in the fields of cancer and heart disease would also be included in the bill. The direct effect in the City of Louisville alone could be in excess of \$3 million. I was the only Congressman from Kentucky or Southern Indiana who did not follow his political party in this vote.

I agree with the Administration that fighting inflation is one of our gravest challenges today. It is interesting to note that just the day after the President's veto, Congress passed another extensive and expensive foreign aid bill. I have always fought inflation and the rising cost of living by voting for cuts in agriculture, defense, foreign aid and the space programs. As a matter of fact, I have consistently voted against foreign aid and agricultural subsidies. I feel that we must continue to reduce the budget by establishing a meaningful list of priorities. I will not, however, disregard our needs in the fields of education and health.

POLICE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1970

After six months of research and study, I recently introduced a comprehensive local

police assistance act to help law enforcement agencies combat crime in urban areas. As the Chairman of the Task Force on Urban Affairs, I have been working closely with the National League of Cities in preparing this legislation. My bill would provide \$500 million annually for five years in direct grants to cities with a population of over fifty thousand to improve the effectiveness of local police services. I feel that the primary responsibility for police protection rests with local government. Tax money on the federal level should be returned to the cities to effectively fight the rising crime rate. My bill has received the endorsement and backing of the U.S. Conference of Mayors and the National League of Cities. Incidentally, I have also joined as a co-sponsor of legislation known as the Hartke Amendment to the Safe Streets Act of 1968. George Yenowine has joined our Congressional staff as Administrative Assistant to replace Lew Tingley, who has accepted the position of Executive Director of the Louisville and Jefferson County Convention and Visitors Bureau.

Mr. Yenowine is a graduate of the University of Kentucky and was for several years an advertising executive in Louisville.

RATINGS

Recently I was presented the Distinguished Service Award from the Americans for Constitutional Action. The ACA is a conservative organization, primarily interested in votes on constitutional legislation. I had received a 63% conservative rating for my votes to cut appropriation bills. Incidentally, last year the Congressional Quarterly gave me an 83% liberal rating for my voting record concerning urban legislation. The Americans for Democratic Action, a liberal organization, has recently given me a rating of 30%. COPE, an affiliate of the AFL-CIO, rated me 50% on my votes involving organized labor.

These ratings are confusing, for each group selects individual votes that serves their own purpose. I shall continue to cast conservative votes to reduce the budget in an attempt to slow inflation. At the same time, I will have a liberal voting record in matters that concern our cities, in the fields of health, education and the fight against poverty.

POLICY COMMITTEE

During this past year, I was appointed by the Republican Congressional Leadership to membership on the Policy Committee. We meet once a week to discuss pending legislation and recommend a Party position. I took the place of Congressman Donald Rumsfeld, who was appointed to President Nixon's cabinet.

BIGGEST CHRISTMAS PARTY

My annual Christmas Party for children of servicemen in the Vietnam war zone was the biggest and best yet. There were over 200 children and their mothers attending.

Santa made his appearance, accompanied by Frosty the Snowman, and had a present for all the children, plus snacks, games to play and entertainment.

DOD AWARDS CERTIFICATE OF ESTEEM TO UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Defense has awarded the certificate of esteem to the University of Texas in Austin. This award is not

lightly given; it is confined to those instances in which an individual or an organization, acting in a civilian capacity, renders the Department an outstanding patriotic service in an overseas assignment.

The University of Texas rendered such a service last summer by sending representatives of its noted Drama Department on a USO-sponsored tour overseas. For 12 weeks University of Texas collegians entertained our servicemen in the East and West Mediterranean commands with a stellar review entitled "Here's US!"

Those of us who have served our country abroad in the armed services know full well that shows from home provide a general tonic for the troops and serve as a big morale booster. This fact is recognized by the Department of the Army, for as Army Secretary Resor stated in a letter to University of Texas President Norman Hackerman:

Entertainment from home is extremely popular without servicemen and women throughout the world and is among the most effective of the recreational programs designed to stimulate and maintain high group morale in the Armed Services.

Mr. Speaker, I am particularly proud that the University of Texas has achieved this coveted award. It constitutes official recognition of the fact that this great Texas institution is achieving high standards of excellence in the arts as well as the sciences. I congratulate the university for a patriotic service performed and a job well done.

**RANDOLPH SMOKE-OUT TRADING CIGARETTES FOR SCHOLARSHIPS**

**HON. JAMES A. BURKE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this time to call to the attention of the membership of the House of Representatives an excerpt of an article appearing in the March 2, 1970, edition of Newsweek magazine entitled "Kicking the Habit."

Described in the article are the notable efforts of the residents of Randolph, Mass., which I have the great pleasure of representing in the U.S. House of Representatives.

Randolph residents gave up cigarettes for a day, depositing what they normally would have spent on cigarettes into a scholarship fund for high school students, or as Newsweek so succinctly phrases it: "Randolph smoke-out: Trading cigarettes for scholarships."

My congratulations go to the residents of Randolph for their courageous efforts in "Kicking the Habit."

The article follows:

**RANDOLPH SMOKE-OUT: TRADING CIGARETTES FOR SCHOLARSHIPS**

Last week, smokers among the 28,000 residents of Randolph, Mass., were asked to give

up cigarettes for a day, turning over what they would have spent for a day's supply to a scholarship fund for local high-school youngsters. "I remembered the old statistics about the amounts this country spends on education, alcohol and cigarettes," says Arthur P. Mullaney, the high-school guidance counselor who came up with the idea, "and I thought if everybody pitched in toward a scholarship fund we'd have our money, save lives and get our priorities straight." The campaign began with sermons on the hazards of smoking in all the town's churches. Cigarette counters in many stores were draped in black. At the end of the day it appeared that the scholarship fund had reaped \$3,500.

**REPRESENTATIVE CRANE REPORTS FROM CONGRESS**

**HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, at the end of his third month as a Member of Congress Mr. CRANE of Illinois has summarized his activities in the House in a newsletter report to his constituents. Because it may be of interest to other Members, I insert the text of Mr. CRANE's first newsletter in the RECORD:

CRANE SWORN IN; VISITS PRESIDENT; RECEIVES 200 SUPPORTERS FROM DISTRICT

(By Phil Crane)

At a few minutes after noon on Monday, December 1, 1969, Philip M. Crane officially began his term as a Member of Congress from Illinois' 13th District. House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford asked that he be sworn in, and Representative Ed Derwinski of the 4th District escorted the new Member to the front of the House Chamber, where Speaker John McCormack administered the oath of office.

Following the formal ceremony the scene was re-enacted for photographers in the Speaker's chambers. Crane said that he regarded his new office as a "great honor," and added: "I am looking forward to the opportunity to implement some of the ideals that led me to make the race for Congress and for which my supporters worked so hard this fall."

The December 1 occasion represented a last-minute change in plans. It had been expected that Crane would take his seat on Wednesday, December 3; but the date was moved up so that he would be able to take part in the debate and vote on a House Resolution expressing support of the current U.S. policy in Vietnam.

Later in the afternoon Congressman Crane paid a visit to the White House, calling on President Richard M. Nixon. The President extended his personal congratulations and best wishes to the new Congressman, whom he has known for some time. Crane took the opportunity to thank the President for his support and congratulatory telephone call on election night.

The new Member's first Congressional votes were recorded that same afternoon: they were cast in support of the Administration's Vietnam policy on preliminary roll calls. On the following day Crane submitted his own resolution of support for that policy, and voted with the 333 to 55 majority on the very similar resolution that the House adopted.

**FANS GATHER IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA**

The "Crane Campaigners," nearly 200 strong, came to Washington December 3 to honor their new Congressman, Philip M. Crane. They came by air, filling two planes that left O'Hare before dawn, and were greeted on arrival at Washington's National Airport by the Congressman and Mrs. Crane.

After a bus trip to Capitol Hill the group took part in the official opening of the Congressman's office. Crane cut a ceremonial ribbon placed across the doorway of his Longworth Building suite, and with his gracious wife, Arlene, greeted each of their well-wishers as they entered. Passes to the House and Senate galleries were handed out: The House passes newly signed—by hand—by Crane himself. The visitors had the opportunity to inspect their Congressman's offices and, if they wished, to wander down the hall and visit those of Congressman Ed Derwinski of Illinois' 4th District as well.

The Congressman and Mrs. Crane posed for dozens of pictures, taken by members of the visiting group and by official photographers. Mrs. Crane, the mother of seven, particularly charmed the dozen or so children who had accompanied their parents. Later, the group was taken on a special, after-hours tour of the White House.

A high point of the day was a luncheon at the Statler-Hilton Hotel in downtown Washington. Several of the Illinois Republican delegation in the House attended. Special guests included House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford and the man Crane supplants as "low man" on the seniority "totem pole"—Congressman Barry M. Goldwater, Jr., of California.

Ford said that Phil Crane "fits the pattern of excellent representative from the 13th District," and Goldwater and the Illinois delegation members offered their welcomes to the Congressional "club."

The visitors spent the remainder of the afternoon seeing the House and Senate in session and stopping back, individually or in smaller groups, to Crane's office. That evening the Congressman and Mrs. Crane received their supporters once again, this time at a reception held at the Capitol Hill Club, a semi-official social retreat for Washington Republicans.

The "Crane Campaigners" returned to Chicago later that evening, tired out from the day's activities but glad they had made the trip. And the Congressman and Mrs. Crane turned their attention again to getting settled into the routine of official Washington.

**CRANE MAKES FIRST SERVICE ACADEMY APPOINTMENTS**

Thirty-seven young men from the 13th District have been nominated by Congressman Philip M. Crane to the three U.S. service academies for the classes entering in September of this year.

The potential officers were selected on the basis of tests administered by the Civil Service Commission and their high school grades. The nominees are:

To the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, New York: Michael F. Crowe, Glenview, and Kevin R. Kelsey, Northfield, who both graduated from Loyola Academy; John M. Fitzpatrick, Arlington Heights, John Hersey High School; John G. Flesch, Des Plaines, Elk Grove West High School; Douglas A. Grant, Winnetka, New Trier West H.S.; Shellee H. Hart, Evanston, Evanston Township H.S.; Robert K. Meyers, Morton Grove, Niles Community West H.S.; David R. Stadfeld, Palatine H.S.; and John Valentino, Mount Prospect, Prospect H.S.

To the U.S. Naval Academy at Annapolis, Maryland: Frederick W. Baetzey, Rolling Meadows, and Kenneth J. Glueck, Palatine, both graduates of Fremd High School; Joseph



A. Conroy, Rolling Meadows, and Gregory A. Padovani, Mt. Prospect, from Forest View High School; Robert A. Dussman, Winnetka, and Gerald R. Mack, Glenview, from Loyola Academy. Mr. Dussman graduated in 1969 and Mr. Mack was a member of the class of 1968.

Also: Timothy R. Erickson, Morton Grove, Niles Township West H.S.; Michael J. Herrero, Buffalo Grove, Wheeling H.S.; David J. Kaskie, Arlington Heights, St. Viator; William H. King, IV, Winnetka, New Trier East H.S.; and Michael N. Lyon, Arlington Heights, who attended Fermin Lasuen H.S. in San Pedro, California.

Others were Jeffrey A. McCracken, Evanston, Evanston Township H.S.; Kevin J. Rielley, Glenview, Glenbrook South H.S.; Michael A. Ryder, Mt. Prospect, John Hersey H.S.; Bradford S. Schwartz, Skokie, Niles North H.S.; Gene P. Sheldon, Palatine, Palatine H.S.; Raymond P. Wiggers, Jr., Wilmette, New Trier H.S.; and Leslie T. Maiman, Glencoe, who graduated from Campion High School Prairie du Chien, Wisconsin.

To the U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colorado: Gary R. Abramson, Mt. Prospect, Forest View High School; James R. Camphouse and David K. Reilly, both of Des Plaines and graduates of Elk Grove High School; James C. Chalfant, Palatine, Fremd H.S.; Thomas R. Coldren, Evanston, Evanston Township H.S.; and Ronald J. Cuff, Prospect Heights, Wheeling High School. Also: Peter M. Gavares, and David Schulman, both Northbrook graduates of Glenbrook High School; Geoffrey W. Kinka, Palatine, St. Viator; and Samuel J. Wit, Jr., Arlington Heights, Arlington H.S.

These young men will be accepted by the academies upon evaluation of the results of their physical and competitive academic examinations.

#### MAN OF THE YEAR BROTHERHOOD AWARD

### HON. JAMES R. GROVER, JR.

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. GROVER. Mr. Speaker, for many years, now it has been common knowledge that one of the most difficult elected positions any man could hold is that of being a member of a local school board. As a former school board trustee, I know from personal experience the hours are long, the financial remuneration is nil, and frequently the abuse is plentiful. As a matter of fact, there are times when one wonders how we succeed in obtaining the services of a good man to run for school board office.

A. Terry Weathers is a member of the board of education of the Farmingdale school system which is within my congressional district. In my years as a New York State legislator, a decade ago, I met Mr. Weathers and admired his vision and zeal as one of the most articulate, progressive innovators in the field of education today. He has been a leading authority for all school boards within New York State explaining the plight and the needs of education. In recognition of his accomplishments, the interservice clubs of Farmingdale—Kiwanis, Rotary, and Lions—on February 22 presented to Mr. Weathers the Man of the Year Award.

I know this award has gone in the past to deserving and outstanding men of good will; but this year, it has gone to a man who is the epitome of humaness,

charity, and an articulate spokesman for education. The service clubs of Farmingdale are to be congratulated for making such an excellent choice.

#### FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE, A VOICE OF DEMOCRACY

### HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a part of the RECORD the following speech delivered by Miss Cindy Putman of Caldwell, Idaho, State winner of the Voice of Democracy contest, sponsored by the Veterans' of Foreign Wars and its Auxiliary. I commend it to your attention because it illustrates that, at least, some of our young people today feel a deep devotion to their country:

#### FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE, A VOICE OF DEMOCRACY (By Cindy Putman)

The dawn is cold and a white crust of ice trims every leaf, every blade of grass—as if some unknown seamstress had sewn fine lace all through the night in preparation for this historic moment.

Just a few feet away stands the red-coated British soldiers awaiting the command of their officer which will bring this occasion to its climax.

My heart goes out to the young, lonely figure standing in the midst of the soldiers. What is he thinking? Why doesn't he plead for his life?

The noose is put around his neck, but this young patriot stands with head erect as he gives his life to defend a way of life in which he believes.

The final command is given and the noose tightens around his neck, but his final words shall echo forever in the hearts of Americans: "I only regret that I have but one life to give for my country."

#### ONE LIFE FOR FREEDOM—ONE VOICE FOR DEMOCRACY

There are those who think Nathan Hale was a fool. They feel that he was not justified in giving his life for America. Where do we draw the line beyond which personal responsibility ends? Are we justified in defending the principles for which it stands?

America was a great land when Columbus discovered it. . . . The acceptance of personal responsibilities has made it a great nation.

In 1775, Patrick Henry said "I know not what course others may take, but as for me, give me liberty or give me death."

#### TOTAL COMMITMENT

Have American principles become less important to freedom loving people in the last 200 years? Perhaps our answer lies in one's understanding of freedom. There are many people who view freedom as absence from responsibility, but in reality freedom can not survive without individual responsibility.

The Golden Gate Bridge in San Francisco is suspended by one large cable, consisting of thousands of smaller wires. Each wire has but one purpose, to support the wires surrounding it and as a unit suspend the bridge. It takes every wire to accomplish this task. One wire could not hold up the bridge alone, yet that one wire is necessary to accomplish the ultimate goal. So it is in building the bridge of freedom. The strength of America's bridge depends upon each individual's contribution of basic American ideals.

This then is freedom's challenge: to instill in the individual American citizen the desire to accept personal responsibility for

democracy . . . to enforce our bridge of freedom with our personal commitment. This is the responsibility of every true American.

#### ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION LEGISLATION

### HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the quiet conservation crisis of the 1960's has grown into a large environmental emergency—our No. 1 domestic problem in the 1970's.

Over the last few years I have been proud to be a cosponsor of the landmark conservation bills passed by Congress and enacted into law—the Wilderness Act and the Land and Water Conservation Act. I was also the chief sponsor of the legislation establishing the National Key Deer Refuge in South Florida in 1953, to protect the tiny, white-tailed Key deer, which has grown in population from only 30 in 1949 to now over 300; and the Fort Caroline National Memorial established in 1951 at the site of the French 16th century colony, which began the settlement of what is now the United States and is located in the present city limits of Jacksonville, Fla., on the St. Johns River.

In 1969, the Congress founded the Council on Environmental Policy, which was similar to legislation I have pushed in the last several Congresses. I have been active in other environmental laws, for example, the plan to study the St. Augustine-Fort Caroline trail, America's oldest road, 1565-70, for possible inclusion in the national trails system.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced in this Congress, four proposed bills which would help clean up pollution in the air, rivers, lakes, and waterways, and insure adequate outdoor recreation areas for the enjoyment of future generations.

These four bills I have introduced have been proposed by the administration: H.R. 15872, to assist development of comprehensive programs for water pollution control and enforce antipollution standards in interstate and intrastate waters; H.R. 15873, the new program to provide financial assistance for the construction of waste treatment facilities; H.R. 15871, to beef up the Clean Air Act by strict national standards for air quality, and H.R. 15870, to expand the Land and Water Conservation Act, including a provision to allow the sale of surplus Federal property to augment park funds and another to provide for such sales to State and local governments for park and recreation purposes at public benefit discounts of up to 100 percent.

In his state of the Union speech, President Nixon said:

Clean air, clean water, open spaces—these should once again be the birthright of every American. If we act now—they can be.

In Jacksonville, public officials and private groups are working for a cleaner city. I have assisted them and will continue to do so. In the last year, over \$4

million in Federal funds have been approved for antipollution measures and outdoor recreation for the area of my representation.

I believe the antipollution and environmental bills I have will help us to protect our natural beauty and the quality of our everyday life. I am hopeful for early hearings and that the measures will be reported for full House action as soon as possible.

DEMOCRATIC COUNCIL POLICIES

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, in a desperate search to find some issue with which to degrade President Nixon and bolster their party's flagging chances in the upcoming congressional elections, the Democratic Party Council has now put forth a pronouncement on Vietnam, calling for total withdrawal of U.S. troops within 18 months.

The hypocrisy of this move, Mr. Speaker, will not be ignored by the American people. For we all know that it was the Democratic Party which directed this Nation's course as we put more and more troops into Vietnam. The greatest irony of all is that two of the main architects of our escalating Vietnam policy, former Vice President Hubert Humphrey and W. Averell Harriman, are now in the forefront calling for this dangerous, self-defeating withdrawal timetable.

But, Mr. Speaker, the American people realize the truth about the war in Vietnam: that it has taken a Republican President to reverse the trend and begin bringing our troops home; that only if we continue to support President Nixon in his responsible actions toward an honorable peace, one which assures the right of self-protection to the Vietnamese people, will peace in Asia and in the world be a real possibility.

I commend to the attention of my colleagues two recent editorials which discuss the dangers of the Democratic Policy Council's proposed plan, and state clearly why the American people will not be fooled, either:

POLICIES AND POLITICS

The Democratic Party, hard pressed for a winning issue in the forthcoming congressional elections, has come up with a formal position pronouncement on the Vietnam War. It may well turn out to be self-defeating.

As proclaimed by the 76-member Democratic Policy Council, headed by former Vice President Hubert Humphrey, the party has arrived at two major conclusions on the conflict:

1. All United States forces, both combat and support troops should be withdrawn from Vietnam within 18 months under "a firm and unequivocal commitment" by our government.

2. "Our continued unconditional support of the Thieu government in Saigon, as now constituted, is not only unjustifiable but delusive."

These policy declarations were formulated

by a committee headed by W. Averell Harriman, our former chief negotiator at the Paris Vietnam talks. They sing a much different tune than he and most other party leaders sang when the war was being escalated under two Democratic administrations.

The Democratic masterminds underestimate public common sense. Opinion polls show the majority of Americans are solidly behind President Nixon and his responsibly considered withdrawal program. The majority knows the President would like nothing better than to have all U.S. troops out of Vietnam in 18 months. But it also knows that the rigid deadline demanded by the Democrats would only hamstring his efforts.

There are two other questions the majority of Americans might well raise. If the Democratic policy makers don't think the Thieu government merits our support, what do they suggest as an alternative? And how come Mr. Humphrey, who only recently came all out for the Nixon disengagement policy, now goes along tactfully with a party declaration which tends to undermine it?

WITHDRAW ALL TROOPS?

The Democratic Policy Council declares all U.S. troops should be withdrawn from Vietnam within 18 months.

The council is headed by former Vice President Hubert Humphrey who, as second man to Lyndon B. Johnson, helped build up our forces in Vietnam.

The suggestion that the council adopt the withdrawal timetable came from Averell Harriman, who applauded when the United States first moved into Vietnam on a large scale.

Apparently the Democrats hope to win some congressional seats this year, and possibly the presidency later, by claiming they were never hawks.

All of us know better than that. The Democrats created the mess in Vietnam.

Americans realize that President Nixon has done more to end the Vietnam war in the past year than was done in the previous four years.

Nixon continues to wind down that way in a way and at a pace that will allow the South Vietnamese to build their own defense and choose their own way of life.

In this endeavor, Nixon has the support of most Americans.

Yet there are those who not only seek to direct the course the President should take; they would even tie his efforts to a fixed timetable.

This kind of tactic is exactly what Hanoi wants.

It undermines the President's efforts. It gives false hope of our surrender to the enemy to the extent the enemy refuses to negotiate in Paris toward peace.

The Democrats are changing the idea of peace at any price to surrender at any price.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, a child asks: "Where is daddy?" A mother asks: "How is my son?" A wife asks: "Is my husband alive, or dead?"

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,400 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

ASTRONAUT GORDON GIVES ROCHESTER CUB SCOUTS AN EMOTIONAL GREETING

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, during the first week of February, I had the exhilarating experience of accompanying Astronaut Richard F. Gordon, pilot of the command module on the Apollo 12 moon shot to a press conference at the Rochester Planetarium.

His advice to young people which typifies his life was:

To give everything of himself, everything he's got from day to day; for this is what makes men great . . . to do anything well requires a broad base of study and knowledge on which to start . . . and no matter what his life's work is, enjoy it! . . . study and enjoy it!

There is something special about such a man that discounts the trivia and grasps the important values in life. Children of all times have a way of siphoning out the real from the phony. To them, there is something extremely attractive about a man who risks a lot for a cause in which he believes.

I was with Astronaut Gordon when he walked out of the press conference and saw five little boys in their Cub Scout uniforms giving him a salute. Gordon's response matched their spontaneity.

I would like to share with my colleagues a column by Cliff Carpenter in the Democrat and Chronicle on February 4 about this day in the lives of these Cub Scouts which they will never forget:

FIVE CUB SCOUTS AND A HERO

(By Cliff Carpenter)

This is a true story of five boys and a hero. We tell it because all small boys ought to have a hero, and all heroes ought to have small boys around.

It began Monday morning when Mrs. T. S. (Pat) Kasberger of 38 Duncott Rd., Fairport, den mother of Cub Scout Den 1, Fairport Troop 325, took a deep breath, squared her pretty shoulders and prepared for a trying day. This was the day she was to take the Den 1 cubs to the Planetarium on East Avenue. They were going there because the boys had begun studying missiles and rockets and space travel in school, and the Planetarium has exhibits about things like that.

So in the late afternoon Mrs. Kasberger drove up to the Planetarium, and her station wagon disgorged Ricky Walzer, 9; Dan Osborn, 9; Todd Goddard, 8; Jay Sober, 9, and Mark Kasberger, 9, all immaculately dressed in cub uniforms.

What they didn't know that at that moment, inside the Planetarium, astronaut Richard F. Gordon, pilot of the command module on the historic Apollo 12 moon shot, was concluding a press conference.

A quiet, solid, muscular man with sideburns, wearing a neat business suit and side vents, Gordon had answered technical questions with patience and competence. If he was more eloquent at any one time than another, it was when he was asked what advice he would have for young people:

"To give everything of himself, everything he's got from day to day; for this is what makes men great . . . to do anything well requires a broad base of study and knowledge on which to start . . . and no matter what his life's work is, enjoy it! . . . study and enjoy it!"



And with that Astronaut Gordon shook hands with the Planetarium staff and, flanked by Congressman Frank Horton, headed for the door.

Meanwhile, just inside the door, Mrs. Kasberger and Den 1 were asking why so many policemen and deputy sheriffs and television trucks were on hand. Five small jaws dropped and five pairs of eyes bugged when a kindly cop told them, "We've got Astronaut Dick Gordon with us . . . the command module pilot."

An then it happened, a spontaneous thing from the hearts of children.

The five blue-clad cubs lined up, and as the astronaut appeared they snapped off the neatest salute the Planetarium ever will see. Den 1 knew a hero when it saw one! And Gordon responded the way a hero should . . . he walked away from his escorts and over to the five small boys standing at attention, and he shook hands with each one in turn and he had some quiet words of friendship and praise.

And then he was gone, and one dazed member of Den 1 looked at his hand and looked up at Mrs. Kasberger and said: ". . . he shook hands with me. I'm not gonna wash this hand, ever!"

Later we telephoned Mrs. Kasberger to ask her how the trip home went. "They spent most of the trip opening car windows and yelling at everybody. We saw the astronaut . . . we shook hands with the astronaut . . ."

And that is the true story, except for an epilogue.

When last seen in the gathering dusk of their own neighborhood, the five members of Den 1 were solemnly contemplating charging the other kids a nickel apiece to shake hands with them . . . after all, they would be shaking hands with the astronaut too, in a second-hand sort of way.

Yes, it is a time when small boys need heroes, and heroes need small boys . . . and it doesn't hurt grownups a bit to watch such episodes, if they happen to be lucky enough to be on hand.

## BERKELEY'S AUTO REBELLION

### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult in this day and age when the media demands fast-paced news for constructive acts being undertaken by individual citizens to be given adequate coverage. In a recent article that appeared in the California Living magazine of the San Francisco Sunday Chronicle on February 15, there was a discussion of the constructive work being done in the city of Berkeley, Calif., which I have the privilege of representing, which displays the initiative being shown in the area of city planning by the "Berkeley Anti-Car Rebellion."

Under the leadership of Messrs. Albert Raeburn and Calder Hayes, the "Berkeley Anti-Car Rebellion" seeks a halt to what they term the "Los Angelization" of the city of Berkeley. This group opposes crosstown freeways, street-widening projects, the creation of fast-traffic streets, and other situations that would place more importance on automobiles than people.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I would like to insert this article by Mr. Gerald Adams entitled "Berkeley's Auto Rebel-

lion" in the RECORD and I commend the reading of this article to my colleagues:

#### BERKELEY'S AUTO REBELLION

(By Gerald Adams)

As Berkeley rebellions go, this one is strange but—excuse the expression—relevant . . . so much so that it could spread across the nation.

The tyrant it seeks to overthrow is the automobile.

Its rebels are largely middle class families. Its weapons are the peaceful ones of persuasion.

Its battle cry is really a plea: Don't let cars ruin the city as a place to live.

And, it's successful. After four years, the Berkeley Anti-Car Rebellion has wrought these changes:

Children, once targets for speeding cars, now play outside without danger on a number of streets that used to be speedways.

The trend of taking space from people for parking has been reversed: Car parking spaces—in shopping districts—have been filled in for plazas.

Families who feared their homes would be removed for street widening projects are suddenly resting easily thanks to a virtual moratorium on such projects.

Before the revolution is over, the entire populace could be riding around town on bicycles and free buses.

As cities from Paris to Petaluma suffer from a glut of cars (in the French capital, police want to kick the Unknown Soldier's tomb out of the Arch of Triumph because of the traffic it creates), smog and traffic-beset citizens here should learn how Berkeleyans began to overthrow their automated yoke.

"We've simply learned to say, 'Automobile, slow down!'," says planning commissioner Albert Raeburn, who chairs the group's circulation committee.

If there are any Mario Savios in this Berkeley rebellion they are Establishmentarian citizens like onetime planning commission chairman Calder Hayes and Raeburn who took their fight to the chambers of City Hall. It is men like these who have bucked the pressure to utilize state gas tax-financed road funds, and who oppose those who insist on accommodating the auto.

"Family interests are more important than automotive interests," declares Raeburn who cites some of the testimony that has led to the big change.

Mrs. William Gilbert in southeast Berkeley told of a speeding meat truck that overturned on the front lawn where her children usually play. Fortunately, the kids were indoors.

Mrs. Mary Jane Johnson of southwest Berkeley told of a car that went through a schoolyard fence, narrowly missing a group of youngsters at play.

Mrs. Rosalind Lepawsky recalled her anger on hearing that 50 Berkeley streets were recommended for widening. "What offended me," she recalls, "was the insanity of destroying the topography of a city to make way for more cars."

Another woman said she had to hose the soot off her flowers, so thick had the traffic dirt gotten. One mother reported losing four pet cats—all killed by cars.

For a community that was to vote \$20 million in bonds by a four-to-one margin just to underground its part of the rapid transit line, the 1965 proposal to widen 50 streets was an environmental insult, to judge by the outpouring of 300 citizens at a planning commission public hearing in November of that year.

Since then, Berkeley's anti-car rebels have begun their siege. Mrs. Johnson, a leader in the NAACP, helped organize a city-wide environmental group called Urban Care. Mrs. Lepawsky worked on the same project. Mrs. Gilbert joined up with neighbors in the

Emerson School district to commission a transportation study (they persuaded the city and the A/C Transit Co. to help finance it).

Meanwhile Raeburn, an old political pro who had managed election campaigns for Assemblyman Robert Crown, Congressman Jeffery Cohelan and several Berkeley councilmen, was busy buttonholing other planning commissioners and city councilmen on behalf of a plan written by his circulation committee.

He and Calder did their lobbying well, for on Aug. 13, 1968, the Berkeley City Council unanimously approved a document that could be a Magna Carta for American pedestrians, children and families.

Titled rather unmemorably the Circulation Amendment to the Berkeley Master Plan, it is apparently unique.

"If there's another city in the country that's done this much," says U.C. Planning Professor T. J. Kent, "we don't know about it."

Briefly, the amendment declares that the city is basically opposed to the following: crosstown freeways like those which bisect neighboring Oakland, street-widening projects, one-way streets, creating more fast-traffic streets and the destruction of homes or trees either for speeding up traffic or parking cars.

What it favors are things like these: parks, panoramas, open spaces, preserving trees, home delivery service, bicycle paths, pedestrian paths and every form of transportation that keeps people out of cars.

It also introduces some sophisticated planning techniques like reducing population potential in certain family neighborhoods on the theory that fewer people bring fewer cars. (Imagine a city government voting to reduce population!)

Is it working? Since the Circulation Amendment's passage, there have been plenty of changes in Berkeley.

One section actually has had its population potential slashed. It's a 40-block area of single family homes, most of them occupied by blacks, near the northern BART station. The population limit was reduced by almost a third so that its quality of family life would be undisturbed.

Spaces for parking cars have been turned back to pedestrians. Mini-plazas, tiny islands of greenery, benches and water fountains, have replaced more than 74 parking spaces along commercial Shattuck Avenue.

Residential streets in both rich and blue-collar neighborhoods have become safe for children to cross and even to play in thanks to installation of some 18 sets of diverters and chokers. Diverters prevent cars from using streets as thoroughfares; Chokers, which are bits of cement, prevent cars from parking at intersections, thereby permitting pedestrians and drivers to see oncoming traffic more easily.

And it's now open season on street-widening projects. The projected widening of Hearst Avenue was halted for at least a year; that of Ashby Avenue, an arterial lined by modest-income homes, delayed indefinitely.

A proposal to cut a new street through a family residence block has been dumped.

Not all these decisions have been accepted without opposition. Police and firemen have been less than wild about the traffic diversions as has Dr. Richard Garrett, an orthopedic surgeon in the Claremont Avenue area, who resents the unfairness of installing them along his usual driving path and not along others.

Raeburn is the first to admit that these are piecemeal solutions, but he has broader plans.

For one thing, he's convinced that people must start leaving their cars at home in favor of buses and bicycles.

He also believes in free public transportation which he's urging the city to investigate. "It's cheaper than building a bunch of those

expensive parking structures," says the economist.

Others echo him. Joseph Engbeck, father of two, is so anxious to ease the flow of cars which use his street as a shortcut that he has personally contacted a Los Angeles firm which builds minibuses.

Jim Burleigh, a young man who heads the firm called Peoples Architecture, is trying to scrounge a fleet of used vans and VW buses for the north side of town. "You could dispatch them like a fleet of taxis and charge a nickel a ride," he adds.

Raeburn's ideas are grander still. As a land use economist, a member of the Bay Area Transportation Study's advisory committee and chairman of the now-defunct Berkeley Transit Impact Commission, the 57 year old commissioner cannily foresees these possibilities:

1. Bicycles for commuters to ride between home and BART station. Publicly owned, their locks could be opened by means of pass-keys available with commuter tickets.

2. "We could legislate a requirement that all new buildings transfer the moneys that would ordinarily be spent on parking facilities to a fund for bicycles or free shuttle buses."

These and other issues will be aired at a civic goals conference of Berkeley's Urban Care Feb. 28 at the Claremont Hotel. Among the questions on tap: Should 120,000-population Berkeley lower its population limit, currently 180,000?

While many questions will remain unanswered that day, one has already been decided: Berkeley officially places more importance in people than on cars!

**WORLD PEACE THROUGH LAW CENTER**

**HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE**

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in further reference to the World Peace Through Law Center, I believe my colleagues will be interested in the following recent action of this international organization.

As a result of resolutions adopted at its biennial conference in Bangkok, Thailand, last year, the organization's president, Charles S. Rhyne, has announced establishment of a Special Committee on the Review of the United Nations Charter.

It seems to me that many amendments could be made to the United Nations Charter which would improve the functions of the United Nations and strengthen the forces who seek peaceful settlement of international disputes.

President Rhyne has appointed Dr. Max Habicht of Geneva, Switzerland, as chairman of the special committee on which it will be my privilege to serve. I know my colleagues are concerned that improvements be made in the U.N., and I shall report on the committee's progress.

It is hoped that the committee will complete its work by April 1, 1971, so that the charter review may be presented to the Fifth World Conference on World Peace Through Law to be held in July 1971.

The resolutions adopted concerning the United Nations and its charter follow:

**RESOLUTION 3: STRENGTHENING UNITED NATIONS CHARTER**

Whereas, the stated purpose of the World Peace Through Law Center has been to work together to build law rules and legal institutions for World Peace Through Law;

Whereas, time is of the essence due to the spread of arms and tensions in the world; and

Whereas, the United Nations is the most realistic center for effective law rules and institutions,

Resolved, that the Center establish forthwith a special study committee on possible revision and strengthening of the United Nations.

**RESOLUTION 19: INTERNATIONAL MEDIATION AND CONCILIATION SERVICE AND COMPULSORY ARBITRATION OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES**

Whereas, the need for utilizing all promising procedures for peacefully settling disputes between nations is all too evident,

Resolved, that the Bangkok Conference urges the establishment within the framework of the United Nations of a permanent available service of competently trained mediators and conciliators to facilitate peaceful settlements between nations in conflict; and

Further resolved, that the United Nations Charter be amended to provide a method for the compulsory arbitration of international disputes.

**FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE**

**HON. EDWIN W. EDWARDS**

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to refrain from using cliches and speaking in platitudes when one is describing an outstanding young person such as Bryant Copeland of Lake Charles, the winner of the Voice of Democracy contest in Louisiana whose winning speech I wish to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD today. You will excuse me, therefore, for saying that it is gratifying, heartwarming, and encouraging during these times when some of our most pressing problems are emanating from protesting, dissenting youth who abuse our flag, our institutions, and all authority, including our laws and the principles on which our Nation was founded.

Bryant, who I am sure speaks for the majority of the fine young people of Louisiana and hopefully for the majority of our youth across the land, gives us, in his sincere and eloquent remarks, reason to hope and to believe that the fate of our country is not in jeopardy after all. He lets us know that young people are aware of their responsibilities and challenges and are willing to apply their energies to constructiveness rather than to the destructiveness engaged in by the few who occupy so much of the news. Bryant appreciates his priceless heritage of freedom as an American and he is ready to accept the challenge of maintaining it. May we be equally as aware of freedom's challenge and ready to meet it. Godspeed to Bryant and his contemporaries who share the views he outlines in his speech called "Freedom's Challenge."

The speech follows:

**FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE**

(By Bryant Shive Copeland)

When Benjamin Franklin emerged from the final session of the Constitutional Convention, it is said that he was asked, "What shall it be, Mr. Franklin, a monarchy or a republic?"

Franklin responded, "A republic—if you can keep it."

This indeed is the challenge of freedom placed upon succeeding generations of Americans by our country's founding fathers. And for today's generation of Americans, we can have freedom—if we can keep it. This is freedom's challenge.

When presented the Gold Medal for History and Biography by the Academy of Arts and Letters, Carl Sandburg said, "We find it momentous that Lincoln used the word 'responsibility' nearly as often as he used the word 'freedom'. The free men . . . of the world can well ask themselves every day and almost as a ritual, 'Who paid for my freedom and what the price?' and 'Am I somehow beholden?' The question is not rhetorical. It is a burning and terrible historical question."

Am I somehow beholden? I feel that I am. I feel that, to use the words of a popular song, "freedom isn't free . . ." For freedom is a public and a private trust. My freedom is legitimate and just only when it does not deny you your freedom. My country is free only when it respects the freedom of its neighbor. Keeping this delicate balance of self-regulated freedom is one of its challenges.

A second challenge is the challenge to extend freedom to everyone. Wendell Willkie put it this way, "Freedom is an indivisible word. If we want to enjoy it, and fight for it, we must prepare to extend it to everyone, whether they are rich or poor, whether they agree with us or not, no matter what their race or color of their skin." For you see, freedom is not something which can be the sole property of any individual or nation. There is a marvelous contagion about freedom that spreads the quest for it far and wide. So the second challenge is that of extending freedom—responsible freedom—to everyone.

A third challenge of freedom is the challenge of peace. Although we must wage wars at times in the preservation of freedom, it is evident that the very nature of war is incompatible with freedom. Freedom in its truest sense is impossible unless it abounds mutually with peace.

How can I meet these challenges of freedom? Surely the answers are not easy. One can meet the challenge to balance the exercise of freedom with the over-exercise of freedom, that is the balance between freedom and infringement, by obeying the laws of the land. This seems a simple task, but in reality too many of us have tried to break or bend the law when observance of the law was inconvenient. No matter how incidental or unimportant a law seems, it must be obeyed if freedom is to be preserved and the balance between freedom and infringement kept.

The challenge to extend freedom can be met individually by every citizen. By one's attitude and by his example, he can show his willingness to extend freedom to everyone. The student who refuses to tolerate prejudice and injustice helps to further the cause of freedom just as dynamically as does the nation when it commits its people and resources to freedom's cause.

The challenge of peace is one that has never been met very long by any person or nation. Our record in this respect is not good. But perhaps if one would wage peace with as much energy as he wages war, peace could be achieved. If the energies and talents of every student were channeled with the same fervor that one employs in waging war, perhaps true freedom—that is freedom with peace could someday be achieved.



Thus we see how we can meet freedom's challenge as individual students and citizens. If we meet Freedom's Challenge, we will be equal to Franklin's charge concerning it . . . the charge to *keep it*.

Freedom will be ours if we can only meet Freedom's Challenge and . . . keep it.

UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD:  
MR. NIXON ON TARGET

HON. DONALD G. BROTZMAN

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BROTZMAN. Mr. Speaker, a long-needed document was given to the American people, and indeed to all the people of the world, in the form of President Nixon's recent "State of the World" message.

The greatest significance of this message is that at last a clear-cut definition of American foreign policy has been laid out, one which takes into consideration conditions throughout the world, and during both war and peace times. Equally important, this newly set forth policy recognizes the realities of the world as they are now—not as they were in 1945.

The Miami Herald explained in an editorial of February 19 why this message is "President Nixon's masterpiece to date." I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

UNITED STATES AND THE WORLD: MR. NIXON ON TARGET

His lucid description of the state of the world in 1970, and the proper role of the United States in it, is President Nixon's masterpiece to date.

Coolly and dispassionately, he sets forth the facts as he sees them and the conclusions he has drawn from those realities.

The overall effect of the 40,000-word message to Congress is a 360-degree view of this planet's continents, as seen from the highest peak of international power, which is the Presidency of the United States.

Mr. Nixon recognizes the disparity of interest between the United States and its allies, on the one hand, and the Communist powers. He speaks plainly of the present hostility of Red China and the intransigence of the Soviet Union. Yet he says the 25-year-old cold war "makes no sense" now that communism no longer is monolithic and the U.S. has lost its monopoly on nuclear weapons.

To replace recurrent crises, the President proposes negotiations—"patient, detailed, and specific"—to reconcile the true national interests of all parties, if possible.

Some of his thoughts on relations with the Soviet Union have been glossed over by others in the past. For instance: "The overwhelming majority of the war material that reaches North Vietnam comes from the U.S.S.R., which thereby bears a heavy responsibility for the continuation of the war. This cannot help but cloud the rest of our relationship with the Soviet Union."

As to America's friends and partner, Mr. Nixon's main theme is a shift from U.S. dominance to partnership everywhere.

The U.S., he notes, possesses 95 percent of the Free World's nuclear arsenal, and thus has the duty for atomic defense. But the rest of the Free World, he says, has more manpower than this country, and must do its full part, accepting the job of coping with insurgency wherever it breaks out.

He renounces isolationism while insisting that America's partners rise to their own defense and economic development.

He voices determination to keep the U.S. strong militarily and economically.

To those who demand instant cessation of hostilities, Mr. Nixon remarks that peace is "far more than the absence of war," adding: "If we are less strong than necessary, and the worst happens, there will be no domestic society to look after."

He accepts his constitutional role as the final arbiter of this nation's dealings with others, and he points out the directions he has chosen for this decade. Specific parts of his statement will be applauded in some quarters, booed in others, received coldly elsewhere. At least, everyone, at home and abroad, knows where he stands.

International relations are Mr. Nixon's special strength. He is correct in calling this document "a watershed in American foreign policy."

PETER J. HANLON: CONSERVATION-IST OF THE YEAR

HON. ROY A. TAYLOR

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege last Friday evening to attend the 25th Annual Dinner of the North Carolina Wildlife Federation. This is the largest statewide conservation organization in North Carolina and has accomplished much in promoting conservation and sound wildlife programs in our State.

At this awards dinner, honors were bestowed upon a Federal employee and upon the National Forest Service, as Mr. Peter J. Hanlon, supervisor of national forests in North Carolina, received the Governor's Award as Conservationist of the Year.

It has been my privilege to work closely with Mr. Hanlon for 10 years and to observe his dedication and willingness to serve the public in every way possible. I commend the North Carolina Wildlife Federation for its selection of Supervisor Hanlon for this important recognition.

As justification for the award, the banquet program read as follows:

After receiving his degree in Forestry from Syracuse University and subsequent employment as a consulting forester in private industry, Peter J. Hanlon entered government service in 1934. Early assignments included: Superintendent of a Civilian Conservation Corps encampment in Pennsylvania after which he assumed charge of another CCC camp in West Virginia; Ranger; and Management Analyst Officer of the U.S. Forest Service in Pennsylvania.

Since being promoted in 1961 to the position of Forest Supervisor with the duties of protection and management of 1,127,000 acres of woodland in the Nantahala, Croatan, Pisgah and Uwharrie National Forests, Pete has been a champion of the multiple-use concept of our national forests.

With the experience obtained in working with the wildlife agencies of other Appalachian states, he was a "natural" to come to North Carolina in his present assignment. His hobbies are hunting and fishing—though he hunts without a gun—and claims to be an outstanding authority on fishing for fun! Whether it be a request for modification of

the Timber Stand Improvement Program, an experimental project for trout streams, the planting of chestnut trees and shrubs which are beneficial to wildlife, or the slashing of vegetation to provide deer browse in times of emergency, Pete is always sympathetic and cooperative to any sound proposal that would conserve wildlife in the National Forest.

Big things have happened since he came to North Carolina—the establishment of the Shinning Rock Wild Area, the "Cradle of Forestry in America" (a facility in the Pisgah Forest), and the pending approval for the inclusion of the Chatoga River in the Wild and Scenic Rivers National System.

As an interested citizen in the many conservation affairs of his state, he has served on: The Asheville Agricultural Development Council Board of Directors, the Asheville Federal Executive Council, U.S.D.A. Club, Haywood Technical Advisory Committee, Advisory Committee of the Outward Bound School, Governor's Advisory Committee on Forestry, N.C. Forestry Association, N.C. Forestry Council, Fontana Conservation Round-up Advisory Committee, and the Board of Directors of the Asheville-Biltmore Botanical Gardens.

Pete's untiring efforts, spirit of cooperation, and patient understanding in the cause of conservation have paved the way for the true multiple-use of our National Forests to the recreational benefit of the public.

V.F.W. VOICE OF DEMOCRACY CONTEST "FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE"

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to congratulate Richard Thomas Mattingly, Jr., Spearfish, S. Dak., on being named South Dakota's winning contestant in the 1970 Veterans of Foreign Wars Voice of Democracy contest.

When there is so much unrest among our young people today it is indeed encouraging to know that there are youth in whom we can place our confidence and who are sincerely interested in facing up to the responsibilities and challenges of this new decade.

Richard's speech is as follows:

We, the youth of America, are faced with many problems concerning our personal future as well as the future of this country. We are faced with furthering our education; the draft; prosperity versus poverty; and a variety of militant minorities.

If, as emerging adults, we concentrate on any one of these problem areas to the exclusion of the others, we in fact are losing sight of the "Big Picture"—we are not allowing ourselves to develop a total awareness of that which will soon be our responsibility—freedom's challenge. While we have the time to look forward and to prepare to face this, our most important responsibility as mature citizens, we must study, dissect and analyze each facet of freedom's challenge if we are to chart a course of freedom for ourselves and for those who follow.

The great French writer Laboulaye placed the following words in the mouth of one of his American characters:

"A free country is a country where each citizen is absolute master of his conscience, his person, his goods. If the day ever comes when individual rights are swallowed up by those of general interest, that day will see

the end of Washington's handiwork: we will have a master."

Our freedom, the freedom of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, is being ever challenged today. "Challenged by what?" one may ask. Challenged, not by one factor alone, but by the ever-changing events in this world today. It is the responsibility of the youth of this country to accept this challenge; to preserve the rights and the liberties our forefathers fought for; to provide and guarantee a better and more promising future of self-determination for the American generations to follow.

Webster defines freedom as "the power to make one's own choices or decisions without constraint from within or without. It is the right of enjoying all the privileges of citizenship in a community or the like". This is the type of freedom the American people possess today as assured by the Constitution and Bill of Rights. However, each citizen must know and exercise the responsibilities of his freedom in accordance with the laws of this society.

In exercising the power to make one's own choices and decisions, we must provide those who differ or dissent from the opinion of the majority with the right to express their views so that all "sides of a question" are considered in determining the will of the majority. It has been a long fight to retain our freedom and liberty. However, the fight for freedom of the individual will be successful only when one realizes that freedom has its limits. The challenge of the American people is to consider the opinion of the minority in conjunction with that of the majority and to compromise on the ideas of each to insure the continued freedom and right of expression for all. If the will of the minority or the majority is imposed without consent or compromise upon the other, anarchy and turmoil will overrun this Nation.

The right to make and change the laws governing our society is guaranteed to us by our Constitution. However, this does not give any individual or group the license to break or defy the law without the voted consent of the majority.

We, the youth of today, must face up to the responsibilities, good or bad, that we will meet in the approaching years. We must continue guiding and helping our country to remain on the road of continued freedoms for all. If the road becomes rough, as it has on occasions in the past, we cannot give in to ideas or situations we do not believe in. We must strive for what we know is right. Strive not only for our freedom but for the freedom of future Americans. To continue this battle for freedom and liberty for all, we must stand tall and steadfast as a unit; a unit with one common goal: to provide and guarantee independence for all mankind.

TRIBUTE TO HILARY PIEPER

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I was saddened to learn of the death of my good friend and fellow Democrat, Hilary Pieper, O'Fallon, Mo., on February 28, 1970.

He was an outstanding member of his community, a devoted family man, a citizen who contributed much to the growth, development, and improvement of the county in which he lived and whose integrity and faithful service as a member of the Democratic party was truly exemplary. He will be deeply missed by all who knew him.

CXVI—365—Part 5

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. CARL D. PERKINS

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prizes. The contest theme was "Freedom's Challenge."

I insert in the RECORD the winning speech from the State of Kentucky as delivered by Ronald Wheeler, 604 Kincaid St., Ashland, Ky., of my congressional district. It follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

Challenges—since the beginnings of time have flowed forth to mankind as a mighty river flows forth to the land. A river that springs from a small stream and gradually builds as it travels onward, leaving its mark on all it passes and all it contains. So is this river like the challenges of mankind. For the challenges that face us today started out as one basic challenge, one basic call. It was freedom's challenge that set the wave of History crashing through the land of Time, like a mighty river, swelling and roaring with its own momentum.

Challenges, brought by freedom, have kept mankind progressing onwardly. This mighty river did not become so great just because of a few tributaries. It was fed by millions; some large and many small. So it is with the progress brought by freedom's challenge. It, too, is fed by millions, whose part is both great and small. From the few leaders of the land, to the mall populace, labeled as the "average citizen", that controls the real power. You see, the challenge of freedom entails work; and with these workings of freedom there comes progress. Progress of many types. Progress labeled as "inalienable rights"; progress labeled as "equality"; progress labeled as "being just what I want to be"; progress labeled as "freedom."

But this challenge—specifically—should it be considered in terms of motivation or responsibilities? Is freedom's challenge in the motivation of remaining free, to be challenged and to challenge those things that affect us most; or is it in the responsibilities that must be met to keep that freedom? Responsibilities such as being informed on what goes on around us; being open minded to things which are new and different; being active enough in those things which are available to us as a means of change to better ourselves and those around us. To answer whether freedom's challenge lies in motivation or responsibilities would be impossible. The truth of the matter is, the challenge falls between the two.

But the river flows on and man continues to be challenged. And it seems, with each new conquest, greater challenges call to him. This was the case with his lunar conquest for now the extreme most reaches of space call him "just beyond the next hill." This should be our example with freedom's challenge. The more we conquer with our freedom the more we shall have to conquer. The more we conquer with our freedom the more we progress and the more we benefit ourselves and others. For who knows, maybe someday we will evolve into a perfect utopia.

But that will take work and our tools must be used to their fullest extent. What tools do I speak of? The tools of democracy: voting, voicing our opinions, attending and participating in local government meetings,

and using, in general, the freedom by which we are challenged to its greatest potential. And with time, these tools will increase beyond our present speculations.

But unless we do accept this challenge of freedom in motivation and responsibilities, we will fall back into a stagnated pool—unmotivated—unchallenged. Challenges—since the beginnings of time have flowed forth to mankind, but today they flow to us; and we must meet them with freedom's challenge.

ISA YUSUF ALPTEKIN—DEFENDER OF FREEDOM

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, Isa Yusuf Alptekin is the kind of man you meet once in a lifetime—a man of multiple accomplishments, a hero, but most of all, an eloquent defender of freedom-seeking people against the ruthless suppression of human rights. You know this, Mr. Speaker, for you kindly and warmly greeted Mr. Alptekin and his son, Arslan, during their recent visit to the Nation's Capital. Accompanied by Gulamettin Pahta and my good friend, Milton J. Clark, they came to my office for advice. That was all they sought—advice on how they could best bring before the world the plight of the forgotten people of Eastern Turkestan. Mr. Speaker, I include in behalf of Mr. Alptekin and the subjugated Turkic people his biography and unedited appeal from the people of Eastern Turkestan to the nations of the free world. This moving appeal will not, I pray, go unnoticed or unrewarded.

The material follows:

ISA YUSUF ALPTEKIN

Isa Yusuf Alptekin was born in 1908 in the city of Yanghissar, a subdistrict of Kashgar in Eastern Turkestan. He attended a local religious school and at the age of 20 proceeded to Western Turkestan as an employe of the Chinese consulate. His stay in Western Turkestan coincided with a period of severe Bolshevik oppression, which led in turn to a violent outbreak of national resistance. These events were profoundly moving for young Alptekin, who became involved in politics and took part in the national liberation movement.

While in Western Turkestan, Alptekin established contact with Eastern Turkestan nationalists living there and worked closely with them. His objectives were to prevent Soviet infiltration of Eastern Turkestan and, at the same time, to secure full autonomy for his land under Chinese domination.

The outbreak of a large-scale uprising against Chinese rule in 1933 opened the way for the Soviets to intervene in concert with Chinese war lords to suppress the national movement in Eastern Turkestan. Because of this tragedy, Alptekin went to Nanking, then capital of China, to work for the expulsion of the Soviets from Eastern Turkestan and for the granting by the central government of China of full autonomy to his country. He represented Eastern Turkestan in the parliament of China between 1933-1946.

Chinese atrocities in Eastern Turkestan became the cause for another large-scale revolt in 1944. It was at this time that the central government of China was forced to grant to the native people the right of administering



the internal affairs of their own land. Thus, after a long exile, Alptekin found his way home. In 1947 he was appointed Secretary General of the provincial government of Eastern Turkestan.

When Eastern Turkestan was overrun by the Peking regime in 1949, Alptekin was forced to leave again and seek asylum in India. He lived for five years in Kashmir until his departure for Turkey in 1955. He now has Turkish nationality and resides in that country.

During his stay in China in the years between 1933 and 1946, Alptekin published the magazines *ALTAY* and *TIYANSHAN* in both Turkic and Chinese languages. He carried on his struggle for the freedom of Eastern Turkestan between 1946 and 1949 while publishing the magazine *ALTAY* and the newspaper *ERK* in Urumchi.

He has travelled far and wide representing the cause of his motherland, exploring avenues for its liberation. For this purpose he has visited Hong Kong, the Philippines, Malaysia, Ceylon, Burma, India, Pakistan, Saudi Arabia, Egypt, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria, Iraq, Afghanistan, Aden, Somali and West Germany.

He has met and talked with such statesmen and leaders as Mahatma Gandhi, Pandit Nehru, Mohammad Ali Jinnah, Mohammad Ali (the Prime Minister of Pakistan in 1955), Field Marshal Ayub Khan, Kings Abdulaziz Ibn Saud and Faysal of Saudi Arabia, King Farouk of Egypt, King Hussein of Jordan, King Zahir Shah of Afghanistan, Prime Minister Abdulkarim Kasim of Iraq, President Cevdet Sunay of Turkey, Prime Minister Suleiman Demirel of Turkey, and others. During his trips he has met not only state leaders but also has interviewed a great number of chiefs of various political parties, dignitaries and journalists.

Alptekin has participated in international conferences and delivered speeches on the subject of Turkestan, managing to secure resolutions in favor of the national cause of his country: the Afro-Asian Conference held in New Delhi in 1960, the Baghdad Conference of Islamic countries held in 1963, the World Congress of Islam held in Karachi in 1964, the Afro-Asian Islamic Conference held in Mogadiscio, Somalia, in 1965, and Mutamar Islam held in Mecca in 1965.

His eloquent defense of this cause has also been appreciated by the Turkish people, so that he is often invited to give lectures in universities, plants and student unions. In 1968 alone, he lectured on twenty six occasions.

Alptekin is now President of the Eastern Turkestani Immigrants' Association in Istanbul and also the head of the National Center for the Liberation of Eastern Turkestan. He has a very good command of Turkish and Chinese, which he speaks as fluently as his mother tongue. He also speaks English and Russian to some extent.

#### AN APPEAL FROM THE PEOPLE OF EASTERN TURKESTAN TO THE NATIONS OF THE FREE WORLD

##### ATROCITIES

We are the people who sought refuge in the free world to escape the horrors of an inferno in this modern age of civilization. In our homeland from which we have been exiled and for whose liberation we have been fighting are 10 million captive people suffering over the years under the most horrible and the most brutal subjugation of imperialism. Our land possesses rich sources of wealth, both on surface and underground. It covers an area of 2,000,000 square kilometers. Yet, the rightful owners of the country do not have any right to benefit from their own resources due to their deprivation of all facilities.

This is the land we call "Eastern Turkestan". Geographically, it is linked with Outer Mongolia, Western Turkestan, Afghanistan,

Kashmir, Tibet and China Proper. The name "Sinkiang", which the Chinese arbitrarily applied to this land, means "New Dominion", suggestive of the historical fact that Eastern Turkestan had been outside the borders of the Chinese empire only a century ago.

This is the unfortunate land we belong to and this is the land we left as its unfortunate exiles. We are here in the free world with a mission of difficult task. Our immediate aim is to give alarm to the free world against the "Yellow Peril" which, in the event of erroneous identification and lack of decisive action, may at any time cause destruction to the whole world of freedom and mankind. Needless to say, the Soviet Union is the primary target of this peril. It is also our aim to publicize the importance of our homeland and to arouse interest for it in the free world.

It will be a great achievement for the people of Eastern Turkestan, now under the Red Chinese domination, if they are given an assurance at this moment of despair.

##### ENTREATY

The people of Eastern Turkestan wish: That the nations of the free world use their good office to persuade the Government of Nationalist China to declare that Eastern Turkestan is independent;

That the nations of the free world especially the Moslem states try to bring the problem of Eastern Turkestan before the United Nations Organization as an item for debate;

That the influx of Chinese colonists from China to Eastern Turkestan be protested; and that genocide and persecution be condemned;

That academic institutes be founded to undertake research work concerning Eastern Turkestan;

That a freedom movement for the people of Eastern Turkestan be sponsored;

That the children of the Eastern Turkestan exiles be granted scholarships to study in various countries of the world.

ISA YUSUF ALPTEKIN,

President of National Liberation Center of Eastern Turkestan and former Secretary General of the Government of Eastern Turkestan.

#### MAJ. GEN. CHARLES BROWN: AN OUTSTANDING CHIEF

##### HON. TOM STEED

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. STEED. Mr. Speaker, one of Oklahoma's outstanding contributions to our armed services, Maj. Gen. Charles P. Brown, has just completed 2½ years as commander of Fort Sill to take a new assignment in Vietnam. He has achieved an outstanding record at this important post.

Mr. Bill Bentley, publisher of the *Lawton Constitution*, paid tribute to the general's work this week in the following editorial:

##### AN OUTSTANDING CHIEF

Maj. Gen. Charles P. Brown, who relinquished his command at Fort Sill Friday in preparation for a new assignment in Vietnam, provided outstanding leadership during an eventful and trying two and one-half years as boss of the big U.S. Army Artillery Center.

During this critical period when large numbers of Americans were fighting, or preparing to fight in the jungles of Asia, Fort Sill was turning out large numbers of freshly-trained artillery men and new commissioned

and noncommissioned officers. This task alone was a challenging one.

But the Army and Fort Sill have been performing their essential duties under abnormal conditions. During the course of his service, General Brown was forced to handle some unpleasant duties that had nothing to do with training combat soldiers. He was called upon to cope with the unique situation of having Communists or fellow-travelers in uniform conducting anti-war and anti-American demonstrations and activities on post. Trials for such misconduct attracted New York radicals and other malcontents to harass the Army and Fort Sill. Gen. Brown deserves special commendation for the skilled manner in which he handled these difficult situations.

During the same period, Fort Sill was directed on more than one occasion to provide trained forces for possible use in quelling racial disturbances in some of the larger cities. This, too, proved disruptive to the primary mission of the post. But these added assignments were carried out in a professional manner.

Lawton and Fort Sill were fortunate to have the services of General Brown at this particular time in history when the post celebrated its 100th birthday. As a native Oklahoman, he considered it an honor and a privilege to help plan and execute the year-long celebration that brought an abundance of favorable publicity to the base. His presence and participation served to enrich the proceedings.

Over the years, Fort Sill has had many outstanding commanders. In the opinion of those in a position to know, Gen. Brown ranks with the very best. His demonstrated pride in the Army and in the country he serves has made a deep and lasting impression on the people of this area.

Lawton, in particular, is grateful for his warm friendship and the fine spirit of cooperation that has existed during his tenure. Like many others, we regret having to say farewell. But farewells are common for those who serve in the armed forces. So, to General and Mrs. Brown, we speak for the community in saying, "so long and good luck." We hope they will be coming back soon to make their permanent home on Oklahoma soil.

#### NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF COUNTIES SUPPORTS PRESIDENT NIXON'S PROGRAM FOR IMPROVED QUALITY OF OUR ENVIRONMENT

##### HON. CHESTER L. MIZE

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. MIZE. Mr. Speaker, it pleased me to note in the February 19 edition of *News Views*, published by the National Association of Counties, the excellent editorial on "A Meaningful Environmental Message" by Bernard Hillenbrand, the executive director of the association. Under leave to extend my remarks, I bring this editorial to the attention of my colleagues:

##### A MEANINGFUL ENVIRONMENTAL MESSAGE

(By Bernard Hillenbrand)

Congratulations, Mr. President, your environmental message may very well be the most significant message sent to Congress in modern times. Such leadership toward mobilizing the nation for a massive battle against pollution is critically important.

The National Association of Counties has been working diligently in the areas of water,

air and solid waste pollution control and in the acquisition of open space land—so perhaps we are more aware of the need for creation of an overall coordinated effort led by the federal government. President Nixon's proposals can unite the elements necessary to accomplish pollution control.

NACO endorses the 37-point program the President outlined in his call for "new philosophies of land, air and water use." We in county government who are involved in the local grassroots implementation of such programs hope that a constant review and constructive appraisal of such a multifaceted program, can play a role in guiding it to success. However, several areas are of immediate concern to local officials all over the country.

We must question whether \$10 billion will really be adequate funding for a water pollution control program of the magnitude envisioned. But, it is a healthy start even though local government will have to come up with \$6 billion of the \$10 billion. A \$4 billion federal commitment over the next four years, however, will remove some of the uncertainty we have had in the past when large sums have been authorized, but smaller appropriations have been passed by Congress.

One of the most important proposals for local governments is creation of Environment Financing Authority (EFA). If the EFA is to be successful, the interest rates charged to cities and counties must be well below the interest rate for other municipal tax exempt bonds. If the EFA will only handle bonds of "financial basket cases" at the city and county level, then it will not accomplish its purpose. NACO proposes that a 3% interest rate be set, believing that this will stimulate the necessary local response. Because counties are faced with many urgent priorities such as schools, hospitals, mass transit, and mental health facilities, a powerful financial incentive will be needed to gain implementation of water pollution control programs. Since it will be the cities and the counties that are going to be ordered by the courts to end pollution or possibly face punitive fines, it will be necessary to aid their fight for local funds by providing lower interest rates.

We hope that the Treasury is able to make available subsidies to local government at no additional cost to the federal government—by issuing taxable government bonds.

Another appealing aspect of the President's message is the proposal to include in the price of many items such as cars and refrigerators the cost of disposal of those items.

We support the full funding proposed for the Land and Water Conservation Fund and we support the idea of disposing of surplus federal lands and returning them to the localities for park development and recreation purposes. We feel the federal government holds too much property most of which is exempt from local property taxes.

If the President's proposals for pollution control are translated into action, we believe it will capture public imagination and could lead to enormous strides toward improving our environment.

**SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK—1970**

**HON. HENRY HELSTOSKI**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HELSTOSKI. Mr. Speaker, this week of March 1-7 marks the 43d annual observance of Save Your Vision Week, and the 7th successive year this worthwhile event has been nationally proclaimed by the President under authority of a joint resolution approved on December 30, 1963.

I believe it is appropriate that we in

the Congress publicly express our appreciation to the Nation's optometrists who initiated Save Your Vision Week in 1937 as a means of increasing public awareness of the need for preservation and improvement of functional vision. I am proud to say that optometrists in my own district and many other members of the New Jersey Optometrist Association have had a great deal to do with the success of this special week down through the years.

Good vision is an important aspect of general good health and well-being. Continuing studies have provided mounting evidence of the tremendous role the visual system plays in the education of our children; during the working years of an individual in modern society, good vision is essential for efficient performance on the job; and in the golden years, today's citizens find good vision one of their most valuable sensory resources for pursuit of hobbies, viewing of television, and many other activities which occupy the free time our great American system has provided them.

Many of us in this House of Representatives have introduced legislation which we believe reflects the deep concern of this body for eye safety and vision care. I personally have had the privilege of introducing H.R. 14456 to require that impact-resistant eyeglasses be provided for members of the Nation's Armed Forces, for the purpose of assuring maximum possible protection from eye injuries. Enactment of another bill I introduced, H.R. 7876, would protect the general public from the dangers inherent in the use of cellulose nitrate and other flammable materials used in eyeglass frames. I have also introduced H.R. 2367 to include optometrists as providers of services to medicare beneficiaries under title XVIII of the Social Security Act. Reviewing the legislative activity on this Congress, I am gratified to find the 91st Congress is highly conscious of the importance of good vision, and I thank my colleagues for the concern we all share.

We in the Congress, as well as all Americans, owe a great debt of thanks to optometrists, researchers in the field of optics, and to other health care professionals generally who have made major contributions resulting in better visual care for the general public.

On the occasion of Save Your Vision Week, I would like to commend these outstanding professional people for their fine work, and wish them well in their future endeavors.

Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the intent of the joint resolution of 1963, the President has issued a proclamation on Save Your Vision Week, which I request be considered as part of my remarks on this subject.

The proclamation follows:

SAVE YOUR VISION WEEK, 1970

By the President of the United States of America a Proclamation:

Sight is one of man's greatest gifts. The preservation of that gift is one of his greatest challenges.

Modern research has developed the technology for preventing nearly one-half of all new cases of blindness in this country. Cataracts that cruelly deprive older people of their sight can now be corrected surgically. Regular examinations can detect visual dis-

orders, especially among school children who need good sight in order to learn.

In the case of disorders such as glaucoma—which can rob a person of much of his sight before he is aware that a problem exists—early detection is essential if treatment is to be effective.

To impress upon each person in this country the urgent need for eye care, the Congress by joint resolution approved December 30, 1963 (77 Stat. 629), has requested the President to proclaim the first week in March of each year as Save Your Vision Week.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of March 1, 1970, as Save Your Vision Week; and I invite appropriate officials of State and local governments to issue similar proclamations.

I also call upon our citizens, especially those in the communications media, the health care professions, and other interested organizations to unite during that week in support of programs to improve and protect the vision of Americans.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-third day of February, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred ninety-fourth.

RICHARD NIXON.

Mr. Speaker, it is estimated that more than 30,000 Americans become blind each year. Early detection and proper treatment would prevent at least half of these tragedies. Those who act in time can often protect the irreplaceable gift of eyesight. Eye examinations at stated intervals can detect sight defects early enough for proper treatment.

Every American should make a practice of obtaining eye examinations at regular intervals, and those who cannot afford the services of a professional can obtain this professional treatment through public and private health agencies.

It should be impressed upon all Americans that vision is most valuable to us in our everyday life and we should take every precaution to maintain good eyesight. We should practice Save Your Vision Week not just during 1 week set aside to focus attention on this problem, but through the other 51 weeks of the year as well.

**THE GOOD OF THE PEOPLE**

**HON. JAMES A. BURKE**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, an editorial appearing in the February 7, 1970, *Leather and Shoes* weekly magazine brings out some very significant aspects of the worsening condition of our domestic footwear industry because of the increases in shoe imports into the United States. It follows:

**THE GOOD OF THE PEOPLE**

Governments are supposed to be run for the good of the people. This is particularly true of our government as evidenced by the frequent occurrence of the phrase in the Constitution and inaugural addresses. Lately one begins to wonder.

Our foreign economic policy has been tied to the age old dream of free trade mutually beneficial to all participants. We have come to the reluctant conclusion that there ain't



no such animal. Everybody wants to take advantage of our free trade policy not for mutual benefit but for their own. The very thought that we might want to protect some of our industries and workers from economic chaos meets with accusations of selfishness, of greed, of 19th Century Protectionist thinking. When a man is losing his shirt is it treason if he complains of the cold?

Just now the atmosphere in American shoe towns is pretty chilly. More closings this week and rumors of more coming up. Just what does it take to convince our legislators that unrestricted imports are not for the good of the people here at home, regardless of how much profit they bring to flourishing foreign manufacturers and their low-paid workers.

Once it was the dream of workingmen everywhere to travel to America to get a decent job. Now they stay home and our accommodating foreign economic policy sees to it that the job is sent to them.

This is neither rhetoric nor exaggeration. Just look at the record.

Baseball is America's national pastime, yet those U.S. citizens who once made ball gloves for a living do so no more. Their jobs have been taken over by Japanese workers. Not hundreds, not thousands, but hundreds of thousands of jobs have been taken from American workers and exported to Europe and Asia in textiles, electronics, scientific instruments, glass opticals and shoes. This is for the good of the people?

Of course those responsible for this growing menace to U.S. workers and small businessmen are not unaware of the harm being done. They have admitted in public utterances time after time that 'something must be done for injured industries and workers'. In other words they pay lip service to 'the good of the people'. But that's all it has been up to now, lip service.

It is difficult to imagine that our Department of Commerce does not yet know what's wrong with the shoe manufacturing business. Yet they indulge in a long and 'thorough' and 'difficult' investigation of the industry's problems. That they are not sincere is evident by their approach. They are not studying the shoe manufacturing business, they are studying the entire footwear industry, which is another matter entirely. Shoe manufacturing is being badly hurt. *Shoe retailing is not. And shoe importing is booming.*

If there were any honesty whatsoever in this study now occupying so much time and being made at so much cost to the people, the study would get down to the simple procedure of studying jobs lost, production declines, and the profit and loss statements of manufacturers, disregarding any retelling or importing or other activities individual shoe firms might have.

Shoe manufacturing has never been regarded as a high profit business. Those who have been at the lower end of the profit picture are already out of business. Those who have been at the higher end are now feeling the pinch. Meanwhile the 'study' goes on amid a confusion of voices of importers, retailers and those with other than manufacturing interests.

But, gentlemen, this is a government study being carried on by a body dedicated to the good of the people. What bothers us is that we're not quite sure as to *which people.*

#### A BRIEF FOR PREVENTIVE DETENTION

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I believe my colleagues will find useful the fol-

lowing article which quite clearly presents the reality of the need for preventive detention:

#### A BRIEF FOR PREVENTIVE DETENTION

(By Ronald L. Goldfarb)

A 19-year-old drug addict with a long criminal record—his initials are P.D.—robs a savings and loan association in Washington, D.C., with the aid of two companions. As they leave, there is a gun battle with police and a bystander is wounded but not killed. Several blocks away, the getaway car crashes into a bus and the three men are captured. Arrested on assault and armed robbery charges, P.D. posts a \$5,000 bond and is released while awaiting trial. Eleven days after that a local liquor store is held up, a janitor recognizes P.D. and he is rearrested at a friend's home. At his presentment a few days later, bail is set at \$10,000; again P.D. is able to get a bond and goes free.

Before he comes to trial on any of the charges, he attempts to rob a neighborhood gas station at gunpoint, but an off-duty policeman who happens to be present subdues him after a struggle. This time, bail is set at \$25,000. But P.D.'s lawyer pleads that his client cannot afford it and therefore will be incarcerated just because of his poverty. He also argues that P.D. has good ties in the community—for example, he is employed locally and has lived there all his life—and that he has never failed to show up in court when ordered in the past. Moreover, members of P.D.'s family and a clergyman appear to say that they will assure his presence in the future. Bail is reduced to \$15,000, which P.D. can afford, and he is released.

Less than a month later, two men stick up a bank; when an alarm goes off, they panic and shoot into the crowd of customers, killing one person and wounding two others. Photographs taken by the bank's concealed camera identify P.D. as one of the robbers and he is arrested once again. Now, since he is charged with a capital offense, P.D. is denied bail and, during a court appearance, an angry judge tells him: "It is a disgrace that my colleagues on this court have had their hands tied and were unable to lock you up before this. Untold and unnecessary ravage has been wreaked upon this community as a result of our impotence."

Exaggerated as it may sound, this kind of case has happened countless times in just about every American city. It illustrates a problem which has been occurring in American courts with increasing frequency and which has provoked a passionate debate about criminal law reform that is likely to be resolved in Congress this year. The problem is the commission of repeated crimes (increasingly involving violence) by men already charged with other crimes and free on bail awaiting trial. The issue is whether to solve the problem by adopting some scheme of preventive detention, a loose and provocative term used to describe procedures under which defendants deemed dangerous could be incarcerated during the time between their arrest and trial.

In July, 1965, I was asked to testify before a Senate subcommittee which was holding hearings on bail reform. On the morning of my appearance, a subcommittee lawyer cornered me outside the hearing room to ask if I would discuss preventive detention when I testified, along with the other points I wished to make about the money bail system. No one else was willing to go on record regarding this touchy subject. Today, the subject is no longer taboo. Not only has the Nixon Administration submitted a bill to authorize consideration of danger to the community in setting conditions of pretrial release or as a basis for denying release, but so have Senators Charles Goodell, Joseph Tydings, Robert Byrd and Roman Hruska, and Representative William McCulloch, each

joined by other colleagues. Chances are that one of these bills will be passed in 1970.

The subject is an explosive one and there has been considerable critical reaction. But the line-ups of opponents and proponents is full of surprises. For example, along with the Nixon Administration, the major advocates in the Senate of preventive detention are Maryland's Tydings—a young, liberal, Kennedyesque legislator who has been a brave advocate of progressive legislation—and the present darling of the doves, New York's Goodell. Leading the opposition with the American Civil Liberties Union is Senator Sam Ervin Jr. of North Carolina, a conservative who is one of the Senate's leading spokesmen on constitutional matters. (Such straight-shooters as New York County District Attorney Frank Hogan have also come out against the procedure.)

No doubt, one reason for widespread, instinctive reactions against preventive detention is that it sounds like something it is not meant to be. Other countries that practice an inquisitorial form of criminal investigation condone a police practice of arrest for investigation (called in some places preventive detention) which is anathema to the sense and spirit of our accusatorial criminal justice system. Senator Ervin made this haunting comparison when he described recent proposals as reminiscent of "devices in other countries that have been tools of political repression" and a "facile police state tactic."

The preventive detention legislation that recently has been proposed in this country would vest the power to detain not in the police but in the courts, and, at that, would subject it to limitations and protections which make it different in kind from the foreign practices. A better label could probably be found which might more correctly reflect the content of the proposals and avoid emotional comparisons.

A problem which most perplexes the critics of preventive detention is that it would allow people's liberty to be taken away precipitously on the basis of predicted behavior. The inexact and unscientific nature of all prediction, they argue, militates against using such an inquisitorial technique. Furthermore, it is feared that cautious judges will over-predict danger to play it safe—and innocent men will inevitably go to jail without trials.

Suppose you are a judge confronted with this situation: A man is before you charged with committing a violent crime; he pleads not guilty and asks to be released until his trial. Your investigative report convinces you that he has ties in the community and will appear for trial. However, there is persuasive evidence indicating that if he is released, he would be likely to commit another violent crime. Thus the community would be in danger. You know that the traditional law of pretrial criminal procedure has been clear: The only proper purpose for denying a defendant his freedom before trial is to deter flight, not potential criminality. You are aware that the time between arrest and trial is critical to a defendant. With court delays of sometimes a year or more, a defendant obviously wants to be free to live with his family, earn a living and prepare his defense.

What do you do? Do you allow the defendant to go free because your judicial hands are tied by law? Or do you stretch your legal powers and restrain him because, by your own lights, you think he endangers public safety? Why should a judge not take into consideration a defendant's danger to the community in deciding what to do with him? It seems a natural and commonsensical step.

Former Supreme Court Justice Robert Jackson explained why not in a venerable dissent: "The practice of admission to bail, as it has evolved in Anglo-American law, is not a device for keeping persons in jail upon mere accusation until it is found convenient

to give them a trial. On the contrary, the spirit of the procedure is to enable them to stay out of jail until a trial has found them guilty." And, in another case two decades ago, Justice Jackson wrote: "Imprisonment to protect society from predicted but unconsummated offenses is so unprecedented in this country and so fraught with danger of excesses and injustice that I am loath to resort to it. . . ."

Yet, as a practical matter, judges often keep certain defendants whom they consider dangerous in jail. They do so by setting bail at such a high figure that the defendant cannot possibly pay it, or by denying him bail altogether. In both instances, the judge exceeds his lawful authority. Nevertheless, according to Prof. Abraham Goldstein of Yale Law School, this technique for pre-trial detention "has been so widespread that fewer persons are released on bail in most of our states, where there is nominally an absolute right to bail, than in England, where there is no such right."

Recent developments have highlighted the need for reform. Studies done in the early sixties demonstrated that money bail, as it has been administered in American courts:

Inherently discriminates against poor people and prejudices their subsequent trials and sentencing;

Allows judges to manipulate bail to punish, to proselytize, and for other ulterior purposes;

Sloughs off responsibility for pre-trial justice to bondsmen, who accumulate undue power and have a corrupting influence on justice officials;

Is less effective than simpler, fairer techniques for insuring against flight.

As a result of these disclosures, a Federal law—the Bail Reform Act of 1966—required Federal judges to release defendants before trial except in capital cases; henceforth, they could establish conditions for pre-trial release, but they could not deny it. While the Act only applied in the Federal Courts, its supporters hoped that, if it worked, it would be a prototype for the states to adopt.

The act applied justice more evenly, but did not do anything about dangerous defendants and left the old, covert methods for dealing with the problem uncertain. By failing to authorize judges to consider potential danger to the community as a reason for denying pre-trial release, many observers feel that the Bail Reform Act focused on the problem with a hand over one eye. The blind spot, moreover, was nowhere more evident than in the Government's own back yard.

Because Washington, D.C., is governed by Federal law, because 40 per cent of all Federal offenses occur there, and because its crime rate receives nationwide attention, the new act had a particularly alarming impact in the District. Washington's able Chief of Police, Jerry V. Wilson, relates this telling episode of modern urban history:

Shortly before the beginning of 1969, armed robberies in the District had become a critical problem; they were occurring at a rate of about 700 a month. Only 11 days after his Inauguration, President Nixon promised in a message on crime that he would recommend legislation to permit preventive detention of hard-core recidivists. Shortly after that announcement, the number of armed robberies in the capital suddenly dropped off to around 300 a month. This steep slack lasted for several months.

Then, in April, the United States Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia noticed an upsurge in the number of appeals from high bail by defendants who had been imprisoned before trial because they could not raise the money; four times the usual number had been filed within a few months. Ruling in one of these appeals—*U.S. v. James E. Leathers*—the appellate court recognized the disquiet of trial judges who feel

that the Bail Reform Act gives them no way to protect the public safety. Nevertheless, the court ruled that they must follow the letter of the law and assure pre-trial release.

Thereafter, armed robberies in the capital rose as precipitously as they had dropped four months earlier, reaching an all-time high in September of over 800 a month.

"What this suggests to me," says Donald Santarelli, an Associate Deputy Attorney General, "is that the trial judges, who had been critical of the Bail Reform Act, followed the President's endorsement of preventive detention and took a tougher stance on releasing defendants before trial in serious violent crimes." Santarelli, who framed the Administration's preventive detention bill, continues: "This resulted in many more detentions before trial of violent offenders through the setting of high money bonds—a practical evasion of the Bail Reform Act. It was followed by a significant reduction in armed robbery offenses during the following four months. But the Leathers decision in April resulted in the sharp rise because release of this type offender was ordered."

Judge Charles W. Halleck of the District's General Sessions Court agrees with this interpretation. According to Halleck, "a few judges effectively cut armed robbery rates about 40 per cent in a few months simply by denying pre-trial release to this predictable category of offenders."

Judge Tim Murphy of the General Sessions bench describes what happened this way:

"Before the Leathers case, there was a concentrated effort by the judges to 'sock it to 'em,' which we rationalized on our interpretation of the law and our reading of the recidivism problem. Leathers caught us between the eyes and took away our arguments, so we began to do our best to obey the law as it was laid out for us. We could no longer deny bail on the pretext of fear of flight. Nor could we justify high bonds by the section of the new law that allowed us to take into account the nature of the offense in determining pre-trial release." (This provision meant only that the judge could force men to report to the authorities each day, give up their driver's licenses until they appear for trial or satisfy other, similar "conditions.")

Judge Murphy is not alone in believing that, despite Bail Reform Act, Federal judges in other parts of the United States (as well as state court judges all over) continue to detain defendants through the subterfuge of setting high bail or simply denying it outright, on the ground of risk of flight or danger. Most judges feel they must. Says Judge Murphy: "There are widows and orphans in this city who plague my conscience because I try to follow my oath of office and adhere to the Bail Reform Act strictly, even when releasing certain defendants violates my common sense, reason and experience."

Statistics on the dimensions of the problem are inconclusive. They are interpreted in different ways by friends and foes of preventive detention.

In 1966, a Presidential commission studying crime in the District of Columbia found that out of 2,776 defendants who were released on bail before their trials, 207 of them were later charged with committing another crime while they were free; of these, 124 were accused of violent crimes. The District of Columbia Police Department conducted a study of robbery holdups, the category of offense which is central to the present dispute. Between July 1, 1966, and June 30, 1967, the department found, 130 individuals were released on bond after being indicted on this charge. Of this group, 45 defendants—just short of 35 per cent—were reindicted for at least one additional felony while free on bond.

In testimony before the House Judiciary

Committee last October, Attorney General John Mitchell referred to a study by the United States Attorney's office in D.C. showing that of 557 persons indicted in the District for robbery in 1968, 345 were released prior to trial and 242 of these—or 70 per cent—later re-arrested.

Those who oppose preventive detention point out that these figures relate to unproven charges, and not convictions. They claim, moreover, that the percentages are low and the problem therefore minimal. The pro's point out that the statistics include only reported crime, estimated to be about 50 per cent of the true picture, and cases in which police believe they have enough evidence to bring someone to trial (in the armed robbery category, this is a mere 14 per cent). Whatever the percentages, says Senator Tydings, "it is no consolation to the dead, the robbed, wounded, maimed or terrorized citizens against whom these crimes have been committed that this experience is part of what some people would call a 'statistically insignificant number of crimes.'"

Of the bills now before Congress that provide for some form of preventive detention, the most likely to survive are the Administration bill, the Tydings bill and the Goodell bill. Here is how all three would work: In prescribed cases, the prosecutor could request the court to detain a dangerous defendant until the trial. He would have to demonstrate that the case meets the criteria spelled out in the law. Prior to any detention there must be a hearing immediately or within a few days, a record, a high standard of proof (clear and convincing), the right to appeal and to have counsel—all of which are more than defendants get under the present unofficial system. Each bill prefers conditional release when it is appropriate, and they all allow—not require—detention only in limited categories of cases. The two Senators' bills pertain only to felonies and repeaters while the Administration bill covers some misdemeanors and first offenders. Only Senator Goodell's bill is limited to crimes involving actual force and not mere threats.

The Tydings bill would apply to the District of Columbia only, while the Goodell and Administration bills would reform the 1966 Bail Reform Act and affect all Federal jurisdictions. The Tydings and Administration bills cover more crimes and leave preventive detention in the hands of the appropriate "judicial official"; the Goodell bill would empower only a three-judge district court to order detention (a cumbersome, expensive procedure that would be impossible in many areas). Each bill requires a speedy trial (within 60 days under the Administration bill, 30 days under the Tydings and Goodell bills) for people preventively detained.

Senator Goodell argues that any preventive detention bill should be tied to court and correctional reform. He criticizes the Administration bill as "sloppily drawn and unconstitutional." He attempted to meet one key problem by including a provision requiring civil commitment of those detained—meaning they would be confined in some place other than an ordinary jail or prison. This element is important, since one of the most perplexing questions about any preventive detention scheme is how to rationalize throwing men into inadequate correctional institutions with hardened convicts before their guilt or innocence is determined. The civil commitment required by the Goodell bill would be similar to the procedures for confining a drug addict, a chronic alcoholic or the mentally ill in an institution.

The Tydings bill implies such a provision; the Administration bill suggests it, but does not require it. None of the bills provides financial compensation for those detained and then acquitted; the Administration bill



gives credit on sentencing for time in jail before trial.

The logic of the foes of such legislation is sometimes hysterical. One civil liberties spokesman said during a recent conference on preventive detention that he would prefer the present money ball system's dishonesty and higher rates of detention to "this pernicious doctrine."

The standard argument made by opponents is that preventive detention would not be necessary at all if the time between arrest and trial could be shortened. The courts can only move so quickly, however; there will always be some period of time before trial—and many a defendant needs such a delay to prepare his defense. The preventive detention legislation proposed so far, moreover, requires the prosecution to go to trial within a specified time period, which is in all the proposals far shorter than normal delays.

Simply to say that speedy trials generally are the answer ignores the frustrating reality that trial delay is one of the most elusive and critical contemporary problems in the administration of justice. While reform of the whole trial system will take a very long time, a preventive detention statute inextricably tied to a speedy trial requirement is itself a way of accelerating trials in one of the most pressing categories of cases.

Opponents also argue that better alternatives exist. They say that it would be preferable to bring bail-jumping, contempt or other separate charges against defendants who commit crimes while free on bail or to punish them by adding to their sentences if they are convicted of the original offenses. But would more punishment be as humane as preventive measures aimed at cutting crime rates? Street-wise criminals take advantage of trial delays and other vagaries of the criminal justice system, and prosecutors often drop charges or recommend concurrent sentences for repeated crimes in return for guilty pleas. Once indicted for a robbery, many offenders feel that they have nothing to lose by committing other "free" ones.

Others contend that preventive detention is an anti-Negro measure, that it is part of a scheme to permit summary jailing of militant blacks for political reasons. Yet, it is the poor and black community in urban ghettos who are the most common victims of crime and who would be prime beneficiaries of preventive detention. Senator Tydings points out: "A Negro woman is three times more likely to be raped, a Negro man five times more likely to be burgled and three and one-half times more likely to be robbed than a white person."

William Raspberry, a Negro who is a reporter for The Washington Post and an urban expert, says that while he personally does not like the idea of preventive detention, he has little doubt that the black people residing in Washington (but not their leaders) would be in favor of locking up known criminals who victimize them. "Their reactions to this problem are not philosophical, they are practical," says Raspberry. "The poor people in the central cities react to this problem like 'the silent majority.' They are basically conservative, single-minded and prepared to make assumptions about guilt."

Black people in Washington, according to Raspberry, are as "alarmed and disgusted as whites at the increased frequency, audacity and viciousness of local crime." This impression was corroborated by six District grand juries which have already written to the Justice Department complaining about "the imbalanced pre-trial procedures which are concerned only with release and not at all with protection of the community." In Washington the majority of grand jurors are Negroes; on two of the grand juries that made this complaint, 36 out of the 46 members were Negroes.

Advocates of preventive detention feel strongly that it would jail fewer people before trial—and also "the right ones"—than the unofficial, backdoor system now widely used. One experienced official calculated from recent surveys that 40 per cent of all felons indicted in the United States District Court for Washington, D.C., in 1965 (before the Bail Reform Act) were detained prior to trial; in 1967, the first full year after the new act, 26 per cent of the same class of defendants were detained, and in 1968 the figure rose to 34 per cent; in contrast, a Justice Department survey of cases brought by the United States Attorney in the D.C. General Sessions Court during a recent two-week period (including misdemeanors and most felonies) discovered that pre-trial detention would have been possible in only 10 per cent of the cases under the Administration's proposed preventive detention law. (Since some serious felonies were not included in these figures and since misdemeanors, which are for the most part excluded from the Administration's bill, compose roughly half the cases in General Sessions Court, a figure a little over 20 per cent would probably be a better projection.)

Those who favor some sort of legislation deny that permitting a judge to imprison a man on the basis of a prediction of future behavior is an egregious procedure.

However chancy it may be, they argue, humans engage in predictions in all of their affairs; if society fretted about the imperfect quality of its speculation, it would not dare to make progress. The criminal justice system especially is dependent on human estimates, such as are frequent in deciding guilt or innocence, sentencing, probation and parole. Indeed, under the present system, the judge may jail a defendant whom he fears may flee—and this, too, involves a prediction. Experienced trial judges argue that anyone familiar with the arraignment process can make very educated and generally correct judgments about the kind of defendants whom the authorities would want to detain. One judge recently stated the case this way:

"When a man with a long criminal record admits he has a \$50-a-day narcotic habit and no job, and I have seen him arrested and released previously, and he comes before my court on a burglary or a robbery charge on Christmas Eve and is released, and then comes before me on New Year's Eve for another burglary, I can make a damn good prediction that if I do not lock him up, he is going to go out and commit another burglary or robbery pretty damn soon."

Whether prediction is possible or not, critics argue that preventive detention would be unconstitutional. They say that (1) it would deprive a man of his presumption of innocence; (2) it would deny due process of law by subjecting people to imprisonment without indictment and jury trial and (3) it would violate the Eighth Amendment's guarantee against excessive bail.

There are reader answers to the first and the last objections than to the second.

The presumption of innocence—a sacred American value not mentioned in the Constitution—puts the burden on the prosecution to prove its case at trial; it is not an absolute demand that the judicial system always must act contrary to the strongest dictates of common sense in exigent circumstances.

Whether there should be an absolute right to bail is doubtful. Actually, preventive detention is traceable to ancient Anglo-American legal history: In his "Commentaries," Blackstone referred to detaining men "not of good fame" as an example of preventive justice. One legal historian—Prof. Caleb Foote of the University of California, Berkeley—recently has stated that there are English antecedents that support the theory of an absolute right to bail. But this coun-

try has never proceeded as if that were so. In the United States, bail always has been a qualified right withheld by law in capital cases (where recidivism is relatively low), commonly refused during appeals of criminal cases and, in fact, denied unlawfully in many other cases through manipulation of the money ball system.

The most challenging argument against pre-trial detention is the one that says incarcerating a man without the traditional criminal trial protections of the Constitution is dangerous and threatens cherished guarantees. Indeed, any such practice must be limited to a bare minimum of cases, to situations where there is the strongest demonstrable need, surrounded by the most careful procedural protections and administered under extraordinary conditions. With such restrictions, the procedure will be very demanding. Without them, preventive detention would no doubt be deemed unconstitutional.

In my opinion, a pre-trial procedure would pass constitutional muster only if it were limited to cases involving repeated, violent offenses, if it required compelling proof of potential danger and could be imposed only as a last resort, if there were tight time limitations on confinement before trial, if special facilities were planned for these defendants to minimize the harm and inconvenience to them, if time in jail before trial were subtracted from any subsequent sentence and was compensated for when followed by acquittal.

Let us see how this proposed procedure would have worked in the case of P.D., whose escapades I described at the outset of this article. After the initial holdup of the savings and loan association, P.D. could not have been detained—thus demonstrating to opponents of such a measure that it will not result in confinement of masses of first offenders.

But pre-trial detention would have been likely after the liquor store heist that followed P.D.'s first arrest. Taking away P.D.'s freedom at this point would thus have averted the gas station holdup and probably the bank robbery and felony murder that eventually led to his detention before trial anyway. In addition, P.D. would no doubt come to trial far sooner than if he were not confined under this kind of statute.

With the features that I have suggested, pre-trial release would properly be liberalized in the great majority of cases, while society would be afforded a method of self-protection. The procedure need not lead to what some fear would be the frightening extreme of imprisoning all allegedly dangerous people summarily. Quite the contrary. If allowed only in specific cases, and no others, the result would seem to lead to less pre-trial detention.

Such a statute, moreover, would not permit Gestapo-like arrests or the jailing of political dissenters, as so many people fear. One result of it would be to eliminate the very possibility of defendants being confined solely because of the personal predictions and unsubstantiated fears of judges and other officials. If a judge could not make a case for detention under the strict terms of the statute, he would have to release the defendant under the appropriate conditions of the Bail Reform Act.

The critical point remains that we already have an expansive and abusive, though informal, practice of preventive detention. The issue which needs to be faced is not whether, but how best to do it.

In his New Yorker series on the Justice Department in the sixties, Richard Harris described the strange political alignments in the preventive detention battle: "In the scrimmage over the issue," he said about the positions taken by liberals and conservatives, "the participants' jerseys became so

muddled that it was difficult for spectators to tell who was on which team." But labels are less important than realities; and the symbolism of this battle is important for future treatment of the over-all crime problem." Many responsible people with good liberal credentials feel that in the very proper search for equal justice during the sixties, the concern over crime and law enforcement has been wrongly belittled as the paranoia of the far right. In Senator Tydings's words: "Liberals have to be realistic and credible in coming forward with programs to check crime and violence in this nation. We cannot vacate law enforcement to extremist groups. Such a difficult problem needs the best minds and not tricky clichés. Preventive detention can be one such commonsensical, partial solution to the crime problem if it can be handled in a cautious and a constitutional way."

CONSUMERS HIT AGAIN

HON. SAM GIBBONS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, it is quite apparent that the consumer has lost again to the oil lobby. President Nixon has appointed another commission to again study the question of oil imports. Apparently the President was not satisfied with the recommendations submitted by his own task force. This task force, as we all know, recommended an end to the costly quota system.

The subject has been studied exhaustively, and yet we see inaction again by the President. While the administration is fighting inflation in the press and on television, it is continuing to ask the American people to pay out an unnecessary \$5 billion a year to support the present oil import quota system.

It would seem that the extensive preparatory work that preceded the formal work of the task force, including contacts with the American Petroleum Institute and the exhaustive process of briefings to all parties concerned in Government and industry would have eliminated the need for further studies.

We are again faced with Presidential inaction.

Since the Eisenhower administration instituted the existing oil import quota system in 1959, the world situation and that of the United States have changed considerably. A new approach to the problem of oil imports is more than overdue.

The Suez Canal crisis may well have been the cause for the promulgation of these regulatory but restrictive quotas in the name of "national security." Meanwhile oil import quotas have generated a coveted license to reap windfall profits for companies that import crude oil without any appreciable benefit to current national security or the national coffers.

There clearly is no benefit for the American consumer in the current system.

The peril of a disrupted world oil market has long diminished if not disappeared. Not so the growing entrenchment of vested oil interests.

The domestic potential of oil produc-

tion has increased. The significance of new oilfields discovered in Canada, Libya, Nigeria, Indonesia, Mexico, and now Alaska has been generally disregarded. Technology has produced the supertankers.

The Task Force on Oil Import Controls has made a comprehensive review of the mandatory oil import restrictions. Six Cabinet-level members and the Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness have carefully examined all aspects of our national security and their majority has recommended a substantial change in both the method and direction of import controls. Historically, the theory of vested interests has always been evident in the economic life of every nation. The degree of influence exercised by vested interests, however, is a matter of national policy. The original provision of the quota system had never aimed at the protection of the domestic industry per se but only at national security.

Our times clearly reflect a popular desire to improve the lot of the American consumer. Governments at all levels and this administration are on record to aid consumers in this country. The issue is no longer a political slogan but it has become a national economic necessity.

The oil import quotas impose artificially high prices of distributed oil products in the country. The resulting added cost to the American consumer remains unfortunately a debatable question. Less than 2 years ago an "official" estimate of the U.S. Department of the Interior suggested that the extra outlay amounted to between \$2.2 and \$3.3 billion a year. Reasonable current estimates increase that amount to between \$4.5 and \$5.5 billion. An estimated projection for the next 5 years would further aggravate this situation with the oil industry getting an extra \$7 billion annually by 1975.

Of course, there are explanations for the wide band of differing estimates, but no one can deny the fact that the extra cost to American consumers for heating their homes and driving their cars is exorbitant.

Moreover, the license given to importers for millions of barrels of oil each day enables them to charge the public inflated prices creating an unneeded increase in the cost of living to the American working families. These same licenses provide the importers with an extra average of \$1.25 per barrel while resulting in a conservatively estimated loss of half to \$1 billion of revenue to our Treasury annually.

The import quotas are not only archaic but they are clearly uneconomical.

Certainly the administration has still the duty to insure the Nation an adequate supply of crude oil. But it should not try to achieve this goal by causing the consumer to suffer the consequences of its indecision combined with sectoral inefficiencies of our oil industry. We cannot both preach freer trade 1 day and practice unwarranted and unjustifiably selected protectionism the next.

Surely, some sector of the oil industry will need some subsidies to overcome the adjustment required with the introduction of tariffs to replace existing quotas, but at least the assistance will be visible and extended only where really needed.

The Presidential task force after examining the existing problems has concluded by a strong majority to scrap the present quota system and replace it with a tariff system. The chief stated emphasis of the innovation is to provide revenue for the U.S. Government. Let us also consider the inflated costs that the consumers shoulder.

For the President to ignore the recommendations of the majority of such a distinguished group of his top advisers is an abdication of national leadership. Presidential policy formulation cannot be relinquished to the vested interests of the oil industry. They have the right to seek to make a profit. But this hardly means that they have the right to exploit the consumer and certainly not the right to emerge with a national policy while deliberating on their private business.

It is time for the President to lead the Nation in the fulfillment of the promised improved public welfare.

The times suggest it; the consuming public demands it and the inflationary forces eroding the purchasing power of our dollar require action now.

NEW APPROACH TO STRIKES

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's press is applauding President Nixon's action in presenting tangible proposals to the Congress to combat nationwide strikes in the transportation industry. The following editorials in the Washington Star and Washington Post are pertinent to consideration of the issues:

[From the Evening Star, Mar. 2, 1970]

NEW APPROACH TO STRIKES

The President has made a pioneering proposal for ending the nation's vulnerability to strikes affecting transportation. The plan deserves prompt and sympathetic consideration by the Congress.

It has been obvious for years that further federal legislation is needed to prevent strikes or lockouts that create national emergencies. By zeroing in on the transportation field, Mr. Nixon has chosen a likely target for a new approach. The national interest is immediately and unquestionably involved in a coast-to-coast railroad, airline or trucking tie-up. The issue is particularly relevant right now, with only an expiring court order blocking a rail shutdown, and the possibility of a Teamster strike later this year.

At present, the strike-delay provisions of the Railway Labor and Taft-Hartley Acts leave the nation defenseless after the required cooling-off periods have elapsed without settlement. The administration's plan would provide the President with a set of further options. He could (1) require 30 days more of cooling off and, it is hoped, fruitful negotiations; (2) insist on partial operation of a struck industry to minimize danger to health and safety; or (3) invoke a unique procedure in which the "final offer" of either union or management could be imposed as the settlement.

The last of these proposed options is expected to produce the most fireworks in Congress, with organized labor and some seg-



ments of business opposing it as a form of "compulsory arbitration." The administration denies that this term applies, but the semantic argument is unimportant. The vital question is how best to rule out transportation stoppages that the nation cannot afford.

Mr. Nixon should be given much credit for trying in a field where past presidential promises have been followed by inaction. Unless someone has a better idea, the plan should be given a chance to prove itself in practice. Ideally, the new set of presidential options would work best by creating uncertainty in the minds of labor and management about what would follow their failure to achieve settlement. If the administration plan should prove itself in the transportation field, it could be extended usefully to other industries on which the nation's welfare depends.

[From the Washington Post, Mar. 3, 1970]

#### THE EMERGENCY STRIKE PROBLEM

The country has waited so long for proposals to modernize the Railway Labor Act and the emergency-strike provisions of the Taft-Hartley Act that any message on the subject is likely to be welcomed by those who think first of the public interest. The specific message which President Nixon has sent to Capitol Hill has substantial merit, however, and it may well serve as the basis for constructive legislation if Congress is so disposed.

Because of the controversial nature of the subject in the past, the White House was probably well advised to concentrate for the present on the transportation industry. It is in this area where most of the trouble from emergency strikes has come. If the new procedures recommended are successful, it would be a relatively simple matter to extend their use to other industries which must be kept in operation to protect the national health and safety.

It makes sense also to bring the railroad, airline, maritime, longshore and trucking industries under the same rules. Certainly something must be done to improve procedures under the Railway Labor Act now applicable to the railroads and airlines only. In 45 years its emergency provisions have been invoked 187 times. "Designed as a last resort," the President noted, "the emergency procedures have become almost a first resort." And after a strike has been postponed for 60 days without a settlement, the only course open to the President is to go to Congress for emergency legislation, as happened most recently in 1967. This fact alone should spur Congress into enactment of more useful and effective machinery for handling emergency strikes.

The new law proposed would put railroad and airline strikes and lockouts under the Taft-Hartley procedures and broaden the options available to the President in dealing with them. Taft-Hartley now makes it possible for a federal court to enjoin a strike for 80 days, if it is found to threaten the nation's health or safety. That period is devoted to fact-finding, mediation and an employee vote on the employer's last offer. But if the dispute persists, the government is left helpless to protect the public interest at the end of the 80 days. Strikes have followed in 8 out of 29 cases in which the so-called "cooling-off" provisions of Taft-Hartley have been applied.

The administration seeks authority for three different means of meeting situations of this kind. First, it wants to be able to extend the cooling-off period for an additional 30 days if it appears that the dispute is near settlement. Second, it would allow the President, on the advice of a special board, to require partial operation of the industry in question. The idea here is to permit sufficient operation to safeguard the public interest, if

that appears feasible, while leaving pressure on the parties for a settlement. If neither of these options seemed hopeful, the President could give the parties three days to submit one or two final offers to the Secretary of Labor. Bargaining on the new offers would be required for five days. As a last resort the parties, or the President, if they failed to agree, would name a "selector committee" to decide which one of the final offers would become binding on the parties.

Secretary Shultz makes much of the argument that this procedure would put both parties under great pressure to make reasonable offers. Each would be competing, it is said, to have its offer accepted. But both might also be in a gambling mood and offer only objectionable and arbitrary terms of settlement. The entire procedure would then tend to be discredited, as it would force a committee of three to impose unreasonable terms of settlement or allow a crippling strike. It seems to us that the proposed "selectors" should at least have a third option of choosing segments of the rival offers in the hope of putting together a reasonable package that would become binding for a limited period if the government is going to force a settlement, it must be fair, and this can seldom be attained by acceptance of one party's terms in toto.

The objective of broadening the options available to the President is sound. Why, then, confront a board which may have to make the final decision with narrow options which might discredit both itself and the machinery under which it would be operating? This aspect of the proposal will need thorough scrutiny on Capitol Hill.

#### WHY ENVIRONMENT COMES TO THE FORE

#### HON. JEFFERY COHELAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. COHELAN. Mr. Speaker, a short time ago Mr. Robert Hunter wrote an interesting article for the Washington Post on some of the reasons why the fight against pollution is gaining rapid appeal among the middle classes in our country. Mr. Hunter reasons that this appeal is a diversion from the many other problems that face this Nation.

Although I do not share the pessimistic tone of Mr. Hunter's analysis, I do commend the reading of this article, entitled "Why Environment Comes to the Fore," to my colleagues and the readers of the RECORD:

#### WHY ENVIRONMENT COMES TO FORE

(By Robert E. Hunter)

With the state of the Union address, the fight against pollution became our nation's most talked-about political issue, even helping us to forget the war in Vietnam. The President's concern demonstrates that the issue of preserving the environment has come of age. More important, it reflects a new awareness that the dangers of pollution are of direct consequence to middle class Americans.

So far few observers have seen the pollution issue in terms of class—and this helps to explain why it has come so suddenly upon a sleepy people. Only in the last few months has the state of the environment attracted more than passing attention from anyone but the ardent conservationists. Why the sudden change? Why the instant popularity? Quite simply, the middle classes woke up to

the fact that it is becoming increasingly costly—if not impossible—to buy out of the stifling conditions that were once the lot only of the city dweller, but which now smother both city and suburb.

Many of us put up with the Potomac and Anacostia sewers when mountains, lakes, or seashore were only a short drive away on uncrowded super-highways. But when the cheap country property has been bought up, our favorite trout stream filled with industrial wastes, or the highways clogged with traffic, we find that money by itself no longer buys escape from the dirt and press of urban living. Then we have a "problem" seeking an urgent remedy.

This middle class basis to demands for reform is nothing new. In fact, it would be strange to see anything different. Revolution itself has traditionally leaned on the middle classes for its motive power, and our own recent experience with internal change has focused on the role played by the man who is relatively well off. Civil rights got off the ground in the 1950s through the NAACP—mostly white and liberal—then spurred upwards when television brought evidence of Southern misdeeds into white, middle class homes in other parts of the country. The protest against the War in Vietnam—the "Year of the People"—found little mass support among the poor; there were few black faces in the crowd at Chicago in August 1968; and campus protest has certainly had little to do with the working man, despite efforts by some students to make this connection.

Does the non-Marxist reformer quarrel with this state of affairs? Not at all, provided he gets a positive answer to a central question: can middle class concern with middle class problems be broadened to include the poor, the black, the dispossessed? If this can be done, as with federal aid to education and President Nixon's proposed War on Crime, then all prosper. If it can't—remember Resurrection City?—then reform too often fails and most of us would rather not be reminded of our nation's shortcomings. An understanding of this phenomenon seemed to be behind the attempt by Martin Luther King Jr. and others to link civil rights to anti-war protest: they could see their white, middle class constituency drifting to an issue that more directly concerned it, in large part because of the draft.

This tactic failed. Indeed, war protesters have found it impossible to gain much support on the basis of the argument that black Americans are being exploited, and the latter have benefited only to the extent that the end of the war is being hastened by middle class whites who protest for their own reasons.

The same middle class emphasis appeared in last year's protest against the ABM. When the sites were scheduled for the wastes of the Middle West, few people cared; then the Pentagon blundered with its plans for the suburbs, and we had a national issue. So, too, with protest against chemical and biological warfare: it crystallized only after there seemed to be a connection between middle class man and the danger of accidents—at the airport in Denver or off the coast of the New Jersey beach resorts.

With this impact of Middle America on the success of reform, is it any wonder that pollution control now receives so much public attention? But, the reformer asks again, will conquering this problem do much to help out in the cities, where we face more trouble than anywhere else in the coming decades? It is true that city residents will benefit in passing from control of such things as automobile exhaust. But beyond that, the prospect for the cities is bleak, even though "national priorities" are frequently mentioned in the same breath as "pollution." Perhaps that is just the point: for most middle class Americans, "changing

priorities"—such as cutting down the Pentagon's share of the budget—doesn't mean diverting resources to the cities, or even passing the President's welfare proposal. It means a general tax cut favoring the man in the middle most of all—a pre-election gambit by the Democrats—and a lot of talk and a few dollars for the environment.

It was no surprise, then, that President Nixon's State of the Union address concentrated on problems of the environment, even though this means that attention is being diverted from the bread-and-butter issues of urban change (and, of course, from the war in Vietnam). For the President, this is undoubtedly good short-run politics in an election year: his best constituency will be served, while the cities—most of which are controlled by the Democrats—can go their own way, despite the arguments for a national effort put forward by the Kerner, Douglas, and Eisenhower Commissions.

Eventually, Cassandra says, there is a price to be paid. Unfortunately, the bill won't fall due until middle class Americans find that, as with pollution, they can't buy themselves out of the city's problems simply by moving out. Hopefully, this understanding will come before the economic and spiritual death of the city engulfs us all.

ASIAN DEVELOPMENT BANK

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, almost 4 years ago the Congress—with strong bipartisan support—authorized the United States to accept membership in the Asian Development Bank. This action was taken in the belief that such an institution would contribute significantly to the peaceful development of Asia through the involvement of both the outside the Asian and Pacific region.

The first 3 years of the Bank's operations have proven this confidence to have been well placed.

The countries of the region have subscribed to 64 percent of the Bank's capital stock. In addition to the United States and Canada, 11 Western European countries have subscribed to the Bank's capital stock.

It was recognized from the outset that the Asian Development Bank should have the facilities and resources to provide concessional financing where required because of the economic situation of the recipient country or the nature of the project.

For this purpose the Bank has established its special funds and has received offers from four countries—Japan, Canada, Denmark, and the Netherlands—of a total of \$128 million for such concessional lending.

The present proposal for a U.S. contribution to the ADB special funds would permit us to join other countries in supporting the development of an effective concessional lending facility within the Bank.

The proposal for a U.S. contribution of \$100 million over 3 years would assure that the United States would be contributing to a truly multilateral fund

where the United States would not be bearing the major financial burden.

I trust that this legislation may be enacted without delay.

JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY—HAS ONE OF THE NATION'S TOP BASKETBALL TEAMS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's leading basketball scoring team, and also the country's tallest college team, Jacksonville University, has received an invitation to participate in the National Collegiate Athletic Association championships next month.

This is a great honor for the basketball team and its coaches and Jacksonville University, one of the Nation's fastest growing independent institutions, located on the banks of the beautiful St. Johns River in Jacksonville, Fla. The team, coached by Joe Williams, is now ranked No. 6 by the Associated Press and United Press International.

With a spectacular 22 to 1 won and lost record, the Jacksonville University Dolphins represent the best of American collegiate spirit. In just 1 year the team has reached acclaim across the country. The team leads all college squads with an average of over 100 points per game, and its star center, 7-foot-2 Artis Gilmore leads in rebounds.

Mr. Speaker, the Federal Government and Jacksonville University have mutually benefited in cooperative activities, primarily through college loan construction funds for three projects housing 1,000 students on the Jacksonville University campus with a total investment of \$4.5 million. A junior college three decades ago, the university now has 3,000 students, with sound bachelor's and master's programs in the liberal arts. At the present time almost 50 percent of the faculty hold doctorates and the average class size is 21. Its president is one of America's dynamic and farsighted scholars and leaders, Dr. Robert H. Spiro.

I include in the RECORD several articles about Jacksonville University's basketball team, including references to the Dolphins' revenge victory over Florida State University, the only team to defeat Jacksonville University this season, and on Coach Williams:

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union, Feb. 25, 1970]

A WELL-EARNED HONOR FOR JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY

Anybody who suggested a few years ago that Jacksonville University might be in the NCAA basketball tournament in 1970 could have been regarded as a prime candidate for a psychiatrist's couch.

But then anybody who suggested at the seventh annual college banquet in May, 1941, when only one diploma was awarded, that Jacksonville Junior College would one day be a thriving university would also have been suspect.

The prospects at that time were slightly brighter—but only slightly—than they were in June, 1938 when the college's bank balance showed the whopping sum of six dollars and thirty cents.

JU's growth has been solid and its contributions to the academic and cultural life of Jacksonville have been enormous. Its graduates form a substantial and committed segment of the community.

Yet it still is a tiny entity when put up against some of the titans of the sports world, whose teams dominate the wire service's "top ten" in college basketball.

Only St. Bonaventure, a much older school with a winning basketball tradition that goes back for decades, is smaller in student enrollment and that by only 331 students. Every other school in the list of basketball elite has more than three times JU's enrollment, most at least five times the enrollment and one—UCLA—more than ten times the enrollment.

This success is symptomatic of JU's accomplishments in other fields as well. It did not become the type of institution that could attract top-quality players without a lot of hard work by the administration, the faculty, the student body, the alumni, and its friends in the community—especially the private donors who have made its continued educational success possible.

But the basketball accomplishment has much of an "Operation Bootstrap" about it. Coach Joe Williams and his staff set their sights high and worked hard to bring it about. The team members came through like champions.

We wish them success in the tournament and no matter what happens there, they already have done more than most of us would have thought possible just a few short months ago. They have earned the plaudits they have been receiving on all sides. Jacksonville has cause to be proud of them.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal, Feb. 25, 1970]

GO GET 'EM, DOLPHINS!

The news that Jacksonville University has been extended an invitation to play in the Midwest Regional meeting of the NCAA basketball tournament comes as much of a boon to Jacksonville proper as it does to the school itself.

Performing in a national tournament such as this provides the participants with a rare honor and experience. But it also brings a great deal of prestige to the community from which they come.

Coach Joe Williams and his staff have done an outstanding job bringing JU's basketball program to the front. Quite aside from this latest prize of being invited to the NCAA, JU has obtained publicity from one end of the nation to the other. It has, quite literally, put Jacksonville on the map.

The Dolphins have also been responsible for filling the Coliseum on two occasions this year, against Miami and Florida State, no small achievement in itself.

The Jacksonville University team of 1969-70 will be remembered for many years to come for many reasons. A pair of seven-footers in Artis Gilmore (actually 7-2) and Pembroke Burrows and a fleet of other giants, led by Rex Morgan (6-5) and the city's own Rod McIntyre, (6-10), enabled JU to claim itself as basketball's tallest team.

But there was more to the Dolphins this year than mere height. There was raw talent, honed to precision edge by Coaches Williams, Tom Wasdin and part-time assistants such as J. M. Watson, Nellie Vinal and Bill Curtis.

Any team would have been delighted to have had such "little fellows" as Vaughn Wedeking (5-10) and Chip Dubin (6 feet), who helped make the Dolphins the balanced team they were.



But a lot more is to be said for this team. They possess a spirit of team fellowship and pride that is the ultimate aim of every coach.

All of this has gone into the success of JU this year. President Robert Spiro and the entire school is to be congratulated on their success.

And Jacksonville has every right to be button-busting proud of JU.

Whatever happens as the Dolphins go forth into national competition, they have already provided a great service to this community.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Journal,  
Feb. 24, 1970]

#### THE RISE OF JACKSONVILLE UNIVERSITY AND JOE

(By Jack Hairston)

By the time you read this, the phone will have rung at Jacksonville University, and a bid to the NCAA basketball tournament will have been received—and accepted—by JU Coach Joe Williams.

Many are surprised by the basketball success of JU and its personable young coach. It may be correct to say that one of the most surprised is Joe Williams himself.

Oh, he could see it coming several months ago, but consider this:

In high school and college, Joe Williams couldn't even decide which was his game—basketball or football.

Through college, and almost five years thereafter, Williams couldn't even decide where he was headed professionally—doctor? Teacher? Coach?

Four years before he took over at JU as basketball coach (which was just over five years ago), he was coaching the eighth grade team at Terry Parker Junior High.

Today let us look at the man most responsible for JU's sensational rise . . . Joe Williams.

Williams was the son of a Methodist preacher, which meant his family packed up and moved about every four years. His father was preaching at Morton, Miss., when Joe was born. By the time he was a sophomore in high school, he was playing football and basketball at Muskogee, Okla.

He thought then that football might be his game. That sport's importance to him at the time is easily understandable. Four future All-Americans were on the team: Eddie Crowder, Max Boydston, Bo Bolinger and Bo Burris.

He spent his last two years at Durant, Okla., where he played end and was captain on the football team and led the southern part of the state in scoring in basketball with an average of about 16 points per game.

Williams went to Southern Methodist University, where he played freshman football and basketball, and Oklahoma City University, where he played some basketball.

#### THE INFLUENCES ON HIS CAREER

"I was undecided on what I wanted to be," Williams said yesterday. "I'd completed premed work and was seriously considering that. I'd been accepted to the Oklahoma University medical school.

"I spent a couple of years in the service and went to Tulane graduate school in literature, and I was in Jacksonville in 1960, visiting my brother, who was the preacher at Riverview Methodist Church.

"My brother suggested me teaching a year in Jacksonville. A principal he knew talked to Sidney Friend, principal at Terry Parker. Aaron Brown (then athletic director and football coach) at Terry Parker High encouraged me to come with them. My brother and Aaron were big influences on me working in Jacksonville. My brother has a church now at Daytona Beach, but he comes to all our games.

"That year at Terry Parker, I coached the backs in junior-varsity football and coached

the eighth-grade team in basketball. At the time, I was more excited about coaching football. I thought that might be what I wanted to do."

Abe Lemons, who'd coached Joe at Oklahoma City and who's in town today with his Oklahoma City University basketball team, entered the picture here.

"My mother was in the hospital in Oklahoma City," Joe said, "and I went out there for a couple of weeks. Every day I'd go by and talk to Abe. He'd tell me about the drills he was planning for his team, and then we'd go out to practice, and I'd watch him put in the drills. It was like a basketball clinic just for me, and I got more interested in coaching basketball than ever before.

"When I came back to my job at Terry Parker, I treated the kids the same way Abe treated his . . . putting in all his drills. It was the beginning for me."

Williams' first game as coach was against Paxon's eighth-grade team, coached by Tom Wasdin, now Joe's assistant and recruiter.

"It was some game to break in with," Williams said. "We both scored in the sixties, which was high for a 28-minute game, or whatever we were playing. I was so excited, I never sat down during the whole game. I was up and down the sideline. Both teams were pressing all over the court.

"Johnny Gellen, now Wolfson High principal, was the referee, and he told us after the game it was one of the best games he'd ever seen. It was close all the way, and we finally won.

"I've always had great respect for Wasdin. Wasdin's team won the city championship, but we won the county. The next year we were both in high-school coaching; I was at Ribault High, and he was at Paxon. After a year, I got a job as freshman coach at Florida State, and Wasdin pretty much dominated high-school basketball here for the next few years. When I came back to JU, I wanted to get him with me as soon as I could . . . and I did."

#### THE INDIRECT PATH TO THE NCAA

The year Williams spent at Ribault High was beneficial in more ways than one. His team won the Gateway Conference title, and he met his wife, Dale.

"Dale had been out of school one year and was working as a secretary at Florida National Bank," he said. "She was the homecoming queen when we played Jackson High in a big game—for us—at Ocean Way Gym. We won the game, and she came down and hugged my neck. I thought she was real cute, but at that time I was thinking only of winning basketball games. After the season I asked her for a date, and we wound up getting married."

Williams went to FSU for a year, then to Furman as an assistant for a year, then to JU as head coach.

Joe was asked if, when he started in coaching, he dreamed he'd ever have a team in the NCAA tournament.

"I really never thought about it," he said. "I've always been happy in whatever I was doing. I enjoyed coaching when I was at the junior-high level.

"I think I've been lucky always going to a program where they were sagging a little. Ribault had lost its key players when I went there, and Furman was down, then came back to upset Davidson, West Virginia and Wake Forest.

"My first year at JU, we won our way to the NAIA tournament in Kansas City, and that was a real pleasure. They treated us real well, and it was a fine tournament of about 50 or 60 teams. I thought, 'We'll have the kind of team that can come out here and enjoy itself almost every year.'

"But later I thought about it and decided, 'If I want to stay at JU for a long time, we're going to have to develop a major program.' I figured we should play all around the country and play the top teams.

"So we got out of the NAIA and went major college. The second year we were 12-11 and beat Florida State and Miami. We were much stronger, and I believe we would have dominated the NAIA, but we couldn't go to the tournament.

"The next year I talked the school into a four-year program of spending more money and trying to build a fine team, and this is the fourth year. It hasn't been easy. I'd promised JU I'd get a master's degree in physical education, and I've spent my summers going to graduate school at Florida and selling tickets for JU basketball at the same time. Those were the toughest summers of my life."

But now JU is in the NCAA. And how does Williams figure the Dolphins will do?

"I think if we go up ready to play, we'll do real well," he said. "I don't know who we're going to play, but all the boys have come along well. We've concentrated in recent weeks on getting physically ready for the tournament. If we're physically ready, I believe the boys will get mentally ready to play.

"It's been like a long race. You start strong, and then you get tired and wonder if you'll ever reach the end. Then you find the strength to finish strong. I think we'll finish strong. We're getting near the end."

Williams and his Dolphins have run a long race . . . and they've run it well.

[From the Jacksonville (Fla.) Times-Union,  
Feb. 20, 1970]

No. 6 GETS PAST No. 8

(By Bill Kastelz)

Yesterday morning the sun rose and Joe Williams woke up and immediately he remembered he had won, 85-81. He smiled to himself. A warm smile. Joe Williams is now 20-1.

Yesterday morning the sun rose and Hugh Durham woke up and immediately remembered he had lost, 81-85. He sighed to himself and thought of a dozen ways the game could have been won, because after it is all over you can think of all kinds of ways you could have won it . . . and didn't. Hugh Durham is now 20-3.

Four lovely . . . or crummy, depending on which was your team . . . points separated the two clubs after the biggest, grandest, most pulsating basketball game ever played in Florida.

It matters not that there were at least two dozen instances in the game itself where an errant pass, a stolen ball or a negligent defensive move could have—if avoided—blown the game apart.

This one was destined to go down to the wire. It did. And, when it was all over, a thousand Jacksonville University students and fans boiled over onto the Coliseum floor and went about the staggering task of hoisting their sweaty favorites high and screaming. "We're No. 1!"

That's big-time basketball, friend. That is college basketball at its best. Exciting. Electric. Spine-tingling. Ecstatic. Heartbreaking.

#### BIG-TIME BASKETBALL

Ten thousand and fifty saw it in person. Hundreds of thousands more saw it on TV.

And, at the end, an Orlando newsman's comment summed it up about as well as anybody's:

"You just saw the best two basketball teams this state has ever produced."

Not just the best one. The best TWO. No. 6 vs. No. 8 in the national polls. No. 6 won, but if No. 8 drops out of the Top Ten, it will be a crying shame.

There have been other basketball games played with more finesse, more polish, more fans and more at stake.

But this one was something more. Big-time basketball had burst over the Florida horizon as never before—with the whole state and much of the nation's fans following the proceedings with intense interest.

It was a time . . . and a game . . . to remember.

WITH A JAUNTIER STEP

Just as was the case in Tallahassee last month after FSU won by six, there were no alibis offered.

Just as the case in Tallahassee last month, the officiating could not be blamed for the loss, nor credited with the win. In fact, except for only two isolated instances, it was a superbly officiated game, and both coaches were the first to say so.

Florida State is no worse a basketball team than it was before it lost by four points. The Seminoles are—as has been written here many times—a superb basketball team.

They proved it again Wednesday night by almost pulling it out in the final minutes.

So, all Seminole boosters will understand if all of a sudden there are in Jacksonville thousands of new, red-hot Dolphin fans.

They will understand if all of a sudden basketball dominates street-corner conversations, and if a goodly portion of our citizenry strode about with a bit more jauntiness yesterday morning.

Florida State has been that route. It knows the feeling.

For JU, it's something new. Even though it was not totally unexpected, it still came as a pleasant jolt.

Yesterday morning in Jacksonville was different.

It was good. Warm. Prideful. Charged-up. Happy.

Or, as that seven-foot composer, Pembroke Burrows III, noted in his smash hit, "The Rooster":

"Jacksonville's got a team!"

[From the New York Times, Feb. 15, 1970] JACKSONVILLE SOARING WITH DYNAMIC DUO; GILMORE AND MORGAN LIFT QUINTET INTO NATIONAL ROLE

(By Sam Goldaper)

Holy jump shots, Gotham City—Batman and Robin have turned up in Florida.

The comic strip characters, Bruce Wayne (Batman) and his ward, Dick Grayson (Robin), are being impersonated by Artis Gilmore and Rex Morgan on the cover of Jacksonville University supplementary basketball brochure. But they are wearing the gold, green and white colors of their school instead of the traditional black and gray of the fictitious crime fighters.

In the realm of fantasy, Batman and Robin are hailed as the dynamic duo. But it's doubtful they could be as dynamic on the basketball court as Gilmore and Morgan have been in propelling the Dolphins to prominence far beyond the bounds of Gotham City and Jacksonville, Fla.

Last February, before the National Invitation Tournament committee went to work, Hans G. Tanzler, the mayor of Jacksonville, made a strong pitch on behalf of the Dolphins, who finished with a 17-7 won-lost record, as a participant.

A NEW DEAL

There will be no need for that this year, when on Feb. 24, the first bids by the National Collegiate Athletic Association and N.I.T. are made. Jacksonville billed as the nation's tallest team, will be among the top two or three independents to be tapped.

With Gilmore, 7 feet 2 inches, at center, Pembroke Burrows 3d, 7-0, at the high post and Rod McIntyre, 6-10, at forward, the Jacksonville front line averages 7 feet, which Dr. Laney Yelverton, sports information director, points out is the size of an average dolphin, the team's nickname.

Morgan, 6-5, and Vaughn Wedeking, who at 5-10 is thriving in a world of giants, are the wingmen in the 1-3-1 offense.

When the basketball coaching job became available at the end of the 1963-64 season, Joe Williams was selected to lead the Dolphins.

Williams, a gaunt man with a penchant for thick milk shakes at breakfast, has brought the team to national prominence with the aid of Tom Wasdin, the school's chief recruiter. Junior colleges (Jacksonville was one before becoming a university) have been a prime area of talent hunting.

Gilmore and Burroughs are junior college transfers. Gilmore, a muscular 235-pounder came from a poor all-Negro high school in Chipley, Fla., about 80 miles on the other side of Tallahassee. He played his senior season at Dothan, Ala., because his age eligibility had run out at Chipley. He averaged 29 points.

The 20-year-old Gilmore spent two years at Gardner-Webb Junior College in Bolling Springs, N.C., where he averaged 25 points and 25 rebounds a game.

At Jacksonville, Gilmore, who is being compared with Lew Alcindor, is averaging 28 points a game and leading the nation with 25.6 rebounds.

Jacksonville is the top scoring team with a better than 100 point a game average.

A LATE STARTER

The 240-pound Burrows, another Florida product, spent two years at Brevard Junior College and didn't start playing basketball until late in his high school career. He still has some catching up to do, especially in building his endurance.

Among the Dolphins' victories was a triumph over Evansville in the Christmas tournament sponsored annually by the Indiana small-college powerhouse.

Evansville has been another of Wasdin's favorite recruiting grounds. Morgan was the leading scorer there as a freshman before transferring to Jacksonville after a year's stay at junior college. Wedeking and Greg Nelson, Jacksonville's sixth man, are Evansville residents.

IN FAST COMPANY

Morgan, a senior and the nation's 10th leading scorer last season, played at Lake Land Junior College in his home state of Illinois before coming to Jacksonville.

Norman Sloan of North Carolina State, in the same brochure that tabs Morgan as Robin, is quoted as having said last season, "Morgan is the best offensive performer we have played all season. That includes Charlie Scott of North Carolina and that puts him in pretty good company."

Success has been wonderful for Jacksonville and for Wasdin's recruiting.

"When I go somewhere now and tell them I'm from Jacksonville, they don't ask who or where anymore. They know all about us now," Wasdin said.

TRIBUTE TO THE ACHIEVEMENTS AND CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE UNITED STATES FROM A GRATEFUL CANADIAN

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, we are often asked, "Just what can one person do?" I have just received one answer to that question.

One person can do a lot, especially if that person is a lady of good will and determination such as Patricia Young of Vancouver, British Columbia. Mrs. Young, who is a Canadian novelist, has written a letter to the editors of newspapers in both the United States and Canada in an effort to counteract anti-U.S. propaganda.

When she received over a thousand letters in response to her efforts, she had to have help in dealing with this mountain of correspondence. The Canadian-U.S. "Friendship" Associates was a result.

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Young's letter to the editors, which eloquently expresses the intent, purpose, and philosophy of the organization, follows:

TRIBUTE TO THE UNITED STATES

While we are inundated with a continuing avalanche of "hate-America" propaganda, little has been done to promote understanding, cooperation and friendship between our two nations, sharing as we do a common border, common language, common ancestry and, in many respects, a common economy.

Permit me, a Canadian, to express a long overdue Thank You America—not only for putting men on the moon, but for almost 200 years of contributing to the betterment of mankind. For the airplane, radio, cotton gin, phonograph, elevator, movie machine, typewriter, polio vaccine, safety razor, ball-point pen, and zipper.

No other land in all the world has, in so brief a history, contributed so much and asked so little—only that we live together in peace and freedom.

From the days of Washington and Lincoln, you have demonstrated the creativity, invention and progress of free men living in a free society—where ideas and aspirations may be promoted to the extent of man's willingness to work and build a "better mousetrap" with commensurate rewards.

Thank you for upholding the principles and rights of freedom and liberty; for the American Constitution and Bill of Rights and for protecting those rights even when it results in the burning of your flag and the murder of your President.

Thank you for those brave men who helped defend freedom on foreign soil in two world wars—a debt we have been able to repay in small measure by way of some 10,000 Canadian volunteers who serve in your Armed Forces; for the foreign aid you continue to give even when your hand is bitten and your motives impugned; for keeping your dignity in the face of insults from nations still wet behind the ears; and those who would envy what you have made of yourself; for your patience with those who seek to steal the world and enslave its people; for keeping your cool even when the Trojan horse mounts the steps of the White House to insolently spew forth its treason.

Thank you for helping keep alive the concept of individual liberty and faith in God in a world wallowing on humanistic collectivism. For these reasons and so much more, we say: "Thank you America, and God bless you."

NATIONAL JUNIOR MISS FINALS

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that Miss Carleen Mlynarek of Warren, Mich., has been chosen to represent her State in the National Junior Miss finals in May at Mobile, Ala.

Miss Mlynarek was sponsored in the State competition by the Warren Junior Chamber of Commerce.

A student at Regina High School in Harper Woods, she plans to enroll at Western Michigan University next fall to study either theater arts or medical technology.



She is the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Adolph Mlynarek of Warren.

I wish her the best of luck in the national competition.

#### PUEBLO WEST

### HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the territory and later the State of Colorado flourished originally on the boomtown riches of gold and silver bonanzas in the 19th century. Today, with a diversified economy headed by industry, agriculture, lumbering, tourism, and mining, the State has entered a period of rapid growth that is attracting nationwide attention. Beautiful Colorado, still pioneering in spirit, is channeling its energies into many new and productive outlets.

Today I am pleased to report a new phase in this history of growth. I refer to the master planning and current construction of a unique new city, "Pueblo West." Pueblo West is designed to be a balanced community development to meet the realities of the population surge in Colorado and the Nation.

Pueblo West was conceived as an entirely new American city for 60,000 residents, 6 miles west of Pueblo and adjacent to the site planned for the 26.5 square mile Pueblo Reservoir scheduled for completion in 1974. The site for the city consists of 25,990 acres, or approximately 40 square miles, for long-range, low-density expansion—an eventual ratio of slightly more than two persons per acre. It has been planned as a unified residential-recreational-light industrial community with a self-sustaining payroll economy and a 21st century concept of spacious country living.

The bipartisan National Committee on Urban Growth Policy recently recommended that 100 cities of 100,000 population and 10 larger cities of 1,000,000-plus population be built within the next 30 years to help cope with an anticipated national population increase of 140 million by the year 2000. Pueblo West falls within the scope of the committee's recommendations.

Planning and building of Pueblo West is being carried out by McCulloch Properties, Inc., a subsidiary of McCulloch Oil Corp. Together these two companies are pioneering leaders in new city development and are best known in this field for their building the all new city, Lake Havasu City, Ariz., on the Lower Colorado River. The McCulloch companies believe that the building of balanced, planned new cities is a logical alternative to the patchwork process of aimless urban growth in the old cities.

Pueblo West is strategically located to serve the purpose for which it was planned. There has been some concern that Colorado might experience its own "urban sprawl" on the east side of the Rocky Mountains. It is there that the State's major cities and industrial cen-

ters are located on a north-south line from Greeley-Fort Collins through Boulder, Denver, Colorado Springs, and Pueblo.

Planning is underway to prevent high density urbanization along this eastern "Front Range" of the Rockies through the development of cluster cities and greenbelts to preserve open spaces. Pueblo West is designed to fit into this plan and may become a model for other new Colorado cities that inevitably will be needed to cope with population influx.

C. V. Wood, Jr., president of McCulloch Oil Corp., points out that new cities can substantially increase the Nation's housing supply by releasing new sources of investment funds, meeting the land supply of builders, and creating more efficient housing and community development operations. The unified planning and large-scale operation of the new community development process are aimed at achieving economies not possible under present fragmented development—the tract-by-tract growth of sprawl.

For example, I am informed that the master area utilization plan for phase I of Pueblo West's development, comprising 14,310 acres, is divided as follows: Residential, 9,640 acres; commercial, 640 acres; golf course, parks, and greenbelt, 2,980 acres; and equestrian park, 50 acres. The balance of the land within the master plan, 11,680 acres, has been zoned and planned and will be developed later as phase II.

McCulloch Properties, Inc., devoted more than 5 years of intensive research before selecting the site at Pueblo West.

Pueblo West will be within convenient driving distance of some of the world's most famous winter and summer mountain resorts and outdoor sports areas. Nearby mountain ranges, within 30 minutes' driving time, offer excellent recreational opportunities the year around, including skiing, fishing, hunting, and camping.

The Pueblo West site is adjacent to the planned Pueblo Reservoir, where a major recreational lake with a maximum capacity of 357,000-acre feet of water, 9 square miles of surface area, and 60 miles of shoreline is scheduled for completion in the mid-1970's as part of the Bureau of Reclamation's Frying Pan-Arkansas Trans-Divide \$241,000,000 water project.

Government preserved recreational lands with planned public use facilities adjoin the Pueblo Reservoir site on both north and south shores.

I am advised that McCulloch Properties, Inc., will have invested over \$7 million in the project during the first year of development and that others will have spent a comparable amount. During this first year a major manufacturer of ski wear started construction of a plant, which will be in production late this spring and employ 135 persons at an annual payroll of approximately \$300,000. Additional industries are expected to locate at Pueblo West in the near future. The economic impact of this development is already being felt in the Pueblo area, where we look forward to a period of major economic growth.

Finally, the developers state that they have developed safeguards that have been established for the protection of land purchasers, residents, and business investors at Pueblo West.

Purchasers of residential property are required to personally inspect the city site and the homesite they have selected before they are allowed to buy. The "see before you buy" policy at Pueblo West is patterned after a similar plan at Lake Havasu City, which I am told was recommended by Arizona Real Estate Commissioner J. Fred Talley to Senator HARRISON A. WILLIAMS of New Jersey, head of the Securities Subcommittee of the Senate Banking and Currency Committee, as a model sales program for large-scale land-use projects throughout the Nation.

In general, it is the developer's policy at Pueblo West to sell residential property to those who are able and willing to contribute constructively to the new city's growth and welfare. Moreover, the availability of residential property is coordinated with the growth of other segments of the city, in accordance with the master plan for balanced community growth.

I commend the planners and builders of Pueblo West for carrying forward this unique and giant undertaking. I have great hopes that this new city will be an asset, not only to Colorado, but to the entire Nation, and I wish to convey good wishes to all those participating in the project and to the first residents of our State's newest community.

#### CRIME IN NATION'S CAPITAL

### HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, the January 1970 Monthly Crime Index was released recently by District of Columbia Police Chief Wilson.

Generally speaking, for the first time in months, there was a noticeable downward trend of crime reflected. It may be that the unusually cold seasonal period in January, as well as other weather factors, played a crucial part in this decline in certain crime statistics. However effected, the decline is welcomed.

The House District Committee has reported out a clean omnibus crime bill, H.R. 16196, which, if enacted, will contribute appreciably to a decline in crime statistics in the coming months and years in the District of Columbia.

It is a good bill which attacks the crime problem from a number of different directions: court reorganization, increase in the number of judges to try cases, pretrial detention, juvenile procedure reform, and a number of substantive criminal procedural reforms.

It is my sincere hope that the Congress will enact this new bill quickly so that the District officials connected with the fight against crime can get down to the business of permanently reversing the crime situation in this city.

I insert below a pertinent portion of the January Monthly Crime Index and a recent article which appeared in the February 11, 1970, issue of the Wall Street Journal relating to crime in the Nation's Capital:

CRIME INDEX FOR JANUARY 1970

On February 16, 1970, the Office of the Chief of Police released the reported Crime Index Statistics for the month of January 1970. The total number of offenses reported for this month was 5,484. The total number for last month was 5,808. The cumulative total Crime Index Offenses for the twelve-month period ending with January 1970 was 63,115 and the number for the corresponding period in 1969 was 50,781, an increase of 24.3%. From October 1969 through January 1970, the total monthly reported crimes were 6063, 6071, 5808 and 5484 respectively, showing an average monthly decrease of 3.2%, or a total decrease of 9.5% for the 4-month period.

In the categories of Homicide, Rape and Aggravated Assault, 24, 13 and 320 offenses respectively, were reported in January. In comparing the twelve-month total ending with January 1970, with the same period in 1969, an increase of 87 (+42.6%) was reported in Homicide, 57 (+21.2%) in Rape, and 619 (+20.0%) in Aggravated Assault.

Reported Robberies for the twelve-month period ending with January 1970 were 12,396,

a 34.9% increase over the same time span in 1969 (9,188 Robberies reported). However, monthly Robberies from October 1969 through January 1970 were 1348, 1256, 1163 and 1097 respectively, an average monthly decline of 7.6% from October, or a total decline from October of 22.9%.

This month, 2,175 Burglaries and 919 Larcenies were reported. These two categories represent 39.7% and 16.8% of the total offenses reported for this month, thus Burglary and Larceny total over 1/2 of all the crimes reported. During the twelve-month period ending in January 1970—23,252 Burglaries and 11,669 Larcenies were reported, an increase of 26.0% and 43.4% respectively, over the corresponding period in 1969. Larcenies in October 1969 through January 1970 were 1101, 1074, 1028, and 919, a downward trend with a total decrease in Larcenies of 19.8% for the four-month period. Although Burglaries increased from October through December 1969 (2182, 2197, and 2246), the increases were relatively small (+16.2%, +0.7%, and +2.2%), and January 1970 with 2,175 Burglaries reported decreased by 3.4% when compared with December 1969.

Auto Theft with 936 offenses represents 17.1% of total offenses reported for January. A total of 11,464 offenses were reported for the twelve-month period ending with January 1970, an increase of 0.3% over the same period in 1969. However, offenses in this category have decreased markedly in the past 3 months (November—1,221; December—998;

January—936) for a total decrease of 23.3% for the 3-month period.

Chief of Police Wilson noted that, overall, these data indicate a generally downward trend of crime over the past few months which is sufficient to warrant cautious optimism for the coming months.

Chief Wilson noted that a small part of this increase can probably be attributed to seasonal and weather factors. But he noted that without question much of the decline has resulted from the cumulative effect of revitalized law enforcement efforts during recent months, including increased emphasis on control of crime by each police district; expanded use of police tactical forces resulting in several apprehensions of criminals; strong prosecution policies instituted by United States Attorney Flannery; efforts by both the Court of General Sessions and the United States District Court to reduce calendar delays and backlogs; and, especially, increasing citizen concern and cooperation with law enforcement.

Chief Wilson noted that, as these factors are supplemented during coming months by the effects of the crime control programs included in the 1970 budget, particularly the program for both mandatory and voluntary treatment of narcotics users, and by pending legislation which may be approved by the Congress, and as the number of policemen on the force and through recruit training increases, there is a real possibility that significant decreases in crime can be achieved.

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT—CRIME INDEX OFFENSES, JANUARY 1970

Classification	January		Change		Cumulative through January		Percent change	12 months end January 1969	12 months end January 1970	Percent change
	1969	1970	Amount	Percent	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970				
Criminal homicide.....	20	24	+4	+20.0	127	186	+46.5	204	291	+42.6
Rape.....	23	13	-10	-43.5	183	199	+8.7	269	326	+21.2
Robbery.....	1,124	1,097	-27	-2.4	6,255	8,424	+34.7	9,188	12,396	+34.9
Aggravated assault.....	224	320	+96	+42.9	1,837	2,216	+20.6	3,098	3,717	+20.0
Burglary.....	1,915	2,175	+260	+13.6	11,037	15,060	+36.5	18,451	23,252	+26.0
Larceny (\$50 and over).....	798	919	+121	+15.2	5,536	7,513	+35.7	8,139	11,669	+43.4
Auto theft.....	836	936	+100	+12.0	7,312	7,627	+4.3	11,432	11,464	+0.3
Total.....	4,940	5,484	+544	+11.0	32,287	41,225	+27.7	50,781	63,115	+24.3

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT—CRIME INDEX OFFENSES BY DISTRICT, JANUARY 1969-70 COMPARISON

District	January		Change	
	1969	1970	Amount	Percent
1-D.....	1,062	987	-75	-7.1
2-D.....	503	551	+48	+9.5
3-D.....	1,073	959	-114	-10.6
4-D.....	625	848	+223	+35.7
5-D.....	713	839	+126	+17.7
6-D.....	964	1,300	+336	+34.9
Total.....	4,940	5,484	+544	+11.0

GOVERNMENT OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA METROPOLITAN POLICE DEPARTMENT—CRIME INDEX OFFENSES REPORTED—NUMBER AND PERCENT, BY CLASSIFICATION, JANUARY 1970

Classification	Number	Percent
Homicide.....	24	0.4
Rape.....	13	0.2
Robbery.....	1,097	20.0
Aggravated assault.....	320	5.8
Total crimes against persons.....	1,454	26.5
Burglary.....	2,175	39.7
Larceny \$50 and over.....	919	16.8
Motor vehicle theft.....	936	17.1
Total, property crimes.....	4,030	73.5
Total, reported crimes.....	5,484	100.0

† Does not total because of rounding.

LIVING SCARED: SURGING CRIME FORCES WASHINGTON RESIDENTS TO CHANGE WAY OF LIFE

(By Monroe W. Karmin)

WASHINGTON.—John D. Holland is afraid. For 40 years he has been selling packaged liquor at his Maryland Beverage Mart in this city's southeast sector. Four years ago he installed a burglar alarm system. Three years ago he put iron bars on his windows. Two years ago he began arming. Now on his desk on a platform overlooking the sales floor are a black Italian-made pistol, a silver German-made pistol, a Winchester rifle and an L. C. Smith shotgun. "I've never been held up," Mr. Holland declares, "and I don't intend to be." Since mid-1967, intruders have murdered seven local liquor dealers in the course of an estimated 700 robberies of such stores. Leroy R. Bailey Jr. is afraid.

He drives a taxi. Last year he paid \$20 to install an emergency flasher in his cab. If he's threatened, Mr. Bailey steps on a button that sets off a flashing signal for police aid in his front grille and rear bumper. At night, he says, "nine out of 10 cabs won't pick up a man alone." The number of Washington cab drivers has dropped to about 11,000 from 13,000 two years ago. Says James E. Jewell, president of the Independent Taxi Owners Association: "This is a very dangerous town to drive in. Many men won't work after the sun goes down."

The people at the Mexican embassy are afraid.

Last September, during an independence day celebration, two guests were robbed. Fe-

male employes have been accosted. Vandals have struck repeatedly. Now all embassy doors are kept locked. A fence has been erected around the property, located two miles north of the White House. "We live in fear," says a spokesman. So does much of the crime-plagued diplomatic community. President Nixon is asking Congress to expand the 250-man White House police force to offer additional protection for Embassy Row.

THE NO. 1 ISSUE

Most of Washington is afraid of crime. Fear has changed the way of life of residents of the nation's capital and its environs, affecting everyone from cab-driver to Senator. It has also changed the way institutions, from schools to embassies, operate. While race relations continue to be a major problem for this city, whose 850,000 residents are more than 70% black, there is no doubt that today's No. 1 public concern is personal safety.

"A couple of years ago the city's tension was seen in terms of white police versus the natives," says an aide to Mayor Walter Washington. "Now it's seen as criminals versus victims. It's more crime and less racial."

Mayor Washington, himself a Negro, says that black as well as white neighborhoods are demanding more foot patrolmen, even though the cop on the beat was viewed as "a Gestapo agent" by many blacks not long ago. The mayor finds ground for optimism in the change. "Never before have I seen such an attitude on the part of the people of the city, both black and white, to work together on a problem," he says.



## A "TRAGIC EXAMPLE"

The nation's capital is by no means alone in its fear of crime; rather, as Mr. Nixon pointed out in his State of the Union Message, it is a "tragic example" of the way crime and violence "increasingly threaten our cities, our homes and our lives." But Washington is suffering more than most cities. In the nine months through September, according to District of Columbia Police Chief Jerry Wilson, reported crime in Washington jumped 26% over a year earlier, compared with an average national increase of 11%. Cleveland, San Francisco and Baltimore also topped the national average.

Chief Wilson, who was appointed last summer, hopes to come to grips with the rising crime rate here this year, if he gets enough help. President Nixon has proposed a new \$12.4 million crime-fighting package for the district to supplement the city's regular budget, which emphasizes public safety measures. And Congress is at work on other anticrime legislation for Washington.

This war on crime focuses on several trouble spots. It aims to break the local court bottleneck (it now takes an average of nine months for a criminal case to go to trial and some wait as long as 20 months); to curb the freedom of those awaiting trial through a controversial preventive detention measure (an estimated 35% of those arrested for armed robbery and released on bail commit another crime before they come to trial); and to crack down on drug traffic and use (50% of those arrested here are drug addicts).

## EXPANDING THE POLICE FORCE

But this year's main thrust, Mayor Washington says, is to put more policemen on the streets. The mayor hopes to beef up the force to 5,100 men by June 30 from 3,868 on Jan. 1. Also planned are expanded criminal rehabilitation and social-welfare programs that the mayor hopes can be meshed into a comprehensive criminal justice system.

Because Washington is the seat of the Federal Government, the crime surge here is an important stimulus to action on both district and national anticrime legislation. Among the victims of local crime have been Sen. Frank Church of Idaho, White House Press Secretary Ronald Ziegler, Mr. Nixon's personal secretary, Rose Mary Woods and Deputy Defense Secretary David Packard, to name just a few. Political partisanship is diminishing as liberal Democrats feel the impact of crime and join the President in his anticrime crusade.

Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield recently expressed outrage over the "senseless" slaying of a fellow-Montanian and friend in the streets of Washington. He took the Senate floor to demand "new and better ways to fight crime, to cut down the inordinate rate of violence." Another liberal Democrat, Rep. Frank Thompson Jr. of New Jersey, warned the other day that "things may get worse if the Administration and Congress do not put crime control on the front burner."

But until this campaign begins to make headway, life in the District of Columbia will reflect fear, especially after dark.

Cruise through downtown Washington in a police car on a Saturday night and the mood can be felt. On F Street, the main downtown shopping street, merchants lock their doors at 6 p.m. Many put up iron grill-work nightly to protect their windows. Shoppers and employees hurry to the bus stops. Many employees who fear the lonely walk at the end of the bus ride wait in the stores until their spouses drive by to take them home. At 7 p.m. F Street is almost deserted.

The relatively small number of people out for an evening of entertainment arrive a bit later. Some go to the National Theater, which now raises its curtain at 7:30 p.m. instead of 8:30 so patrons can get home early. Some head for downtown movie theaters. The servicemen's crowd patronize the rock joints along 14th street. Fashionable Georgetown, more

than a mile from downtown, is still lively, as are some of the posh restaurants and clubs. But that's about it. Much of Washington is dark, and scared.

"Watch the people," advises a seasoned policeman. "See how they walk quickly and with a purpose. There's no casual strolling. People don't come into this town at night unless they have a specific destination in mind. They go straight to it and then go home as fast as possible."

## RESTAURANTS CLOSE

The effects are evident. The Ceres restaurant next to the National Theater is closed, nearby Caruso's restaurant is gone and neighboring Bassin's has lost 50% of its night business. The Commerce Department, a block away, was robbed recently. Fumes Bassin's angry manager, Ed Hodges:

"There isn't a waitress, cashier, busboy or anyone who works here who hasn't been robbed, mugged or attacked in some way. And there isn't a place in this block that hasn't been robbed, and most have been hit more than once."

A few blocks away, on 9th street, the Gateway Theater is showing "Man and Wife," an intimate film "for adults over 21." Even an attraction of this nature fails to draw the audience it once did. "Business is very bad, way off," says Robert Morris, the ticket seller. "People are afraid to come downtown. We've had lots of purse-snatchings, pockets cut out and all sorts of other things."

Fear inhibits daytime activity as well. A survey taken last summer by the Metropolitan Washington Council of Governments discovered that 65% of the city's largely white suburban residents visit the downtown area less than once a month, and 15% come downtown less than once a year. Asked their chief worry, the large majority of those surveyed respond: "Crime."

Actually, crime is spreading in the suburbs as well as in the city. Three brutal slayings of young women, one in Alexandria, Va., and two in Bethesda, Md., have occurred within the past few weeks. While these crimes remain unsolved, many suburbanites tend to view crime in their neighborhoods as a spillover from the city, and they still feel downtown is more dangerous.

Crime continues to speed the flight of Washingtonians to the suburbs. Though many single people and childless couples remain in the city, Joseph Murray of the big Shannon & Luchs real estate firm reports: "Families are leaving at an accelerated rate; this includes both black and white." (In neighboring Prince Georges County, Md., Negro arrivals have recently outnumbered white newcomers.)

## "NO CASH"

Sales of downtown department stores dropped by 4% in the first 11 months of last year from a year earlier, while sales throughout the metropolitan area, including those of suburban stores, were rising 8%. A recent Commerce Department survey of 10 central-city areas showed that the District of Columbia suffered the steepest loss of business of all. Shoppers who do venture downtown are continually reminded of the risk. D.C. Transit bus drivers use scrip instead of cash to make change. Delivery trucks bear signs proclaiming, "This Vehicle Carries No Cash."

There are bright spots. New office buildings are sprouting in some parts of town. Convention business continues to grow and tourists arrive in record throngs. Lane Bryant has opened a new store on F Street, and the downtown Woodward & Lothrop department store is remodeling. But the merchants know safety must be assured before enough suburban shoppers will come downtown again to make business snap back.

The big department stores are bolstering their protection. Harold Melnicove, an executive of Hecht's, says his organization now has a security force "big enough to protect some small cities"; he won't give details.

Smaller stores do the best they can. Frank Rich, president of both Rich's shoe stores and the D.C. Urban Coalition, is a downtown optimist. But in his F Street store he no longer displays shoes in pairs, just singles; all display cases are locked; key employees carry electronic devices in their pockets to summon help in the event of danger.

High's dairy stores, which stay open nights and Sundays, have been robbed so many times, says General Manager William Darnell, "we don't like to talk about it." The chain's 37 D.C. stores were held up "hundreds of times" last year, Mr. Darnell sighs, and several had to be closed. Money in all stores is kept to a minimum by frequent armored car pickups.

## GETTING OUT

A survey by the mayor's Economic Development Committee of small businessmen found that one out of seven contacted "wanted to close down, relocate or simply stop doing business in the city."

One who wants to get out is E. N. Hampton, president of the Hampton Maintenance Engineering Co. His firm has been robbed, his trucks have been vandalized and his employees have been threatened. "It's disgusting," Mr. Hampton snarls. "Now we ride armed guards in the trucks with shotguns. As soon as I can find somebody to buy this I'm getting out."

Nor is black business immune. Berkeley Burrell's four dry cleaning stores have suffered 17 holdups in 10 months. Now the front door of each is locked; a customer can't get in "without a ticket or pair of pants in his hand," says Mr. Burrell. Employees are armed, and the proprietor is trying to replace females with males. "I may sound like Barry Goldwater," he says, "but we've got to get the community back to where it's safe to live in."

Banks have been a favorite target for bandits. Though these attacks have slackened lately, Francis Addison, president of the D.C. Bankers Association, says a "very high percentage" of local banks are robbed every year. The National Bank of Washington recently closed one branch because of the danger. All banks have tightened security, but the most extreme case is a Security Bank branch in the northeast section.

In 1968 the branch was held up three times within 55 days. Now the bank has put all employees behind plexiglass.

Tellers receive any payout money through scoops beneath the plexiglass. "The personnel were all shook up and couldn't work," President Frank A. Gunther says, "so we bullet-proofed the whole place." The bank has not been held up since.

## INSURANCE HARD TO GET

Faced with the cost of crime in Washington, insurance companies have turned cautious. "Lots of companies have stopped writing fire and casualty insurance," says Thornton W. Owen, president of the Perpetual Building Association, the city's biggest savings and loan outfit. "And lots of investors will abandon properties rather than maintain them." Hilliard Schulberg of the local liquor dealers association says that for his members "the cost of crime insurance is extremely high, and many companies won't write it." Proposed legislation would permit the Government to offer crime insurance where private insurers won't.

Office building managers, both Government and private, are attempting to cope with the danger. James Sykes, manager of the William J. Burns Detective Agency here, reports many buildings have posted guards at their front doors and says, "We're providing lots more escort service for female employees working late at night." The local chapter of the American Federation of Government Employees has advised its members to buy, at \$5 apiece, anti-mugger aerosol spray devices.

Security is a prime concern of apartment

dwellers. The 670-unit Marberry Plaza, open three years ago in southeast Washington, exemplifies what a new building must offer to reassure nervous tenants. On weekends the project is patrolled by four armed guards with two dogs. All exterior doors are locked. A tenant who has invited a guest for dinner must present an "admit slip" with the guest's name to the desk clerk during the day. When the guest arrives, he must identify himself to the clerk and sign the register. "All of this is at the request of the tenants," says Sidney Glassman of the Charles E. Smith Property management company.

**SCHOOL VIOLENCE**

In some neighborhoods, newsboys no longer collect for their papers for fear of being robbed; subscribers must mail in payments. One cabbie drives with self-addressed envelopes; whenever he accumulates \$10 he mails it home. Some maids require their employers to drive them home. An outbreak of violence including the shooting of a junior high school student has prompted Mayor Washington to post policemen throughout the city school system. Many schools have stopped dealing in cash, requiring students to pay for supplies and other items costing more than a dollar by check or money order.

"It used to be that holdup students would use their fists; then came knives; now it's guns," says George Rhodes, a member of the D.C. school board. "Not that there have been that many incidents, but it's the fear that parents and teachers must live under that is most troublesome."

School principals, anxious to protect the reputations of their institutions, tend to minimize the problem. William J. Saunders, principal at Eastern High School (2,400 students including just three whites), says violence is "not a major problem" in the school. Yet several thousand dollars worth of football equipment has been stolen, and police officer Sherman Smart says there have been three alleged rapes in and around the school since September. As Officer Smart talks to a reporter, a photographer's agent joins in to complain that he has visited the school twice to take orders for class pictures and has been robbed of his receipts both times.

Not even the churches are spared. At the Vermont Avenue Baptist Church, the collection plate was stolen by intruders in full view of the parishioners. Says Charles Warren, executive director of the Greater Washington Council of Churches:

"Some churches have begun to lock their doors at 11 a.m. on Sundays for the worship service. Some have policemen at the service during the offering. Some have canceled evening activities or rescheduled them for the afternoons."

The National Presbyterian Church has moved from its 60-year location about half a mile from the White House to a new site three miles farther out. The Rev. Edward L. R. Elson calls the new location "the quietest zone in Washington," but vandalism is as bad at the new church as at the old one. According to Mr. Elson, the vandalism has included "obscurity on chapel pillars, destruction in the church hall and lights pilfered and broken."

**A BILL TO MAKE INDIAN HOSPITAL FACILITIES AVAILABLE TO NON-INDIANS IN REMOTE AREAS**

**HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.**

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill today cosponsored by Mem-

bers from every section of our country. The measure would make Indian hospital facilities available to non-Indians in remote areas.

The high costs of medical treatment and the scarcity of professional skills have made many of us critically aware of the need to best utilize all available health facilities to the fullest extent possible.

We who are sponsoring this measure believe it would provide the means, with existing operations, to achieve such improvement.

Throughout the United States there are areas devoid of medical care, not necessarily caused by the lack of health resources, but by lack of legislative authority to make existing health services available to those in need.

There is precedent for enactment of this bill, in that other hospitals of the Division of Indian Health are made available to Federal employees and their dependents under existing law, but without provision to provide for the health care of others residing in the vicinity.

Under this proposed legislation, the health services would be supportive in nature; without in any way anticipating Federal usurpation of State, local, community, or private health prerogatives and responsibilities.

It is further not anticipated that the enactment of this bill would result in additional costs to the Government, as the services would be provided on a "space available basis" and the costs of the services would be reimbursed by the non-beneficiary.

Indian people are assured priority for use of the facilities, and this bill would require the consent of the major Indian tribe or tribes served at the facility in order to make it available to non-Indians.

In addition, it requires reimbursement at reasonable rates for the costs of such services to non-Indians, which I believe is reasonable and appropriate.

Mr. Speaker, I am hopeful we can complete action on this bill very soon, and urge my colleagues to join with the sponsors in support of passage.

**BEING AN INDIVIDUAL**

**HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER**

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, in a day and age when conformity is widely accepted and practiced, it is both encouraging and exciting to encounter persons who insist on being themselves, on being individuals. Such persons are most often the achievers, the leaders, those who are capable of moving mountains, and those whose accomplishments are worthy of our admiration and emulation. For such persons, doing one's "own thing" is a mark of excellence and a sign of strength.

Mrs. Marguerite H. T. McGregor, of Taunton, Mass., a highly distinguished

resident of my district, fits this description.

She has required no great cause to motivate her active and useful life. She has been a successful mother, an outstanding lawyer, an owner-operator of Taunton's radio station WPEP, and a contributor to her community's betterment in a hundred constructive ways. She is recognized by inclusion in "Who's Who of American Women."

I think the reader of the following portrait of Mrs. McGregor from the Taunton Daily Gazette will agree that she is "a very unique woman." But I also believe there is a marvelous revelation of character in her assertion that she enjoys being an individual, being herself, and enjoys other people's individualism. She has never felt the need to copy others. Her philosophy echoes that of Shakespeare's Hamlet, "Above all: To thine own self be true."

Being an individual today is not easy. The pressures of our society, and of forces operating outside it, can often cause a person to lose his individual identity and his independence of spirit and will. But it is possible to acquire and exercise the kind of unselfish self-confidence which, I feel, is Mrs. McGregor's strength. I greatly admire this quality in her, and in others.

The text of the article, which I am pleased to insert in the RECORD at this point, reads as follows:

[From the Taunton (Mass.) Daily Gazette, Feb. 6, 1970]

**MARGUERITE MCGREGOR: A VERY UNIQUE WOMAN**

Marguerite H. T. McGregor is a woman with a variety of roles in life, her favorite one is that of being an individual.

She is the daughter of the late John B. and Florence Tracy and was born in Taunton and in 1931 became the wife of J. Marshall McGregor during a ceremony at the home of a relative in Fall River.

She is listed in "Who's Who of American Women", is a lawyer, a radio station owner and a woman with numerous activities in the community.

She is also the mother of two children, J. Marshall McGregor Jr. works for the CIA and lives in Washington, D.C. Her daughter, Laurel, lives in Arizona where she is in business with another woman.

When asked if there was one particular woman that she greatly admired, Mrs. McGregor replied: "I really don't think there is one."

"I enjoy being myself and I like being an individual. There hasn't been anyone that I would have patterned my life after, nor would I have wanted to be more like someone else."

"The most influential woman in my life was my mother," she explained. "She studied to be a lawyer while raising the seven children in my family."

"My father was a lawyer and my mother helped him in his office until 1924 when she was admitted to the bar and she and my father took up practicing law together."

"I've always grown up knowing the life of a lawyer and have been around law offices all my life," she noted.

After graduating from Taunton High School Mrs. McGregor graduated from Tufts University with a bachelor's degree and received her LLB from Boston University.

She attended Harvard University, the University of Maine, the Sorbonne and the University of Paris.



"I went to the Sorbonne during my sophomore year in college," she reflected, "and I really enjoyed myself in Paris."

In 1930 she was admitted into the bar and after she and her husband were married, a year later, they took up general law practices together forming McGregor and McGregor.

"My mother and father were trial lawyers, but my husband and I decided to go into general practice when we were first married," she recalled.

"Then, after we had established ourselves and saw that we could afford to specialize, we decided on probate law," she added.

Milton Hammond and the McGregors began the radio station WPEP in 1949 on the second floor of the Roseland Ballroom. It celebrated its 20th year on the air in December of last year.

"In 1956 my husband and I bought the other shares of the station and four years ago we moved it to the Broadway location," she reported.

"The building used to be my family home and my husband and I converted it into the offices for our radio station plus our law practice office."

Most of the downstairs rooms have been panelled to muffle sounds and what was once a big porch has been changed into the reception area for the station and Mrs. McGregor's office.

Just to the right of the main entrance is Mrs. McGregor's office and the rest of the first floor is devoted to the radio station.

"On the second floor a portion of the building is set aside for the radio station's use and the other part is where my sister lives," she explained.

"The third floor is almost entirely devoted to old 78 records and records that have gone out of date, but sometimes we have requests for the old songs and have to go to the third floor and find the selection store," she added.

Mrs. McGregor is one of four girls in the Tracy seven-children family. Most of her spare time aside from the radio station and law practice is taken up with community work.

"I'm not the athletic type, if you know what I mean," she confessed, "but I do find time to enjoy knitting or reading as outside interests from my work."

You'll never catch this woman out crusading for women's freedom and equality to men.

"There were some cases back many years ago—women not being able to vote or serve on the jury—but that has been changed and I feel now that women today have all the rights that men do," she said.

"I certainly feel equal intellectually to most men and I was never bothered about equality between the sexes. I feel we have that equality."

"Sure, there is a difference between feminine logic and male reasoning, but that's what makes the balance. We need to have two approaches to a situation."

"I feel very feminine and I'm a lawyer and run a radio station. I never felt that I had to compete with a man for a job, nor did I want to compete."

"When I was in a law school, and there weren't too many women at that time studying to be a lawyer, I got along just fine. I never felt that I was looked down upon because I was a woman."

Mrs. McGregor does remember a time when a woman, after marriage, was expected immediately to give all her belongs to her husband.

"That wasn't right and that ruling has been straightened out now," she added.

For those women thinking of law as a profession Mrs. McGregor could only offer one suggestion—work.

Aside from her law practice, Mrs. McGregor also has a 25-minute radio program five mornings a week geared to the women of the area.

"I discuss current community interests, legislation and all of my programs are ad-libbed," she commented.

When asked if there was any other ambition she looked forward to conquering, Mrs. McGregor replied, "There really isn't any one particular thing."

When pressed if she would like to be a grandmother she added, "I'll just have to leave that up to my children. I couldn't make that decision for them."

And so it goes that Mrs. McGregor, who enjoys being an individual, also enjoys other peoples individualism.

In August of 1968 J. Marshall McGregor died and his wife took over their law practices on her own. She is kept busy with not only the law practice and the station, but also has community activities in which she is very active.

Among the past offices she has held are the past district governor of the Quota Club International, past president of both the Taunton Business and Professional Women's Club and the Taunton Quota Club and she is a past matron of the Rose Croix chapter, Order of the Eastern Star.

She is a former member of both the Taunton Appeal Board and the Taunton Human Relations Committee. She was the former vice president of the Taunton Republican City Committee and also the past vice president of the Bristol County Bar Association and was parliamentarian for several organizations.

At present, Mrs. McGregor is the director of the Plymouth Bay Girl Scout Council, Inc., the director of the Taunton Area Mental Health and director for the Taunton Quota Club.

She is a member of the Taunton Bar Association, the Taunton Woman's Club, the American Association of University Women, the legislative chairman for the Taunton Quota Club and also the legislative chairman for the Taunton Business and Professional Women's Club.

She also is a member of the Pilgrim Congregational Church Women's Guild, the Old Colony Historical Society, Past Matrons Association O.E.S., Morton Hospital Women's Auxiliary, the Kappa Sigma Sorority and the Kappa Beta Pi Legal Sorority.

#### THE BATTLE FOR CLEAN AIR: A BIG HAND FROM THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, since it seems to be so fashionable these days to blame the Atomic Energy Commission for many of the environmental woes which the Nation suffers, I thought it would be of interest to point out that the AEC is playing a major role in the fight against air pollution.

Not only is the Commission developing nuclear powerplants, which do not pollute the air, but the AEC's Argonne National Laboratory is working on a program which could have an even greater impact on the fight to clean up the air.

I believe we all recognize that the best available answer to curbing air pollu-

tion is the electric automobile. Although this is still many years away from economic and technical reality, the Argonne National Laboratory is working to bring that day closer.

It is worth pointing out that the AEC's National Laboratories represent the nation's largest reserve of scientific manpower. The labs include top-flight scientists of every technical discipline—not only those relating to the physical sciences, but the life sciences as well.

Several years ago, Argonne scientists were working on a means of converting heat from a nuclear reactor directly to electricity. Out of this research has come a new family of rechargeable batteries which may provide smogless propulsion for vehicles or power for an artificial heart.

Details of this exciting program, which won a 1968 Industrial Research magazine award as one of the most significant new technical developments of the year, are included in a news release from the Argonne National Laboratory. The text of the release follows:

#### NEWS FROM ARGONNE NATIONAL LABORATORIES

ARGONNE, ILL.—Smogless propulsion of commercial vehicles or possible power for an artificial heart can be applications of a unique family of rechargeable batteries being developed at the Atomic Energy Commission's Argonne National Laboratory.

These batteries have a much larger capacity for storing energy than conventional batteries of the same weight; they also can be charged in minutes, rather than hours, explained Dr. Elton J. Cairns of Argonne's Engineering Division, Section Head in charge of battery research.

The new cells were originally developed by Argonne scientists who were seeking means of converting heat from a nuclear reactor directly to electricity. Currently, three agencies, the National Heart and Lung Institute, the U.S. Army, and the National Air Pollution Control Administration, are supporting battery development at Argonne.

The cells have anodes made of lithium, a silver-white metal which melts at a relatively low temperature. The cathodes are composed of alloys of lithium and sulfur, selenium, or tellurium—members of the chemical family called "the chalcogens." The electrolytes are pastes of fused lithium compounds with such elements as chlorine or iodine. The cells operate at about 500-800° F. At these temperatures the anodes and cathodes are molten.

Though still very much in the experimental stage, the batteries appear to have a promising future, Cairns said. In 1968, *Industrial Research* magazine honored the cells as one of the most significant new technical products of the previous year. Since that time, the scientists have started efforts to develop specific batteries for medical uses and vehicle propulsion.

The objective of the work supported by the Artificial Heart Program of the National Heart and Lung Institute is an implantable electrical-chemical power source for artificial-heart devices. Lithium/selenium cells are being evaluated for this purpose. Calculations based on experiments with three-inch diameter cells show that a thermally-insulated, implantable battery with the desired electrical capabilities would weigh about two pounds. Such a battery could be recharged by radio frequency power transmitted through the skin. Two Argonne scientists, Dr. Hiroshi Shimotake and Albert A. Chlenskaskas, are working on this phase of the program.

For propulsion application, the scientists are seeking to design a battery that would provide military vehicles with acceleration and hill-climbing power. To meet this goal, research is being directed to perfecting lithium/selenium cells which are capable of 1 to 3 watts per square centimeter of electrode area at peak power, which have lifetimes of 1 to 2 thousand hours, and which can be charged and discharged 1 to 2 thousand times. Batteries composed of these cells should have more than a tenfold advantage over conventional lead-acid batteries in energy-storage capacity and in power at a given discharge rate. These batteries would be part of a hybrid power supply; a gas turbine would satisfy the average power demand, while the batteries would supply additional power during peak periods. During off-peak periods the turbine would recharge the batteries. Dr. Eddie C. Cay is investigating this propulsion concept.

Another related effort at Argonne is sponsored by the National Air Pollution Control Administration of the Consumer Protection and Environmental Health Service, U.S. Public Health Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Under this program, economical rechargeable batteries are being developed for possible use in urban automobiles. The scientists are studying lithium/sulfur cells to obtain information for constructing a multikilowatt rechargeable battery that would store more than 100-watt hours per pound of battery weight. Such a battery would power a small automobile for over 200 miles and could be recharged in less than 15 minutes. This concept is being investigated by Martin L. Kyle and Dr. Victor A. Maroni.

In all of these applications, the Argonne scientists are investigating cell and battery designs, developing means of fabricating suitable components, and selecting the most effective current collectors. They are also making extensive corrosion studies on potential construction materials. Small laboratory cells are being tested and then scaled up prior to being incorporated into a practical battery.

A SAIL FROM THE SILO

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, as we give further consideration to additional defense outlays and ABM enlargement, I think the enclosed article will be of interest:

A SAIL FROM THE SILO

The United States Air Force may launch an unarmed Minuteman missile across the Western United States and into the Pacific next year.

There has never been a successful launch of a Minuteman missile from an operational silo—a fact that has worried defense strategists for several years.

Three launches have been attempted. But the missiles were tethered to prevent their going far. And various changes were made in the missile-control system with fuel reduced to a minimum.

The result: failure—due largely to these necessary constraints, Air Force officials believe.

Now the White House wants \$31 million in fiscal 1971 for research and development and preparation for the launch of one or more missiles without warheads.

COLLEGE CHIEF TO STAY—BY DEMAND

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Malcolm Love, the president of San Diego State College, is respected and admired throughout San Diego. When Malcolm retires next year, it will be a great loss to the school and the community at large because he has dedicated himself to building San Diego State into a fine institution. The following excerpt from the Los Angeles Times outlines a few of his activities and I am pleased to share them with my House colleagues:

COLLEGE CHIEF TO STAY—BY DEMAND

(By William Trombley)

Meet a college president who is actually liked by his students, faculty and staff—Dr. Malcolm A. Love of San Diego State College.

At a time when presidents and chancellors across the land are locked in mortal combat with students and professors, Dr. Love has been asked to postpone his retirement at least one year.

The 66-year-old Love, who has been president of San Diego State for 17 years and is already serving one year past his planned retirement, had hoped to leave his post by next September.

Now, at the urging of students, faculty, staff members and alumni, he has agreed to remain on the job until at least September, 1971.

Love said he was "surprised and pleased" by these expressions of support. "I cannot refuse under these circumstances. It is a privilege to serve this school," he stated.

What is the key to Malcolm Love's success? Recent interviews with students and professors on the large (23,500 students), bustling campus indicate that both believe Love defends them against hostile outside forces.

"I know of no comparable institution of higher learning where the faculty member can be so assured that he is protected against arbitrary and unfair personnel decisions," said Dr. C. Dale Johnson, professor of sociology and spokesman for the faculty Senate.

President Love and veteran faculty member Ned V. Joy established excellent procedures to deal with personnel grievances, Prof. Johnson said.

On the few occasions when these procedures did not work, Love stepped in "to handle the situation through informal arrangements," Johnson added.

Ross Y. Koen, executive secretary of the Assn. of California State College Professors, which is frequently at odds with the presidents of the 19 state colleges, said his organization rarely has had reason to complain about Love.

"Over the years we've just accepted the fact that Love has worked out a pretty good relationship with that faculty," Koen said. "There's been very little reason to criticize Love."

Students also see Love as a buffer against outside attack.

"One of our biggest problems is protecting ourselves from the hatchet actions of the (state college) trustees and the Legislature and the governor," said Ron Breen, a long-haired urban studies major who is president of the Associated Students Council.

"President Love offers us good support. He attends all those boring meetings and defends our interests. In Love's view there are 18 state colleges and then there is San Diego State—San Diego and the seven dwarfs if you like—and that's great."

Breen and student council Vice President B. J. Nystrom said they feared that if Love had left at the end of the current academic year, as planned, then an acting president would have been named by the trustees and State College Chancellor Glenn S. Dumke.

"We are not interested in any president, acting or otherwise, who is the candidate of Dumke and the trustees," Breen said.

Nystrom said Love's announcement has given the faculty and students an extra year to search for a successor. "We have assurances from the faculty that students will be involved in a meaningful way in the selection," he said.

MUST BE CONFIRMED

The college's choice must be confirmed by Dumke and the trustees, however, so trouble may lie ahead.

Love is a tall, white-haired man who speaks bluntly.

Asked why he wants to change the name of his institution from "college" to "university," he snorted, "This is not a college. This is a university, if that word has any meaning."

"We have graduate programs and nationally accredited professional schools. We're not talking about changes. We're talking about a name that will reflect the changes that have already taken place."

Such remarks do not warm many hearts in Sacramento, where cost-conscious legislators and Reagan Administration officials worry that university status would lead San Diego State to compete with the University of California for costly doctoral and professional programs and research activities.

At present San Diego State, like all the state colleges, can offer only the master's degree, except for two or three special joint doctorate programs with UC.

When Love came to San Diego State from the presidency of the University of Nevada in 1952, the college had only 4,000 students and a faculty of 160.

Now there are 23,500 students, 1,400 professors and 1,000 staff members on the 300-acre campus. A new, million-volume library under construction will contain more floor space than the entire 1952 campus.

Love has been helped by the fact that San Diego State has been tranquil through these years of turbulence on California campuses.

WELL-SCRUBBED

Beards, long hair and hippie dress are seen, but most of the students rushing from the jam-packed parking lots to their classes appear to be well-scrubbed and neatly barbered.

On a recent day a visitor found a Shakespearean Festival taking place outdoors and a senior faculty member reading Dickens' "A Christmas Carol" in the auditorium but no sign of any student political activity.

Student leaders Breen and Nystrom contend that this situation is changing.

"Two years ago the students and the San Diego community were very alike—very conservative," said Breen. "But since then there has been a remarkable series of changes, both attitudinal and in events."

One of these events was the election of Breen as student body president, the first nonfraternity man to hold the job in 17 years.

Another is the presence of about 1,400 black and Chicano students who have brought the concerns of minority students to the campus.

Last spring several thousand San Diego



State students staged a strike in protest against Gov. Reagan's handling of the People's Park disturbances in Berkeley.

"It was successful in waking people up to the fact that San Diego State is not the sleepy place it once was," said Nystrom. President Love demonstrated his political skill when he appeared at a large rally that concluded the strike week.

He said only "I am proud to be president of San Diego State," a remark innocuous enough to fend off criticism yet considered by the students to be support for their cause. Love received a standing ovation from the crowd of several thousand strikers.

Several observers said another factor in Love's success is an excellent personal staff.

"He has the best second-line administration in the state," said an envious University of California chancellor. "He has several people I'd love to get but they won't leave."

Love credits these aides with much of the college's good fortune. "These are very good people," he said in a recent interview. "I just sit back and let them run the place."

Love is fond of listing things "we were told we couldn't do," by statewide administrators or others, but went ahead and did anyway.

"We were told we couldn't give any honorary doctorates," he recalled, so Love arranged for President John F. Kennedy to receive an honorary degree and no one saw fit to dispute the move.

In the same manner, the president said, San Diego educational television station on a state college campus, offered the state's first master's degree outside teaching and started the first faculty senate, among other state college "firsts."

Looking into the future, Love foresees problems if the state continues to grant more generous appropriations to the university system than to the state colleges.

Love served on the committee which helped to bring a UC campus to San Diego but he said: "When your faculty sits here and looks across town at UCSD, in a plant as big as ours, accommodating only 4,000 students when we are accommodating 23,000 or 24,000 . . . when you have that in the same city, not much happiness can be generated."

#### TREND FEARED

Love is also worried about the prospect of more centralized administration in the state college system.

"The most critical problem we could face," the president said, "would be to have the direction of this institution determined by forces outside . . . A healthy institution will have its roots in its own being. It must move in the directions that come out of the minds and the imaginations of its own people."

Love said he sees "no immediate threat" to San Diego State's autonomy from Chancellor Dumke or the trustees but warned that "events on one campus tend to lead to rules for all and this can bring about a tightening of regulations that would be damaging to all."

As for the general problems of California higher education, Love said: "It is very unfortunate that politics is being played with higher education in this state."

#### NEED INDUSTRIES

"Higher education is basic to California's well-being," he said. "It is not peripheral. San Diego, for example, is not a place where the typical eastern industry would survive. We need industries that employ more highly trained people. Higher education is the basis of the economy in this community and in this state."

Love believes current public hostility to higher education is part of a wave of conservatism in the country that will pass.

"Conservative reaction is causing people to use a lot of words against high education," he said, "but I don't think they believe them. I think they know higher education is important. Otherwise, why do they keep sending their kids here in larger numbers all the time?"

#### WASHINGTON STATE LEGISLATURE PETITIONS ON BEHALF OF PRISONERS OF WAR

### HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, evidence received from the nine POW's who have been repatriated by the North Vietnamese indicates that Hanoi is brutally mistreating our servicemen it holds captive.

The suffering and humiliation to which these men are being subjected, and the cruel uncertainty with which Hanoi forces their families to live, demands the vigorous protest of the American people.

Therefore, I wish to include in the RECORD the following memorial passed by the legislature of Washington State, January 30, 1970:

#### HOUSE JOINT MEMORIAL 3

To the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, and to the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress Assembled:

We, your Memorialists, the Senate and House of Representatives of the State of Washington, in legislative session assembled, respectfully represent and petition as follows:

Whereas, Article VI of the United States Constitution specifically states that provisions of treaties ratified by the United States Government become the "supreme law of the land"; and

Whereas, Notwithstanding solemn promises ratified at the international conference at Geneva that all prisoners of war captured would be given the respect of humane treatment; that Article 2 of the convention provides that it "shall apply to all cases of declared war or any other armed conflict which may arise between two or more of the High Contracting parties, even if the state of war is not recognized by one of them"; and

Whereas, The government of North Viet Nam acceded to the convention on June 28, 1957, and the government of South Viet Nam acceded to the convention on November 14, 1953, and the government of the United States acceded to the convention on August 2, 1955; no pretense of compliance has been advanced by North Viet Nam or the National Liberation Front (Viet Cong) despite the reminder to do so on June 11, 1965, by M. Jacques Freymond, Vice President of the International Committee of the Red Cross; and

Whereas, Repeated appeals on the part of wives, parents, relatives, and dependents of those unfortunate victims of Communist violence have proven ineffective through the United States Department of State;

Now, therefore, your Memorialists respectfully pray that the President and Congress of the United States of America do direct the Department of State to undertake a more determined effort to obtain the release of names of prisoners now held; to effect the

immediate release of sick and wounded prisoners; to achieve impartial inspections of prisoner of war facilities; to assure proper treatment of all prisoners; to facilitate the regular flow of mail; and most importantly, to obtain the release and freedom from captivity of those American men of this "undeclared" war with North Viet Nam.

Be it resolved, That there be enacted by the Congress of the United States a code of protective legislation similar to the Uniform Code of Military Justice, Public Law 506, applicable to American personnel captured in military operations other than in a "declared war" to assure that the full force, authority, and power of the United States of America shall henceforth be publicly committed to the attainment of freedom from captivity of all Americans captured in such military actions, past and future.

Be it further resolved, That copies of this Memorial be immediately transmitted to the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States, the President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, the Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and to each member of the Congress from the State of Washington.

#### UNIONIZED TEACHERS SPREAD ANTIBUSINESS IN CLASSROOM

### HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, my attention was recently called to an article in the chamber of commerce's Washington Report of February 23, 1970.

As I believe this article describes quite clearly the dangers of public employee unionism, I insert it in full at this point in the RECORD:

#### UNIONIZED TEACHERS SPREAD ANTIBUSINESS BIAS IN CLASSROOM

Perhaps the most apparent danger in unionization of public employees is the threat of loss of vital services through a strike.

Unionized teachers, however, have introduced a new threat which may prove to be even more harmful to the public interest.

Under the pretense of "instruction in current events," these teachers used "lesson plans," prepared by union officials describing "The ABC's of the GE Strike," to give their students a biased interpretation of the strike.

Behind this effort to indoctrinate the minds of high school youngsters with anti-management propaganda was Albert Shanker, President of New York City's United Federation of Teachers.

A syndicated columnist quoted Shanker as saying:

"Those 100,000 instructors, who teach 150 students a day, will reach millions of youngsters. We have teachers in most big cities. Their students will be motivated. We contributed \$50,000 to the strike fund, but money is not enough."

Maybe money isn't enough, but it seems that taking the battle into the classroom is too much.

As *The New York Times* commented in an editorial Jan. 12:

"The issue is not the right or wrong of either side in the GE dispute. The plain fact is that the union, which represents all the

city's teachers, is guilty of an intolerable conflict of interest.

"Few outsiders studying the U.F.T.'s lesson plan are likely to agree with the union's own declaration that it is 'a fair presentation of the facts.' In the same sentence, the U.F.T. notes its conviction that 'justice is on the side of the workers, not the company.'

"The transparent aim of all the material the U.F.T. has supplied to its members is to turn teachers and pupils against the company.

"The right of the union to actively support the striking workers is, of course, beyond question, as is similar personal action on the part of teachers and school officials whether or not they are union members.

"But it is sheer hypocrisy to pretend that what the U.F.T. is doing in stating this 'teaching unit' is anything other than making propaganda within the classroom . . ."

We question both the right and integrity of the teacher's union in using this tactic.

Moreover, it would seem that the teachers, no doubt inadequately informed about management's side in the dispute, could use a lesson in integrity and abuse of privilege.

Beyond that, it may be well for all of us to rethink the dangers of public employee unionism.

**BELLE SPAFFORD HONORED TODAY**

**HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON**

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, an outstanding Salt Lake City woman, Mrs. Belle S. Spafford, is being given Brigham Young University's "Woman of the Year" award today at ceremonies in Provo, Utah. Mrs. Spafford is being honored for her work as president of the 300,000-member Relief Society, the women's organization of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints; as well as for her leadership as president of the National Council of Women, with a membership of 16 million American women. An article in the February 26 Salt Lake City Deseret News gives some background on Mrs. Spafford, and I include it in the RECORD at this point:

**MRS. SPAFFORD TO RECEIVE HONORS AT Y**

PROVO.—Brigham Young University's "Woman of the Year" honor will be presented to Belle S. Spafford, president of the Relief Society, Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints, and president of the National Council of Women of the United States.

The honor will be given at a devotional assembly March 3 in the George Albert Smith Fieldhouse. She will address the student body at the 10 a.m. meeting and will be presented with a quilt made by members of campus Relief Societies.

Following her address at the devotional assembly, Mrs. Spafford will be honored at a luncheon. Guests at the luncheon will include her two counselors on the Relief Society General Board, members of the administrative council of BYU and presidents of BYU stake Relief Societies.

As Relief Society president, Mrs. Spafford is in charge of women's organizations in all states and in many foreign countries, with a total membership of over 300,000.

Chosen president of the National Council of Women in October of 1968, Mrs. Spafford presides over some 16 million American women in this capacity.

Named by members of the women's activity office of the ASBYU for Woman of the Year honors, Mrs. Spafford believes the basic role of woman is found in the home.

Mrs. Spafford received the BYU Distinguished Service Award in 1951 and an honorary doctor of humanities degree in 1956 from BYU.

A former teacher in Salt Lake City schools, she was at one time grade supervisor, and later special instructor of remedial work at BYU Training School.

After service on stake Relief Society boards, she was called to the General Board of the Relief Society and named editor of the organization's magazine. She was appointed counselor to President Amy Brown Lyman in 1940 and was named president of the organization in 1945. The Relief Society is considered the oldest active women's organization in the United States.

**ENVIRONMENTAL BENEFITS OF THE CALIFORNIA PERIPHERAL CANAL**

**HON. CRAIG HOSMER**

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, Californians have recently been subjected to a barrage of misinformation by opponents of a project designed to solve an environmental problem. This is the peripheral canal, an integral part of the Federal Central Valley project and the California State water project.

The problem which faced the project planners was how to preserve the highly productive Sacramento-San Joaquin delta and permit these two important water development projects to move forward.

Preservation of the fishery and wildlife habitat, maintenance of recreation and meeting the agricultural and industrial water needs of the delta were the planning objectives. The peripheral canal concept was adopted, particularly because of its benefits to the fishery resources.

In response to the misinformation which is being disseminated, Mr. Doyle Boen, president of the California Water Resources Association, addressed the following letter to the Los Angeles Times, which discusses some of these problems:

**CALIFORNIA WATER RESOURCES ASSOCIATION, FEATHER RIVER PROJECT ASSOCIATION,**

Glendale, Calif., January 28, 1970.

The EDITOR,  
Los Angeles Times,  
Los Angeles, Calif.

DEAR SIR: The Times article of January 18, 1970 presented, in great detail, the views of opponents of the Delta Peripheral Canal but omitted a number of important facts which, if known by the general public, would arouse broad support for this indispensable project. A few of these are:

If the Canal is not built, water needed for the State Water Project and the Central Valley Project, must be delivered across the Delta, causing irreparable damage to farming in the Delta and destruction of fish and wildlife by reason of reverse flows, channel scour, levee erosion and other factors. Further, such water withdrawn from the Delta would be contaminated by the salt water tides from the Pacific Ocean as it crossed the Delta, endangering the health of mil-

lions of water users from Greater San Francisco to San Diego.

Evidence, produced after many years of exhaustive studies, is conclusive that the Canal offers the only solution which will provide a Delta water transfer of suitable export water quality, while stabilizing Delta water quality conditions and protecting the Delta fishery resources.

These conclusions are supported not only by fish and wildlife agencies and conservation groups, but by recent reports of both the Assembly and Senate Water Committees, both of which endorsed construction of the Canal, while insisting upon strong Delta protective provisions.

It is entirely false to say, as the Times quoted an opponent, that the Canal would "virtually dry up the fragile and beautiful Delta, destroying its ecological balance, damaging its fish and wildlife and the bordering agricultural lands of the San Joaquin Valley." Some of these things will truly happen if the Canal is not built.

Operational plans for the Canal provide for large releases of water into the inner Delta from outlets along the Canal. Such releases will protect and enhance the fishery and other aquatic life by eliminating flow reversals, provide salinity control through a net downstream flow to repel sea water intrusion, and greatly increase the recreational opportunities in the Delta through new facilities and better access to the waterways.

Our Association and many state and local agencies have endorsed the Peripheral Canal as a boon to the entire state, especially the Delta.

Sincerely yours,

DOYLE F. BOEN,  
President.

**DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA CRIME BILL**

**HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN**

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, WRC-TV, Channel 4, in Washington, aired an editorial on February 9 and 10 which opposed the "no-knock" provision in the District of Columbia crime bill.

To rebut the misinterpretation of this provision by WRC-TV, Mr. Donald Santarelli, Associate Deputy Attorney General for Criminal Justice, prepared a statement of clarification which was broadcast by this station on February 19 and 20. I support this provision and have also made a statement in rebuttal to the WRC editorial.

Since some of our colleagues might share this television station's confusion on this issue, I submit the WRC-TV editorial, Mr. Santarelli's rebuttal, and my statement:

**WRC-TV EDITORIAL, No. 4**

The "no knock" provision passed by the Senate in the D.C. anti-crime bill and also part of a House measure should be eliminated now.

It is a flagrant violation of the right of privacy—of due process and the guarantees of freedom from unreasonable search and seizure.

In simple form, the "no knock" provision permits a law enforcement official to go before a magistrate and obtain an order to allow him to enter a home or establishment by breaking down the door, or in any other fashion without announcing who he is, or his



purpose. The official must show to the magistrate that he has probable reason to believe that evidence inside the establishment may or will be destroyed before it can be seized.

It is all very well to refer to the loathsome narcotics peddler, the gambling boss or the common criminal as "they" and ourselves as "we"—the upright law abiding citizen.

This is a nation of laws—and whatever the law can do to "them", it can do to "us". And whatever diminishes the rights and freedom of "them" also diminishes "us".

This is the issue.

There is one more frightening aspect of the "no knock" proposal. Police officers would enter a home or establishment in precisely the same fashion a criminal would enter—by force or stealth. Under such circumstance, the occupant could react to the point of killing the intruder and be absolved on the basis of justifiable homicide.

That also is too great a price to pay for the dubious result envisioned by this repugnant procedure.

(This editorial was broadcast at various times throughout the day on February 9 and February 10, 1970.)

#### REPLY TO WRC-TV EDITORIAL

The following is a reply to the WRC-TV editorial which opposed the "no-knock" provision of the D.C. anti-crime bill. It was delivered by Donald E. Santarelli, Associate Deputy Attorney General for Criminal Justice, and was broadcast on the facilities of WRC-TV at various times on Thursday, February 19 and Friday, February 20, 1970.

The WRC-TV editorial opposing no-knock in pending D.C. anti-crime legislation, misconstrues the background and purpose of this proposal.

The United States Supreme Court has approved twice in the last few years police entry into homes without knocking for certain purposes as a principle existing since the common law in England. The vast majority of state courts and legislatures have supported no-knock, recognizing the need to prevent destruction of evidence authorized to be seized in a search warrant and to avoid danger to officers in the execution of these warrants. No-knock, therefore, is a long accepted and widespread principle and procedure in the law.

Contrary to the WRC-TV editorial, no-knock does not violate the right to privacy. For invasion of the right to privacy has already been authorized by the court when it issues a warrant to enter and search. No-knock relates only to the method of entry after the entry itself—which is the invasion of privacy—has been sanctioned by the court.

Nor is it fair to equate a police officer's no-knock entry to entry by a criminal. Unlike the criminal, a police officer no-knocks only with a search warrant issued by the court and only when the court has also concluded that no-knock entry is necessary. As a California court recently explained in upholding a no-knock entry because of reasonably anticipated danger, knocking by the officer "could have been the equivalent of an invitation to be shot. Reasonable conduct on the part of a police officer does not require that he extend such an invitation."

#### RESPONSE TO WRC-TV EDITORIAL No. 4

(By LAWRENCE J. HOGAN)

WRC has misconstrued the "no-knock" provision by labeling it a "flagrant violation of the right of privacy." It is no such thing.

Congress is merely clarifying the existing law which already authorizes "no-knock" entries.

The purpose of the proposal is to provide comprehensive statutory language to make it clear when officers must announce before entering and when they need not. Citizens

need this protection and police officers need this clarification.

The legislation now pending before Congress has written into it stringent safeguards to protect innocent citizens. A police officer can only obtain the "no-knock" warrant in certain cases and he must in every case appear before a judicial official and justify why the "no-knock" warrant is necessary. It can only be authorized when the evidence sought would be destroyed, if the life of the officer would be endangered, or if the delay would result in the person's escape.

This statute will not result in a massive infringement of citizens' rights. In 1965, New York passed a law allowing "no-knock" warrants. Of 1800 cases since then, police officers have applied for "no-knock" warrants in only 14 instances and executed only 12 of the 14. The constitutionality of this statute has been upheld by the Courts.

In the last decade we have over-balanced the scales of justice in favor of the criminal. We must now rebalance those scales to give more weight to the rights of the law-abiding segment of society.

#### ILLINOIS OGILVIE—A POLITICAL GIANT

#### HON. WILLIAM L. SPRINGER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie is the subject of an interesting profile by Guy Halverson in the February 27 issue of the Christian Science Monitor.

"A political giant is emerging," writes Mr. Halverson in assessing Governor Ogilvie's first year record and his qualities as a political leader.

Governor Ogilvie's political star is rising in the Midwest and I commend this article to my colleagues:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Feb. 27, 1970]

#### OGILVIE STAR RISES

(By Guy Halverson)

PEORIA, ILL.—A political giant is emerging here on the windswept plains of Illinois, but for all the lack of fuss about it, one might hardly notice.

That giant is Republican first-term Gov. Richard B. Ogilvie, a stolid, soft-spoken pragmatist with little ideological leaning but an admitted excess of political grit. The Governor is almost single-handedly reestablishing the Illinois GOP. He has begun a long-needed modernization of state government, is dragging many of his own party's stalwarts into a more progressive stance, and has even begun an all-out assault on the state Democratic Party structure headed up by Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley.

And in the process, the Governor—who denies any ambitions for higher federal office—is being increasingly touted as one of the Republican Party's most promising political heirs. By 1976, at the end of an expected second term for both President Nixon and Mr. Ogilvie, the Governor will be only 53—an age, political pros point out, of which presidents and vice-presidents are made.

#### CRUCIAL TIME SEEN

For all that, however, 1970 is the crucial year for Mr. Ogilvie and, by necessity, the Illinois GOP.

Despite the state's long tradition of supporting Republican candidates, only one out of every three Illinois voters is considered Republican now.

Yet up for election this year is incumbent Republican Sen. Ralph Tyler Smith, appointed by the Governor last September after the death of Sen. Everett McKinley Dirksen. Mr. Smith faces a formidable challenge from popular Democratic state treasurer Adlai E. Stevenson III as well as a challenge in the March 17 primary from conservative Republican businessman William H. Rentschler.

Also at stake is continued Republican control of the Illinois Legislature. All seats are up.

#### AN OGILVIE SLATE

In the House, Republicans control by only four seats.

In the Senate, Republicans control by only eight seats.

Moreover, the GOP slate is in many respects an Ogilvie slate. Besides Senator Smith, who headed up the Governor's down-state campaign two years ago, the ticket includes Cook County GOP Chairman Ed Kucharski, a close Ogilvie confidant and candidate for state treasurer.

Democratic critics, and some dissident Republicans as well, insist that the Governor is basically a colorless, unimaginative politician who is becoming a "Republican Richard Daley" because of his strong efforts to gain almost monolithic control over the state party structure. The Governor, naturally, denies such charges.

"When I first became Governor, I found that the party had a tendency to drift apart after an election," he told this reporter in a recent car trip between the Peoria airport and a political rally in a nearby community.

#### FUNDS FLOW OUT

"Sure, we're building a strong party base," he says quietly. "Now the party is spending up to \$750,000 a year on the state central committee. We even have a cadre of field men throughout the state."

The Governor vehemently denies charges of being a "Republican Daley." "Dick Daley is a very autocratic person," he says. "The Mayor rarely listens to advisers. He tends to make decisions on his own, with little prior consultation."

Mr. Ogilvie, a strong admirer of California's Ronald Reagan and Ohio Gov. James A. Rhodes, notes that when the decision had to be made to find a successor to Senator Dirksen he consulted a broad range of party chieftains. His state chairman, he says, talked to all members of the central committee. Finally, he personally talked with the three men that he was considering for the post.

"In all, I probably spent eight or nine days thinking over this one decision," he says.

Ogilvie enthusiasts—including scores of independents and younger voters—argue that the Governor's approach to filling the Senate seat typifies his entire approach to managing state government: low-keyed—with success. Initial criticism within the party at the Smith appointment has by and large faded, they say, now that voters are discovering that Mr. Smith is a first rate speaker and political craftsman in his own right.

#### CRITICISM VOICED

Party euphoria aside, however, many political scientists give the Governor a more mixed report card to date. On the plus side, they insist, is legislative enactment of the state's first income tax, establishment of a new budget bureau, creation of a department of local affairs and an Illinois Bureau of Investigations, and establishment of a special highway trust authority which can issue up to \$2 million in bonds.

But on the other side of the ledger is what some critics feel to be an indifferent effort to unify the state's deeply divided black and white communities (the governor has called out the national guard three times in riot situations already), an over-cautiousness in attacking problems of poverty and hunger in major metropolitan areas, and a failure to move vigorously for pollution control.

Indeed, the war on pollution has in great measure been staked out by Attorney General William J. Scott, an old law-school classmate of the Governor's (along with Illinois Republican Sen. Charles H. Percy) and a man regarded in some circles as the leader of a developing "dissident block" within the GOP structure.

Whatever the final verdict on the Ogilvie legislative record, however, the Governor is quickly stepping out like a man on the rise. His schedule is constantly jammed with speaking engagements and rallies, many of them out of state.

A visit to an Ogilvie political dinner quickly identifies the genuine muscle to the Governor's political strength.

This reporter followed Mr. Ogilvie to a Lincoln Day dinner at Canton, about 20 miles from here.

There, some 400 to 450 stalwarts had paid up to \$10 a ticket to fill party coffers for a not overly appetizing roast-beef dinner at the Canton Senior High School. The air was filled with the buzz of political talk. In the background, an organist was playing a rousing rendition of "Battle Hymn of the Republic." American flags adorned each table.

"Support the Endorsed Republican Team," a massive poster proclaimed. Affixed to it was a giant picture of President Lincoln.

UNITY STRESSED

The Governor, a squat, reserved man from suburban Chicago who astounded the pros by winning the office of Cook County sheriff in 1962 and becoming Cook County Board president in 1966, arose from his seat to the applause of his audience with an almost boyish shyness. But when he talked—on patriotism, on the need for taking a dispassionate view of student unrest and the Vietnam war, and most of all, on the need for a united Republican Party in Illinois, the audience was clearly his.

"At first Ogilvie was unpopular down here," one elderly Canton townsman whispered during the speech. "Many of us disliked his income tax. But you know, he's our man now. We like his fight. He wants to make the Republican Party mean something in Illinois. And he's not pushed around by all those folks in Cook County."

"Ogilvie's our man," he said again—a broad grin crossing his face.

In the background—flanked by dozens of American flags—Richard B. Ogilvie was talking to Republican Illinois.

And every eye was riveted upon him.

YEAR OF THE VOTER: THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FOUNDING OF THE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS.

HON. DANIEL E. BUTTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BUTTON. Mr. Speaker, 1970 marks the 50th anniversary of the founding of the League of Women Voters. This year, the league has chosen the "Year of the

Voter" as their theme and have pledged themselves to reaffirm the value of the franchise to the American people. I feel privileged to join in a salute to their goal and to draw the attention of my colleagues to this worthy observance.

The league shares the anniversary of its founding with passage of the 19th amendment in 1920, which granted woman suffrage. Since its inception, the league has been distinguished by its commitment to the guarantees of our democratic process and has worked steadfastly in its role of promoting political responsibility among all citizens. Carrie Chapman Catt, president of the American Woman Suffrage Association and honorary president of the League of Women Voters that followed, aptly described the league's function as "an anomaly." We want political things; we want legislation; we are going to educate for citizenship. In that body we have got to be nonpartisan and all partisan. The league has remained true to its responsibilities for nonpartisan voter education and its record in promoting voter participation is unparalleled. It is my firm belief that participation in the democratic process is the foundation on which all our ideals must rest. To this end, I salute the League of Women Voters and this—the "Year of the Voter."

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION FOR POOR PEOPLE

HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, any meaningful racial integration of this society rests upon the commitment of this Nation to insure equal opportunity to quality education for all people, irrespective of color or affluence. We do not have this kind of commitment today. Instead, we have rhetoric about eliminating poverty without any action on the fronts of social, educational, and economic injustices which perpetuate poverty. Indeed, there is every indication that this Nation will now defer to those who believe equal opportunity is too great a responsibility for this Nation to assume.

Mr. Speaker, the black people of this Nation will not relent in our efforts to attain a reasonable share of the economic, educational, political, and social benefits of American life. Accepting the premise that black people will have due impact on public policy, we will continue to call for change, and we will continue to fight against backsliding on the equal rights legislation which became law during the 1960's.

We are committed to the proposition that our right to education does not terminate at the 12th grade level—that black students—a majority of whom are poor, must be given access to higher education since the college degree is now prerequisite to job opportunity. The poor must not be condemned to the ranks of the unskilled laborers by a public policy

which does not recognize their right to education and to job training. It is the height of injustice to discriminate against people because they are poor, to criticize them for their condition, and at the same time deny them the opportunities to escape poverty and to contribute their talents toward a greater productivity for this Nation.

In testimony before the Special Subcommittee on Education of the House Education and Labor Committee last week, Dr. Herman Branson, president of Central State University, Wilberforce, Ohio, presented us with the case for financing the higher education of poor people. Dr. Branson effectively dispels the notion that this Nation cannot meet the educational needs of the poor. I commend to the attention of my colleagues the following statement by President Branson, who also serves as vice president of the National Association for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education:

FINANCING HIGHER EDUCATION FOR POOR PEOPLE: FACT AND FICTION

"In this twentieth century, the uneducated man is not a man. He does not quite exist. In its deepseated, visceral motivations, the Negro revolt is, in part, a desperate reaction against non-existence."—Eric Sevareid, New York Post, June 17, 1963

INTRODUCTION

Financing higher education for poor people—and for a special sub-group of poor people, blacks—can be discussed with conviction only if we accept the American ideal of equal opportunity as being genuinely sincere. One expression of that ideal, which I like, reads as follows:

"It is clear, however, that the American ideal of equality of opportunity for all depends for its realization on making post-high-school educational opportunity a reality for the culturally and economically disadvantaged, who constitute both the greatest untapped human potential of our society and its greatest problem." (Wolk, p. 103).

Thus in discussing the implications of this position I shall attend to how big a problem it is, how can it be done, and how rapidly can the imbalances be righted. Nary a word will be given to the "ought." I shall not even entertain the slight pessimism of Raymond Aron who wrote,

"The government (U.S.A.) is now more or less committed to a combination of legal measures (universal extension of the right to vote, abolition of the more obvious forms of segregation, integrated schools, etc.) and social measures (slum clearance, better schools, welfare services, etc.) especially tailored to the needs of the Negro minority. These, presumably, will gradually reduce the gap between the progress of the Negro ethnic group and that of other groups. Will the goal of integration then be reached, or at least will the United States come close to reaching it? Let us frankly admit that we do not know."

The goal is attainable; it is consistent not only with our expressed social preferences but is also in our best interests as a nation.

Moreover, it seems advantageous to employ blacks as the representatives of poor people as my focus. Surely if we can solve the problems of how to bring them into higher education in numbers commensurate with their population ratio, the same social techniques can with slight modification be employed for other students from low income families.

HOW MANY

The percentage of blacks in the American population is usually presented as being between 10 and 12%. Wisdom and Shaw use



12% in their projections; using the census estimates of 1967 and the assumption that 90% of the non-white population is black we get a value slightly under 10%. Hence, it seems safe to use 10% in our calculations. Thus, blacks should constitute about 10% of all students enrolled in higher education. From the *U.S. News and World Report* (June 9, 1969) figures we can construct the following table:

Year	Enrollment in colleges	Blacks
1968	6,801,000	680,100
1971	7,820,000	782,000
1974	9,051,000	905,100
1977	10,190,000	1,019,000
1980	11,181,000	1,118,100

The data on the actual enrollment of blacks in colleges and universities as reported by *The Chronicle of Higher Education* (October 13, 1969).

Year	Blacks enrolled	Percentage of age group between 18 and 24 years old
1964	234,000	8 (w. 22)
1968	434,000	15 (w. 27)

The figures in parentheses are for whites during the same year.) These tables indicate that in 1968 there was a deficit of 250,000 blacks in the number who should have been in higher education. These statistics reveal, however, that the number in college almost doubled in the 4 year period, 1964-1969. But before we become too ecstatic over these figures we must keep in mind that the increases have occurred similarly in the first two years and that an inordinately large number of these students will never graduate unless extraordinary attention is given to their needs.

A disconcerting point is that there 434,000 students, constituting 6% of all students in higher education, were much under-represented in the South. John Egerton's study (*State Universities and Black Americans*, page 14) showed that of the 398,249 students in 28 of the best known predominantly white state universities and land-grant colleges of the south only 6,004 were black amounting to only 1.76%. In the professional schools of these same universities among the 91,732 students, there were 1,552 blacks (1.69%). The black students in the southern and border state public institutions are overwhelmingly in the predominantly black state universities and land-grant colleges where the numbers for 1968 are 44,803 undergraduates and 3,576 graduate and professional students. The droll discovery is that the predominantly black public schools as a group are more integrated than the predominantly white having 1,993 white students or 4.4%—contributed overwhelmingly by 5 schools in the border states.

A capsule description on Alabama might illumine the region. The state has a population of about 3.3 million people of whom 30% are black. The university enrolls about 21,000 students, 15,000 full-time and 6,000 part-time. In fall of 1968, 308 of the 15,000 students were black, distributed as follows (However, *The Chronicle's* figures add to only 235):

283 undergraduates (including 108 freshmen).  
21 graduate students.  
4 medical students.  
0 law students.  
0 dentistry students.

Those zeroes are real. Four blacks received undergraduate degrees in 1967-1968. Yet the

drop-out rate for blacks entering in 1967 was almost 33%, only 8% higher than for others. Such distributions as found at the University of Alabama are usual.

Turning to Florida, where there are approximately 6 million people, a sixth of whom are black, Egerton reported:

	Full-time undergraduate students		Graduate and professional	
	Total	Negro	Total	Negro
Florida State University	12,083	131	3,601	43
University of Florida	18,426	80	3,762	11

Looking at the colleges and universities in Florida reported in *The Chronicle* (April 21, 1969) we find that of the 145,353 students in all schools—two year, four year and universities—there were 11,581 Negroes, most of whom in four year colleges were in predominantly black state supported schools. Using the population fraction of 1/6 there should have been 24,000 in all Florida schools—a deficit of about 12,000 Negro students.

An interesting statistic on Florida is reported by Leeson (*Southern Education Report*, pp. 38-39, May 1969) that "Florida has 5,855 Negro residents attending black schools within the state, and 2,139 leave to attend predominantly Negro schools elsewhere in the region. Florida attracts only 728 out-of-state Negroes."

In summary, the national deficit of Negro students was about 250,000 in higher education in 1968 of which Florida shouldered about one-twentieth of the total 12,000 Negro students.

#### WHAT WILL THEY NEED?

"The means are at hand to fulfill the age-old dream: Poverty can be abolished. How long shall we ignore this underdeveloped nation in our midst? How long shall we look the other way while our fellow human beings suffer? How long?"—Michael Harrington, *The Other America* (1962)

The Negro young people who will enter higher education to swell the numbers toward parity are almost certain to be disproportionately from poor families. The U.S. Department of Labor statement "A startling ratio of 6 in 10 of all nonwhite children were in poor families in 1963" plus the realization that the children from higher income Negro families are attending college in high proportions bolster this conclusion. Moreover, the large scale study of Boyer and Baruch (*A.C.E. Research Reports*, 4 (2), 1969) reveals that even now a disproportionate number of Negroes enrolled as college freshmen are from very low income families:

Estimated parental income	Black	Nonblack
Less than 4,000	29.3	4.6
4,000 to 5,999	26.0	9.5
6,000 to 7,999	17.2	15.9
8,000 to 9,999	10.6	18.0
10,000 to 14,999	10.9	28.5
Over	6.2	23.4

Since these are estimates given by the students their reliability may be seriously questioned but they point in the same direction as other data. From them we get some startling insights. Three interesting ones are as follows:

1. Almost a third of the black freshmen are from families earning less than \$4,000 per year.
2. 72.5% of the black freshmen are from families earning less than \$8,000 per year while only 30% of the white freshmen are from such families.
3. According to *Fortune* (December 1969, page 91), 33% of the nonwhite families in

America have annual incomes from \$7,000 to \$15,000, thus this group contributes little more to the college group than their percentage, i.e., about 40% of the freshmen from 33% of the families. This makes me further suspect the Boyer and Baruch data—but they are all we have.

These data must be combined with estimates of what can a family be expected to pay towards the higher education of a child to be useful. For this we have the CEEB table. Using the CEEB table, for a family with two children and *Fortune's* figures that 1/3 of Negro families have incomes of less than \$7,000 per year we see the most affluent numbers of this group would be expected to contribute no more than \$740 per year towards the costs. On the Boyer-Baruch data we see that 72.5% of the black freshmen now would expect to receive no more than \$950 per year. Still these figures might mislead since only the top few could reach this amount.

The table proposed for Florida (Table V, p. 9) reads:

Family income	Expected parental contribution
Below \$5,000	0
\$5,000 to \$6,999	0
\$7,000 to \$9,999	605
\$10,000 to \$15,000	1,380
Above \$15,000	3,000

From this table and the *Fortune* data, we see that 1/3 of black families in America would be expected to contribute nothing to the expenses of higher education of their children. Interestingly this table and the Boyer-Baruch data lead to essentially the same conclusion for the Negro freshmen, that 1/3 of their families would be expected to contribute nothing.

An earlier report of Egerton (*Higher Education for "High Risk Students"*, S.F.F., April, 1968) supports the position that if we go out for significantly more Negro students we must be prepared to support them fully, for he reported that at the University of Wisconsin.

"Admission was offered to 37, and 24 of them enrolled. About \$49,000 in financial aid, including federal grants and loans, fee remissions and grants from the university president's budget was made available."

That is something more than \$2,000 per student.

Hence, it seems honest to conclude that any program which realistically expects to increase significantly the number of Negro students in higher education must plan to meet those costs with no aid from the student's family. The money must come from state, federal, and private sources with a nominal contribution from self-help by the student from summer earnings and working during the school year. For Negro students the most realistic approach might be to emphasize the state and federal sources for his minimum needs.

The analysis in this section has proceeded as though the financial need lies only with the new Negro students, that all is well with those now enrolled. Such is far from the truth. Many schools which enthusiastically recruited Negro students in the last year or so find themselves sorely pressed to support those they have and with little prospect of maintaining the black-white ratio they so eagerly established. This is true of colleges and professional schools including medical schools. Thus, there is an easily documented need for increased aid to these schools.

The plight of the predominantly Negro college and university is especially dire. With rise in costs there is need for much more aid to the students to keep them in school. I

remarked earlier this year that the truly forgotten man in American higher education is the Negro student in the predominantly Negro school. Using my own school as an example, last autumn quarter (1968), 284 students who were in good standing, without warning, left for the Christmas holidays and did not return the winter quarter beginning in January. Our Registrar, Mrs. Frances Hawkins, sent a questionnaire to them which got about 40% response. Nearly 70% of the students stated that they had to drop out for financial reasons.

This year, for example, we must collect about \$4 million from our students while our total financial aid is only \$800,000, about 20% of what our students need. Conservatively, we need now another \$1.8 million per year in student aid for our 2,600 students, that is, aid averaging about \$1,000 per student per year which would enable us to cut our attrition rate drastically and recruit honestly the children from low income families in the state who need and desperately want a chance at college. Since we should double in size in the next four years, too, in relieving the national and state deficit, our student aid package should total \$5 million per year when and if we are to reach 5,000 students with the same characteristics as our present student body.

At first blush to talk of a predominantly Negro state-assisted school having direct and indirect financial aid support of \$1,000 per student reeks of the frivolous. Yet, it is found in some predominantly white state-assisted schools. The University of Iowa in Iowa City comes to mind. With 20,235 students this fall (1969) the school had financial support for its students of \$21.5 million. My breakdown of that amount is as follows:

- \$6.1 million for teaching and research assistants.
- \$7.0 million for other working students.
- \$1.7 million for loan funds.
- \$0.4 million for work-study.
- \$6.3 million for scholarships, fellowships, and other.

I could not determine what part of these monies are supplied by state, federal, and private sources. The important consideration is that a state supported school not in the top of Carter's or other prestigious grouping, has what the predominantly Negro schools should have.

Thus, the pattern is established, but we should consider that even if we made higher education free to these students there remains some responsibility to his low income family. Schultz reminds us that—

"So-called free education is far from free to students and their parents, which in turn implies that many families with low incomes cannot afford to forego the earnings of their children."

Although an important factor and a real one as all of us who have taught know, I shall not include it in my summary of amounts. A later analysis, after some of these proximate goals have been achieved, will be necessary.

In essence, then, I believe that this section indicates that

(1) Any school planning to increase materially its number of Negro students must plan a financial aid packet that will meet the total expenses of all of them—tuition, room, board, books, supplies, pocket money—with no aid for their parents.

(2) The Negro young people from relatively affluent families are already attending college. Thus, predominantly white schools may succeed, then, in enticing some of them away from the predominantly black schools they might normally have attended and these students may require less financial aid. But the need is for schools to recruit the Negro who would not attend any

college unless actively recruited with requisite aid.

(3) For the 250,000 students, referred to on page 5, this means a financial aid package averaging about \$2,000 each or a half billion dollars a year.

(4) For the 434,000 Negroes now in college who, in my estimate, need about another \$1,000 per year in aid to cut their dropping-out and to enable them to live and work with a medium of security and ease.

(5) Thus, the national need to gain parity now is roughly an additional billion dollars a year. To be sure this parity cannot be gained in a year. Still, could it not be projected from the quinquennium 1970-1975? If we keep in mind that by then, the number of blacks in colleges and universities should be about 900,000 rather than the 680,000 we are budgeting for, we see our roughly a billion now growing to a billion and a half with the concomitant inflation.

(6) On page 5 we saw that Florida should carry about 1/20 of this responsibility. Thereupon it would be warning indeed if Florida were planning a combination of state and federal aid to bring 12,000 non-Negroes into higher education as rapidly as possible—but certainly not with all deliberate speed—and to gain parity by 1975. This would require additional expenditures of some \$60 million more per year for this purpose alone. Inasmuch as this amount is far beyond the projected aid needs in the Florida University system as a whole, where the maximum amount is \$48.3 million for 1974-1975, we see that the state alone could not possibly assume this expense. If we think that Florida would be willing to spend 1/3 of the \$48.3 million on Negro students, the Federal contribution to Florida would have to be about \$44 million to aid in the climb toward parity. Observe that had we talked of 2/3 of the students needing aid or such the order of magnitude would be unchanged. What we come upon is that the remedies are costly and will take time.

"What the best and wisest parent wants for his own child that must the community want for all its children. Any other ideal for our schools is narrow and unlovely; acted upon it destroys democracy."—John Dewey, *School and Society*, 1894

#### HOW CAN THE NEED BE MET

"No nation goes bankrupt educating its people."—Confucius

Having waded through these repellant statistics of neglect and inaction, we can be heartened by the seeming fact that states and the Federal government have or easily can enact legislation aimed at making higher education truly available to children from low income families. On the surface I see no reason why imaginative handling of (1) The Educational Opportunity Grants Program, (2) The College Work-Study Program, (3) The Guaranteed Loan Program, cannot achieve what we have described. I favor extending and funding the first two of these students. Moreover, there could be a state program such as the very promising Ohio Instructional Grants Program that could meet a part of the expense. But, all these programs must be operated so that they reach these students.

According to Section 508 of the Higher Education Amendments of 1968 (Public Law 90-575) "on or before December 31, 1969, the President shall submit to the Congress proposals relative to the feasibility of making available a post-secondary education to all young Americans who qualify and seek it." The wording here permits almost anything. But we can be hopeful.

"They, then, who knowingly withhold sustenance from a newborn child, and he dies, are guilty of infanticide. And, by the same reasoning, they who refuse to enlighten the intellect of a rising generation, are guilty of

degrading the human race! They who refuse to train up children in the way they should go, are training up incendiaries and madmen to destroy property and life, and to invade and pollute the sanctuaries of society."—Horace Mann, 1846

Florida has several programs which if extended and made available could supplement Federal programs admirably. The important consideration for the students we are discussing is that

(1) The aid be swiftly attainable, not requiring multiple forms to be filed in sequence, with compatible data.

(2) The aid be adequate to meet all the higher education needs.

(3) The aid preferably not require solvent co-signers or complicated bank arrangements.

#### OTHER NEEDS

The vast majority of Negro students in higher education in the 70's will be from low income families with the social, cultural, and intellectual habits of that group. Higher education in America is by and large middle class and upper middle class. Thus, the Negro who enters with his financial needs met will need a great deal more. Here we enter a thicket. Although some observers expect them to be conditioned by their environment as different social beings, others expect them to be "qualified," meaning that these students should have somehow acquired social and intellectual habits, and especially language habits, characteristic of able middle class youngsters from "good" high schools. The colleges which accept them must be aware of this and stand ready to supply the genuinely supportive environment needed. In Bloom's words

"At late stages in the development of a characteristic, only the most powerful and consistent environments are likely to produce marked changes in the individual."

Unfortunately, there has been too much of the precipitate in programs aimed at this group. Too few have worked at maintaining the forward thrust when the novelty had gone. Enough Negroes come in, too, caught in the frustration-aggression cycle to make headlines and thereby divert attention from the main task as we conceive it here.

"The art of progress is to preserve order amid change and to preserve change amid order."—A. N. Whitehead

#### SOME CAVEATS

Although I talk here of attaining 10% in colleges and universities, I am aware that this is a meager attainment unless the further goal of 10% in all disciplines, divisions, schools, or what have you is not kept consciously in mind. Right now medicine perhaps is making more progress towards that 10% than any other field.

One of the handicaps in aiding the Negro student to maintain a good wholesome view of himself—that acceptable self-image—and to feel as though what he is doing is mature, worthy, and significant—that ego reinforcement—is the persuasive tendency to place him in a separate category with a pejorative title. Thus, he must be in a "remedial program," and he has to be considered "disadvantaged." If you escape these, at least, he must be tagged a "high risk" student. Carried to extreme you encounter those eager to tag him as congenitally inferior resting their opinion upon the pseudoscience of semi-intellectuals—to borrow Aron's phrase.

And finally with this emphasis on getting more Negroes into higher education we must guard against a most serious subversion of that ideal: have the numbers but have no programs geared to aid them in gaining genuinely useful and personal satisfying intellectual, social, and cultural skills, habits of thought and behavior, values and judgments essential for modern society. The evidence is



that some secondary schools have done just that, given up, thrown up the hands, shunting such students into a "general curriculum" where they vegetate, coming out with excessive credits in "choral music," "home-making," and the like. The titles do not convey the emptiness and the triviality. The student is "graduated" from high school poorly prepared for anything.

"If you can look into the seeds of time, and say which grain will grow and which will not."—Macbeth.

#### MURDER IN THE AIR

### HON. JOEL T. BROYHILL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is in protest against the barbarous murder, both in the air and on the ground, of innocent Americans and nationals of other countries by Arab extremists. Their inhuman actions, supported and applauded by the Soviets and their Arab vassals, have only one purpose, the elimination of the little Jewish State of Israel. I also hold responsible France's President Pompidou who by his actions against Israel is giving aid and comfort to the Arab terrorists.

In contrast to these Nations, I point with pride to President Nixon and his administration, which is standing firmly for a balanced policy in the Mideast and designed to insure Israel's balance of power and, thus, to prevent the Arab goal of annihilation of this bulwark of democracy in the Mideast.

I am taking this opportunity to applaud and congratulate the American Bar Association which, jointly with the Israel Bar, is cosponsoring a 3-day conference on the "Legal Aspects of Doing Business in the United States and Israel." This conference will be presented March 30-31 and April 1, 1970, in Tel-Aviv, Israel, to present an intensive analysis of some of the most urgent and pressing developments in the law relating to doing business in the United States and Israel.

The conference is designed to provide meaningful and practical legal information to lawyers and their clients, to American and Israeli business executives and managers, regardless of their place of business, on how to export to, sell in, or manufacture within the United States and Israel. Investors interested in establishing manufacturing plants in the United States or Israel; business concerns desiring to enter into joint ventures with American or Israeli business concerns; and exporters seeking markets in the United States and Israel for their products will benefit by this conference. The Manufacturers' Association of Israel will maintain an information desk at the conference to facilitate personal contacts between registrants and Israeli businessmen.

The conference faculty is composed of a distinguished panel of United States and Israeli attorneys from private, corporate, and government practice.

The American Bar Association's cosponsorship of the conference gives expression to the prevalent American view that Israel has an absolute right to exist, to function fully and to live in peace within safe recognized borders.

I am inserting in the RECORD a news release by the American Bar Association relative to this conference:

#### AMERICAN BAR TO COSPONSOR LAW CONFERENCE WITH ISRAEL BAR IN TEL-AVIV

CHICAGO.—An international conference on the legal aspects of doing business in the United States and Israel will be held in Tel-Aviv March 30, 31 and April 1 under the joint sponsorship of the American Bar Association and the Israel Bar.

In announcing ABA participation in the conference, President Bernard G. Segal said it was part of a continuing effort to foster closer cooperation between the U.S. legal profession and lawyers of other nations.

The conference will be open to any interested U.S. lawyer. It will bring together recognized legal authorities of both countries as speakers, panelists and workshop leaders exploring legal problems and solutions affecting trade and investment between the two nations. Topics will include taxation, import-export regulations, and foreign investments. The sessions will be held at the Hilton hotel in Tel-Aviv, Israel.

The American Bar Association's Section of International and Comparative Law is arranging U.S. participation through a committee under the chairmanship of Charles R. Norberg of Washington, D.C. The ABA Section is headed by David M. Gooder of Oakbrook, Ill.

Program, registration and travel information may be obtained by writing to Foreign Tours, Inc., 500 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10036.

#### REPUBLIC OF ESTONIA

### HON. WILLIAM T. MURPHY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, February 24 marked the 52d anniversary of the declaration of independence of the Republic of Estonia. It is appropriate that on this occasion every year we take time to pay tribute to this country which represents freedom-loving people throughout the world.

Through Soviet military aggression, the Estonian people were deprived of their independence and the country was deprived of its right to self-determination. But during this long period of occupation and oppression, the Estonians have maintained a firm dedication to the ideals of freedom and a deep desire to regain their liberty. The spirit of the Estonians should be an inspiration to us and a reminder of the struggle that other countries are enduring to achieve the freedom that was have possessed and cherished for so long.

On the anniversary of Estonian Independence Day, we wish to convey to the Estonian people our concern for their welfare and our respect for their many years of patient efforts to restore their independence.

#### THE MAN CALLED LINCOLN

### HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, since 1932 the Republicans in my congressional district have held a Lincoln Day celebration in Independence, Kans. One of the highlights is the Lincoln eulogy. This year's eulogy was delivered by Kim Moore, a young Republican from my district and student council president of Southwestern College at Winfield, Kans.

Kim Moore did an outstanding job and I urge my colleagues as well as everyone else to read the excellent eulogy written and delivered by Mr. Moore that follows:

#### THE MAN CALLED LINCOLN

(By Kim Moore)

What a waste of time it would be to recount the life of Abraham Lincoln! For every person who is the least little bit American knows the tales associated with the famous rail-splitter. The volumes of materials covering this man's life fill entire libraries. Yet, with all the stacks of books, it is so easy to overlook the contemporary significance of the Man called Lincoln.

The Man called Lincoln is often largely ignored in the legends. In his place, the predestined President stands. We all know the tale of Lincoln's voyage down the Mississippi where he saw the cruelty of slavery. The unlearned authors are quick to add—that from that moment on he decided to fight that evil and destroy it. Abe Lincoln was not super-human. His decisions were reached by the same grueling processes men in leadership today still employ. So, as we pause in today's celebration of his birth to look at Lincoln, I hope that we as the Republican Party, his posterity, can once again glean from this man's life those principles which made Lincoln the greatest nineteenth-century American.

What would this nineteenth-century giant say to us today? It is very dangerous to put words into Lincoln's mouth and take his ideas out of their context. It is done too frequently. Lincoln himself was very critical of long-winded speakers. He is known to have once commented about a fellow lawyer by saying that he had the talent of putting the smallest ideas into the most words. So with that command, let us consider only three major Lincolnian traits.

Throughout his life, one can trace Lincoln's sincere faith in and love of the young republic. He watched slavery tear America apart and was prepared to help rejoin the sections when his life was taken. The South had originally wanted to go peacefully, but Lincoln commanded that all governmental properties and tax-collecting agencies would be maintained. He could not allow his sacred oath to preserve and protect the Constitution to go unheeded.

Beyond this, Lincoln had a faith in the basic tenets of America's infancy—even though some had been prepared by that Democratic rogue Jefferson. America was the world's proof to Lincoln that there could be a government of, by, and for the people. This experiment had to succeed in spite of divisive slavery. His love for America was not the "America Right or Wrong" breed (we hear so much about today) but a faith in the ultimate strength and righteousness of her course.

His love of country was matched only by his concern for her people. The slavery issue provides an example of this trait. Lincoln

had consistently opposed slavery in its expansion attempts. He had hoped that eventually the institution would die out. Modern historians, who have to have something to do to keep themselves employed, have attempted to revise Lincoln's reasons for signing the Emancipation Proclamation. They now believe them to be the sterile ideas of military and diplomatic advantages. However, the fact remains that Lincoln saw the human suffering slavery produced and was mentally and emotionally prepared to start its death knell.

The fight to end slavery resulted in much bloodshed. Lincoln always seemed to grasp the suffering of all. We are all familiar with pictures of him bent over the casualty lists with his enormous head sadly resting in his hands. Often, he wrote personal letters of condolences. He expressed his own anguish to Mrs. Lydia Bixby of Boston who had lost five sons in this war.

"I feel how weak and fruitless must be any words of mine which should attempt to beguile you from the grief of a loss so overwhelming. But I cannot refrain from tendering to you the consolation that may be found in the thanks of the Republic they died to save. I . . . leave you only the cherished memory of the loved and lost, and the solemn pride that must be yours to have laid so costly a sacrifice upon the altar of Freedom."

While others lost their faith in everything, Lincoln retained his faith in his fellow man. He even maintained that famous dry wit. At the end of the conflict, once Mrs. Lincoln excitedly told her husband that she hoped Jefferson Davis would not escape the law. "He must be hanged!" she exclaimed. Lincoln dryly replied, "Judge not, that ye be not judged."

His two traits of love of country and love of humanity are overshadowed by that very old-fashioned idea of the American dream which Lincoln so magnificently represents. We hear a great deal about the generation gap; yet, in reality, all generations come together in their desire to achieve beyond what the last one achieves. It may be easy to question the direction of this achievement, but it cannot be doubted. Lincoln was part of this American achievement process. From poverty to prosperity, from obscurity to prominence, and yes, (I must include) from log cabin to White House, he moved—this strange man Lincoln.

At that time, it could not have happened anywhere else in the world. Only in America was such opportunity. There was nothing in Lincoln's early life to indicate that he had such a destiny. If he had lost a certain wrestling match at New Salem or perhaps if he had not grown that famous beard when requested to do so by an impressionable girl, his story might be quite different. But the "ifs" would change any man's story. Lincoln carved out his own destiny. Some cynics claim that events produce the men. Other believers in humanity feel that man has some control over his events. Whichever view we take, we must surely admit that Lincoln was the man for the challenge of his era.

This is the man Lincoln—the lover of America, the humanitarian statesman, and the representative of the American dream. Like Joan of Arc of France, like King Arthur of England, Lincoln the man soon became Lincoln the legend. More than the historical events of his life, he came to stand as the representation of the word "American." Every generation grasps at his story for it moves something deep within the human conscience.

His party remains today as the only viable alternative to the unmentionables. As the party of Lincoln, we look back for guidance. Lincoln was idealistic, we realize, but he was also so realistic. In a very different situation,

he gave these words which remain a call to all Americans:

"Our Republican robe is soiled and trailed in the dust. Let us repurify it . . . Let us readopt the Declaration of Independence, and with it the practices and policies which harmonize with it. Let North and South—let all Americans—let all lovers of liberty everywhere join in the great and good work. If we do this, we shall not only have saved the Union, but we shall have so saved it as to make and to keep it forever worthy of saving. We shall have so saved it that the succeeding millions of free, happy people the world over, shall rise up and call us blessed to the latest generations."

Certainly, no political party has had a stronger founding father. Every year we look back and in doing so we look far ahead. For the wisdom of Lincoln is enduring. The story is always the same whether told in oratory, eulogy, caricatures, or impersonation. Yet, we attach no triteness to its re-telling. The principles of Lincoln—his love of country, his belief in humanity, and his will to succeed as a free individual in a free land—remain the beliefs of America's real leaders. Should America endure 1000 years, 100 years, or only until tomorrow, we could do no wrong to continue to follow in the footsteps of the Man called Lincoln.

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

HON. CARLETON J. KING

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary conducts a Voice of Democracy Contest. This year over 400,000 school students participated in the contest competing for the five scholarships which are awarded as the top prize. The winning contestant from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., for final judging as guest of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

The winning speech from the State of New York this year was delivered by Miss Kathleen Maclutsky, the daughter of Mr. and Mrs. John S. Maclutsky of Rensselaer, N.Y., constituents of the 30th Congressional District.

Because I feel Miss Maclutsky's speech entitled "Freedom's Challenge" deserves the attention of my colleagues, I would like to include her speech in the Extensions of Remarks of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. We in New York are proud of this young lady's accomplishment and wish to extend to her our heartiest congratulations on writing a truly outstanding speech.

Miss Maclutsky's comments are as follows:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

Freedom: where does one begin the explanation of so cherished an ideal? A definition or a few stereotyped examples would only serve as a brief preliminary to an ever-present, ever-changing, yet ever-meaningful concept.

As nations have grown and prospered, they have striven for many things: intangible as well as tangible. Foremost of these intangibles was liberty: for the people as individuals, for the nation as a whole. Yet this is precisely where a challenge begins.

As recently as the preceding decade, there have been nations severing their last attachment to a motherland. Many people undoubtedly believed these countries had finally achieved a long desired goal. But was this new independence true freedom? To the state, perhaps, yes. The population, however, was awarded what is best described as limited freedom. True, now they were no longer under the influence of another. A new government of their own making would direct them. Yet the laws of this new government can insure liberty to a certain point. It is inevitable that some laws would displease some portion of the ruled. It all amounts to what is generally known and accepted: freedom is only relative.

It is not in a derogatory sense that freedom is said to be only relative. Quite the contrary. It is its relativity that makes it such a challenge. We are fortunate enough to have been handed down a system of government "of the people, for the people, and by the people." However, such a system was a long and continuous struggle. Individuals and groups have been ignored, abused, deprived, and even suppressed to further the growth of our nation. But the struggle is far from over. Today, sections of the country are racked by some of the injustices still prevalent. Peace and tranquility, two obvious indications of absolute freedom, remain quite elusive.

A democracy has never been a true democracy. The ideas embodying such an institution, no matter how seemingly uncomplicated and realistic they may appear, eventually prove to be idealistic. Yet it is the idealism that is so essential. What we try to practice is the complete equality of all people among themselves and before the government. But deviations have occurred and such setbacks must be eliminated. Nations must not permit any form of ruling to exist that hasn't the acceptance of all. Idealism must prevail.

We, as responsible human beings, must not allow freedom to remain so strongly relative. To reconcile differences, obtain suitable compromises, and practice the love of freedom and self, which we all possess, are basic and, possibly the only solutions, essential to enhancing freedom. But this task can not be easily undertaken. Nor will an endeavor of such commanding significance be reckoned with lightly. Support and opposition will be met and it is an utmost necessity they be met properly. This will lie in part in the utilization of a bounteous education. Precedents, both worthless and worthwhile, have been set. Use them! Opinions are constantly being voiced. Use them! Ideas will never cease to arise. Use them! In short, use every God- and man-given right so that one day it may be correctly said that there is a government "of the people, for the people, and by the people."

ONE FOR THE FEDERAL SYSTEM

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, those of us honored to be in Congress devote much of our time and energy in attempting to contend with the many gripes against big Government.

It comes as a refreshing surprise when, once in a great while, there comes in the mail a letter in which a constituent advises us that the Government did a good job for him and he wants us to know about it.



I am pleased to share with my colleagues such a grateful letter from Robert W. Schaefer, village manager of New Brighton, Minn.:

VILLAGE OF NEW BRIGHTON, MINN.,  
February 26, 1970.

Representative JOSEPH KARTH,  
Rayburn House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE KARTH: In 1967 you were very gracious in giving of your time to assist us in application for federal assistance for a comprehensive Village park plan. The Village received some \$156,000 of HUD monies. Subsequently, HUD monies became unavailable and we then turned to LAWCON. It was at that point that we neglected to keep in contact with you as to our progress. Since we had made that commitment, we would now like to bring you up to date.

In 1969, we made application for LAWCON monies for the Long Lake park site. (This, you may recall, was the one site that we personally walked). The 1969 application was approved in the amount of approximately \$50,000.

In 1970, we made another application under LAWCON for participation in the acquisition of the balance of the site. We were verbally informed that this application has been approved and we shall receive another \$75,000.

We wish, once again, to express our thanks for your assistance. Should you be interested in any additional information, feel free to contact us and we shall attempt to provide you with it.

We frequently hear comments regarding the bureaucratic red tape associated with federal funding programs. Naturally, it would not be appropriate to say that everything flows as smoothly as we would like it. On the other hand, we must confess that in recognition of the size of federal programs, the intent to treat all equitably and to be accountable to the elected officials, we feel that because we exercised strict discipline of the requirements placed upon us by federal regulations we encounter the minimum of problems.

You probably are thinking to yourself that this is evident, since you did not receive a letter from us complaining about snags and other difficulties. We do believe that all public officials also like to be informed when groups or individuals are satisfied with the method employed by federal agencies.

Very truly yours,

ROBERT W. SCHAEFER,  
Village Manager.

#### THE FEBRUARY REVOLT: ITS SIGNIFICANCE

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI  
OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a very effective commentary dealing specifically with the anniversary of the 1921 revolt of the Armenian people against Soviet-Russian oppression appeared in the Thursday, February 19 edition of the Armenian Weekly of Boston. The editorial, however, very effectively relates to Soviet-Russian suppression of Czechoslovakia and Hungary and thus, the historical reference to the Armenian revolt assumes present day significance.

The editorial referred to follows:

#### THE FEBRUARY REVOLT: ITS SIGNIFICANCE

It is a significant commentary on the state of general incognition on the matter of Armenian affairs that the world remains almost supinely uninformed on the issue of a major uprising against the Soviet which remains the first and only successful revolt against a constituted Soviet Russian regime in history—the Armenian Revolt of February 18, 1921.

The curious fact that the Armenian Revolt, which expelled from a "republic" of the Soviet Union a Kremlin-selected government, remains hardly a memory among the peoples of the West was graphically displayed in Western commentaries of the stirring events of the latter day revolts of the peoples of Hungary and Czechoslovakia against native Communist regimes of a satellite character.

Western sources struck no parallels with the pioneer Armenian event; and neither was it pointed out that while the Hungarian and Czech attempts to free those nations of the remote control of Moscow failed, the revolt in Armenia, a truly people's effort in a nation annexed to the Soviet State, succeeded. The fact that that success was short lived takes nothing away from its position in history as the first and only successful uprising against the Soviet in history.

The real significance of the revolts in Hungary and Czechoslovakia in relation to the earlier, forgotten event in Armenia is that the ruthless Soviet reaction to the autonomy movements in those European satellite nations was conditioned precisely by the memory of the Soviets still bore of the Armenian Revolt.

A glimmer of understanding of why the Soviet so massively military reacted to Hungary and Czechoslovakia has of late, at long last, permeated Western diplomatic thinking. Certainly, these sources argue, the Soviet need not have moved its heaviest iron into these two satellite states out of any fear either of the military of those two nations, which is dependent on Soviet logistical support, or of intervention from the West, careful indeed as it is to avoid a direct confrontation with the Soviet.

Why then did the Soviet react so hysterically?

While suppressing the rebellious spirits of satellited Europe, the Soviet designed its intervention to drive home to the peoples of the federated, annexed non-Russian "republics" that any attempts to emulate the examples of Czechoslovakia or Hungary would be as vigorously dealt with as in the latter two instances.

In its response to the Hungarians and the Czechs, the Soviet simply told the peoples of the imperium, especially the nations of Soviet Russia proper, that it had better not try another Armenia in this day and age.

In forgetting the event of February 18, 1921, the world has forgotten its significance—and this is what bothers us. For the Armenian Revolt struck a note that is mounting in its intensity as time goes on. It was the Armenian who let Moscow know earliest in the latter's career of imperialistic adventure that free peoples are not ready, and will never be ready, to accept Soviet or foreign occupation as a permanent presence, that the spirit of freedom is deathless, that colonialism after all is a passe phenomenon among mankind, that tyranny and empire is never everlasting, that the day of universal liberation as the catalyst of true peace is ahead—the day when all nations, large or small, in every continent of the sphere, will be able to live in self-sovereignty—and brotherhood.

There is a tendency to regard the Soviet Union as an immutable, indestructible political entity. When the faint-hearted regard the colossus of Russia and the comparatively minor strengths of the various nations which

today the Soviet Russians occupy, the impulse is to feel that the parable of David and Goliath is a poor one.

#### WATER RESOURCES RESEARCH INSTITUTES

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing legislation today to amend section 100 of the Water Resources Act of 1964 to increase the authorization for allotment grants to water resources research institutes at State universities from \$100,000 per year to \$250,000 per year. This bill, which is a companion measure to H.R. 15957, introduced earlier this year by my colleagues, Mr. ROBISON, of New York, and Mr. SAYLOR, of Pennsylvania, recognizes that the cost of conducting research has risen appreciably since 1964. It recognizes also that water resources research programs at the water resources research institutes have matured to a degree where they are now able to attack major problems of their regions.

The proposal is modest both in cost and nature, in view of the overall dimensions of the environmental challenge we face. As the following letter from Dr. John Lederle, president of the University of Massachusetts, indicates, however, the proposed legislation can, nevertheless, prove to be of considerable significance in the fight against water pollution. I am pleased to be able to include his comments on this legislation for the attention of my colleagues:

UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS,  
Amherst, Mass., February 23, 1970.

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mr. MORSE: HR-15957, a Bill to amend the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 just introduced by Representatives Robison of New York and Saylor of Pennsylvania, is of considerable interest to the University and to the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. This Bill would amend Section 100 of the Water Resources Research Act of 1964 to increase the authorization for allotment grants to Water Resources Research Institutes at State Universities from \$100,000 per year to \$250,000 per year. I urge that you introduce or co-sponsor similar legislation. I am writing to the entire Massachusetts delegation for this purpose.

HR-15957 recognizes that the cost of conducting research has risen appreciably since 1964. It recognizes also that water resources research programs at the Water Resources Research Institutes have matured to a degree where they are now able to attack major problems of their regions.

The current authorization of \$100,000 has enabled this University's Water Resources Research Center to undertake research on 28 projects since 1965—the year the Center was established. These projects have been directed to the following problems of Massachusetts: water based recreation, ecology, watershed management and water capture, groundwater contamination, water use for agriculture, stream sediment transport, eutrophication of lakes, pesticide control, treatment of animal waste, thermal pollution,

groundwater storage, community attitudes on water resource development, population predictions for water resource planning, and estuarial studies.

Specialists in 12 disciplines have participated or currently are participating in this research. A total of 100 students, including 66 working for graduate degrees in water related disciplines, have been given an opportunity to undertake research in the Center. Most are making their careers in the water resources fields. In addition, cooperative research has been supported at Clark University, Springfield College, Northeastern University, and Smith College. This program of cooperative research will be expanded to the extent that our funds permit. In short, a solid core of water resources research specialists has been created through these research projects.

The University, working cooperatively with other universities of the Commonwealth, is now in a position to conduct research and field studies on significant regional problems which, unless solved, will retard the full use of our water resources. But to undertake this expanded program of research, education, and public service will require substantially more funds than the current allotment grant provides. HR-15957 recognizes this need and responds to it.

I hope you will be able to support this legislation. In particular, I urge again that you introduce or co-sponsor similar legislation.

Sincerely,

JOHN W. LEDERLE,  
President.

LOST INDEPENDENCE

HON. ALPHONZO BELL

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BELL of California. Mr. Speaker, last month Lithuanian Americans celebrated an anniversary, but it was not a celebration of joy. February 16 was the 52d anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence. My con- the 52d anniversary of Lithuania's American Community of the U.S.A., Santa Monica-West Los Angeles Division, sent me a copy of an editorial from the Tidings, a Los Angeles Catholic weekly. I found the editorial to be a most appropriate commentary on this brave and hopeful people and I would like to commend it to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

LOST INDEPENDENCE

During this month, Lithuanian Americans are commemorating the 52nd anniversary of Lithuania's Declaration of Independence, which took place on February 16, 1918. But the celebration has not been similar to our celebration of the Fourth of July. It has contained no note of joy, no jubilant tone of achievement and victory.

On the contrary, the observance has been somber, sorrowful, underlined with the grim accent of defeat and tragedy. For Lithuania has lost its independence, and today survives only as a captive nation behind the Iron Curtain. It is listed among the 22 nations which have been deprived of national independence and subjugated through direct and indirect aggression of Communist Russia.

The Lithuanians are a proud people who

have lived peacefully on the shores of the Baltic from time immemorial. Their language is the oldest in Europe today. They were united into a State in the year 1251, and by the 15th century their nation extended from the Baltic to the Black Sea and almost to the gates of Moscow. Their fortunes gradually declined and the nation was completely taken over by Russia in 1796.

The next century was a period of struggle and national revival, and Lithuania won back her independence in 1918. Her sovereignty and independence were recognized by the Soviet Union in a peace treaty signed in 1920, and confirmed by other treaties in 1926 and 1939. But in 1939 the Soviet Union signed secret agreements with Germany and gave Hitler the release he needed to begin World War II. In violation of its solemn treaties, the Soviet Union forcibly occupied Lithuania in 1940.

During the mass deportations between 1941 and 1950, more than 300,000 Lithuanians were swallowed up in Siberian slave labor camps. About 75,000 others were able to escape to the West, and about 30,000 Lithuanian freedom fighters were killed in guerrilla warfare resisting the Soviet occupation. Thereafter, the history of Lithuania follows a familiar pattern of repression and tyranny.

Lithuania in 1940 was 85 per cent Catholic, with Jewish, Protestant and Orthodox minorities. There were 12 bishops, 1640 priests. Today there are only two active bishops left, and 850 priests, most of them old and infirm. In 1940, Catholic organizations counted 800,000 members. There were 32 religious publications, with a combined circulation of seven million copies. Convents and monasteries, engaged in education and hospital work, numbered 118. Today, there are no Catholic organizations, religious publications, monasteries or convents.

The Cathedral Church of the city of Vilna has been converted into an art gallery. St. Casimir's Church in the same city is now used as a museum of atheism. Resurrection Church in Kaunas has been made into a radio factory. Students are punished for attending church services. The few priests are forbidden to teach religion; any lay person presuming to instruct children in Christian Doctrine is liable to a sentence in Siberia for 10 to 25 years.

Lithuania does not celebrate its independence anniversary joyfully. But does celebrate it with hope. For Communist pressure has not succeeded in destroying Lithuania's religious faith and love of freedom. There is a strength of the spirit contained in a commitment to justice, an allegiance to principle, a dependence on God's grace. As long as Lithuania retains that, and the free world supports it, there is hope.

NEWSLETTER

HON. FLETCHER THOMPSON

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. THOMPSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I insert the attached copy of my most recent newsletter in the RECORD in order that it may be available to all the Members who receive the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and are not on my mailing list:

NEWSLETTER

DON'T DIVIDE AMERICA

DEAR FRIEND: It's wrong to legally artificially divide Americans based on race, creed

or color. When the courts required precise mathematical racial balance of teachers in Atlanta, they were wrong. The protests not only from Atlanta but from throughout the entire South because of court-ordered mathematical racial balance among faculties and students seem for the first time in recent years to have made the courts realize that they, too, can be wrong. Recent events point this out.

PUBLIC OUTCRY

Of the thousands of responses to the "Freedom From Force" Bill which I drafted, 98% are in favor. I have shown these to House Minority Leader and discussed them with the President. His concern was shown by the fact that he issued a statement strongly supporting the neighborhood school concept, opposing bussing to achieve racial balance and said "The primary objective must always be the preservation of a quality education for the school children of America." Thanks for your help in sending in the replies. It had an effect.

TURNING THE TIDE

Some said it couldn't be done, but because of the public outcry even the courts are beginning to put education above racial balance. In my opinion, were it not for your protests, the courts would have forced racial balance on Atlanta schools. Now, through continuing public expressions of concern, not only the President has spoken out against bussing but a similar statement has come from the Secretary of HEW. A liberal Northern Senator has called for nation-wide desegregation efforts and stated many Northerners are hypocritical on the race issue. Very important is the newest Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals decision stating that the neighborhood school system is not illegal when pupils are assigned to the schools nearest their homes without exception. A child has a right to attend his nearest school. Progress is taking place but all has not been done yet that can be done to bring reason back into public education. Gerrymandering of school districts to achieve racial balance is still being tried. It can be stopped if you continue to speak out.

90.7 PERCENT

Each year, the record of Congressmen's voting and attendance is calculated. The Georgia delegation as a whole last year averaged 81%. For all members of Congress nationwide, the average was 86%. Naturally, it was good to learn that my record was 90.7% . . . 4.7% higher than the average of all Congressmen nation-wide. This is the third consecutive year my attendance and voting has exceeded 90%.

ALLIGATORS OR PEOPLE

Who has the greater rights? When construction of a jetport west of Miami in the Florida Everglades was underway, conservationists said this bothered the alligators and other wildlife in the swamp. Such pressure was brought by the public that the airport was halted so that the Everglades would be free of jet noises. If airports can be stopped for alligators, why not for people? The people of North Fulton County want to maintain the beautiful residential character of their area. Even though a massive airport may mean increased property values because of the additional activity, they want to keep the residential nature of their area. Apparently, most people in Henry County want the airport, therefore, the wishes of the people in North Fulton should be considered.

YOUR RIGHT TO KNOW

At the request of some people in the North Fulton area, I asked that all persons in a decision-making position regarding the location of the new airport—whether they be



governmental or airline—make a public disclosure of any land or options they or corporations in which they have an interest located in the areas under consideration for a new airport. I own no such land or options nor do I have any interest in any corporation having any such interest and the public has a right to know if others do if they are in a decision-making position.

High interest rates are preventing people from buying homes, slowing down the sales of new automobiles and other consumer goods. The trend has been more than a year in developing. Last year the Democratic controlled Congress approved increasing interest rates for student loans of up to 10%, as well as removing the current interest ceiling then on FHA and VA loans. Though I favor student, FHA and VA loans, I am unalterably opposed to granting every increase asked for. The Congressional leaders leading debate argued we had to have the increases or no money would be made available. This I do not believe! I voted against the interest rate increases in both instances, being one of only 43 Congressmen on FH and VA loans and one of only 10 on student loans. Somebody has to stand up and say, "We've had enough!" of high interest rates.

#### PAYING FOR THE NEWSLETTER

Last year we put out only four issues of this report to you primarily because there was not enough money for more. I paid out of my own pocket \$900 and the balance was contributed. This year, I have had a man and his wife whom I have never met but who said they have been closely following my service in the Congress, send me \$6,000, enough for five issues of the newsletter. I am indeed grateful because this will help me to stay in contact with you. They believe it is in the interest of the country that there be direct communication between you and myself. They asked no favors . . . I am not using this money personally or in my campaign, but I still feel you have a right to know about this.

#### MORE ON FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

Being one who helped lead the fight for financial disclosure by all members of Congress, I am now proposing that all members of the press covering the Congress and White House be required to make the same disclosure as Congressmen. The reason is simply that a columnist or newsman could use his column to influence legislation in which he has a financial interest . . . either by attacking Congressmen opposed to legislation or pressuring others to back it. Though few newsmen would misuse their position, if one does and you know of his financial involvement, you can draw your own conclusions.

#### ABILITY COUNTS

One of the first things I did as your Congressman was to place appointments to West Point, Annapolis and the Air Force Academy on ability and not politics. Last year, because of his ability, we were able to place Michael Gaines in West Point. He is the first black high school graduate from Georgia during the 20th Century to go there. This year, selected in open competition, is Lonnie A. Robinson, a black high school graduate who is included among seven principal appointees to the academies. Three others, because of superior scholastic records, were named as alternate candidates to West Point and the Air Force Academy, along with 18 white alternates. As long as I am serving the people, appointments will be competitive regardless of race, creed or color.

It is a high honor for me to serve you in Congress.

Yours very truly,

FLETCHER THOMPSON,  
Member of Congress.

## AMERICAN NEGRO MAKES PROGRESS DESPITE SOME U.S. RACIAL POLARIZATION

HON. JOSEPH E. KARTH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. KARTH. Mr. Speaker, Cecil E. Newman who is a distinguished editor and publisher in the Twin Cities has put into perspective the recent progress which has been made in American Negro-white relations. This analysis of success and failure deserves a wider audience because so often in these days the strident voices of the extremists on both sides distract us from the quiet, thoughtful counsels of such astute men as Cecil E. Newman. I am pleased to include in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD Mr. Newman's editorial in the St. Paul Recorder of Thursday, February 26, 1970:

#### AMERICAN NEGRO MAKES PROGRESS DESPITE SOME U.S. RACIAL POLARIZATION

(By Cecil E. Newman)

That the American Negro has continued to make substantial progress during the past year, despite increasing polarization between American blacks, and whites, is a credit to those of both races—who are determined that all Americans become free people, without restrictions based on color, creed, religion or national origin.

With a large percentage of American whites for years traditionally committed to the segregation which has produced a racist society—America now faces an increasing number of blacks who now advocate a reverse segregation of the races which would reverse the longtime trend which hopefully would have brought the end of American race segregation.

The decision of some of the blacks to reject integration and accept segregation as a way of life grows generally from a hopelessness in some quarters of the achievement of the American Dream—which extends to all citizens, freedom of opportunity, and justice.

Those who oppose this instrument of polarization in the national Negro community point out that America's racial unrest and turmoil results from over 100 years of segregation with the fruits of disenfranchisement, oppression, unemployment, poor education, poor housing and their attendant evils.

More than this, opponents of the separatist movement among American blacks feel that no nation has successfully existed for long with society tightly divided along ethnic lines with both groups enjoying equality of opportunity.

With an overwhelming majority of the American Negro population still hoping and working for their rightful place in the Mainstream of American life, and still believing it will come as sure as night comes after day—there are many who ironically enough sympathize with the separatists, feeling, perhaps that the anti-segregation, integration approach has not brought as many results as rapidly as it should.

With this debate going on in the Negro community as well as the majority community progress stimulated by the urgency of the United States most urgent domestic problem—Negro-white relations—continues to be the order of the day despite the counter diversion of the separatists white and black.

The Establishment, so-called, the corporate structure of American business and industry

has begun to play an active and helpful role in finding the answer to the race problem, that it in a real sense was responsible for, in that its powerful influence on American economy was never used until the 1960's to change policies in government, and society which were diametrically opposed to the nation's Constitution and Bill of Rights.

The threat to the security of the country, the threat of rebellion from the poor and the blacks has caused America's prosperous and influential business and industry corporations to reevaluate their role in present social problems which face the nation as a whole.

This new awareness has been evidenced in most of the leading U.S. firms as demonstrated by the establishment of the Urban Coalition and the National Business Alliance, supported financially, and by the manpower and brainpower of business and industry.

Men who have spent their successful careers in building business and industry now devote some of their time in trying to close the gap between blacks and whites, the poor, and the middle and upper economic classes of our "classless" society, the disillusioned young, the product of the after World War II permissive society, and the "older" people past the age 30.

Progress will continue to be made because the powerful business and industrial complex of this nation is not about to allow the years of work and planning which gave this nation its high standard of living, and profits—go down the drain because there are those who want to "turn the clock back" by maintaining an insuperable status quo in race relations, and the other related fields that have caused today's tensions on the American scene.

It is hoped of course that this awareness and activity of an influential segment of our population with the resulting organized movements to meet the crisis will be successful with the assistance and cooperation of other important elements in American life, the organized labor movement, the churches, and the political parties.

There are many who realize in this regard that "it is later than you think." The American Negro, particularly the parents are more aware of the truth of this cliché than many others in our society.

Many other blacks than ever before, are taking advantage of the flexibility of new opportunities provided by a greater interest on all sides of their advance towards a fuller participation in community life at all levels. They are taking advantage of the special programs, the new instruments for better community living, the attack on the ghetto concentration, and help to Negro business enterprises. Another important trend is the disposition of the sources of communication to show the normal life of the American Negro and more than that the historic contributions he has made to American society, contributions which were hid by omission for almost a century by the chief communication sources, the news media, the text book publishers, the educators and the historians who generally ignored the presence of and the real worth of one-tenth the U.S. population, the American Negroes or blacks.

Today, not a 24 hour period passes without some public announcement of America Negro advance from an individual promotion by some corporation to the signing of a pact with a plumber's union to train Negroes to become pipe fitting journeymen.

There remains hardly a field of American endeavor today that there is not a growing representation of black Americans except possibly in a sport like hockey, which sooner or later like all other areas of American life will represent the multiracial society which is hidden strength and unappreciated asset of the United States of America.

As one reads this special edition, and the

press as a whole today and tomorrow, the signs that the American of color is continuing his advance even while his forward steps are hindered somewhat by racial polarization, an evil which if continued will compound the problems which many people of good will, and understanding are attempting to face up to, as the nation grapples to bring its racial house in order.

**SPEECH OF MR. JACK P. NIX AT THE GEORGIA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION 18TH CONFERENCE, ATLANTA, GA.**

**HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, on February 5, 1970, Mr. Jack P. Nix, superintendent of schools for the State of Georgia, delivered the following address at the Georgia School Boards Association 18th conference in Atlanta. His speech gives us a clear understanding of the background and present problems involved with the integration of our public schools. I agree with Mr. Nix that the people of Georgia will meet these problems and continue to preserve, improve, and expand public education in our State. Mr. Nix's address deserves full consideration and widespread distribution. Therefore, I include Mr. Nix's speech in the RECORD:

REMARKS BY JACK P. NIX, STATE SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS, DELIVERED FEBRUARY 5, 1970, IN ATLANTA, TO THE GEORGIA SCHOOL BOARDS ASSOCIATION 18TH CONFERENCE

The pressures and problems facing public education today and tomorrow will most certainly challenge the very best in all of us. But I have confidence that Georgia's citizens will face these pressures and problems squarely and will continue to preserve, improve and expand public education in this state. You have this responsibility as a public school official. How you carry out your responsibilities will determine to a great extent whether or not educational opportunities continue to exist for the people of your system.

We have suffered from lack of funds to do an adequate job in education—not enough for teacher salaries, instructional materials, innovative programs or well-equipped buildings. Even with these deficiencies we have made progress in Georgia; however, the bringing about of a unified school system is the most pressing problem we face today.

Implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 has already brought about a great deal of change in the traditional ways of living in the South. But I believe the South and the Southern people are equal to this challenge—that we can survive and even thrive on change. This has been true in the past as we have fulfilled our responsibilities in rebuilding the economy following the Civil War, and I am confident it will always be true.

Allow me to review with you events which have brought us to this point in time for you to more readily understand the pressures before us in implementing the Civil Rights Act in the public schools of Georgia.

But before I review, let me explode one prevalent myth at the outset.

Many people seem to believe that the Congress can change court rulings relating to an interpretation of the U.S. Constitu-

tion. This is not true. Under our governmental structure, a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court relating to a constitutional provision cannot be changed directly by the Congress. The Congress can pass a resolution which would provide the people with opportunity to vote on amendments to the Constitution, but the Congress itself cannot nullify a decision of the U.S. Supreme Court relating to the Constitution.

The only other procedure for changing existing court decisions relating to an interpretation of the Constitution is for the U.S. Supreme Court to reverse itself in a subsequent decision.

In 1954, the United States Supreme Court rules "separate but equal schools" unconstitutional.

The Supreme Court said, "... in the field of public education the doctrine of 'separate but equal' has no place. Separate educational facilities are inherently unequal."

During the next 10 years, 1954 to 1964, many states and their state and local officials spent considerable time and effort in searching for ways to modify this ruling. One school system in Virginia went to the ultimate extreme and closed its public schools. This action was challenged and ultimately the federal courts ordered these Virginia schools reopened and required the citizens to tax themselves for maintenance of the public school system.

The Supreme Court agreed with the District Court decision which held "the public schools of Prince Edward County may not be closed to avoid the effect of the law of the land as interpreted by the Supreme Court, while the Commonwealth of Virginia permits other public schools to remain open at the expense of the taxpayers."

In 1964, after several years of debate and filibuster in the National Congress, the Congress did actually pass a Civil Rights Act which in many respects was aimed at and designed for 17 specific southern states.

At the time of its passage, and even today, many of the people residing in these southern states as well as people in other geographical areas of the nation question not the essence of the Act, but the constitutionality of a federal act directed at one geographical section of the nation. If we as a people stand united as a nation, in my opinion, any federal legislation or provision of the U.S. Constitution must apply equally in all 50 states.

The next step came in the development of guidelines by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare for implementation of the Civil Rights Act. Prior to my becoming state school superintendent, the former superintendent and the State Board of Education assigned me the responsibility of seeking interpretations and modifications of administrative provisions established by HEW for the implementation of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

From 1964 to the present, various methods have been tried by HEW and more recently by the Department of Justice to assure compliance with the Act.

At my request several nationally known figures—David Seeley, Peter Libassi, Mrs. Ruby Martin and Leon Panetta have met with me, members of my staff and system superintendents here in Georgia for the purpose of establishing procedures of communication and working relationships. This action was taken in an effort to maintain a quality program of instruction in the public schools of Georgia as we fulfilled our responsibilities in complying with the law and court orders incidental to the elimination of the so called "dual school system."

During this time it has been one of our major concerns, and we have waged a continuous battle with federal officials, to have this Act apply to the nation as a whole. Our Congressmen and two senators have given

tirelessly of their time in an effort to make the Act applicable to all states. They feel this would eventually bring about sufficient support for the southern viewpoint—a more rational and reasonable approach for administering the Act to eliminate the dual school system while we, at the same time, are continuing our efforts to preserve and improve public education.

As late as last July several state officials and political party representatives from Georgia and I met with Attorney General John Mitchell and members of his staff in an effort to influence a more reasonable administration of this Act but to no avail.

The Justice Department on July 7, 1969, addressed a letter to Georgia's State Board of Education and to me as State School Superintendent asking to be advised within the next 15 days whether the State Board would "voluntarily adopt and implement rules, regulations and policies to require the desegregation of the public schools of Georgia."

On July 23, 1969, we replied, asking that the Justice Department furnish copies of complaints "made by Negro parents" since neither the Education Department nor the State Board had any knowledge whatsoever of the "specific matters complained of."

But our strongest question was concerned with State Board authority. We pointed out that the State Board powers to regulate are not unlimited but rather are circumscribed by the Constitution and school laws of the State of Georgia, and that local boards of education are not compelled by law to adhere to policies, rules and regulations of the State Board, whose only means of enforcing the same is the threat of withholding state fiscal support from the local school system.

On August 1, 1969, the Justice Department filed suit in the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Georgia in Atlanta against the State of Georgia, the State Board of Education and myself requesting the court to require us to take "affirmative action to disestablish the dual systems of schools based on race and to correct the effects of past discrimination based on race."

On September 25, 1969, the Georgia Attorney General Arthur Bolton filed a reply in U.S. District Court which requested the court to have the Justice Department 1) explain at what point after a school system has initiated a desegregation plan it is deemed by the Justice Department to cease being a dual system; 2) state specifically where defendants are alleged to have perpetuated dual school systems; 3) name specific ways defendants are supposed to have provided educational opportunities for Negro students different from or inferior to those provided for white students; and 4) say precisely what actions the Justice Department contends defendants should take to disestablish the dual school system.

On October 20, 1969, the Justice Department filed a 31-page motion for a preliminary injunction requiring us to "take affirmative action toward disestablishing the racially dual system of public schools of Georgia."

The motion asked that we be required to:

1. sponsor conferences to help school personnel and HEW representatives develop plans for inservice training programs in the school districts in the state to train and retrain teachers to work effectively in desegregated schools;
2. develop plans for disestablishment of racially segregated dual system of schools in 81 school systems named;
3. develop a program for the implementation of desegregation as soon as possible and no later than 1970-71 school year;
4. withhold construction funds not coordinated with reorganization necessary to desegregation plans.



Following a hearing on this motion, the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia ordered the Board and myself to require 81 school systems to submit plans for ending the dual system of schools in these Georgia systems by September 1, 1970.

The State Board of Education immediately issued the following statement: "Under the circumstances the Board has no alternative, within the limits of our (the Department of Education) personnel and funds available to us, than to comply with the court order."

The court stated specifically what conditions must exist for a school system to be considered in compliance and directed the State Board of Education to withhold state funds from any system failing to submit a plan conforming to the order of the court.

Under this Court order, these 81 systems are required to submit by March 1, 1970 to the State Board and HEW plans for desegregation of their school systems to begin September, 1970. These plans will be reviewed and reports made back to the Court by April 1. Any plans deemed unacceptable by the Court may be revised and resubmitted before state funds are cut off on May 1.

Aside from the 81 systems named in this court action, there are another 30 or more Georgia school systems now acting under some kind of court order. Most prominently in the news at the present are the orders involving Atlanta City, Bibb, Houston and Washington County.

Unfortunately, court orders use legalistic language and are most confusing to the average lay citizen. As a result, there is a considerable amount of misunderstanding, rumor and a number of false assumptions are made by individuals on what its local system is being required to do. Consequently, the work of school superintendents, local board members and professional staff has become increasingly more difficult as they go about the business of operating the public schools.

Therefore, as local system leaders take action under current court orders, it is vital that they take into consideration the citizenry in the community. Maintaining adequate communications with the people in the school system is vital—interpreting the exact steps which must be taken, outlining the required procedures for complying with the court's decisions—are essential steps we must take.

Above all else, we must think of the children during these changing and trying times. We must act responsibly as adults and as educators if we are to preserve the public school system in this state and nation.

Then, as we proceed, we must be diligent in collecting for and providing to the nation factual information relating to the effect of these desegregation activities on public education.

Let me add one personal note.

I have been receiving a number of letters from concerned parents and school administrators asking me or the State Board of Education to take some action against the court orders.

Let me say that I share their concern. I am most sympathetic with your feelings over the way in which integration of our schools is being compelled without regard for the needs of the school systems or teachers involved or without regard for the children in terms of the timing for desegregation to take place.

I know that many of the problems involved make things seem insurmountable.

But you must understand, and I know that many of you do, that the State Board of Education and the State School Superintendent and your local school superintendents are under court order, and we therefore have no choice but to abide by this order.

If we should elect to defy the court order, be found in contempt and incur a fine or

receive a jail sentence, the court order to desegregate the schools will remain in full force and effect. The courts would then have the authority to appoint an administrator to see that desegregation was carried out.

In the final analysis, the foundation upon which any true democracy rests, is a program of public education for all citizens. If we are to maintain our democratic form of government, we must provide a sound system of public education.

Private education will not do the job. Good private schools such as Westminster, Lovett, Darlington, Woodward Academy and others that strive diligently to maintain a high level of standards will always be a challenge to a system of public education. But a system of private education will not reach the masses.

And private schools hastily established in make-shift facilities without certified teachers, adequate instructional materials and textbooks cannot survive.

The immediate future, my friends, is going to challenge the very best in all of us as we move toward a unitary school system—a system which will provide us with opportunity to reach every individual in the state with an educational program equal to his needs and challenging to his abilities.

So it behooves all of us to think rationally at this time and to work together to solve our problems caused by untimely and compelling court orders. At the same time we must continue to move ahead with the business of educating our children.

Legally, we will continue to question the courts as to the State Board's power in directing local school system desegregation, as well as continuing to bring pressure for equal application of the law in all segments of the country.

Humanely, we will continue to move toward a unitary system in keeping with the law of the land.

And when it is all behind us, I am confident that we will still have maintained our free public school system designed to serve all of the people of Georgia.

#### SIXTH GRADERS AT LAKE OSWEGO SEND AMERICAN FLAGS THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

### HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, 30 sixth-grade students at Pacific Palisades School in Lake Oswego, Oreg., have embarked on a worthwhile and inspirational project that shows their deep appreciation of the country they live in. The students of Rowland Tamblin have been working at the school to earn money to purchase American flags. Then each student selects a site where he would like the flag flown. The flags are mailed to such shrines as the Lincoln Memorial, the Statue of Liberty, and even as far away as Normandy Beach, with a letter explaining why the youngster wants his standard to fly at the particular site. The flag is then returned to the school.

Mr. Speaker, the project not only impresses on each youngster the importance of his heritage but is a magnificent learning experience bringing home a sense of history that would be impossible to get from a textbook. An article by Jim Kadera in the February 22 edition of

the Portland Oregonian—appropriately enough on the birthdate of the founder of our great Nation, George Washington—has been brought to my attention and I am inserting this inspirational story in the RECORD:

SIXTH GRADERS AT LAKE OSWEGO SEND AMERICAN FLAGS THROUGHOUT WORLD

(By Jim Kadera)

LAKE OSWEGO.—From the halls of Washington, D.C., to the shores of Normandy, a group of Lake Oswego children are flying their American flags.

Learning patriotism and heritage of "Old Glory" is project of 30 sixth-grade students of teacher Rowland Tamblin at Palisades Elementary School.

It's an appreciation for America which has jerked a tear or two from the eyes of more than one observing adult.

#### LANDMARKS SELECTED

Each student selected a landmark, such as Valley Forge or Lincoln's Tomb, where he or she wanted a school flag flown and returned.

Dave Irwin, for instance, wrote to the USS North Carolina battleship memorial at Wilmington, N.C. After reading the Oregon's boy's letter, the memorial superintendent flew the class' flag on the fantail of the battleship's main deck.

Project chairman Jeff Olson selected the American cemetery at Normandy Beach, France.

"My class is . . . going to buy a flag by working for our school," Jeff wrote. "We feel the flag will have more meaning to us if we work for it."

"When we get a flag, we wish to send it to places of historical interest. Normandy Beach is where I wish to send it. . . . I wish to have our flag flown there because many Americans died there for freedom," the 12-year-old boy wrote.

The project began last fall when Tamblin told his class about another flag project of children he taught one year earlier in New York. Those youngsters mailed a flag for a serviceman to fly over his post in Vietnam.

The idea fascinated Jeff, Dave and their classmates. Within a few minutes they filled a blackboard with names of places to fly a flag.

"I wanted the kids to get a feeling for the flag and what it stands for. And I wanted them to work for it," Tamblin explained.

The class worked two Sundays cleaning up the school playground to earn money for postage and a four- by six-foot flag. Later, they earned more postage money by assembling a school handbook. They were paid 20 cents an hour and no one complained.

But one flag wasn't enough. They needed at least three to complete the project this year. Fortunately, a serviceman's casket flag had been donated to the school, and the grandfather of one of the children provided another.

Their parents have been impressed, Tamblin said. "A couple even got a little teary-eyed when they read the letters we've received," the teacher noted.

#### BULLETIN BOARD FILLED

A bulletin board in the classroom is filled with letters, photos and memorabilia from throughout the nation.

"I think your class has a very good idea," wrote W. P. Crawford, a national park ranger at the Statue of Liberty, to Palisades student Janet Cook.

"It seems people don't have the pride and interest in their country that they should have any more, and a request such as yours renews my faith in the American people," the ranger said.

## FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

## HON. ROBERT G. STEPHENS, JR.

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. STEPHENS. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars and its Ladies Auxiliary conducts a Voice of America contest. This year the winner from the State of Georgia is a young lady from the 10th District, Miss Cathy Snellings Pinson, of Augusta, Ga. Miss Pinson, daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Raymond E. Pinson, is an outstanding student at Butler High School in Augusta. She has made many fine contributions not only to her school but also to her church and community. Therefore, it is with pride that I insert her winning speech, "Freedom's Challenge," in the RECORD:

## FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

Today I stand on the threshold of this exciting world of "Growing Up", and I wish to live it well. For, you see, I am an American, a Free American. And I wish to enter this challenging game of life well armored to carry on the obligations I must assume, the obligations which were met by the founders of our country who made it great and kept it great. For as a wise man once said, "Be life long or short, its completeness depends on what it was lived for."

In this challenging game of life I know that if I am to continue to enjoy freedom, then I must have a great love for freedom. Living in a land of milk and honey we have become accustomed to so much that we may value it too little. Our freedom and liberty we may sometimes take for granted as we do the air we breathe. But freedom is not free. It has never been free and will never be free. It was bought with the blood of men in uniform—with the discoverers who came to these shores and faced bravely the unknown—with the missionaries who came to teach the good way of life so that we might learn to live together peacefully by simple kindness toward our fellowman—with the government that was formed by these first settlers so that we might have law and order—and, now and then, with some great person playing a special part in making other improvements on freedom because they used freedom to make America greater. These ideals brought out the sound of freedom so loudly that the echo is still ringing loud and clear.

We, too, can ring the bell of freedom and hear its echo each time we use a voting booth. For one day in the not-too-distant future we shall stand before the ballot box and cast our vote to choose those who shall govern our state and nation. And if we had a thousand tongues we should use all of them to tell people all over this great state and nation of ours, "Go to the polls and vote everytime there is an election." Surely there is no way to make freedom ring louder than by using our freedom to vote and by giving our support to a nation whose leadership must be chosen and trusted in the midst of difficult times.

Again we ring the bell of freedom and hear its echo when we voice our opinion for what we think is right and oppose what we believe is wrong. That great laborer for freedom, Abraham Lincoln, has said, "If we could first know where we are and whither we are tending, we could better judge what to do and how to do it." It is our job to keep ourselves well informed on the everyday happenings of our Country's business so

that we might better know how to deal with the outside forces which threaten to strike down our freedom.

In school we learn about our great historical documents; and we must remember, as we study, to become better informed on the affairs of our country, that we are not learning just to make something for ourselves but to make something of ourselves, that we are not planning toward using our education to get rich, but to enrich our American way of life.

In recent months we have been confronted with so-called "demonstrators" for peace. I am sure these protesters mean well, but I doubt seriously if many of them know much about what our nation ought to do regarding the situation at hand. Let's leave off the demonstrations and give our energies to the support and appreciation of our President, who has made the best possible decision in these troubled and turbulent times. When we affirm our faith in our Country's leaders we are again meeting Freedom's Challenge.

And so to the American youth goes the responsibility of keeping America Free. We have accepted this grave trust and with it the realization that the way to build a greater America is to keep off the streets in protest and take to our knees in prayer, praying for our nation's leaders, lending them our support for peace, and trusting in their knowledge and wisdom for leadership. As a free American citizen this is my answer to Freedom's Challenge and how I can best meet it. For what America needs most is not so much protest, as prayer.

## RESCUE LINE FOR PRISONERS OF WAR

## HON. MANUEL LUJAN, JR.

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Speaker, we all deplore the plight of Americans being held captive by the North Vietnamese. There has been considerable interest in gaining the release of these men by citizens in New Mexico.

Mrs. James Lindberg Hughes, wife of Lieutenant Colonel Hughes who is now being held captive, has advised me of the formation of an organization called Rescue Line. It is a vehicle whereby citizens of the State and others can participate by contributing to a central working fund which is used to promote projects all over the world to rescue these trapped men.

The project initially began with an advertisement in the Albuquerque Journal during December 1969, and many New Mexicans have responded by contributing funds. These have been used to partially pay for advertisements almost immediately inserted in a Hong Kong Chinese newspaper—Wah Kiu Yat Po—and in the Bangkok Post on February 4, asking for every point outlined in the International Red Cross Geneva Conventions: release of the sick and wounded, lists of captured personnel, free flow of mail, impartial inspection of camps by neutral forces.

Mrs. Hughes attributes these addresses to the North Vietnamese leaders as being responsible for a taped recording of her husband's voice being broadcast over Hanoi Hannah's English-speaking pro-

gram on February 5 and beamed to our troops in Southeast Asia. It was the first indication in nearly 2 years that Lieutenant Colonel Hughes was still alive.

It has been suggested that human compassion is a quality so highly contagious that it just might spread from this embryonic idea in New Mexico to the far corners of the world. Certainly combined individual efforts are a powerful force; indeed, they are the basis on which our system of government operates.

While we continue our efforts to effect accord with the Geneva Conventions by North Vietnam and to also press for release of prisoners, let us encourage these individual efforts by citizens. The address of Rescue Line for Prisoners of War is Post Office Box 2392, Santa Fe, N. Mex. 87501.

## MAYOR LINDSAY TESTIFIES ON SAFE STREETS AMENDMENTS

## HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, a thorough review of the implementation of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act passed by Congress in 1968 is one of the most important missions of the final session of this Congress. Such a review is currently underway in Subcommittee No. 5 of the Judiciary Committee under the dedicated direction of Chairman CELLER.

On Monday, March 2, the Honorable John V. Lindsay, mayor of New York City, appeared and contributed a very valuable assessment of Safe Streets Act programs and problems as part of this review. I was pleased that, in the course of his testimony, the mayor expressed his support for legislation introduced by me and other Members of the House proposing a change in the granting formula to make more funds available to urban areas where crime rates are highest. The mayor also made several additional suggestions for revision of this crucial legislation which deserve careful consideration.

Mayor Lindsay's testimony follows:

TESTIMONY BY MAYOR JOHN V. LINDSAY BEFORE THE HOUSE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Almost three years ago, the original Safe Streets bill came before this Committee. Primarily, it provided for direct grants to cities. Those who wanted almost all grants to go through the states and not directly to the cities were making a fight on that issue. I was among those prepared to fight back.

In testimony before this Committee in 1967, I urged against a state controlled program:

"Many states [that testimony said] have emphasized highway patrol and traffic control in their police activities and therefore lack experience in urban crime problems. New York State has pioneered in several areas of law enforcement and is providing various forms of assistance to localities. But the problems of our major urban areas, such as New York City, are not state-wide and they cannot be resolved by a state-wide plan. At least for our major cities, the appropriate



planning unit is the locality and not the state. Planning grants for our largest cities, where the problem of crime is most severe and the feeling of insecurity most intense, should be given the same, if not higher, priority than grants to the states."

The cities lost that fight. Despite the warnings of many mayors, a bill authorizing block grants to the states rather than direct grants to the cities became law in 1968. Its state-oriented supporters had claimed several advantages for their block-grant approach. They said it would reduce the centralized bureaucracy in Washington, allow state officials close to the problems to set priorities, and stimulate state-wide coordination and cooperation.

Now, after the first full year under the new Act, it is time to review its operation. This review will show, regrettably, that state administration has been in many respects nonproductive or counterproductive. A report this month by the National League of Cities and the U.S. Conference of Mayors demonstrates gross discrimination in distribution of funds, absurdly favoring non-urban areas where the crime problem is far less serious. The report contains a detailed mathematical analysis of the Act indicating that state administrations have not directed the money to the areas that need it most. Political and geographic considerations have dominated the distribution of funds rather than the incidence of crime. The report also shows that instead of eliminating a level of bureaucracy, the state administrations have created a new layer of inefficiency—regional planning boards within the state that are using up funds originally intended for local governments.

At least with regard to this last point, New York has fared better than most cities. Our state, like most other states, created a system of regional boards to participate in the planning and grant-review process. But unlike other states that lumped major cities together with surrounding counties, the state of New York treated New York City as a separate region so that we could continue our crime control efforts unhampered by an artificial partnership with areas whose problems required solutions substantially different than ours.

Even so, New York City, too, has suffered from many of the other fundamental defects in the state-administered block-grant system.

Before I outline some of these difficulties, let me explain New York City's position within New York State in the area of crime control. Slightly less than half the people in the State live in New York City, but far and away we have the state's dominant crime problem. More than 75 percent of the reported crime in the state is committed in New York City. More than 70 percent of the arrests in the state are in the city. And more than 70 percent of the local police employed in the state are within New York City.

New York City's crime problems is so serious, its commitments of resources to deal with the problem is so great, that even the State's own efforts are small in comparison. The City Police Department has almost 32,000 officers, all paid for by the City. We also fund separate Housing and Transit Police forces with more than 5,000 additional officers, while the entire State Police force is less than 4,000 and does virtually no enforcement work in New York City, but are primarily trained and used for highway safety and rural law enforcement—and we are known as an urban state.

New York City has also been a leader in criminal justice reform. Three years ago, in anticipation of the passage of this Act, I established a Criminal Justice Coordinating Council including every law enforcement agency working in New York City. As a result of our headstart in partnership with the Vera Institute of Justice, the City now has

underway more than 30 pioneering projects in virtually every area of crime control, from methadone treatment for narcotics addicts, to computerization of court calendars, to volunteer counselling for ex-offenders. The Council's structure, strategy and programs have been studied and copied by local governments across the nation, including Washington, Boston and Cleveland. The New York City Criminal Justice Coordinating Council has most recently been praised by the National Commission on Violence.

Despite the enormous size of our crime problem and this record of initial accomplishment, we have done poorly under the state's block grant system.

First, the Governor created a 21 member State Crime Control Planning Board, as required under the Act, to prepare an overall plan for New York State, to set guidelines, and to review specific grant proposals. The New York City Criminal Justice Coordinating Council, which has jurisdiction over 70 percent of the State's crime problem, received virtually no direct representation on the State Board. We had proposed to the State that 5 of the State Board's 21 members should be nominated by the City's Criminal Justice Coordinating Council. By its failure to give formal recognition to the City's actual importance in crime control activity, the present State structure actually undercuts our local planning agency.

Second, the action funds received by the state have not been equitably apportioned in those areas where the crime problem is most severe. New York City, with more than 75 percent of the State's crime problem, this year received only 56 percent of the funds distributed to local governments. Moreover, under the provisions of the Act, the state may keep 25 percent of the funds for state programs. As a result, New York City actually received only 43 percent of all action funds given to New York State, although we have more than 75 percent of the crime.

These are two clear indications that the Act is not working because of the State-administered program.

One major reason that Congress gave the states control of this program was the fear the federal officials might encroach on local law enforcement, even resulting in a national police force. But in giving control to the states, Congress obviously failed to provide adequate safeguards for the cities. As Dr. B. Douglas Harman of American University recently pointed out, "all of the governmental units involved in [the Safe Streets program] want to maximize their powers." In short, for the first time, the authority to allocate funds has given to the State significant power over local law enforcement operations in areas where the State has little competence or experience or—most importantly—responsibility.

Whereas the purpose of the block grant approach was to prevent federal bureaucratic control of local law enforcement, state administrative practices have now tended to institute state bureaucratic control. This violates a basic principle of creative federalism—that the level of government with responsibility for an activity should also have the decisionmaking authority and operating power. Our cities continue to have prime responsibility for law enforcement and crime control. Yet the state-administered block grant system has encouraged state officials to second-guess the professional judgment of city officials, and to impose unreasonable conditions on federally funded projects that hinder our flexibility to innovate. This is in addition to the misallocation of funds away from the cities.

I believe that the government with primary responsibility for safe streets should determine the use of these funds and should receive the bulk of these monies, and that government is city government.

I do not mean to suggest that the state cannot have a constructive role in this planning effort. We have seen ways in which the state can beneficially provide supporting services, technical assistance and coordination for local governments, especially those in smaller communities. Professional cooperation between State and City planners, thanks in large part to the efforts of Peter McQuillan, the Executive Director of the State Office of Crime Control Planning has been very useful. But the City's interest still is unprotected because the states are not involved on a day-to-day basis with the street crime problem. And New York State is no exception.

So I believe that large cities like New York can best deal directly with the federal government in this area. Failing this—if the block grant approach continues—I believe that local governments must have greater protection from state encroachment. Legislation introduced by Representative Bingham and others, would be a considerable improvement in safeguarding the interests of our cities. It would provide that only 50 percent of federal crime control funds goes through the state, instead of 85 percent that the act now requires. However, the Bingham bill would allow 70 percent of the funds to go through the State only if the State plan adequately deals with the special needs of urban areas with high crime incidence. Furthermore, the bill would give an incentive to states to share with cities the matching funds required under the Act, by allowing an additional 20 percent of all federal funds to go through the state if the state pays half the matching contribution. This would be an important reform. At present, cities must pay 40 percent of each grant on a matching basis. The states have been granted broad authority under the block grant approach to control local expenditures yet the states do not share any of the fiscal burden.

There are two other key provisions in the Act that are exceedingly restrictive to our ability to use these funds most effectively.

First, the Act requires that not more than one-third of a federal grant can be used for personnel costs. This encourages cities to buy tanks, guns and hardware, but prevents adequate funding of dramatic and vital programs in the most important areas of criminal justice reform. Better supporting equipment is important. But real breakthroughs in crime control will only come from hiring more doctors to treat narcotics addicts, more court administrators to free judges from routine calendar work, and more counsellors to help ex-offenders in trouble. Three of our highest priority crime control areas are narcotics treatment, court calendar reform, and ex-offender rehabilitation. We have developed major projects in each area, but they almost entirely involve personnel costs.

Until the Congress allows us to fund these programs by removing the one-third limitation on personnel, more money will be spent on less important areas and programs that can have the greatest effect on street crime will suffer accordingly. This personnel limitation may be the single greatest technical flaw in the Act, perhaps resulting in millions of dollars being spent on unnecessary equipment rather than critical action projects. Therefore, I urge that the one-third limitation be removed altogether, or at the very least, that it be amended to apply only to Police Department personnel but not to other personnel who are desperately needed to reform our court, prison, prosecution and rehabilitation agencies.

Second, the Act has a totally unrealistic matching requirement for local governments. We all understand the need to ensure that local governments do not use the funds made available under the Act to reduce the level of their own crime control efforts. But given the impossible fiscal squeeze of our cities,

it is unrealistic to assume that we can find significant new funds to match federal action grants on a 60-40 percent basis. New York City next year will be unable to apply city funds to this purpose because of our budget crisis. We will only be able to propose programs that we can match with personnel or outside funds. Matching, then, is a severe limitation on our ability to use these monies most effectively.

I urge that the matching ratio be altered to 90-10. After all, local governments automatically face rising public safety costs to finance increased police salaries. Those funds alone will not be easy to find. In addition, most cities are continually increasing the size of their police forces. In New York City, during my first term, the City added more than 4,000 new police at a cost of \$60 million a year, raising our police department budget to half a billion dollars a year. If we are to have realistic programs, the Congress should ensure that all localities can use these funds in areas of greatest need, not influenced by tight local budgets.

These three basic changes, would, in my opinion, make the Safe Streets Act substantially more responsive to local crime problems; ensure greater protection of and participation by local governments; and enable the most effective use of federal crime control funds in programs where they can have the greatest impact. These changes would make the State-administered block grant approach at least worthy of an experiment.

Let me speak for a moment to the problem of narcotics, which has rapidly become the most critical problem facing local law enforcement officials. New York City, as the key point of entry from abroad, suffers from it more than most cities in the nation. I have often said that heroin doesn't grow in the streets of Brooklyn. It can only enter my city from abroad. And only a substantial federal effort can reverse this deadly trend.

I am pleased to say that there are some hopeful signs. Under the leadership of the Department of Justice and the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs, we are receiving greater cooperation than ever before in a new effort to attack the flow of drugs into our city. But a great deal more has to be done. In the city, I recently created a Narcotics Control Council with former U.S. Attorney Robert Morgenthau as Chairman. We are in the process of adding 200 more men to our Police Narcotics Bureau, increasing its strength to 700 full-time officers. And we will be asking the State and Federal governments in the near future for substantially more manpower and funds to combat this evil.

We hope to use a substantial part of our federal crime control funds this year for narcotics control. But we will only be able to do that if the one-third limit on personnel is amended and the steep matching requirement is reduced. I urge you to take these steps if we at the local level are going to fully utilize the funds from this Act to attack our number one crime problem.

Finally, let me speak to the level of funding authorized in the Act. This Act, more than any other, was designed to have an impact on street crime. Yet the proposed level of funding for the entire nation next year is far less than the budget for the New York City Police Department. That clearly does not deal with crime as a major national problem. It clearly does not live up to the rhetoric we have all heard about a new national commitment to put an end to street crime. Therefore, I support the amendment sponsored by Chairman Celler to provide \$750,000,000 next year which, along with the other changes I have suggested, would allow the Safe Streets Act to live up to its promise.

LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN TO BECOME DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE CHAIRMAN

HON. EDWARD P. BOLAND

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, Lawrence F. O'Brien, my longtime friend and fellow native of Springfield, Mass., has agreed to take on the chairmanship of the Democratic National Committee. Like my colleagues in the Democratic Party, I am delighted at his decision. Experienced, able, one of the most astute political thinkers in the history of the United States, Mr. O'Brien has the powers of leadership that can resolve the squabbles now dividing the party. He is— unquestionably—the best man for the job.

As I said in this body on April 11, 1968, just after Mr. O'Brien resigned as Postmaster General—and repeat now:

One of the most able and versatile men in Washington, Mr. O'Brien has helped two Presidents to accomplish their legislative and administrative goals. As Special Assistant for Congressional Affairs under John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, Mr. O'Brien has made good use of the astonishing political acumen for which he is celebrated to help win passage of the landmark legislation that has come out of the Congress over the past 7 years. As a friend and counselor to these two Presidents, he has helped shape and implement many of their most effective administrative programs. As Postmaster General, he has given to the Post Office Department the same brisk efficiency and dependability that is the hallmark of his own personality.

Mr. O'Brien's professional competence has won the respect and admiration of a host of people in and out of Washington—ranging from the toughest newspaper reporter to the savviest politician.

What is even more remarkable, however, is the number of lasting friendships he has earned by his integrity and sense of fairplay. Mr. O'Brien is known for the abiding loyalty he gives to the men who put their trust in him—whether they are Presidents, Congressmen, or just ordinary citizens.

I value highly my personal friendship with Mr. O'Brien and his family. I know my colleagues in the House join me in extending best wishes to Mr. O'Brien, his charming wife, Elva, and his son, Lawrence, Jr.

The Springfield, Mass., Union published on April 8, 1967, a profile of Mr. O'Brien that neatly sums up his value to his party and his country. I include this article in the RECORD at this point:

NOT TIRED YET—LARRY O'BRIEN, COMPLETE PROFESSIONAL  
(By Bruce Blossat)

WASHINGTON.—Postmaster General Lawrence F. O'Brien is, of course, just about the most complete professional in town.

THAT INSISTENT RING

The other day, after he blistered Democratic state chairmen whose party organiza-

tions are in serious disarray, his telephone rang insistently as some of those same chairmen demanded copies of his speech.

Uniquely in his party, and perhaps in politics, O'Brien has the capacity for getting tough without stirring deep personal enmity. Somehow, he conveys a sense of fairness and balance to nearly all persons and factions.

After the heavy Democratic losses of 1966, party figures in many places clamored for drastic change in the Democratic National Committee. It is no secret that O'Brien was their universal choice to lead them out of the woods.

Among those who wanted him as national chairman was Sen. Robert F. Kennedy of New York. Yet President Johnson's decision to retain Chairman John M. Bailey did not necessarily reflect fear that O'Brien would be a "Kennedy chairman."

It is more likely that the President, having limited respect for the national committee, thinks O'Brien would be at least partly wasted there.

Johnson's trust in O'Brien appears to be deep-set. From their first grave talk on Air Force One returning from Dallas after President Kennedy's assassination in 1963, the two men have had mutually respectful and reasonably warm relations.

It is no quirk of circumstance, therefore, that O'Brien is the only triple-hatted man in the administration. Johnson wants it that way. So O'Brien runs the Post Office Department, labors as he did for more than four years as a key presidential agent in promoting major legislation, and serves LBJ as a top political consultant.

O'Brien still retains his spacious second-floor office in the White House—and he is often there. The President sometimes summons him to the White House two or three times a day.

In 1964 and 1966, O'Brien was the President's crucial political confidant in the heat of the election battles. His appraisals are awaited with the same interest that attends top battlefield reports in war.

Some admirers of the postmaster general's supreme talents as a political organizer think he is being badly "underused" in the political field. However that may be, the situation seems unlikely to change so long as he serves Johnson. For the President plainly is interested in his versatility.

O'Brien is, in fact, so placed that he could go on indefinitely—beyond the Johnson administration—in high political and public service posts. He has no present interest in the six-figure private jobs that have from time to time been dangled before him. He loves politics and public effort—and most of the people in these endeavors love him.

Largely dead today are the first resentments of some of the more emotional Kennedy intimates over the fact that O'Brien, an original top Kennedy aide, chose to give full loyalty and service from the outset to Lyndon Johnson. A new Kennedy administration almost surely would enlist him prominently.

His friends, across all factions and both parties, have to hope that Larry O'Brien does not get tired. Any party—indeed any country—has to count itself lucky to have him around.

ROBERT WIEDRICH NAMED COMMUNICATOR OF THE YEAR

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I call to the attention



of the House the fact that one of this Nation's most popular and talented columnists, Mr. Robert Wiedrich, whose column Tower Ticker appears daily in the Chicago Tribune, was honored last week in Chicago as communicator of the year.

In another tribute to his significant contributions as a columnist, Mr. Wiedrich also received an honorary gold star of police lieutenant from the Chicago Police Lieutenant's Association.

These two separate and distinct honors are well deserved by Mr. Wiedrich.

The Communicator of the Year Award was bestowed upon him by the Chicago Polish Daily News which is one of the Nation's oldest foreign language newspapers and which annually names a "communicator" who, through his excellence in writing or reporting, has made the most significant contribution in the communications media.

The Chicago Police Lieutenant's Association honored Mr. Wiedrich for his support of law enforcement.

I am sure those of us who enjoy Mr. Wiedrich's Tower Ticker daily will agree that both the Chicago Polish Daily News and the Chicago Police Lieutenant's Association have made a wise choice in bestowing these honors on this most deserving and enterprising journalist.

#### A CHANCE TO LEARN

### HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education, chaired by Dr. Clark Kerr, issued its second special report, entitled "A Chance To Learn: An Action Agenda for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education." Today, President Nixon sent a message to the Congress on education reform.

Specifically, the President's message contains three highlights:

First. The establishment of a National Institute of Education to conduct long-range studies in education and teaching. In a manner roughly comparable to the work done by the National Institutes for Health in the field of medicine. The gentleman from Indiana (Mr. BRADEMAS) and I have today introduced legislation setting up such an Institute.

Second. The establishment of the President's Commission on School Finance to make a much needed study of and develop recommendations on the local school financing system—a system which State and local officials, educators, administrators, and taxpayers all agree is no longer able to keep up with the scope and cost of contemporary education.

Third. The right to read, proposed recently by the able Commissioner of Education, Dr. James E. Allen, Jr., is endorsed as a national educational goal for the 1970's and will be financed with an additional \$84 million that the President will request for the combined appropriation for title II and III of ESEA,

bringing that sum to a total of \$200 million.

It is our understanding that the administration will send up a message on higher education later this month. I am hopeful that it will contain assurances that the administration will revise upward the total budget allocation of \$3.4 billion that is now requested for all education programs in fiscal year 1971. That sum reflects far too low a priority for what is probably the most important key to this country's future, and I hope that the forthcoming message will recognize that fact.

In terms of the President's message today, it seems to me that educational research and reorganization of school financing are important for the future, but I think that immediate needs demand that we move ahead on other fronts now. The administration recognizes that "so much education achievement remains unequal" but the Institute proposal is unaccompanied by concrete steps to help young men and women who cannot wait for the results of research. We cannot abandon the entire present generation of schoolchildren.

On the other hand, the Carnegie Commission recognizes that deprivation by income, age, ethnic group, location, and quality of early schooling still handicap many able Americans—and it proposes specific actions that can be taken by universities to: First, assist local school systems in providing better preparation for disadvantaged students and, second, improve their own facilities, quality of instruction, and commitment to the removal of all financially and racially discriminatory barriers to equal higher education.

The Commission sets forth a two step goal; by 1976, the 200th anniversary of the Nation's independence, the Commission recommends removal of all financial barriers to higher education and elimination of all forms of racial discrimination on campus. By the year 2000, the Commission recommends removal of all remaining barriers to any qualified students.

Last year, the Carnegie Commission issued its first special report, "Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education." The distinguished gentleman from Indiana, one of the most knowledgeable and respected education experts in this House, Mr. BRADEMAS, and I introduced the recommendations in that report—with elements of other studies as well—as the Higher Education Bill of Rights, H.R. 6535. In its new report, the Commission reaffirms the proposals it made a year ago, and which still rest before this Congress. It suggests that many of the new emphases it recommends in "A Chance To Learn" can be financed from the cost-of-education supplements proposed in the first report. These supplements, which are an essential part of H.R. 6535, would be provided to the institutions for each student who qualifies for a student grant. The grants are intended principally for students from low-income families, and the supplement would enable the institution to meet the additional costs associated with remedial education.

The cost of the 1968 recommendations is high, and the Commission is not proposing additional financial outlays in its latest report. Funds can be shifted around and resources found in earlier recommendations. What "A Chance To Learn" emphasizes, however, is that commitment and investment of effort and concern is as important as money. Much of that commitment must come from the institutions themselves, but surely the moral leadership should come from the Federal Government.

I insert the report in the RECORD at this point:

#### A CHANCE TO LEARN: AN ACTION AGENDA FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY IN HIGHER EDUCATION

##### FOREWORD

The Carnegie Commission on Higher Education will issue its final report and recommendations in 1972, after all of its research projects have been completed. But many problems in higher education are urgent and need early action. The Commission therefore submits special reports on such matters as soon as it has had an opportunity to review the relevant issues and develop specific recommendations.

The first such report, *Quality and Equality: New Levels of Federal Responsibility for Higher Education*, appeared in December 1968. It focused upon the essential role the federal government should play in preserving margins of academic excellence and expanding educational opportunity.

This present report, *A Chance to Learn: An Action Agenda for Equal Opportunity in Higher Education*, concentrates upon the goals, agenda, and policies for access to and success within higher education for an increasingly diverse student population.

With few exceptions, this report does not offer recommendations that have never been proposed before. Instead, it blends the proposals and current practices which, on the basis of our experiences and careful evaluation, have the greatest merit as part of a coherent, overall policy.

To the many persons who were consulted and gave us helpful suggestions, we wish to express our appreciation. We also wish to thank the members of our staff, and particularly Barry Munitz, for their work in preparing this report.

Eric Ashby, Master, Clare College, Cambridge, England.

Ralph M. Besse, Chairman of the Board, The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company.

Joseph P. Cosand, President, The Junior College District of St. Louis.

William Friday, President, University of North Carolina.

The Honorable Patricia Roberts Harris, partner, Strasser, Spiegelberg, Fried, Frank, and Kampelman, Attorneys, Washington, D.C.

David H. Henry, President, University of Illinois.

Theodore M. Hesburgh, C.S.C., President, University of Notre Dame.

Stanley J. Heywood, President, Eastern Montana College.

Carl Kaysen, Director, Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton.

Kenneth Keniston, Professor of Psychology, School of Medicine, Yale University.

Katharine E. McBride, President, Bryn Mawr College.

James A. Perkins, Chairman and Director, Center for Educational Enquiry.

Clifton W. Phalen, Chairman of the Executive Committee, Marine Midland Banks, Inc.

Nathan M. Pusey, President, Harvard University.

David Riesman, Professor of Social Sciences, Harvard University.

The Honorable William W. Scranton.

Norton Simon.

Kenneth Tollett, Dean of the Law School, Texas Southern University.  
Clark Kerr, Chairman.

#### 1. THE CHALLENGES AND THE GOALS

Our nation was founded upon the principle of equality of opportunity for all men, yet, after almost 200 years, many Americans still do not have an equal chance to benefit from the nation's progress and abundance.

Every institution and social agency in our society must accept responsibility for ending racial discrimination and for increasing opportunities for all of our citizens. This report is concerned with the role of higher education.

Higher education is in a period of conflict and crisis brought on, in part, by the determination of increasing numbers of young Americans to obtain advanced education. Efforts to meet their needs will be costly, difficult, and time-consuming, but they must be made. The challenge for higher education is not how to avoid the crisis. It is, instead, how to emerge from the crisis with institutions of high quality that offer increasing opportunities for education.

Higher education is also in conflict about who should go to college and what standards in college will be met by those who do go. The American system of higher education has always been an "open" system. There has been a place at some college for everyone who wanted to go and could afford to go. The difference now is that more want to go and can afford to go. This report accepts and endorses the concept of an "open" system as against those who would now wish, for the first time in our history, to close it. We believe that the system should remain open and, additionally, that the barriers to access inherent in economic deprivation should not, in fact, close it to some. At the same time, we believe that each college should maintain, the qualifications for its degrees, recognizing that these qualifications are quite diverse. We seek to maintain and improve a diversified system of higher education that has contributed so fruitfully to American life.

In 1900, 4 percent of the 18- to 21-year olds in the United States were enrolled in higher education. In 1970, the figure is 40 percent—a proportion greater than that of any other nation. To achieve this enrollment growth, new opportunities were opened up for millions of young Americans. Never in history has any other nation moved so far and so fast in providing expanded opportunities for higher education.

But there is still a long way to go:

**By income.**—In 1968, according to a recent study by the Bureau of the Census,<sup>1</sup> a family with an income of over \$15,000 and with one or more college-age (18 to 24) children is five times as likely to include a full-time college student as a similar family with an income under \$3,000. This underrepresentation of relatively lower income families becomes progressively worse as the level of education progresses into graduate studies. Another study<sup>2</sup> estimates that, after allowing for ability differentials, the number of college graduates would have been increased by 50 percent in a recent year (1965) if entrance and completion rates throughout the income range had equalled those in the top one-fifth on the basis of socioeconomic status.

**By ethnic group.**—Between 1964 and 1968, according to the Commissioner of Labor Statistics,<sup>3</sup> college enrollment of black students increased by 85 percent, more than twice as fast as total enrollments in higher education during the same period. In 1968, however, the proportion of black persons enrolled from the 18- to 24-year age group was only half that of white persons.<sup>4</sup> Young persons from other minority groups—Indians,

Mexican-Americans, Puerto Ricans—are even less well represented in college enrollments. (The Japanese-Americans and Chinese-Americans are well represented in higher education and are not now educationally disadvantaged.)

**By location.**—Young persons in the Pacific Southwest attend college at twice the rate of those in the Deep South. Within some states there are even greater variations. In Kentucky, the variation by county is from 6.0 to 53.6 percent. Trent and Medsker<sup>5</sup> have shown that the location of a college within commuting distance raises attendance from one-third of the college-age students to one-half.

**By age.**—Many Americans who are beyond what has historically been considered "college-age" did not have an opportunity to attend college. Some of these people would still benefit from further education if it were available to them.

**By quality of early schooling.**—The quality of available elementary and secondary schools varies substantially from district to district and even from neighborhood to neighborhood.

There are other factors, such as size of family and educational attainment of parents, that influence college attendance but the five factors most relevant to social policy are: income level of family, ethnic grouping, geographic location, age, and quality of early schooling.

#### Short- and long-range goals

The transcendent goal is that inequality in one generation should not, inevitably, be a legacy of succeeding generations. Each young person should have a full chance to demonstrate his intellectual ability and respond to his motivations to excel in constructive endeavor. From a national point of view, we cannot afford the domestic brain drain of able young persons who, through no fault of their own, are handicapped in making valuable contributions to the life of society.

**Goals for 1976.**—That all students with the motivation and ability to gain access to and complete higher education should receive the financial aid they need to do so; that economic barriers to college and university access be removed. In our earlier report, *Quality and Equality*, we recommended a program to make this possible. We estimated that this program would draw forth an additional one million students in 1976, one-fourth to one-third of whom would be from ethnic minorities.

That all inequities that are found in curricula, policies and facilities of our colleges themselves be removed so that all ethnic groups may be adequately served.

**Goals for 2000.**—That all remaining barriers to equality of educational opportunity that are subject to public policy be removed so that ability, motivation, and individual choice are the only determinants of college attendance. By the year 2000, ethnic origin, geographic location, age, and quality of prior schooling should no longer stand in the way of access to higher education and success within it.

Although there are many barriers to equality of access to higher education other than those directly associated with the incapacity of low-income families to meet the costs of higher education for their children, financial barriers are of critical importance. Recommendations for expanded student aid and loans included in our first report, *Quality and Equality*, were designed to eliminate economic barriers for an expanding number of students from low-income families during the 1970's. Although they are not reproduced in the present report, those recommendations constitute a highly important part of the effort needed to provide equality of opportunity. We affirm our recommendations in *Quality and Equality* to eliminate

economic barriers and set forth our further recommendations directed toward achieving full equality of opportunity.

#### 2. THE PATH TO HIGHER EDUCATION

The Carnegie Commission recognizes the basic priority of building up our elementary and secondary school systems if Americans are to have equal opportunity to enter institutions of higher education and succeed in their studies. There can be no fully adequate increase of college enrollments for ethnic minority and low-income students unless the number of students eligible for admission is enlarged by increasing both the high school graduation rate and the quality of education represented by a high school diploma.

The Commission recommends that the first priority in the nation's commitment to equal educational opportunity be placed upon the increased effectiveness of our pre-elementary, elementary, and secondary school programs.

The specific suggestions which follow are addressed to particular aspects of this problem that relate to higher education.

#### Elimination of segregation

The harmful effects of racial and socioeconomic segregation on academic achievement are now widely recognized, but the most effective ways of restructuring our pre-college educational systems to eliminate *de facto* segregation are not clear. Institutions of higher education have an important responsibility to contribute to the solution of this problem by performing research on alternative approaches to desegregation, by providing consultants to local school officials who are seeking patterns of school attendance that best fit community needs, and by helping school systems to evaluate the results of their desegregation efforts.

**Implementing Recommendation.**—In communities where effective desegregation of local school systems has not been achieved, institutions of higher education should offer their resources of research and consultation to local school administrators and other community leaders.

#### Teacher training

The classroom teacher is often an effective and persuasive influence upon a young student's attitude toward learning. A skillful and sensitive teacher can motivate students, identify and encourage those with potential ability, and make them aware of the accessibility and value of higher education. Higher education has a responsibility to train more teachers for such roles. Federal programs such as the Teacher Corps and the Educational Professions Development Act that have recently attempted to revise and expand preparation for teaching the educationally disadvantaged are a good beginning.

Prospective teachers must have a genuine concern for the problems of and differences among students from a broad range of socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds. Student teaching opportunities should be provided in areas which have educationally disadvantaged children. These internships should include out of classroom experiences with community agencies that are concerned with social work, public health, vocational education, and law enforcement.

As school systems are effectively desegregated, universities and colleges must concentrate greater resources in the development of new curricular materials and teaching techniques to reach more heterogeneous classroom populations. The needs are clear. The methods of meeting them are not. We need much greater attention to methods by the ablest of our scholars and practitioners. We should not go blindly ahead with methods that do not work. Further research and

Footnotes at end of speech.



greater understanding are of the highest importance. We need to know much more about what to teach and how to teach it, and about how to train those who do the teaching.

**Implementing Recommendation.**—The Commission recommends the allocation of institutional, state, and federal funds to colleges and universities for specific programs to meet the present needs of inner-city schools, and of desegregated schools with heterogeneous classroom enrollments. The Commission also endorses an intensive research and experimental undertaking in the area of education similar to that made possible in medical practice through the National Institutes of Health. In many parts of the country, educationally disadvantaged children are concentrated in rural areas. Indian reservations are often quite far from urban centers, 40 percent of the black children in the South reside in rural localities, and large numbers of white children are in isolated areas such as Appalachia and the Ozarks.

The Commission also recommends a similar allocation of funds for meeting the present needs of rural schools in disadvantaged areas.

#### *Educational opportunity centers*

For some students, academic support from community agencies outside the formal classroom structure may prove effective. Several California junior and senior colleges, acting independently and following the pattern of other states and private campuses, have established programs for improving the academic skills of pre-college students. The central feature of these programs is a series of year-round tutorial centers for elementary and secondary school children, offering the services of paid and trained college and high school students.

Information centers have also been established in some metropolitan centers (e.g., Milwaukee) so that parents and students may obtain information and advice about career possibilities and opportunities for higher education. These centers serve both a counseling and recruiting function.

An educational opportunity center combining the features of tutorial work and advice could:

- Provide study space and tutorial help;
- Clarify vocational and educational goals;
- Conduct complementary testing for level of achievement, aptitude, and interests;
- Provide information concerning financial and academic support available at local colleges;

- Prepare detailed documentation for use by admissions and financial aid officers.

Many of these functions could be performed by college students supported by work-study funds.

**Implementing Recommendation.**—The Commission recommends that institutions of higher education, either alone or in conjunction with local school districts, establish educational opportunity centers to serve areas with major concentrations of low-income populations.

#### *Recruiting*

The active recruiting of disadvantaged students is an important means of bringing more such students into higher education. But institutions now duplicate recruiting resources and energy by competing for the same candidates. The effort thus duplicated does not increase significantly the total number of college entrants.

To make recruiting programs fully effective, there is an urgent need for institutions to coordinate planning and combine resources. Recruiting pools consisting of colleges and universities of convenient proximity should distribute information, link their efforts to those of educational opportunity centers and high school counselors, and share trained staff members. Prospective students should be advised on the full

range of institutional resources and curricular programs available. This is particularly important for fields of study sometimes overlooked by disadvantaged students (e.g., economics, natural sciences) and is crucial for helping them enter some of the higher professional levels. Colleges that have employed their own minority group students as recruiters of new minority group students have been particularly successful in their efforts. The Commission urges institutions and consortia to follow their example. All of these efforts should support and draw upon the private agencies already engaged in some of these activities on a limited basis.

**Implementing Recommendation.**—The Commission recommends the establishment of recruiting and counseling pools among neighboring colleges and universities to coordinate resources and staff efforts for admitting educationally disadvantaged candidates.

The same considerations apply to recruitment for graduate and professional schools. In this case, the effort would be most effective at the department level.

**Implementing Recommendation.**—The Commission recommends that graduate and professional departments coordinate recruiting of disadvantaged students.

#### *Campus as summer camp*

Making college campuses familiar to primary and secondary schoolchildren combats some of the academic and environmental factors of educational disadvantage. In communities where many of these youngsters reside, there is often either total ignorance about colleges or a distressing atmosphere of distrust and hostility toward them. Making facilities of the institutions available during the summer months for organized activities for neighborhood and rural children would help break down distrust and create a sense of affiliation. Dormitories, museums, cafeterias, classrooms, and recreation areas could be used for such activities. Counselors and tutors could be employed under the institution's work-study program.

**Implementing Recommendation.**—The Commission recommends that institutions of higher education devote a portion of their summer schedule and facilities to camps for educationally disadvantaged children.

#### *Verbal skills*

Because of academic and environmental factors associated with low socioeconomic status, some students find it extremely difficult to develop the verbal skills that are required both for college entrance and for completion of college courses. Although academic success is also determined by mathematical skills, these, too, require verbal skills for proper development.

Experimental programs devoted to a comprehensive effort to stimulate the early development of potential ability should be established and sponsored by institutions of higher education. Programs concerned with remedying verbal skill deficiencies at secondary and higher levels of education should also be developed.

There are roles in such endeavor for many members of the academic community. Learning laboratories can be constructed by educational centers. Supervisory help is needed, as well as supportive resources and research from sociologists, linguists, artists, and psychologists.

The Commission endorses the emphasis placed by Commissioner of Education James E. Allen on his "Right to Read" program.

**Implementing Recommendation.**—The Commission recommends the establishment of experimental programs for the early development of verbal skills, to be sponsored and administered by institutions of higher education with active participation from members of the community; and of programs for remedying verbal skill deficiencies

at the secondary and higher levels of education.

### 3. HIGHER EDUCATION

#### *Access*

We do not believe that each young person should of necessity attend college. Quite the contrary. Many do not want and will not want to attend, and it cannot be shown that all young persons will benefit sufficiently from attendance to justify their time and the expense involved. We should resist efforts to create a "captive" audience in our colleges. We should avoid pressures from family and society which impose college attendance on young people who would not voluntarily choose to attend. We therefore oppose universal attendance as a goal of American higher education and believe that non-college alternatives should be made more available and more attractive to young people.

We favor, on the other hand, universal access for those who want to enter institutions of higher education, are able to make reasonable progress after enrollment, and can benefit from attendance. We note that universal access has been the historic practice of American higher education. All who have wanted to go to college and had the funds to permit it have gone to college at one or another of our very diversified colleges, beginning with Colonial days. This practice has been the public policy of several of the states for a long time. Ohio, Kansas, Montana, and Wyoming have provided by law that all high school graduates should be eligible for admission to their state universities. The great current increase in college attendance has meant that the supply of places has, probably for the first time in American history, generally fallen behind the demand of students for them on any continuing basis, and access to higher education is now limited in some areas by the inadequate capacity of institutions of higher education and the resulting need to reject students who meet their admission standards.

In 1960, California, recognizing the new demand for college places, adopted a policy of providing an opportunity within its total system of higher education for each high school graduate or otherwise qualified person. New York City has adopted this policy for 1970. It is also being accepted by New York State, Washington, D.C., and Hawaii, among other jurisdiction. We believe this will become, and even should become, general policy of all states. As we accept universal access by a more diverse student body, offerings of post-secondary education will need to be continually adapted, as may be necessary, so that they may benefit and be enjoyed by persons for whom the conventional undergraduate neo-classical education is inappropriate.

The idea of open access is quite different from that of acceptance on the basis of ethnic or socio-economic quotas. The quota approach has not been the historic practice of American higher education and we do not recommend it. We do believe, at the same time, that our historic approach of open access should not be abandoned just when minority students are arriving in larger numbers. We should not close the door at this juncture in history.

An unusually heavy burden of universal access now falls and will continue to fall on the two-year community colleges. They have the most varied programs and thus appeal to the widest variety of students. Their geographical dispersion makes them, in the states where there are well-developed systems, the most easily available colleges for many students. The community colleges are particularly well-suited to help overcome deprivation by fact of location, deprivation by fact of age, and deprivation by fact of income.

The development of community colleges with academic transfer programs creates a special obligation for four-year colleges to accept all competent students who wish to continue to a four-year degree and to accept the credits they have already earned toward the degree they seek.

The provision of universal access and of transfer opportunities is of importance to all students, but particularly to those coming from currently disadvantaged groups since their numbers are growing proportionately the most rapidly.

The greatest deficit of opportunity for currently disadvantaged groups is now at the graduate level, and particularly at the graduate professional level. In our medical schools, less than three percent of the students are black. Among lawyers in the United States, less than two percent are from minority ethnic groups. A very special responsibility lies upon the universities to seek out graduate students from disadvantaged groups. The greatest single handicap the ethnic minorities face is their underrepresentation in the professions of the nation.

All institutions have a responsibility to serve the disadvantaged minorities at each of the levels at which they provide training. So that progress may be known and future possibilities discussed more openly, each institution should make an annual report of its past accomplishments and prospective plans.

*Implementing recommendation.* The Commission recommends that:

1. Each state plan to provide universal access to its total system, but not necessarily to each of its institutions, since they vary greatly in their nature and purposes.

2. Community colleges or equivalent facilities be established within commuting range of potential students in all populous areas.

3. Four-year colleges generally be prepared to accept qualified transfer students and give them appropriate credit for the work they have already completed.

4. All institutions accept responsibility to serve the disadvantaged minorities at each of the levels at which they provide training, and that universities accept a special responsibility to serve a substantially greater representation of currently disadvantaged minorities in their graduate programs.

5. Each institution issue an annual report on its present and potential contributions to equality of opportunity.

#### *Progress*

Progress is as important as access.

Students arrive on campus with varied backgrounds and interests. Too often they are funneled into a prescribed curriculum and expected to proceed at a prescribed rate. It would be better, instead, to provide more individualized placement and programs. We find attractive the idea of a "foundation" year in which students are given intensive counseling and wide latitude to find a program that fits their interests and needs. This foundation year could be tailored to more rapid, less rapid, or customary progress to a degree depending on the past training and ability of the individual student.

If a college were to structure the first year course work for each student according to his own preparation, maturation, work schedule and educational objectives, with the help of pre-college examinations and individual faculty advisors, then no group—as a group—would be identified as special or disadvantaged and all could be better served educationally.

*Implementing Recommendation.* The Commission recommends the initiation of programs for an individualized "foundation year" available on an optional basis to all interested students.

Some students will need to complete "remedial" work—work that should ideally be completed at the high school level. In what-

ever type of institution of higher education this remedial effort takes place, the Commission favors a limit to the amount of time a student should engage in such courses, provided that the school is meeting its commitments to him. The objective of more flexible admissions criteria and achievement standards is not to lower the quality of anyone's education. It is to give students additional opportunity and time to overcome factors limiting academic progress. Before any student is admitted to a college whose standard entrance requirements he cannot meet, the college should estimate how far below the minimum standards he is, and insure that the degree of its commitment to him, in compensatory resources, is potentially equivalent to the degree to which he falls below these standards.

*Implementing Recommendation.* The Commission recommends that every student accepted into a program requiring compensatory education receive the necessary commitment of resources to allow his engagement in an appropriate level of course work by the end of no more than two years.

The quality of academic degrees should not, under any circumstances, be reduced.

Deficits beyond the control and influence of the individual do, however, exist for many students and higher education has an obligation to help offset them. In the more ideal circumstances we favor for the future—to be obtained by the year 2000—such deficits will not exist. Today they do, and we do not believe that large numbers of young people should be sacrificed to these deficits during this interim period. Thus we support special efforts to overcome deficits beyond the student's control, without any sacrifice in the quality of degrees. Extra effort both by higher education and by the students is needed to close the gap between actual and potential accomplishment.

#### *Institutional environment*

As higher education increases its efforts to overcome deprivation of educational opportunity, evidence grows that these efforts require a transformation of higher education's own often unbalanced academic and cultural environment. As institutions succeed in bringing an increase of minority group students and staff to their campuses, these groups will require special understanding and institutional support.

The members of ethnic minorities within the academic community who are concerned with issues of educational and institutional reform represent a great variety of personalities, ideologies, and styles. The individual members are no more agreed upon detailed objectives and procedures than members of any large group are likely to be on a controversial and complex issue. What brings them together is their common experiences of racial discrimination, and their determination to eliminate any perceived injustice—without further delay.

It is now essential to find direct and comprehensive ways to build the varieties of minority experience into higher education while preserving an environment of continued and constant non-discrimination.

In recent years, attempts of colleges and universities to end discrimination or ethnocentrism have led to difficulties. Yet many of the indictments brought by minority students and faculty members are valid, and require adequate responses.

#### *Ethnic considerations in curriculum*

The Commission does not believe that post-secondary education is the best level at which we should begin correcting the ethnic imbalance of the curriculum. If a lack of ethnic self-awareness and a sense of inferiority begin in elementary school, then we must begin to attack these problems there.

From kindergarten on, every student can benefit from learning the history of his own ethnic group and those of his classmates,

and about the rich diversity of his nation's culture. Such study is not a substitute for the development of basic verbal and mathematical skills, but students deserve the opportunity to study ethnic experiences and to use the intellectual resources of their schools to seek an understanding of problems of their own communities.

All students, at every educational level, and with whatever vocational goal, must be made fully aware of the wide variety of backgrounds and values of their fellow citizens.

State universities and state boards of education have a special responsibility for developing and testing the basic classroom discussion material concerning the history and special problems of different minority groups. Reading and other instruction about such subjects can begin at the elementary school level and continue through junior and senior high school.

Institutions of higher education must be aware of the environmental backgrounds of all of their prospective student groups. Graduates who go on to any vocation in industry, government, or labor, as well as teaching, should be aware of the contributions—individual, collective, and even idiosyncratic—that minority races have made to American culture. This awareness, of course, is cultivated through the mass media, the arts, and many other social mechanisms besides college courses; and the classroom (on all levels) can provide only a part of the total learning experience.

College courses should include, where it is relevant to their content, information about the special problems encountered by members of minority groups and the contributions members of all ethnic groups have made to American and world society. It is also important that introductory courses be offered at the college level concerning the varieties of minority experience, and that they be open to all students and faculty.

Not every institution of higher education, however, has the facilities and the staff to offer comprehensive instruction in ethnic studies. The more such offerings are attempted when trained faculty and course materials have yet to be fully developed, the greater the dilution and disintegration that will occur in existing programs. Granting demands for majors, departments, and colleges which do not have the finances or resources or staff to conduct an effective program, exacerbates campus tension in the long run. One solution to this problem is to develop cooperative programs for groups of neighboring institutions. Another solution is to refer students who want to specialize in ethnic studies at the undergraduate level to campuses that have the resources to develop an adequate program in that field. Also, campuses which have well-developed ethnic studies programs might make them available in the summer to students from other institutions.

Cautions about specialized degree programs should not be assumed, however, to rule out the possibility of an individualized ethnic studies major at any campus. Although there may be a shortage of faculty to staff a degree program for ethnic studies, there is often enough flexibility and interest to allow, through the use of tutorials and independent study, the construction of faculty-sponsored and supervised individual major programs to fit the interests and academic standards of students and instructors.

After examining many ethnic studies programs across the country, some established for years and others just begun, the Commission has been most impressed when colleges and universities which have the appropriate economic and academic resources offer a program leading to a joint degree in ethnic studies combined with another related academic discipline. Such a program enables a student to pursue a concentration in a spe-



cific minority culture within the framework of an appropriately related major field. Precedent for such practice exists in interdepartmental undergraduate programs such as comparative literature and area studies.

The educational benefits that accrue to the academic and ethnic communities from ethnic studies programs are a function of the degree to which members of both communities withstand pressures and insist upon a legitimate educational enterprise. Reforms in curricula are clearly necessary to fill gaps that should never have been allowed to occur and innovative procedures must be considered to meet new conditions, but the temptation to bypass careful academic review and to seek autonomy for weak, new endeavors should be resolutely resisted. Ethnic programs should be staffed by qualified personnel regardless of race and attended by qualified students regardless of race. Academic standards of factual accuracy and careful analysis of information apply here no less than in other areas of study.

Research and advanced study are needed to prepare teaching materials and teachers for ethnic studies. Concentration of such effort in a relatively few institutions where scholars have been assembled and where relevant materials have been gathered is desirable. A number of institutions, including several predominantly black colleges, already have established comprehensive institutes for this purpose.

New centers of advanced study should also be established, but with great care, and only when competent staff and adequate library resources are available. In view of the scarcity of competent personnel and other resources, a small number of excellent centers is preferable to a large number of inadequate ones.

Years ago, the major foundations supported the establishment of centers for Latin American, Slavic, and Asian studies. Today they have a comparable obligation to respond favorably to proposals for the study of American Indian, Black American, Mexican-American, Southern Appalachian, and Puerto Rican history and literature at carefully selected centers.

#### Academic staff

The degree to which our suggested directions for ethnic studies and many of our other proposals for equal opportunity succeed will depend, in part, on the availability of minority teachers at all levels. Their availability in turn depends upon the elimination of barriers to higher education and particularly to graduate and professional training. The Commission's recommendations for graduate and professional recruitment and support are geared in part to this objective.

Minority staff members are urgently needed not only or even primarily for ethnic studies programs. Minority groups are underrepresented throughout the academic community. For example, a racial and ethnic survey of California junior colleges for the fall of 1967 shows that, whereas one-quarter of the students at these colleges are nonwhite, 94.3 percent of the instructors, 97.8 percent of the deans, and 97.8 percent of the district superintendents are white.<sup>9</sup>

Until we can produce a more representative ethnic distribution of persons with advanced degrees, the Commission urges that interim alternatives for hiring faculty be sought by educational institutions. All those with the desire to teach classes for which they are qualified by talent and experience should be allowed to do so. The conventional standards of competence are not always relevant.

There are also minority teachers with doctorates, with years of teaching experience and with research competence, but who have lacked both the opportunity and the incentive to publish. Such teachers should be

considered eligible for regular faculty positions in institutions seeking minority faculty and requiring research activity, and then be given research opportunities.

#### Social centers

The Commission believes strongly in the full integration of the campus as an institution. It opposes the segregation of educational, housing, eating and athletic facilities. It endorses the position of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare that it is illegal to use federal funds to support separate facilities on the basis of ethnic groupings. We believe that all campus facilities and programs should be available to all students on the same terms.

The Commission recognizes, however, that informal social activities, by the choice of the participants themselves, will often take place on an ethnic basis. Consequently it recognizes the desirability of providing adequate accommodations for the informal social activities of diverse ethnic groups.

#### Community involvement

Part of the response of colleges and universities to the interests of minority and other groups on their campuses involves being sensitive to the impact institutions can have on the people living around them. At some colleges, for example, plans for expansion are being reexamined to ascertain housing patterns in the campus vicinity and to insure that lower-income residents of this area are not summarily deprived of adequate facilities. Colleges frequently caution businesses providing services to the institution, to students and faculty members against discriminatory practices.

The degree of institutional involvement in the surrounding community varies. Some campuses are ready and able to begin full-scale research to assess the function and structure of neighboring ghettos, and the means by which, if necessary, they can be transformed. Others prefer to concentrate on filling the need for educated community leaders. Several medical and law schools have organized programs to provide services to poverty areas near the campus. Each of these experiments promises mutual education and benefit for campus and community.

The Commission endorses greater efforts by institutions of higher education to apply their research and consulting and teaching skills to the problems of the surrounding neighborhoods and the people who live within them. It is believed that faculty members and other individuals who give services to the surrounding neighborhood should have their contributions adequately recognized by the campus. It also endorses all efforts of an institution to be a good neighbor in the community. It opposes, however, direct involvement of the institution-as-such in political struggles.

#### 4. AN EQUAL OPPORTUNITY CHECKLIST FOR THE ACADEMIC COMMUNITY

The Commission has offered a series of recommendations and suggestions which would enable higher education to serve better a broader cross-section of students. If results are to be equally beneficial to all groups, then the nation's campuses must be not only totally committed to the goals—and we believe that most of them are today—but also fully aware of the needs imposed by these programs—and it is apparent that some campuses are not. In fact, the campus is sometimes more unprepared for the educationally disadvantaged student than the student is unprepared for the campus.

To indicate the scope of institutional change that is being required, the Commission has compiled from its research and from reports and observations of experience on campuses across the country an equal opportunity checklist for the academic com-

munity. The checklist is not intended to discourage colleges and universities from initiating equal opportunity programs, but rather, to help assure the success of the programs which higher education must establish and expand:

Have other programs at institutions with similar selectivity, academic environments and educational objectives been studied for strengths and weaknesses?

Are considerable numbers of students, faculty, and administrators willing to reexamine and restructure traditional institutional and individual procedures and priorities?

Have both white and nonwhite members of the alumni association, student body, governing board, faculty, community, and administrative and non-academic staff been informed and consulted about the institution's move to help eliminate deprivation of equal educational opportunity?

Have local and state government officials been informed of the plans and asked for their cooperation, ideas, understanding and financial support?

Are recruiters encouraged to present a realistic appraisal of the campus situation, including the scope and nature of the institution's objectives and resources? Are minority students used as recruiters?

Have the requirements for additional educational, financial and psychological support for a portion of the educationally disadvantaged students been discussed and met?

Will each student with an educational disadvantage receive the commitment of compensatory resources necessary to enable him to engage in standard course work within two years?

Can the community be involved in contributing financial resources and providing nonacademic support mechanisms for minority students on the campus?

Has the institution examined its employment policies to identify and begin to eliminate those which are *de facto* discriminatory against minority persons within or outside of the campus?

Will there be programs, facilities, resource persons, and funds available for the recognition of the particular ethnic heritages of minority groups?

Have the campus and the local community been prepared for the language, dress, and social customs of new ethnic groups in the same way that the new students have been or should have been prepared for the values and customs of what has been the dominant academic culture?

Are there administrators with the training and flexibility to provide adequate assistance? Will they be able to modify attitudes and increase understanding on the campus and in the community? Can they encourage and develop in themselves and in the students an ability to work out reasonable solutions?

Are there faculty members sufficiently versed in the problems and needs of students from new ethnic groups to serve as faculty advisors? Are others willing to learn?

Will persons from diverse ethnic backgrounds be available in the community and on the staff as "role models"?

Are there persons either of the ethnic minorities or well accepted by them already on campus who can and will serve as resource persons or as coordinators of programs?

Are these persons aware of, and in touch with, the variety of ethnic experiences? Can they maintain balance among them?

Will health, food, recreation and living facilities be available which acknowledge and are appropriate to the needs and habits of diverse social groups?

Are places of worship for the denominations or religious heritages of minority groups readily accessible or will transportation be provided if they are available only at some distance?

Footnotes at end of speech.

Are a number of persons trained, prepared, or willing to learn how to handle ethnic conflicts which may arise either from a sense on the part of the majority of being neglected because of special attention to the minority, or from a sense on the part of the minorities of being submerged in the life of majority?

Use of this checklist may well reveal imbalances of which an academic community has not been fully aware, and may alert the community to the risks for both the disadvantaged students and the institution. As institutions move increasingly toward providing an excellent education to a diverse student population, the campus discovers how great a distance is yet to be covered. Too many campuses in the United States have started out with the assumption that the only problem was one of admissions. For most campuses, major changes, not just a new policy for admissions, are involved.

#### 5. NATIONAL PLANNING AND COORDINATION

The Commission has outlined extensive programs and experiments for removing the educational consequences of economic and social inequities. Many of the proposals would benefit from a national overview and coordination. We cannot wait for plans or research reports before beginning a more extensive attack on educational inequality, but we do need a long-range view, and we have been limited by a lack of evaluative research and the absence of criteria for determining qualitative improvement. Several groups have suggested the need for one agency or council to study, recommend upon, and monitor policy and strategy; to devise measures of progress and issue annual evaluation reports; to serve as a clearinghouse for materials and consultation; to propose further means to articulate the efforts at all educational levels; and to coordinate and oversee the activities within each regional area. A unit within the United States Office of Education, with an appropriate advisory committee reporting to the Commissioner of Education, would seem to be the best device for serving these objectives.

National policy for equal educational opportunity must be based on the most recent and significant data, and upon answers to questions not being adequately investigated at the present time. High school graduation rates, the flow through undergraduate education to graduate and professional schools, the choice of majors and occupations—these are but a few of the problems relating to black students, low-income white students, Mexican-American students and other groups that require constant research.

Independent researchers are preparing important manuscripts, and the U.S. Office of Education is conducting several relevant studies, but these efforts should be coordinated, interpreted, and distributed. The Commission urges institutions to keep detailed records on all of their activities related to the expansion of educational opportunity and recommends that the Commissioner of Education designate a unit within the Office of Education to develop standard definitions and methods of reporting to insure the coordination, evaluation, and dissemination of available data. The unit should work closely with the Bureau of the Census, the National Science Foundation and other concerned federal agencies.

#### 6. CONCLUSION

Years ago, when economic and cultural well-being for most people did not depend so heavily upon college training, questions of advanced educational opportunity lacked both the relevance and the impact that they have now. Today, the denial of equal opportunity for higher education is also the denial of equal access to full partnership in American society.

In the last decade we have witnessed a significant expansion of educational oppor-

tunity, but the evidence of our present distance from the goal of equal opportunity for higher education is distressing.

#### The year 1976

By 1976, the two-hundredth anniversary of the Declaration of Independence, the Commission proposes:

that all economic barriers to educational opportunity be eliminated, thus closing the present probability differentials for college access and completion, and graduate school access and completion, among groups of equal academic ability but unequal family income level;

that the curriculum and the environment of the college campus not remain a source of educational disadvantage or inequity; that questions of cultural balance no longer be a source of eruptions;

and that substantial progress be made toward improvement of educational quality at levels prior to higher education, and toward provision of universal access to higher education.

#### The year 2000

By the year 2000, the Commission believes that opportunities can and must be totally free of the last vestiges of limitations imposed by ethnic grouping, or geographic location, or age, or quality of prior schooling. It should not be necessary for colleges and universities in the year 2000 to provide compensatory educational programs or to struggle over flexible criteria for admissions and grading. The residual academic liabilities of racial discrimination and environmental deficiencies must not be allowed to influence educational opportunities in the 21st century.

By the year 2000, there should be no barriers to any individual achieving the occupational level which his talent warrants and which his interest leads him to seek. Equalizing educational opportunity for the individual citizen could lead to a percentage of minority persons at the higher occupational and professional levels generally roughly equivalent to their percentage of the population. Such a situation would be a most important signal that society was meeting its commitment to equality, and that education was fulfilling its particular role.

The total number of individuals comprising the many institutions and agencies addressed in these recommendations and comments is vast. But the problem is society-wide, and the Carnegie Commission is convinced that the response must in turn be society-wide. The total cost to the federal and state governments and public and private institutions will be high. But the cost of social services needed to cope with the consequences of educational disadvantages far outruns the economic support necessary to confront the sources of deprivation. Inequality of opportunity must not continue to sap the strength of our nation.

Money is not the only resource needed to solve these problems. In fact, it will be easier to provide the financial support necessary than it will be to create the ethical and political atmosphere which would ensure the achievement of these goals. Many of the recommendations do not involve a great financial input, but they do require a substantial investment of personal and institutional effort.

Insofar as higher educational institutions will incur increased costs as they develop the special programs recommended in this report, these costs can be met through reallocation of existing resources and through the cost-of-education supplements recommended in our first report, *Quality and Equality*. These supplements should be provided to the institutions for each student who qualifies for a student grant. The grants are intended for students from low-income families and the supplements are designed to enable the institutions to meet the additional costs as-

sociated with remedial education and other special efforts to overcome handicaps.

With a national commitment, we have met other immense challenges. Today we can no longer place any domestic priority for unmet needs above the elimination of inequality of opportunity of the United States. The Commission believes that a commitment to adequate support for better educational systems, to comprehensive student aid, and to removing the consequences of discrimination is truly basic to the nation's future. The greatest asset of any nation is its people.

#### FOOTNOTES

<sup>1</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 190, "School Enrollment: October 1968 and 1967," Table 13, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969, p. 33.

<sup>2</sup> Folger, John K., Alan E. Bayer, and Alexander W. Astin, *Human Resources in Higher Education*, Russell Sage, New York, 1970, p. 324.

<sup>3</sup> Statement of Geoffrey H. Moore, Commissioner of Labor Statistics, U.S. Department of Labor, before the Special Subcommittee on Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, on Higher Education Legislation, December 18, 1969.

<sup>4</sup> U.S. Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 190, "School Enrollment: October 1968 and 1967," Table F, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C., 1969, p. 4.

<sup>5</sup> Trent, James W. and Leland L. Medsker, *Beyond High School*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco, 1968, pp. 26, 27.

<sup>6</sup> Berg, Ernest and Dayton Axtell, *Programs for Disadvantaged Students in the California Community Colleges*, Peralta Junior College District, Oakland, California, 1968, p. 39.

#### ALERTING THE PUBLIC

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, almost 23 years ago, on March 21, 1947, Executive Order No. 9835 was issued which established security requirements for Government employment and listed a number of organizations as Communist or Fascist. Other organizations, including the Ku Klux Klan, were listed under the classification of having "adopted a policy of advocating or approving the commission of acts of force and violence to deny others their rights under the Constitution of the United States."

In 1953, the above-cited order was superseded by Executive Order No. 10450 which adopted the guideline set forth in the previous order that a factor in the Federal employment of an individual would be membership in or association with a group which is "totalitarian, Fascist, Communist, or subversive, or which has adopted, or shows a policy of advocating the commission of acts of force or violence to deny other persons their rights under the Constitution of the United States, or which seeks to alter the form of government of the United States by unconstitutional means."

Since that time court decisions have rendered inoperative the Attorney General's list which operated under the two orders mentioned above and also the op-



erations of the Subversive Activities Control Board which listed Communist individuals and organizations only. It is ironic that at the present time while organizations advocating anarchy and revolution are on the increase in this country the American public has no authoritative, up-to-date source which it can consult to learn the true nature of these groups.

As I have pointed out before, the FBI, which is this Nation's chief guardian of its internal security, has the most complete information on these various groups. The FBI reports to the Attorney General but not to congressional investigative committees which also deal in subversive activities. Thus the Attorney General's Office is the foremost repository in the Federal Government of information on subversive and disruptive organizations and is the agency which controls the SACB. In addition, the SACB is the only body dealing in subversive activities which has judicial safeguards such as the right to present oral and documentary evidence and the right of cross-examination of witnesses.

It would appear then that the Board would be the logical choice to keep the public abreast of the identity of those organizations which foment disorder and revolution.

A timely report on the Board appeared in the February 28, 1970, issue of Human Events which indicates that the administration intends to use the unique services of the Board to help provide the public with the needed information to cope with the disruptive elements in this country. I include the Human Events account of February 28 regarding the SACB in the RECORD at this point:

#### SACB REVITALIZATION IMPERATIVE

At the very moment leftist groups are preparing to launch new waves of violence in the United States, the Administration is debating whether to act before the 1970 elections to pump new life into the long dormant Subversive Activities Control Board (SACB). The Justice Department has for several months been perfecting an Executive Order to give the board new authority to certify as subversive any group advocating violence as a means of bringing about radical changes in the U.S. government.

If the order is finally issued—and the question now seems to be just a matter of timing—the five-man, quasi-judicial SACB will then have the power to hold hearings on such organizations as the Black Panthers, the Revolutionary Action Movement, Students for a Democratic Society and Progressive Labor and various other "violent action" groups.

As a result of court decisions and the subtle efforts of Ramsey Clark to emasculate the powers of the board when he was attorney general, internal security experts stress there is a great need for strengthening the SACB. For the board, it is argued, could serve as a powerful weapon in protecting the U.S. against subversion.

The broadening of the SACB's authority could have a dramatic impact on internal security matters. Once an organization is tagged subversive by the SACB, it is put on the attorney general's list. This list is used by federal agencies as an important guide in the hiring of government personnel.

But with the SACB now being limited to holding hearings on Communist groups, non-Communist "violent action" groups like the

Panthers and the Weatherman faction of the SDS do not show up on the Department of Justice's catalogue of subversive organizations. This, of course, would change with the issuance of the proposed Executive Order.

Moreover, there is mounting evidence that members of non-Communist, violence-prone organizations have been permitted to work for various government agencies—including the Pentagon—precisely because these groups are not carried on the attorney general's subversive roster.

Through its hearings and reports, the SACB has also proved to be a useful tool in exposing unsavory aspects of various organizations, thus greatly damaging their ability to recruit members. Two Communist groups, the Labor Youth League and the W.E.B. DuBois Clubs, for instance, went out of existence largely because their cases had been referred to the board for hearings.

By having its powers broadened, the SACB could render similar damage to the recruiting abilities of the New Left revolutionary organizations that have dramatically mushroomed in the past few years.

The Nixon Administration appears to be agreed that the Executive Order expanding the SACB's powers should be issued, but an intensive debate is now going on as to exactly when this should be done.

Some high-ranking Justice Department officials—including Deputy Atty. Gen. Richard Kleindienst—want action postponed until after the 1970 elections on the grounds that the Justice Department will be busy enough this year without having to get into another hassle with Hill liberals over the SACB. And the liberals, it is believed, would probably make a lot of noise over any Executive Order increasing the SACB's authority.

Yet there are equally cogent arguments why the Administration should act quickly to revitalize the board.

For one thing, the SACB has virtually no work to do. Not widely noticed outside of Washington is the fact that Chief Judge David Bazelon of the U.S. Court of Appeals dealt a roundhouse blow to the SACB last December. Writing the opinion for a three-man panel, Bazelon, considered an extreme liberal, held as unconstitutional a 1968 law empowering the Department of Justice to ask the board to classify individuals as members of the Communist party.

Membership, said Bazelon, was protected by the 1st Amendment; hence the SACB could not hold hearings to prove "mere membership." As a result, the SACB has suspended all further hearings.

With the board having been rendered inoperative for the time being, the fear is increasing that the SACB's liberal enemies, in conjunction with the President's continuing calls for spending cuts, will engage in a new effort—similar to the one in 1967—to eliminate the board entirely.

Furthermore, there will be plenty of opportunities for the liberals to exploit the board's present lack of work. Within the next month, for instance, the board will be requesting its fiscal 1971 appropriations. Aside from this, the terms of two SACB members—Chairman John Mahan and Otto Otepka—expire in March and August, respectively. Since the Senate must reconfirm both members if they are renominated, this will provide such anti-SACB senators as William Proxmire (D.-Wis.) with several fresh chances to rail against the board's lack of activity.

SACB supporters stress there are other important reasons why the Administration should act promptly to invest the panel with new authority to cope with subversives.

While radicals and revolutionaries have been relatively quiet since the massive November march on Washington, they are now gearing up for a spring offensive. The New Mobilization Committee, which staged that Washington march and many of whose leaders are advocates of violence, has called for

illegal demonstrations in February, March and April against draft induction centers, IRS offices and corporations with defense contracts.

The Trotskyite Student Mobilization Committee, which also participated in the Washington march, decided in a Cleveland conference in mid-February to undertake a spring offensive against the war on April 15 and support demonstrations staged by other anti-war groups.

The Vietnam Moratorium Committee, another chief anti-war organization, has also issued plans for anti-war activities on April 15.

Meanwhile, there appears to be an increasing amount of terrorism directed against government officials, soldiers and police. Last week two soldiers were reported machine-gunned in Oakland from a passing automobile. The FBI has also been investigating several bomb blasts that have wounded policemen in San Francisco. The police believe the explosions were "the work of revolutionaries."

Equally disturbing was the ghastly murder of an Army doctor's wife and two daughters in Fort Bragg, N.C. According to initial reports, three men and a blond woman burst into the doctor's home, crying "Kill the Figs!"—the chant of the new American revolutionaries. Internal security experts, furthermore, say that such incidents are increasing rather than decreasing.

Thus, it is being argued by SACB supporters, the Nixon Administration will gain public sympathy if it issues an Executive Order that will try to cope with the growing problem of the revolutionaries in our midst. And it may lose public sympathy if it waits until events force it to act.

Though it is a foregone conclusion that Otto Otepka will be reappointed in August, there is some doubt whether the Administration will renominate John Mahan, the board's current chairman. Internal security experts, however, are hoping that Mahan will be re-named, for he is considered extremely able in the internal security field. Although Mahan is a Democrat, the Administration is prevented from replacing him with a Republican, since the law permits only three Republicans on the five-man board—and the GOP already has its quota. Nixon may want to "Republicanize" the board even further by naming one of the GOP members as chairman, but security experts think that Mahan should at least remain part of the anti-subversive panel.

#### TO CONTROL HANDGUN CRIME AND HANDGUN VIOLENCE

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the great American shoot-out must come to an end. The "good old days" of the wild West when everybody carried his own "equalizer" were never very good. They become disaster days when we apply a gun-on-the-hip philosophy to the large, urban areas where millions of people live "uptight" with and toward each other.

America is no longer a frontier society where every citizen must pack his own pistol to insure his safety. In fact, as the National Violence Commission recently concluded, far from contributing to the safety of our citizens, "the availability of guns contributes substantially to violence in American society." But in focus-

ing on all firearms, we have been diverted from the true culprit: the handgun. Because rifles and shotguns have legitimate hunting and recreational uses, sporting enthusiasts have often feared that any attempt to control firearms violence would infringe on the sporting uses of long guns. Thus, it is in all our interests to direct our attention to the weapon which contributes the most to crime, which has the least sporting value, and which is increasing in numbers faster than any other type of firearm: the handgun.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I am introducing a bill which will ban the importation, manufacture, transfer, or transportation in the United States of any handgun by any person except a law enforcement officer, a member of the military, and certain persons licensed by the Secretary of the Treasury. I hope this bill will be the beginning of a debate which will separate handguns from long guns in the minds of the American people, and which will lead eventually to the elimination of handgun crime and handgun violence in America.

#### CRUCIAL DIFFERENCES BETWEEN HANDGUNS AND LONG GUNS

Commonsense and public safety require that we begin to distinguish the dangers presented by handguns as opposed to long guns. Long guns have legitimate sporting and recreational uses; in remote areas of our country they may be useful for self-protection; and they are difficult to hide or to carry concealed on the person. But compare handguns. Handguns are easily concealed and easily carried on the person; they have, with few exceptions, little sporting or recreational value; because they are concealable, they are ideal for covertly applying force or threatening force; they are easily obtained and easily transferred, even when illegal, because they attract little attention. It is no wonder that the handgun, as opposed to the long gun, is the criminal's favorite weapon.

#### TWENTY-FOUR MILLION HANDGUNS IN PRIVATE HANDS

Let us look first at the dimensions of the problem we are talking about. By the estimate of the National Violence Commission, there were in 1969 about 24 million privately owned handguns in America—one handgun for every 2.5 households in the country. What is perhaps even more frightening than the number of handguns is the rate at which they are multiplying. Since 1963, annual handgun sales have quadrupled while sales of other firearms have only doubled. Much of the recent handgun buying, moreover, is taking place in our cities and urban areas—places where there can be little legitimate sporting or recreational use for these handguns. One new handgun is sold in the United States every 13 seconds. The market in used handguns is almost as shocking. Used handguns are traded at a rate of more than two a minute. The handguns which citizens are obtaining—legally and illegally—in increasing numbers are obviously intended for one thing: to kill other human beings.

The National Violence Commission

provided a convincing explanation for the increasing numbers of handguns owned by the American public, especially in the cities. The reason is fear. As a result of widespread urban violence in recent years, both violent crime and civil disorder, the urban dweller is afraid and he wants to protect himself and his family. To do this he buys a handgun. But as more citizens buy handguns, so do more criminals. And as more handguns circulate, they become easier for everyone to obtain: juveniles, the mentally defective, convicted felons, potential criminals. With 24 million handguns already in private hands and close to 2½ million being manufactured or imported every year, the fear and the violence continue to grow. It is a vicious circle in which unregulated and uncontrolled handgun acquisition breeds violence, fear, and more acquisitions. Sometime we must come to our senses and put a stop to this madness.

Who owns all of these pistols, revolvers, and other handguns and how do they get them? Surprisingly, less than 20 percent of all handguns in private hands are owned by people living in rural areas. The vast majority belong to people in cities, towns, and suburbs. More than half of the handguns acquired by Americans are acquired secondhand, a fact which makes control through normal licensing or registration almost impossible. The pistol which killed Senator Robert Kennedy, for example, was acquired by a homeowner during the Watts riot for home protection. It was bought at a sporting goods store in a Los Angeles suburb. The purchaser gave it to his daughter, who gave it to a family friend, who sold it to Sirhan's brother, who gave it to Sirhan. How many millions of times this happens every week with how many hundreds of thousands of handguns no one can say. It is impossible to imagine that any system of registration or licensing could keep up with this incredible traffic.

#### TO BAN THE HANDGUN CRIMINAL OR THE HANDGUN

The standard response of opponents of handgun control laws—or any gun control laws—is that no handgun ever committed a crime by itself; our target should be the criminal, not the handgun. But no machinegun ever committed a crime by itself either, nor did any sawed-off shotgun, or any handgrenade. Yet, these weapons as well as—in the 1938 Gun Control Act—any destructive device have been banned. They are, under Federal law, simply contraband and unavailable to private citizens. The reason is obvious: Whether these weapons are a primary cause of violent crime—in the sense that the crime would not have been committed if the pistol had not been available—or merely contribute to it, the fact is that the more machineguns and destructive devices, the more the danger. When this fact is put against the lack of useful purposes of these items, the citizen's freedom to own a machinegun is simply not worth the risk to the safety of the rest of us. The same logic follows exactly in the case of handguns.

How much do handguns contribute to

violence—crimes, accidental deaths, suicides? We know how many people are killed in firearms accidents every year—an average of 2,400. Accidents of all kinds are tragic, and we must work to reduce accidental deaths from all sources. I have supported legislation to reduce accidental deaths—in automobiles, in factories, in coal mines, and elsewhere. But what is so terribly tragic about firearms accidents is that they strike especially in the home—where most people keep their guns for protection. Sixty percent of all accidental firearms deaths occur in the home; and for women and children the percentages are even higher, 86 percent and 84 percent, respectively. What is more, firearms accidents strike primarily the young—far more so than other types of accidental death. More than half of the fatal firearms accidents in the United States in 1966 involved people under 30; almost 40 percent involved children and teenagers.

Even in firearms accidents, handguns are the worst offender. If we are to allow firearms at all, some accidents will always happen. But handguns—which I am proposing be restricted only to law enforcement and the military—cause more than half of firearms deaths from playing, scuffling, and just plain horsing around, the least justifiable kind of accidental deaths. By comparison handguns account for only about one-quarter of all accidental deaths while cleaning a weapon and for almost no hunting deaths.

#### HANDGUNS: THE VIOLENT CRIMINAL'S FAVORITE

We have been hearing a good deal lately about the crisis in law enforcement. Let us look at what most people are afraid of, what they mean when they talk of law and order. What most citizens fear most is that someone will attack them physically, that someone will forcibly take something from them, or that someone will kill them. In the criminal law, we call these acts assault, robbery, and murder. And the handgun predominates—in every one of these types of crime. Two out of every three homicides, over a third of all robberies, and 1 out of 5 aggravated assaults are committed with a gun, usually a handgun. Not only are the absolute number of armed assaults, robberies and murders going up, but the percentage of all violent crimes which are committed with guns, as opposed to some other weapon or no weapon at all, is also going up. Fifty-four percent of all homicides were by guns in 1962; 59 percent in 1966; 65 percent in 1968.

But the most staggering statistics of all relate to the percentage of armed crimes which are committed with handguns as opposed to other firearms. These are the proof that it is the handgun, rather than all guns, which we have to fear. In 1967, 76 percent of all armed homicides in this country were committed with handguns; 86 percent of all aggravated assaults were committed with handguns; and an almost incredible 96 percent of all armed robberies were committed with handguns. In 1967 over 6,000 Americans were murdered with hand-



guns; in 1968, the number had risen to 6,825.

The District of Columbia Crime Commission described in 1965 what makes the handgun the criminal's favorite:

In the District of Columbia, handguns have become the weapon of choice among people bent upon crime. The reasons for this choice are clear: The handgun is readily obtained at a reasonable price, it is easily concealed until needed, and it is an effective means of threatening and applying force.

Almost 80 percent of the policemen shot in the line of duty during the first half of this decade were killed by handguns. And of course this discussion omits entirely the role of handguns in civil disturbance and riot situations, and in suicides.

#### WHY ALLOW PRIVATE HANDGUN OWNERSHIP?

Given the overwhelming role which handguns play in violent crime and other violence in American life, what justifications exist from allowing them to circulate so freely in our society rather than banning them from private hands as we have already done with machineguns, mortars, bazookas, and other dangerous weapons? There is little sporting or recreational use for handguns. In any case, since the plan I proposed for limiting the availability of handguns will allow for recreational uses, I will not discuss that justification at length.

The reason most often advanced for handgun ownership is defense of the home. This goes back to the country's increasing fear of civil disturbance and violent crime. But how much good is a handgun for home defense? Here again, the careful work of the Violence Commission is helpful. The Commission analyzed the nature of threats to the home. It found that the threat was almost entirely from burglary and robbery. But burglars attempt to avoid contact with homeowners, and usually do not come armed. Robberies, while they do involve violence to the person, happen only infrequently in private homes—about 6 percent—as compared to businesses, banks, and on the street.

The Commission's analysis also shows that in cases of robbery and attempted assault in the home—sexually motivated or otherwise—the homeowner most often has absolutely no warning of the impending attack—and no chance to fetch his handgun so carefully laid by for the emergency. The typical scenario is that an armed robber simply knocks on the door, and when the homeowner opens it, sticks a gun in his face. The Commission's conclusion on handguns for defense of the home bears quotation. It sums up the small contribution they make to safety and the countervailing dangers of accidents and theft:

From the standpoint of the individual householder, then, the self-defense firearm appears to be a dangerous investment. The existence of guns in one-half of America's homes may deter intruders. . . . Our Task Force made an effort to study the extent of this deterrence, but was unable to arrive at any firm conclusion. The evidence is convincing, however, that the home robber most often has the advantage of surprise, and the armed segment of our population is paying a heavy price in accidents and in the shooting of family members, friends and acquaintances for whatever deterrent effect

their possession of self-defense firearms may be providing. In a more rational world, home intrusion would be deterred by other means—such as non-lethal weapons, alarm systems, and other security arrangements—that are less dangerous to the occupants of the home.

#### THE INADEQUACY OF EXISTING LAW

During the last half of the 1960's, this country was subjected to a virtual barrage of recommendations from Presidential commissions, task forces, and study groups. Without exception they recommended restricting the availability of firearms, and most—the President's Commission on Law Enforcement and Administration of Justice, the District of Columbia Crime Commission, and the National Violence Commission—distinguished clearly between the danger presented by long guns and handguns. They recommended that laws be enacted at both the Federal and State levels to restrict the free circulation of all guns—but especially handguns. What has happened to these recommendations?

At the Federal level, the tragic assassinations of John F. Kennedy, Martin Luther King, and Senator Robert Kennedy finally shocked the Congress into passing a comparatively stringent gun law, the gun control law of 1968. But the 1968 act applied to both handguns and long guns. For this reason certain restrictions—which should clearly have been placed on handguns—were not, because they were not appropriate to long guns. The 1968 Gun Control Act did make it unlawful for any felon, person under indictment, fugitive, unlawful user of marijuana or narcotics, mental defective or person in a mental institution to transport or receive any firearm, including handguns, in interstate commerce. The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, as amended by the Gun Control Act, made illegal the possession of any firearm by felons, dishonorably discharged veterans, adjudicated mental incompetents, aliens illegally in the country, and former U.S. citizens who have renounced their citizenship. Finally, the Gun Control Act prohibited the interstate shipment of handguns except between licensed importers, manufacturers, dealers or collectors, and prohibited any transportation in interstate commerce of "destructive devices," such as bombs, handgrenades, antitank guns, and so forth.

Thus, there are obvious holes in the coverage of present Federal laws. Several States do have systems requiring a permit for purchase of a handgun, but there is wide divergence in the amount of enforcement. The National Violence Commission rated only two or three States as strict enforcers of their permit requirements, New York, Massachusetts, and perhaps New Jersey.

Congress, despite all the talk about tough law enforcement, has left the States on their own to deal with the menace of the handgun—the violent criminal's favorite weapon. Perhaps the best example of how helpless a city or State with strong handgun control laws is when it has to fight alone is presented by the Nation's Capital itself, Washington, D.C. Since November 1968 the District of Columbia has had one of the most stringent handgun control laws any-

where in the country. The law regulates the sale of handguns—as well as all other firearms—and absolutely prohibits firearms ownership by felons, drug addicts, minors, mental defectives, and previously convicted firearms law violators ineligible for ownership. Moreover, the law requires an application to the District of Columbia Police Department prior to purchase, and issuance of an annual license to carry a handgun. And yet with all these stringent regulations, so available are handguns in the District of Columbia that the rate of armed crime rose phenomenally between 1968 and 1969. Between January and June of 1969, firearms—mostly handguns—were used in 53 percent of all robberies compared to 47 percent in 1968, in 74 percent of aggravated assaults compared to 38 percent in 1968, and in 72 percent of all murders compared to 58 percent in 1968. I need not add that not only are percentages rising, but that these are higher percentages of higher absolute numbers of crimes.

The conclusion from all of this is that the problem of handgun crime is serious, that it is getting worse, and that existing laws are inadequate to deal with the situation. It is for these reasons that I am introducing today the Handgun Control Act of 1970.

#### THE HANDGUN CONTROL ACT OF 1970

The Handgun Control Act of 1970 prohibits the importation, manufacture, transfer, and transportation within the United States of any handgun, except by law enforcement officers, military personnel, or certain persons licensed by the Secretary of the Treasury. Among those designated as potential licensees are importers and manufacturers qualified under the 1968 Gun Control Act who might engage in the importation or manufacture of pistols for law enforcement authorities, the military, or other licensees. The only kinds of nongovernmental groups which can qualify for handgun licenses are sporting and recreational pistol clubs approved by the Secretary. To be approved, these pistol clubs must have no members who are themselves disqualified from handgun ownership under Federal or State law, and must have facilities and procedures for storing the club's handguns when they are not being used for sporting or recreational purposes. All of the operations of licensed clubs must be conducted in conformity with Treasury regulations.

The bill does not specifically ban the possession or make illegal ownership of handguns. It does, however, prevent such weapons from being imported, made, transferred to another, or transported, with the exceptions noted above. Under these circumstances, it is possible that many present owners of handguns will not wish to retain them. There is, therefore, a procedure for voluntary turn-in of privately owned handguns to Federal, State, or local law enforcement officials, who are authorized to reimburse the owner for the value of the weapon, or \$25, whichever is more. The cost of these reimbursements will ultimately be paid by the Federal Government. It is likely that some citizens will turn in their weapons voluntarily without desir-

ing reimbursement, as happened when Chicago instituted its comprehensive licensing requirements.

The bill is not intended to preempt further regulation of handguns by the States, and there are provisions explicitly leaving to the States the right to further regulate the possession of handguns.

The jurisdictional basis for this congressional action would be the constitutional grant of power to regulate interstate and foreign commerce. A set of findings emphasize that the serious and worsening handgun situation in America, and the criminal and other violence which result from it, are a burden on interstate and foreign commerce. The bill is intended to relieve that burden by the fullest exercise of congressional power possible under the Constitution.

TO END HANDGUN CRIME AND VIOLENCE

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if Congress were to enact this bill, we would within several years see a marked decline in the rate of violent crime in America. The experience of other countries seems to bear this out, although comparisons of countries with different histories and cultures is admittedly difficult. Nevertheless, comparisons may prove useful and provide a target at which to aim. In Japan with rare exceptions only police officers carry pistols. In 1966, firearms of all types figure in only 99 crimes during the entire year. In addition, Japan's homicide rate is one-third that of the United States and, as one would expect, the rate of firearms accidents is much lower than here.

Perhaps a more useful comparison may be made with Great Britain, a country from which our own legal traditions come and a staunch defender of individual rights over the centuries. The rate—not the number but the rate—for homicide is one-eighth that of the United States; for robbery is one-tenth; for aggravated assault is one-seventeenth. During the year 1963 when 5,126 Americans were being murdered by firearms, only 24 Britons died of the same cause.

I use these examples not because I intend to imply that the situations in the United States and other countries are exactly comparable, but to show that other countries, whatever their own problems, have been able to lick the problem of firearms violence. I believe that we in this country owe a better effort than we have yet made against handgun violence to our law enforcement officers who are in the frontlines in the war against crime, to our children who deserve a world less violent than we have known, and to ourselves.

LET THE PEOPLE SPEAK OUT

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, the need for the so-called silent majority to speak out and be heard in the fight against crime has never been better stated than by the distinguished columnist David

Lawrence in the current issue of U.S. News & World Report. As Mr. Lawrence so well puts it: "The main responsibility rests with the American people."

The time has come for those citizens of the United States who are concerned by the rising tide of crime, lawlessness and anarchy, to express their disapproval. This can be done at local meetings, by letters to the editor, and by a chorus of demand that dissent and protest be required to be sufficiently restrained as to refrain from lawlessness and crime.

I commend Mr. Lawrence's editorial to the thoughtful consideration of every American:

[From the U.S. News & World Report, March 9, 1970]

ONLY THE PEOPLE AS A WHOLE CAN CURB CRIME

(By David Lawrence)

We have too long assumed that merely increasing the number of policemen or detectives will diminish the number of crimes in America. It's time to face up to the facts: Many of the burglaries as well as murders are committed in private homes.

We are witnessing a crime wave of unprecedented proportions. There is widespread disrespect for law and order by citizens. Too many individuals in the younger generation have no regard for property rights or for life itself. Stealing is regarded as a proper means of obtaining funds. There is a feeling that punishment for crime will be light. Morality is brushed aside.

A virtual revolution has taken place which has manifested itself in the form of "demonstrations." Buildings have been taken over on college campuses, churches have been invaded, municipal offices have been picketed and their entrances blocked. The spirit of revolt is extensive. Some segments of the press have sympathized with this uprising and given it recognition as merely the exercise of the constitutional right of "freedom of speech" or "freedom of assembly." The fact that it might incite to riot or lead to damage of property or to injury or death has been largely ignored.

When will the American people come to realize that negligence on the part of a large number of their own law-abiding citizens has been responsible for the passive attitude toward crime and violence that has brought America to its tragic status of unmorality?

Even some of the clergy have failed in their duty. A few days ago, William C. Sullivan, Assistant Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, in a speech in Chicago declared that prominent churchmen have been expressing sympathy for the Black Panthers, raising bail money for them, and even in some cases taking residence in Black Panther headquarters to discourage police raids on them. He also noted that some church leaders have been accusing police of murdering Black Panther members in wholesale lots.

"Just what do these clergymen," asked Mr. Sullivan, "really know about the Black Panthers? Have any of them taken the trouble to get the facts about this organization?"

Mr. Sullivan pointed out that there are "about 900 hard-core guerrilla-type" members and perhaps "another 900 intermittent members" active in chapters in approximately 40 cities in the United States, and that the group is committed to the goal of "destroying the government and institutions" of this country. He said that the Panthers have embarked on a deliberate policy of waging guerrilla warfare against the police, and have stockpiled large supplies of weapons. He added:

"Although it has been claimed that as many as 28 Panthers have been killed by po-

lice, the truth is that 10 Panthers have died as a result of incidents involving police. And Panther violence has killed 5 police officers and wounded 42 others. . . .

"Clergymen quite rightly should be very active in establishing social justice, eliminating poverty, and abolishing discrimination. Does this mean, however, that they have to fall under the spell of some strange compulsion to identify themselves with and give support to an organization containing a band of criminals?"

Unless the people of America cooperate with the Government in securing respect for law and order, new statutes will not have a maximum effect.

The Organized Crime Control Act, which passed the Senate on January 23 by a vote of 73 to 1—and now is pending in the House—was sponsored by Senator John L. McClellan of Arkansas after a year-long effort by the Subcommittee on Criminal Laws and Procedures, of which he is Chairman.

Basically, the measure would give broad power to the Federal Government to crack down on racketeers, who are the main influences behind organized crime. This and other laws providing more police and better methods of detection and gathering evidence will help in the arrest and prosecution of wrongdoers. Perhaps the meting out of punishment may discourage other criminals.

But the root of the whole problem will not be reached by legislation or by law-enforcement mechanisms. The main responsibility rests with the American people, particularly the educated class. They must come to recognize that things have gone too far in America when we find ourselves witnessing "demonstrations" in behalf of those convicted defendants in Chicago who provoked disorder in the courtroom and day after day hurled insults at the judge presiding at their trial.

The words "law and order" should mean respect for law and the maintenance of order by everybody—without exception. Neither the courts nor the law-making bodies should hereafter permit quasi-revolutions to be conducted across the land by rebellious individuals. Until youth is taught the meaning of respect for law, we cannot expect crime to be cured in America.

CHICAGO SEVEN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the trial of the Conspiracy Seven defendants in Chicago has and is continuing to receive national attention. Therefore, I feel that the editorial broadcast over WBBM Radio, Chicago, on February 23 commenting on the conduct of the jury is of special significance:

CHICAGO SEVEN

Attorney William M. Kunstler, chief defense counsel for the Conspiracy 7 defendants, has attacked the jury verdict in the controversial case. Kunstler has called the jury's verdict an outrage. He has said it is a compromise and a terrible one. By extension, he is in fact attacking the jury system itself.

We disagree with Kunstler. The jury—a dozen average Americans—was sorely taxed by a very long trial. It had to sit through a case hopelessly entwined in legal and political complexities, and further clouded by the circus antics of the defendants and their supporters.

After a painstaking job, we believe this community owes the jurors a vote of thanks for a job well done under the most trying of



circumstances. The jury has demonstrated that the American system of justice, with all its faults, can still operate effectively.

It is no perfect system of course. And some of the imperfections may even lead to a higher court reversing the decision. Only time will answer that question. But we believe the community owes a debt of gratitude to the 10 women and two men who served on this jury. They were deprived of their homes and their families.

What the jury has demonstrated so very well, is that a system that places its faith in the fundamental decency and dedication of ordinary citizens, is a system that works for the benefit of everyone. It is unfortunate that some of the parties involved in this case do not realize that fact.

LEGISLATION PROVIDING FOR THE  
ESTABLISHMENT OF A NATIONAL  
ADVISORY COMMISSION ON  
SCHOOL FINANCE

**HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am today introducing a bill to establish a commission that will address itself to the urgent problems of the financing of America's elementary and secondary schools.

As the manifold funding difficulties surface in school districts around the Nation, I find that we have no organized effort or plan for focusing public attention on the whole question of maintaining a healthy, solvent educational system. Not only must we address ourselves to ways of upgrading and expanding our total educational resources, but we are now faced with a financial squeeze so acute that it is not uncommon for schools to have to close their doors for portions of the normal term because of shortages of operating funds.

At present, Mr. Speaker, there are wide differences between the amounts spent on the education of each child from State to State, and indeed from district to district within any given State. The education of an individual is thus left to the vagaries of the situation into which he is born, and we have as yet devised no way to truly equalize educational opportunity for all so that no one's potential need be wasted.

As we become more mobile, population shifts drastically overload operating school systems which are trying solely to maintain the necessary level of plant and services. Just as urban areas have received a massive inpouring of people over the past few decades, now it is the suburban areas which are in many cases faced with real crises. As more and more people leave the cities, depleting the tax base of the urban centers, so in the suburbs the real property taxes, the traditional underpinning for local schools, have reached such burdensome proportions that we have encountered massive citizen resistance to further bond issues and tax increases to provide the necessary support. When we consider that 56 percent of all public education revenue comes from property taxes, and when

we hear the recommendation of an urban task force on education for a \$5 to \$7 billion annual increase in funds for city schools, we begin to perceive the dimensions of our problem.

Between the launching of sputnik and the start of our Apollo program, the Federal Government enacted a dozen educational programs, climaxing in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act—a massive Federal commitment to our educational systems.

Billions of dollars have been poured into the classrooms of America. And in city after city, the schools do not teach—the children do not learn. There are schools where less than 10 percent of those who enter graduate; schools where reading ability declines after 3 years' exposure to the system; schools where high school graduates cannot master simple sentences.

The Urban League Street Academies have taken the least-promising children of the ghetto—children who have dropped from the public schools of the city. They are teaching those children the basic educational skills, and teaching them pride and possibility, as well. It is the kind of educational system the Federal Government has the resources to help.

The children of our more affluent citizens are still victims of outmoded, rote education in schools which lack any connection with the technologies which will shape the future of these students—technologies which their teachers all too often do not understand. Yet we know that such innovations can totally alter education for the better, that educational resource centers, supplementing and even replacing conventional schools, may do far better work in teaching these children. Those kind of experimental centers can be helped substantially.

Here in Congress we need to be concerned over recent revelations that title I funds of the ESEA are not being put to the most desirable uses; we have a continuing debate about fairness in allocation of impact aid funds; and we are faced with hard decisions over the merits of categorical grants as opposed to general assistance. The lateness of action on the HEW appropriation this year for fiscal 1970 underscores the extreme hardships being worked on school systems throughout the Nation because of the uncertainty of the level of aid they will receive. Educators simply cannot be expected to make optimum use of funds unless they have firm commitments well in advance to enable them to plan for the long-range goals and needs of their students.

Inflation hits the schools of America, too, Mr. Speaker. Construction costs are rising, equipment and books must be obtained at increasing prices, salaries go up, though in all too many cases teachers have had to forgo deserved raises because of defeated bond issues and other shortcomings in local support. Astronomical interest rates are also imposing burdens, and we are advised that most school districts are required to allocate 10 to 15 percent of their budgets for the retirement of debt and interest.

Furthermore, there is an estimated

\$300 to \$500 billion worth of tax-exempt property throughout the country, and though Congress recognizes the need for making up revenues in areas where Federal installations lower the tax base, the States do not, and we must provide for the education of students in schools in areas having heavy concentrations of such property.

The time to meet these crises is now, Mr. Speaker. My bill would establish a 15-member National Advisory Commission on School Finance to cover the whole gamut of these funding problems. Such a commission will produce our first comprehensive study of alternative financing methods and will focus national attention on the many facets of the problem. It would include representatives of school boards, administrators, faculty, educational authorities, and the public, all appointed by the President. The Commission will be directed to examine all aspects of school financing, including the proper mix of Federal, State, and local effort; a balance between the various types of aid; a redefining of the Federal role; the possibility of Federal revenue sharing; the elimination of inequality of opportunity; and any and all other questions germane to the health of our Nation's schools. The Commission will be directed to submit a final report within 18 months of passage of the act, with interim reports due for our guidance in 6 and 12 months. Every agency of the Federal Government will be required to cooperate and make its expertise and resources available to the Commission, which would be empowered to call upon other public and private organizations for help as well. The act calls for a maximum authorization of \$3 million for this purpose.

We are dealing with nothing less than the future of our country, Mr. Speaker, and I urge the passage of this legislation as a matter of top priority.

EXTENDING DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA  
PUBLIC HEALTH COVERAGE

**HON. DONALD M. FRASER**

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill, H.R. 16244, to extend the District of Columbia compulsory immunization statute. This bill provides the means necessary for implementing in the District of Columbia a goal which has long been stressed by public health authorities nationwide: providing protection, for all American youngsters, from dread communicable diseases—measles, German measles, polio, diphtheria, tetanus, and whooping cough. Each of these diseases can have severe—even fatal—complications; despite massive efforts, Public Health Service officials have been unable to inoculate everybody in their citywide vaccination campaigns.

There have been 189 reported cases of measles in the District of Columbia since January 1, 1970. The major victims

of these infectious diseases are the poor, who are generally characterized by a lesser awareness of the necessity or availability of preventive vaccines. This bill, in requiring inoculations to prevent these diseases before admission to elementary school, would extend the immunization regulations which now successfully cover smallpox to protect every family and every child in the District of Columbia from these other dread diseases.

H.R. 16244

A bill to extend the District of Columbia compulsory immunization statute

Insert immediately before the period at the end of Section 274 of the Revised Statutes of the United States relating to the District of Columbia (D.C. Code, 31-1102) the following: "and the measles, diphtheria, tetanus, whooping cough, polio, German measles."

GRANT US WISDOM

HON. JOE SKUBITZ

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. SKUBITZ. Mr. Speaker, each year the Veterans of Foreign Wars conducts a Voice of Democracy contest. This year more than 400,000 students participated in the contest. I am pleased to announce that the winner for the State of Kansas Voice of Democracy contest is Miss Wendy Ann Elliott, a 17-year-old student at Thayer High School in my district. I want to commend Miss Elliott for a job well done and feel that her outstanding oration merits the attention of my colleagues.

The material follows:

GRANT US WISDOM

"If a man does not keep pace with his companions, perhaps it is because he hears a different drummer. Let him step to the music he hears, however measured or far away."

Although they didn't live in the time of Thoreau, perhaps it was his drummer that convinced America's earliest pioneers their purpose stood above all personal goals. Yet, their fight for freedom was a personal thing. This was their land, their homes and their lives they were defending. It wasn't a game—to lose was to lose everything. They displayed a fierce loyalty to God, country and self that inspires us yet. From the first moment freedom was captured, until today, she has been challenging us to keep her within our grasp. Freedom might be compared to a woman; lovely; something to cherish and show with pride, but, as with all women, if mistreated, she will go on her way never to return. She challenges us every step of the way to be deserving of her favors. Historically, we were challenged by the ever-present thought of enslavement to England. Today the lady is more crafty.

Mama Cass advises, "Make your own kind of music—even if nobody else sings along." And that's exactly what the great majority of young people are doing. More and more, actions of the population are being accepted without question. It is no longer a matter of good or bad—of right or wrong. The challengers of our freedom don't lurk in shadows shrouded in black. Communism, the illegitimate child of good intentions, creeps into our American way of life through ignorance, not through a condoning public. Socialistic ideas infiltrate our government and society not be-

cause we want it to, but because most of us are uneducated as to the workings of government—ours and their's. Khrushchev said he would bury America and not fire a single bullet. The people of communistic countries don't have to meet challenges—their decisions are made for them. We should thank God we have the privilege of searching for the sometimes elusive answers.

Traveling from Russia across a great ocean of division, we arrive at America for a look at our challenging society. Of the world powers, America may be classed as the most permissive of societies. Our "anything goes" attitude certainly provides a challenge to morality. The prevalent use of drugs and its acceptance challenges us, the youth of America, to live up to our own high standards. The standards we must set for ourselves, not those which society dictates to us

Problems of race relations face us daily. A problem of pigmentation that has lasted over a hundred years still cries out for us to listen with our hearts and not with our minds. But society says there is a division.

Religion, another area in which our free society challenges us, is the most delicate, yet the most powerful to consider. Modern technology put man on the moon, but it can't put faith in an unbelieving soul. God will not be taken lightly and the struggle to accept him in a society that claims self importance cannot be taken lightly either.

Of all the challenges set before the American people, the challenge of self is the most persistent. America's challenges are largely self induced. The rest of the world dares us to uphold the grandeur image of the American. We can momentarily dismiss Communism; we can abandon God and morality; we can close our eyes to race, but we cannot escape the ever-present demands of "self."

It would no longer be necessary to fight for freedom or meet its challenges if we would but take the simple step of surrender. America is not accustomed to defeat and it will not surrender. Our freedom will never be taken from us. It will be lost only through our failure to meet its challenge and we will meet its challenge. We will halt Communism through diplomacy and patience; we will break the puppet strings of society through understanding; through honest evaluations of ourselves, we will learn our role in democracy to meet freedom's final challenge—the challenge of self.

Emerson had faith in America's youth and knew it would be their young blood that would keep America free. This faith is seen in his poem, "Duty."

"So nigh is grandeur to our dust,  
So near is God to man,  
When Duty whispers low, 'Thou must.'  
The youth replies, 'I can!'"

MISS RUTH NORCIA, VOICE OF DEMOCRACY WINNER OF CONNECTICUT

HON. WILLIAM L. ST. ONGE

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. ST. ONGE. Mr. Speaker, I was very proud and delighted to learn that this year's winner of the Voice of Democracy Contest in the State of Connecticut is once again a young constituent from my district, Miss Ruth Norcia, of Pawcatuck, Conn. Last year's winner was Mr. Dennis Hanover of Colchester, Conn. Our educators and teachers of eastern Connecticut seem to be doing an excellent job with our young people.

The Voice of Democracy Contest is

sponsored annually by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies' auxiliary. The theme of the contest was "Freedom's Challenge" and some 400,000 students all over the country participated in it. The winning contestant of each State is brought to Washington during the first week of March where the final winners are chosen for the five scholarships ranging from \$5,000 to \$1,000. Some 8,300 students in 91 public and private schools in Connecticut competed in the contest.

Miss Norcia is a sophomore at Stonington High School. She is 15 years old and is the daughter of Michael and Tommasina Norcia, 12 Johnson Avenue, Pawcatuck, Conn. In fact, her essay is about her mother Tommasina and her dream of freedom in America, where she arrived as an immigrant at the age of 17. Writing of her mother, Miss Norcia states in her essay:

She has instilled in me a quality of deep appreciation for the privileges afforded me by our country—privileges that might well be taken for granted by one, like myself, who has always lived in an affluent society. . . . Respect and appreciation for country will never cease to exist if they are taught in the home.

Miss Norcia is very much interested in music. She hopes to attend the New England Conservatory at Boston and study to become a music teacher. At school she was vice president of the student council and is vice president of the sophomore class.

It will be a pleasure to greet Miss Norcia when she arrives in Washington to attend the VFW congressional dinner on March 10. In the meantime, I extend my congratulations to her and her parents and my very best wishes for success in life. I am pleased to insert her essay in the RECORD. It reads as follows:

DREAM OF FREEDOM

(By Ruth Norcia)

They talked to Tommasina of America. They called it beautiful, but they really meant: "Everybody in America lives easy, because they all have lots of money." They said that freedom was the American watchword, but they didn't even know what real freedom was! Still, who could honestly condemn their ignorance? They were just poor foreign farmers, wanting all the things they couldn't have, putting childlike faith in a fallacy, "feeding" their illusions to their children. . . .

For so long as she could remember, Tommasina had dreamed of joining her father in the United States. In the fifth grade, as part of her final examination in art, Tommasina was instructed to make a drawing illustrating the one thing she loved best or desired most. She made a sketch of the American flag. Her teacher was quite perturbed. He asked her why she chose to draw the American flag, rather than the flag of her own country. And she answered: "I know I am not American, but I belong in the United States. That's where my father is, and that's where I should be!"

Her innermost hopes were, at long last fulfilled. Tommasina arrived in the United States in early September, 1937. Almost immediately upon arrival, she was subjected to a barrage of letters from practically every living relative abroad. Most of the letters contained blunt demands for money! To each one, Tommasina replied: "Nothing's free in America. We even have to pay for the water we drink!"



Tommasina grew to love the United States with all her heart. She found her hunger for learning insatiable. Despite her seventeen years, she enrolled in the fifth grade. She studied the language, the history, and the government of her new country; she was fascinated. She read the Bible for the first time in her life, not fearing she would be thrown in jail for doing so. As if to symbolize her release, she burned the hated black and white garments all school girls were forced to wear in her native land.

She learned that true freedom did not mean getting something for nothing. She learned that freedom's promise presented a challenge, too, and that challenge was the right and responsibility to participate in the political affairs of her community, her state, her country. She came to the realization that contributing to society was not only a responsibility in a free land, but also an enjoyable experience.

How well I have learned to value these beliefs that Tommasina held and still holds; I should, indeed, for Tommasina is my mother. She has instilled in me a quality of deep appreciation for the privileges afforded me by our country—privileges that might well be taken for granted by one, like myself, who has always lived in an affluent society. I believe that the greatest contribution I will ever make to my country will be to perpetuate these good and sound attitudes by passing them on to my own children. Respect and appreciation for country will never cease to exist if they are taught in the home.

#### SURPLUS PROPERTY DONATIONS

### HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, the Federal donable property program, authorized by the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, continues to flourish as a system for channeling personal property no longer needed by Federal agencies to our States for use by schools, hospitals, and civil defense units. This program's achievements, to which you yourself contributed so much while a member of the Committee on Government Operations, can be appreciated when one sees that in fiscal year 1969 personal property which cost the Government \$292 million was distributed to all States plus the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico for education, public health, and civil defense.

Almost every kind of property is being put to good use; furniture, office machines, training aids, athletic equipment, medical and dental equipment, cleaning equipment, communications equipment, motor vehicles, aircraft, handtools, food equipment, to name only a few types. It has been well described, I think, as a program which converts obsolescence into opportunity.

The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare principally administers the program, although the General Services Administration and the Department of Defense also play essential roles. But the act requires these Federal agencies to work through special agencies set up

within each State government to effect and to monitor distribution of property. These State agencies are fortunate to have been directed by some very able men whose dedication and experience have been vital to the program's progress. More than 20 years ago, the heads of the State agencies organized themselves into a National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property. Each year, the association's national committee meets in Washington. Interested Federal officials also participate.

The Special Studies Subcommittee of the Government Operations Committee, of which subcommittee I am a member, exercises jurisdiction over this program. On February 18, 1970, the subcommittee chairman, the Honorable JOHN S. MONAGAN of Connecticut, addressed the association's national committee. His remarks there included comment on some new prospects for the program, for example, the development of a promising new property source from unneeded equipment located overseas. Because I believe these remarks will be of interest to other Members, all of whose constituencies benefit from this valuable program, I should like to include them in the RECORD.

The remarks follow:

REMARKS OF HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN BEFORE THE NATIONAL COMMITTEE OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE AGENCIES FOR SURPLUS PROPERTY

I thank you, President Izbicky, and the other officers and members of the National Committee of the National Association of State Agencies for Surplus Property, for this welcome and pleasant opportunity to talk to you. Conferences like yours where State and Federal people exchange information, discuss issues, and seek to resolve problems have great value. But, more than that, they symbolize and demonstrate intergovernmental cooperation at its best. We of the House Committee on Government Operations well understand the importance of such cooperation because one of the Committee's prescribed duties under the rules of the House is to study intergovernmental relationships between the United States and the States and municipalities.

Congressman Dawson, Chairman of the Full Committee on Government Operations, has established eight subcommittees, each with a specifically enumerated jurisdiction. For the most part, subcommittee jurisdictions are directly tied to operations of given Federal agencies. The Department of Defense, for example, is under the Military Operations Subcommittee. The Special Studies Subcommittee, which I head, has under its jurisdiction the Executive Office of the President (except the Bureau of the Budget) and the District of Columbia Government. But the jurisdictional cloaks of our subcommittees may also cover special subjects of functional or program character which usually cross into several agencies' areas of operation. For instance, domestic intergovernmental relations are the province of the Intergovernmental Relations Subcommittee (which, by the way, also looks into the operations of agencies like the Departments of HEW and Labor). And our Special Studies Subcommittee, as you know, has the multi-agency donation program. Another of our jurisdictional concerns deals with consumer protection activities of Federal agencies. Still another is Federal agency accounting systems. The membership of our subcom-

mittee has not changed since the First Session of the 91st Congress. On the Democratic side, we have, besides myself, Congressman Moorhead of Pennsylvania, Gallagher of New Jersey, and Rosenthal of New York. Our Minority Members are Congressmen Wydler of New York, Myers of Indiana, and Cowger of Kentucky.

The subcommittee staff is headed by the Staff Administrator, Mr. Louis Freed, whom many of you know by now. He and Miles Romney from the Full Government Operations Committee staff work closely to assist the subcommittee with its donation program work.

I know you want to hear something about that work: What we are doing and hope to do in the coming year. I will talk briefly about these things:

- (1) Operation DOMUS, that is, our overseas property program;
- (2) exchange/sale disposals;
- (3) allocating areas;
- (4) the Federal Telecommunications System;
- (5) our legislative outlook;
- (6) and finally something that goes by the formidable name of systems analysis.

But first I'd like to pay tribute to your own great effort in the program as demonstrated by these statistics. I mean the \$292 million in acquisition costs of personal property distributed during the past fiscal year. I mean the processing of 80,000 applications for donations on standard Forms 123, representing 260,000 line items. I mean the \$84 million of property received by the States during the last quarter of 1969, almost \$10 million higher than the same period in 1968. I mean the more than \$5 million of property that has been returned from Germany and Japan under Operation DOMUS.

This brings me to topic number one; namely, Operation DOMUS. We are pleased and confident about both its accomplishment and prospect. Overseas property is a vast field of opportunity to be explored and exploited for utilization and donation purposes. You have already heard the details and new directions of Operation DOMUS from others. But I think it is most significant, for instance, that the \$2.9 million of overseas property received during October, November, and December of last year is almost 60 percent of the total of such property received for the entire year from overseas. It was gratifying to learn from Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense Paul Riley last month that the program has been so successful that Defense has recently expanded HEW and State agency screening of excess property in Germany and Japan to include all of Europe as well as the United Kingdom and Southeast Asia. Mr. Riley added that perhaps our property in other areas might also begin to contribute to this program.

I compliment the Department of HEW, the Department of Defense, the General Services Administration, and especially you, of the State agencies, for putting your men, money, and imagination on the line to carry out this innovative project. During the present Session, I want our subcommittee to review this operation in a public hearing. I think it deserves to be looked at formally; and a record should be made of its genesis, methods, achievements, and prospects. I also feel that the experience gained from the operation will be instructive for many outside the program.

New, topic number two—exchange/sale disposals. Next month, DOD will probably have compiled its third semiannual report on exchange/sale transactions, covering the first half of fiscal year 1970. In response to a subcommittee request, DOD has reported these results for each Federal supply group, in terms of original acquisition costs and

also proceeds or allowances received. The figures have been useful as a rough basis for measuring and evaluating this method of disposal. The next semiannual report should be helpful in indicating trends, for such factors as overall volume, property group volume, and financial return.

Of course, price inflation is creating problems about comparing the original acquisition costs of an item purchased ten or fifteen years ago with market value of the used item today.

Nevertheless, I believe that GSA, at least, should follow DOD's practice and begin to report its own exchange/sale transactions not just in terms of proceeds and allowances received. We intend to make a proposal along these lines to the GSA.

For certain high-volume property like motor vehicles, office machines, materials handling equipment, and construction equipment, I believe we should have more detail, such as breakdowns by four-digit classification and by condition code. This would also assist DOD in making case-by-case administrative findings as to whether the expected return is sufficient to justify the effort and cost of disposal by exchange or sale. Such an evaluation is part of a requirement announced in 1968 by then Assistant Secretary of Defense Thomas Morris, although GAO recently told us that no implementing instructions for this requirement appear to have been given to disposal offices. If procurement or disposal officers are to make such economic determinations for exchange/sale transactions, then I believe they need the kind of basic data I have just talked about.

The two pending general amendments bills, S. 2170 and H.R. 15272, would impose additional constraints on the use of the exchange/sale authority. But I shall say something about this later.

As to allocating areas, I feel we should come to some new arrangements whereby the present eight areas can be consolidated into two or three. I am glad this view has wide support, in principle, among State agency heads and within the Department of HEW, although I respect and understand the position of those who prefer to stand by the existing arrangement. I am extremely appreciative of your letters in response to our request for comments on this question. They are helpful and instructive in many ways. Let me add that I think you are fortunate to have so capable a chairman of your Committee on Allocations as Mr. Bob Nolan of Massachusetts. I wish him well in his effort to steer a course through the conflicting opinions concerning this problem. More than that I don't wish to say now, since I realize this is one of the prime items on the agenda of this meeting.

As to my next topic, Federal Telecommunications Systems services for State agencies, most of you know that we have been urging GSA and HEW to find a way to do this. The Intergovernmental Cooperation Act of 1968, a measure which our Government Operations Committee considered and reported to the House, provides for specialized or technical services to be made available to State and local government units. The Bureau of the Budget issued regulations last August which make it entirely clear that Federal Telecommunications System services are among those to be shared with State governmental units. We are still waiting for action by the Federal agencies. I have just written again to the heads of both asking for a status report and urging that it be expedited. The energy and enterprise these agencies have shown in launching Operation DOMUS should certainly be able to produce similar concrete results for the FTS project.

As to the topic of legislation, I can say

that I have every expectation to be able to hold hearings within the next two months on several bills.

These are the public museum bills (S. 2210 and H.R. 11557), the State fish and wildlife agencies bill (H.R. 13737) and the short shelf-life medical supplies and foreign excess property bill (S. 406). The last measure, however, has certain jurisdictional disabilities so far as the Special Studies Subcommittee is concerned. We are trying to work these out so the subcommittee can proceed soon to hearings. It may also be possible to include the general donable property amendments measure in these hearings. I refer to H.R. 12752. We have been waiting for developments on the Senate side, where the related measure (S. 2170) has been under active consideration.

As I mentioned earlier, S. 2170 and H.R. 12752 contain provisions which, though differing as to extent, would both limit the use of exchange/sale authority in favor of a greater disposal for utilization and donation. I believe a hearing on these provisions might lead to a formula which would assure maintenance of a proper balance between legitimate needs of a Federal agency for replacement of property and the utilization or donation needs of other Federal agencies and the States.

My last topic has to do with that latter-day administrative phenomenon called *systems analysis*. Properly applied to most enterprises or activities, it can become a highly effective management tool. I believe this may be so for the Federal donation program. At least, I think we should explore the matter of its adaptability and suitability here.

Let me stress right away that I do not contemplate that the goals of the program should be changed. After all, they were set by the Congress and since then have clearly proved their social and economic worth.

Now, what do I have in mind by systems analysis? I'll try to be clear, even if it means reciting some definitions. First, when I speak of a *system*, I refer to a means for achieving goals. More precisely, it is an organized collection of methods, men, and machines for accomplishing a specific objective. It can represent a large organization or a discrete part of that organization. For example, the entire enterprise of Federal property disposal might be regarded as a system. On the other hand, the donation program activity within that enterprise may also be regarded as a system, or if you will, a sub-system.

What then is systems analysis? It is the process of examining an enterprise or activity to determine what should be accomplished and how the necessary operations can best be carried through. It means looking at the input into the system and also at the output and the output requirement. The objective is the design of a system to achieve the desired output in the most effective way with the resources that are available.

Usually an element of such analysis is a determination whether some automatic data processing techniques can be effectively introduced.

I can suggest several benefits that might flow from design changes as a result of a systems analysis: Broader and deeper coordination within the system; faster and surer screening of property and processing requests for donation; more even distribution of property; less burdensome and time-consuming administrative controls; elimination or consolidation of operations and procedures; providing data to activity management and to the Congress for better measurement of program effectiveness; being able to respond well and quickly to technical or economic changes outside the system; and faster decisionmaking within a more meaningful context.

The Executive Branch has embarked on a

sort of grand systems analysis in the so-called PPBS or Planning, Programming, Budgeting System, which was begun in 1966. The Congress, too, is moving in the direction of an information processing system and supporting structure to meet its legislative and oversight requirements. A Congressional reorganization bill now before the House Rules Committee would set up a special Legislative Research Service, a Joint Committee on the Library and Congressional Research, and a Joint Committee on Legislative Data Processing. The Committee on House Administration already has a working group well launched into a project to analyze Congressional information needs. The General Accounting Office is assisting this working group.

Our Government Operations Committee last year reported favorably to the House, H.R. 10791, to provide for efficient and effective utilization of modern data-processing techniques to give committees and individual members better information for decision-making.

Thus Congressional committees will more and more come to consider matters in terms of information possessing the character and degree of detail that can only be assembled and organized through compatible information techniques within the Executive Branch. I know that thinking along these lines has been done already by some of you. Bob Nolan has sent us a copy of the flow chart for the Western States Surplus Property Organization. I also understand that HEW has given some consideration to automatic data processing techniques within the donation program.

However, a system analysis is a major undertaking, and I am not now proposing that this be done. As I have indicated, we wish simply to explore the feasibility and desirability of such an analysis within the system which we call the Federal donable property program. I am, therefore, asking our staff to look into this matter and report to the Subcommittee their findings and conclusions. They will carefully solicit the views and advice of you in the State agencies and of the appropriate Federal people.

I am told that the personnel who manage and operate the 52 State agencies number about 1250, and that HEW and GSA together have the equivalent of about 130 positions devoted to the donation program. That is really a very small force to direct and operate so big and extensive an activity. These figures speak very well for your individual ability and dedication as well as for the cooperative esprit I always sense within your organization, where you nurture your aspirations with energy and enterprise.

I know that in most of the State agencies there has been a substantial continuity of administration. I think this continuity is another reason for the high degree of commitment and expertise within your ranks. I am glad this continuity is being further strengthened and broadened as a result of HEW's recent amendment to its merit system regulation. I hope the effort to give to the new regulation a degree of flexibility with regard to certain high-level officials will achieve its objective in those States where special problems may be encountered.

We all know that conservation has become just about the leading domestic issue in our country. The Congress, and now the President, are attacking the enormous problems in that area vigorously and vociferously. Conservation means maintenance and preservation of our resources. So all of you here have long been conservationists in the true sense of the word. Let us hope that the growing national consciousness of the need for conservation will help to lift your work and this program to even greater heights of public good.

Thank you.



## THE QUINCY GOLDEN EAGLES

## HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, the Golden Eagle Color Guard from Quincy, Ill., will be in Washington during the annual Cherry Blossom Festival to represent the strength and vitality of our Nation's youth. The Golden Eagles are a precision marching team whose individual members proudly carry the various flags which represent the institutions of our society.

Under the sponsorship of the Quincy CYO with excellent cooperation from Sister Catherine and her staff this unit has displayed color, grace, dignity, and elegance. The group, directed by Mr. Herb Wellman and Mr. Jerry Eldridge, consists of: Mary Jo Awerkamp, Pat Barry, Jackie Bonness, Jane Bozarth, Barbara Daly, Ieelen Daly, Beth Dittmer, Lucy Duesterhaus, Mary Fetter, Barbara Fiechtl, Toni Grant, Kathy Hafner, Mary LaRoche, Sue Lawrence, Peggy Maquire, Jan Mast, Debbie Maxwell, Barbara Peters, Deb Reno, Pat Rineberg, Mary Ruxlow, Dory Scheufele, Jan Schlipmann, Pat Schlipmann, and Linda Veihl.

They are shining examples of young womanhood on and off the field. The meaning of the banners they carry so proudly, represents the very foundation on which this country was founded and stands to this day. As they march, the first group of flags consists of the flag of our Nation and various State and city flags. The second group of flags represents the major religious denominations which give this country moral courage. The third group of flags depicts the organizations which serve to educate and compliment and make our system work.

In this day when teenagers are spoken of in generalities, in tones not always complimentary, it is refreshing to give credit to these young adults who have broken the chain of mediocrity and are such a credit to Quincy, the Midwest, and American youth.

The following letter was forwarded to the director of the Golden Eagles from the parade director of the Cherry Blossom Festival, and I would like to include it in the RECORD at this point:

DEAR MR. WELLMAN: This letter is to inform you that reports of the Golden Eagles have reached my office. Your unit was carefully observed this past summer in three different States. I must agree with the reports that the Golden Eagles are worthy of the honor this letter bestows upon them.

Each year it is my job to carefully examine and select from thousands of possible units across the nation to march at our nationally famous parade and festival. It is a task that I truly enjoy.

I am certain your community will share in the pride you must feel at this time to discover that you are the first unit to be selected from your area to make an appearance at this event.

It is therefore my pleasure to extend an invitation to you, your staff, and the Golden Eagle Color Guard to be present and participate in the National Cherry Blossom Pa-

rade of Princesses to be held Saturday, April 11th, here in Washington, D.C.

Sincerely,

BOB HIGHLAND,  
Parade Chairman.

## BAR REFUSES TO SERVE MAN OF YEAR

## HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I know that all of us were deeply disturbed by the recent news report that Col. Daniel James, Jr., an outstanding Negro Air Force officer and the new Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, was refused a drink in a Pensacola bar. This incident was particularly distressing because Colonel James was accompanied by two Italian officers who were considerably more embarrassed than Colonel James himself. It is most unfortunate that any member of our Armed Forces, officer or enlisted, should be faced with such treatment.

On the other side of the coin, however, it is encouraging news that the Kiwanis Club of Pensacola named Colonel James as Man of the Year. This is a tribute not only to a distinguished officer and gentleman, Colonel James, but also to the Kiwanis Club and people of Pensacola and indicates the rapid changes underway in the South today.

The following news article outlines the specific detail of this incident and I insert it with my remarks:

## BAR REFUSES TO SERVE MAN OF YEAR

PENSACOLA, Fla.—Air Force Col. Daniel "Chapple" James was named "Man of the Year" by the Pensacola Kiwanis Club one night and refused a drink in a bar the next by a man who said he had never served a Negro.

James, who commands Wheelus Air Force Base in Libya, was recently appointed assistant deputy secretary for public affairs in the Defense Department.

"I didn't make a big noise about it at the time," he said yesterday in Washington.

"I was sensitive to the fact . . . that it may be embarrassing to the very people I didn't want to be embarrassed. I knew how the people who mattered in Pensacola felt about me."

## CUSTOM WITH US

Jack Horne, owner and operator of the lounge, said in an interview that he denied admission to James Friday night, "because it's always been a custom with us" not to serve Negroes.

"We never have, and I couldn't make any exceptions in that particular case. I couldn't do otherwise and be fair to all my customers," Horne said.

Horne's Torch Lounge is near Pensacola's Navy yard but he said its clientele is mostly civilians—"it's a neighborhood group."

Horne, 56, said military police had discussed the incident with him, but he had heard nothing further.

"I told the fellows here we probably would have to start serving Negroes sometime in the future," Horne said.

He has operated the lounge six years.

## HE HAD COMPANY

James, in a taped interview with a Pensacola radio station, said he was shocked by Horne's refusal to admit him.

"There were two Italian officers with me and that made it even more embarrassing. I was ashamed for him really," James said.

"With people talking about law and order and, by the same token when some guy like this says I'm not going to serve you because you're colored, you give the militants exactly what they want," James said.

## PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

## HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, a recent editorial statement by WCBS-TV, New York, praised President Nixon's efforts to clean up this land of ours and the air and water on which it thrives.

I very much enjoyed the WCBS comments and recommend them to my colleagues:

[From a WCBS-TV editorial, Feb. 11, 1970]

## PRESIDENTIAL ACTION

President Nixon's program for cleaning up the Nation's blighted environment is thorough, bold and practical. It is in almost every area, more than we had expected, and nearly all that we had hoped.

In the broad scope of the President's program there are proposals for 23 new laws and 14 executive actions that, if carried out, would move far in curbing the wanton destruction of this Nation's air, water, and land.

To cleanse the air, the President would curb automobile pollution through tougher standards on exhausts, and through low-pollution fuels. Most important, Mr. Nixon has pledged the full resources of the federal government to the search for a virtually pollution-free car. This is, by far, in our opinion, the most far-reaching and important proposal in his message.

His program on water pollution is also a good one. Here money is the greatest need, money to build effective sewage treatment plants. The President has responded with a plan that would provide \$1 billion in federal aid each year for the next four years. And, equally important, Mr. Nixon has suggested that a user tax be placed on industries using municipal sewage systems. This would be a pollution tax that would make those who foul the environment bear much of the burden for cleaning it up.

In the handling of solid wastes, trash and garbage, the President is somewhat less specific, but the principles he espouses are sound. First, he argues that the emphasis should shift away from merely collecting trash and dumping it. He urges that solid wastes be recycled, that they be processed for some practical reuse. Moreover, he suggests that the cost of disposing of solid waste ought to be included in the price of an item. For example, the cost of scrapping a car could be included in the purchase price. We would also like to hear more from the Administration on how this principle could be put into practice in dealing with the millions of non-returnable cans and bottles littering our landscape.

In sum, WCBS-TV believes the President has charted an excellent course in reclaim-

ing the environment. But a good blueprint is only part of the battle. It will take real leadership from the White House and Congress to turn good plans into good programs.

PODIATRY SOCIETY OF THE STATE OF NEW YORK

HON. JOHN M. MURPHY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. MURPHY of New York. Mr. Speaker, a recent report issued by the New York City Health Department titled "Publicly Funded Podiatry: The New York City Medicaid Experience," made the following observation:

Podiatry, through the Medicaid program, has made a significant contribution to the well-being of thousands of persons for whom podiatric care previously was inaccessible.

I believe that this most laudatory appraisal of podiatry's role in Medicaid is particularly fitting as the 1,600-member Podiatry Society of the State of New York—which represents the profession in New York—celebrates its 75th anniversary.

Recently, it was my pleasure to attend a luncheon here to help mark the Podiatry Society's anniversary, an event attended by members of the New York congressional delegation as well as the officers and trustees of the society. I would like to take this opportunity to commend the leadership of the society for their efforts in advancing the cause of improved health care for all our citizens.

The officers are Dr. Horace C. DeCotiis, president; Dr. Seymour C. Frank, president-elect; Drs. Monroe Jacobs and Edward Stamm, vice presidents; and Dr. Harold Rubenstein, immediate past president; and Drs. Louis Giordano, Charles Glazer, Alvin Kanegis, Henry Merletti, Maurice Newman, and David Schulefand, the trustees.

These gentlemen and their colleagues have given eloquent expression to the high standards of excellence which have come to characterize the State society's professional and public service activities.

While the New York City Health Department's praise for podiatry in Medicaid could serve as a keynote for the State society's anniversary celebration, I believe it is important also to call attention to the vital role being played by podiatry in Medicare.

In a Gallup poll on health, people were asked, "What do you complain of most?" Sixty percent replied, "My feet." And the older the people, the more they were troubled by foot problems. Long years of rough use, natural physical deterioration in the foot, the extra weight the elderly often carry and simple neglect made the feet a particular problem for those in their advanced years.

In January 1968, the Federal Government took cognizance of the relationship of foot care to overall health and in-

cluded podiatry services in Medicare. This action opened the door to competent foot health care to literally millions of aged across the country: people who might have been forced to spend their later years in idleness because of foot ills now are able to utilize the services of qualified foot specialists.

Mr. Speaker, in July 1968, in a message to the American Podiatry Association, former President Johnson stated the following:

Our goals must remain high and our resolve steady; we must persevere until the blessing of good health and proper care touch all people.

I believe this to be a worthy and an attainable goal, and I congratulate the Podiatry Society of the State of New York for its diligence and its steadfast efforts to meet the great challenge of improved health care for all Americans.

LEGAL RIGHTS BELONG TO EVERYONE

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I am thankful that the attack by the Chicago Seven against the vital American judicial system was nullified by the jury verdicts handed down. The defendants tried to make the judicial system the defendant by claiming their rights were being denied. However, I would like to bring to your attention a question asked during a recent noteworthy editorial stated by WTMJ-TV and radio in Milwaukee, Wis.: "Where would those legal rights end up if our judicial system were ever destroyed?"

The complete editorial follows:

EDITORIAL

Americans tonight should have renewed faith in their judicial system following the jury verdicts in the trial of the Chicago Seven. That the case ever got to the jury was due only to the fortitude of Federal Judge Julius J. Hoffman. He endured for five months disruptive actions that he rightly has punished as contemptible.

The provocation against the respected authority of the court, although shameful, was not unique. It occurred in the fascist sedition trial of 1944 when Federal Judge Edward Eicher, facing a brawling courtroom of 30 defendants and 20 lawyers, died on the 102nd day, resulting in a mistrial. In 1949, the lawyers and 11 defendants in the famous Communist conspiracy trial almost drove Federal Judge Harold E. Medina to exhaustion. Their cruel campaign failed, however, and after 167 days, the longest criminal trial in our nation's history, the eleven were found guilty. By comparison, Judge Hoffman, an older man, was forced to endure slightly fewer trial days, but much the same type of unruly actions in the case of the seven charged with violating the new anti-riot law.

Despite the diversionary actions in the courtroom, which could discredit and destroy the American legal process if not firmly challenged, the Chicago defendants and their attorneys are now seeking judicial relief from Judge Hoffman's contempt of court sentences. They, in effect, are saying their rights

are being denied. Well, what about Judge Hoffman's rights? What about the rights of the jurors? What about the rights of all law-abiding Americans? Where would those legal rights end up if our judicial system were ever destroyed? These are questions the American Bar Association ought to seriously consider in connection with permissible conduct of attorneys in the courtroom.

THE NEW FEMINISM

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, women do not have to deny their biology to want a better world than they now have. The feminist movement does not question the basic differences between men and women; rather it questions the social calcifications which have, over centuries, developed from these differences but which today are no longer tenable.

Many of the discriminatory practices against women originated in other countries and in other social and cultural climates. The new feminists ask men—and other women—simply whether these practices do not constitute a kind of servitude from history which are continued at the convenience of the ruling male sex.

I think these are important questions, deserving the serious attention of all who consider justice the first order of society.

Lucy Komisar considers some of these questions in the following article from the February 21, 1970, issue of the Saturday Review:

THE NEW FEMINISM

(By Lucy Komisar)

A dozen women are variously seated in straight-backed chairs, settled on a couch, or sprawled on the floor of a comfortable apartment on Manhattan's West Side. They range in age from twenty-five to thirty-five, and include a magazine researcher, a lawyer, a housewife, an architect, a teacher, a secretary, and a graduate student in sociology.

They are white, middle-class, attractive. All but one have college degrees; several are married; a few are active in social causes. At first, they are hesitant. They don't really know what to talk about, and so they begin with why they came.

"I wanted to explore my feelings as a woman and find out what others think about the things that bother me." Slowly, they open up, trust growing. "I always felt so negative about being a woman; now I'm beginning to feel good about it."

They become more personal and revealing. "My mother never asked me what I was going to be when I grew up." "I never used to like to talk to girls. I always thought women were inferior—I never liked women." "I've been a secretary for three years; after that, you begin to think that's all you're good for." "I felt so trapped when my baby was born. I wanted to leave my husband and the child."

Repeated a hundred times in as many different rooms, these are the voices of women's liberation, a movement that encompasses high school students and grandmothers, and that is destined to eclipse the black civil rights struggle in the force of its resentment and the consequence of its demands.



Some of us have become feminists out of anger and frustration over job discrimination. When we left college, male students got aptitude tests, we got typing tests. In spite of federal law, most women still are trapped in low-paying, dead-end jobs and commonly earn less than men for the same work—sometimes on the theory that we are only "helping out," though 42 per cent of us support ourselves or families.

Others have discovered that the humanistic precepts of the radical movement do not always apply to women. At a peace rally in Washington last year, feminists were hooted and jeered off the speakers' platform, and white women working in civil rights or anti-poverty programs are expected to defer to the black male ego. Many of us got out to salvage our own buffeted egos. However, most of the new feminists express only a general malaise they were never able to identify.

Nanette Rainone is twenty-seven, the wife of a newspaperman, the mother of a seven-month-old child, and a graduate of Queens College, where she studied English literature. She married while in graduate school, then quit before the year was out to become an office clerk at *Life* magazine. "I could have known the first day that I wasn't going to be promoted, but it took me eight months to find it out."

She spent the next five months idly at home, began doing volunteer public affairs interviews for WBAI radio, and now produces *Womankind*, a weekly program on the feminist movement.

"I always felt as though I was on a treadmill, an emotional treadmill. I thought it was neurotic, but it always focused on being a woman. Then I met another woman, who had two children. We talked about my pregnancy—my confusion about my pregnancy—and the problems she was having in caring for her children now that she was separated from her husband and wanted to work."

One evening Nanette Rainone's friend took her to a feminist meeting, and immediately she became part of the movement. "The child had been an escape. I was seeking a role I couldn't find on the outside," she says. "Then I became afraid my life would be overwhelmed, that I would never get out from under and do the things I had hoped to do."

"You struggle for several years after getting out of college. You know—what are you going to do with yourself? There's always the external discrimination, but somehow you feel you are talented and you should be able to project yourself. But you don't get a good job, you get a terrible job."

"I think I was typical of the average woman who is in the movement now, because the contradictions in the system existed in my life. My parents were interested in my education. I had more room to develop my potential than was required for the role I eventually was to assume."

"I don't put down the care of children. I just put down the fixated relationship that the mother has, the never-ending association, her urge that the child be something so that she can be something. People need objective projects. We all feel the need to actively participate in society, in something outside ourselves where we can learn and develop."

"The closest I've been able to come to what's wrong is that men have a greater sense of self than women have. Marriage is an aspect of men's lives, whereas it is the very center of most women's lives, the whole of their lives. It seemed to me that women felt they couldn't exist except in the eyes of men—that if a man wasn't looking at them or attending to them, then they just weren't there."

If women need more evidence, history books stand ready to assure us that we have seldom existed except as shadows of men. We have rarely been leaders of nations or industry or the great contributors to art and science, yet very few sociologists, political

leaders, historians, and moral critics have ever stopped to ask why. Now, all around the country, women are meeting in apartments and conference rooms and coffee shops to search out the answers.

The sessions begin with accounts of personal problems and incidents. For years, we women have believed that our anger and frustration and unhappiness were "our problems." Suddenly, we discover that we are telling *the same story!* Our complaints are not only common, they are practically universal.

It is an exhilarating experience. Women's doubts begin to disappear and are replaced by new strength and self-respect. We stop focusing on men, and begin to identify with other women and to analyze the roots of our oppression. The conclusions that are drawn challenge the legitimacy of the sex role system upon which our civilization is based.

At the center of the feminist critique is the recognition that women have been forced to accept an inferior role in society, and that we have come to believe in our own inferiority. Women are taught to be passive, dependent, submissive, not to pursue careers but to be taken care of and protected. Even those who seek outside work lack confidence and self-esteem. Most of us are forced into menial and unsatisfying jobs: More than three-quarters of us are clerks, sales personnel, or factory and service workers, and a fifth of the women with B.A. degrees are secretaries.

Self-hatred is endemic. Women—especially those who have "made it"—identify with men and mirror their contempt for women. The approval of women does not mean very much. We don't want to work for women or vote for them. We laugh, although with vague uneasiness, at jokes about women drivers, mothers-in-law, and dumb blondes.

We depend on our relationships with men for our very identities. Our husbands win us social status and determine how we will be regarded by the world. Failure for a woman is not being selected by a man.

We are trained in the interests of men to defer to them and serve them and entertain them. If we are educated and gracious, it is so we can please men and educate their children. That is the thread that runs through the life of the geisha, the party girl, the business executive's wife, and the First Lady of the United States.

Men define women, and until now most of us have accepted their definition without question. If we challenge men in the world outside the home, we are all too frequently derided as "aggressive" and "unfeminine"—by women as readily as by men.

A woman is expected to subordinate her job to the interests of her husband's work. She'll move to another city so he can take a promotion—but it rarely works the other way around. Men don't take women's work very seriously, and as a result, neither do most women. We spend a lot of time worrying about men, while they devote most of theirs to worrying about their careers.

We are taught that getting and keeping a man is a woman's most important job; marriage, therefore, becomes our most important achievement. One suburban housewife says her father started giving her bridal pictures cut from newspapers when she was six. "He said that was what I would be when I grew up."

Most feminists do not object to marriage per se, but to the corollary that it is creative and fulfilling for an adult human being to spend her life doing housework, caring for children, and using her husband as a vicarious link to the outside world.

Most people would prefer just about any kind of work to that of a domestic servant; yet the mindless, endless, repetitious drudgery of housekeeping is the central occupation of more than fifty million women. People who would oppose institutions that portion out menial work on the basis of race

see nothing wrong in a system that does the same thing on the basis of sex. (Should black and white roommates automatically assume the Negro best suited for housekeeping chores?) Even when they work at full-time jobs, wives must come home to "their" dusting and "their" laundry.

Some insist that housework is not much worse than the meaningless jobs most people have today, but there is a difference. Housewives are not paid for their work, and money is the mark of value in this society. It is also the key to independence and to the feeling of self-reliance that marks a free human being.

The justification for being a housewife is having children, and the justification for children is—well, a woman has a uterus, what else would it be for? Perhaps not all feminists agree that the uterus is a vestigial organ, but we are adamant and passionate in our denial of the old canard that biology is destiny.

Men have never been bound by their animal natures. They think and dream and create—and fly, clearly something nature had not intended, or it would have given men wings. However, we women are told that our chief function is to reproduce the species, prepare food, and sweep out the cave—er, house.

Psychologist Bruno Bettelheim states woman's functions succinctly: "We must start with the realization that, as much as women want to be good scientists or engineers, they want first and foremost to be womanly companions of men and to be mothers."

He gets no argument from Dr. Spock: "Biologically and temperamentally, I believe women were made to be concerned, first and foremost with child care, husband care, and home care." Spock says some women have been "confused" by their education. (Freud was equally reactionary on the woman question, but he at least had the excuse of his Central European background.)

The species must reproduce, but this need not be the sole purpose of a woman's life. Men want children, too, yet no one expects them to choose between families and work. Children are in no way a substitute for personal development and creativity. If a talented man is forced into a senseless, menial job, it is deplored as a waste and a personal misfortune; yet, a woman's special skills, education, and interests are all too often deemed incidental and irrelevant, simply a focus for hobbies or volunteer work.

Women who say that raising a family is a fulfilling experience are rather like the peasant who never leaves his village. They have never had the opportunity to do anything else.

As a result, women are forced to live through their children and husbands, and they feel cheated and resentful when they realize that is not enough. When a woman says she gave her children everything, she is telling the truth—and that is the tragedy. Often when she reaches her late thirties, her children have grown up, gone to work or college, and left her in a bleak and premature old age. Middle-aged women who feel empty and useless are the mainstay of America's psychiatrists—who generally respond by telling them to "accept their role."

The freedom to choose whether or not to have children has always been illusory. A wife who is deliberately "barren"—a word that reinforces the worn-out metaphor of woman as Mother Earth—is considered neurotic or unnatural. Not only is motherhood not central to a woman's life, it may not be necessary or desirable. For the first time, some of us are admitting openly and without guilt that we do not want children. And the population crisis is making it even clearer that as a symbol for Americans motherhood ought to defer to apple pie.

The other half of the reproduction question

is sex. The sexual revolution didn't liberate women at all; it only created a bear market for men. One of the most talked-about tracts in the movement is a pamphlet by Ann Koedt called "The Myth of the Vaginal Orgasm," which says most women don't have orgasms because most men won't accept the fact that the female orgasm is clitoral.

We are so used to putting men's needs first that we don't know how to ask for what we want, or else we share the common ignorance about our own physiology and think there is something wrong with us when we don't have orgasms "the right way." Freudian analysts contribute to the problem. The realization that past guilt and frustration have been unnecessary is not the least of the sentiments that draws women to women's liberation.

Feminists also protest the general male proclivity to regard us as decorative, amusing sex objects even in the world outside bed. We resent the sexual sell in advertising, the catcalls we get on the street, girly magazines and pornography, bars that refuse to serve unescorted women on the assumption they are prostitutes, the not very subtle brainwashing by cosmetic companies, and the attitude of men who praise our knees in miniskirts, but refuse to act as if we had brains.

Even the supposedly humanistic worlds of rock music and radical politics are not very different. Young girls who join "the scene" or "the movement" are labeled "groupies" and are sexually exploited; the flashy pornosheets such as *Screw* and *Kiss* are published by the self-appointed advocates of the new "free," anti-establishment life-style, "Plus ca change . . ."

We are angry about the powers men wield over us. The physical power—women who study karate do so as a defense against muggers, not lovers. And the social power—we resent the fact that men take the initiative with women, that women cannot ask for dates but must sit home waiting for the phone to ring.

That social conditioning began in childhood when fathers went out to work and mothers stayed home, images perpetuated in schoolbooks and games and on television. If we were bright students, we were told, "You're smart—for a girl," and then warned not to appear too smart in front of boys—"Or you won't have dates."

Those of us who persisted in reaching for a career were encouraged to be teachers or nurses so we would have "something to fall back on." My mother told me: "You're so bright, it's a pity you're not a boy. You could become president of a bank—or anything you wanted."

Ironically, and to our dismay, we discovered that playing the assigned role is precisely what elicits masculine contempt for our inferiority and narrow interests. *Tooth and Nail*, a newsletter published by women's liberation groups in the San Francisco area, acidly points out a few of the contradictions: "A smart woman never shows her brains; she allows the man to think himself clever. . . . Women's talk is all chatter; they don't understand things men are interested in."

Or: "Don't worry your pretty little head about such matters. . . . A woman's brain is between her legs. . . . Women like to be protected and treated like little girls. . . . Women can't make decisions."

The feminist answer is to throw out the whole simplistic division of human characteristics into masculine and feminine, and to insist that there are no real differences between men and women other than those enforced by culture.

Men say women are not inferior, we are just different; yet somehow they have appropriated most of the qualities that society admires and have left us with the same distinctive features that were attributed to

black people before the civil rights revolution.

Men, for example, are said to be strong, assertive, courageous, logical, constructive, creative, and independent. Women are weak, passive, irrational, overemotional, empty-headed, and lacking in strong superegos. (Thank Freud for the last.) Both blacks and women are contented, have their place, and know how to use wiles—flattery, and wide-eyed, open-mouthed ignorance—to get around "the man." It is obviously natural that men should be dominant and women submissive. Shuffle, baby, shuffle.

Our "sexist" system has hurt men as well as women, forcing them into molds that deny the value of sensitivity, tenderness, and sentiment. Men who are not aggressive worry about their virility just as strong women are frightened by talk about their being castrating females. The elimination of rigid sex-role definitions would liberate everyone. And that is the goal of the women's liberation movement.

Women's liberation groups, which have sprung up everywhere across the country, are taking names like Radical Women or the Women's Liberation Front or the Feminists. Most start as groups of ten or twelve; many, when they get too large for discussion, split in a form of mitosis. Sometimes they are tied to central organizations set up for action, or they maintain communications with each other or cosponsor newsletters with similar groups in their area.

Some are concerned with efforts to abolish abortion laws, a few have set up cooperative day-care centers, others challenge the stereotypes of woman's image, and many are organized for "consciousness-raising"—a kind of group therapy or encounter session that starts with the premise that there is something wrong with the system, not the women in the group.

The amorphousness and lack of central communication in the movement make it virtually impossible to catalogue the established groups, let alone the new ones that regularly appear; many of the "leaders" who have been quoted in newspapers or interviewed on television have been anointed only by the press.

The one organization with a constitution, board members, and chapters (some thirty-five) throughout the country is the National Organization for Women. Its founding in 1966 was precipitated by the ridicule that greeted the inclusion of sex in the prohibitions against job discrimination in the 1964 Civil Rights Act. (A staff member in the federal Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, which enforces the act, said it took pressure from NOW to get the EEOC to take that part of the law seriously.)

NOW members are not very different from women in other feminist groups, though they tend to include more professionals and older women. In general, they eschew "consciousness-raising" in favor of political action, and they are more likely to demonstrate for job equality and child-care centers than for the abolition of marriage or the traditional family unit.

NOW's president is Betty Friedan, who in 1963 published *The Feminine Mystique*, a challenge to the myth that a woman's place is either in a boudoir in a pink, frilly nightgown, on her hands and knees scrubbing the kitchen floor, or in a late model station wagon taking the kids to music lessons and Cub Scout meetings. (An article that previewed the theme of the book was turned down by every major women's magazine. "One was horrified and said I was obviously talking to and for a few neurotic women." When the book came out, two of these magazines published excerpts and several now have commissioned articles about the movement.)

Today, Betty Friedan says, the movement

must gain political power by mobilizing the 51 per cent of the electorate who are women, as well as seeking elected offices for themselves. "We have to break down the actual barriers that prevent women from being full people in society, and not only end explicit discrimination but build new institutions. Most women will continue to bear children, and unless we create child-care centers on a mass basis, it's all talk."

Women are beginning to read a good deal about their own place in history, about the determined struggles of the suffragettes, the isolation of Virginia Wolff, and the heroism of Rosa Luxemburg. The Congress to Unite Women, which drew some 500 participants from cities in the Northeast, called for women's studies in high schools and colleges.

Present are all the accouterments of any social movement—feminist magazines such as *No More Fun and Games* in Boston, *Up from Under* in New York, and *Aphra*, a literary magazine published in Baltimore. (Anne Sexton wrote in the dedication, "As long as it can be said about a woman writer, 'She writes like a man' and that woman takes it as a compliment, we are in trouble.")

There are feminist theaters in at least New York and Boston, buttons that read "Uppity Women Unite," feminist poems and songs, a feminist symbol (the biological sign for woman with an equal sign in the center), and, to denounce specific advertisements, gum stickers that state, "This ad insults women."

With a rising feminist consciousness, everything takes on new significance—films, advertisements, offhand comments, little things that never seemed important before. A few women conclude that chivalry and flirting reduce women to mere sex objects for men. We stop feeling guilty about opening doors, and some of us experiment with paying our own way on dates.

Personal acts are matched by political ones. The National Organization for Women went to court to get a federal ruling barring segregated help-wanted ads in newspapers, and it regularly helps women file complaints before the EEOC and local human rights commissions.

A women's rights platform was adopted last year by the Senate Committee of the California Democratic Party, and the Women's Rights Committee of the New Democratic Coalition plans to make feminist demands an issue in New York politics. A women's caucus exists in the Democratic Policy Council, headed by Senator Fred Harris.

At Grinnell College in Iowa, students protested the appearance of a representative from *Playboy* magazine, and women from sixteen cities converged on Atlantic City to make it clear what they think of the Miss America Pageant. In New York, a group protested advertisements by toymakers that said "boys were born to build and learn" and "girls were born to be dancers."

Women's caucuses have been organized in the American Political Science, Psychological, and Sociological associations. At New York University a group of law students won their fight to make women eligible for a series of coveted \$10,000 scholarships."

Pro-abortion groups have organized around the country to repeal anti-abortion laws, challenge them in the courts, or openly defy them. In Bloomington, Indiana, New York City, and elsewhere, women's liberation groups have set up cooperative day-care centers, which are illegal under strict state rules that regulate child-care facilities.

Free child care is likely to become the most significant demand made by the movement, and one calculated to draw the support of millions of women who may not be interested in other feminist issues. About four million working mothers have children under six years of age, and only 2 per cent of these are in day-care centers.



Even Establishment institutions appear to reflect the new attitudes. Princeton, Williams, and Yale have begun to admit women students, though, on an unequal quota basis—and not to the hallowed pine-paneled halls of their alumni clubhouses.

Nevertheless, most people have only a vague idea of the significance of the new movement. News commentators on year-end analysis shows ignored the question or sloughed it off uncomfortably. One said the whole idea frightened him.

Yet, the women's movement promises to affect radically the life of virtually everyone in America. Only a small part of the population suffers because it is black, and most people have little contact with minorities. Women are 51 per cent of the population, and chances are that every adult American either is one, is married to one, or has close social or business relations with many.

The feminist revolution will overturn the basic premises upon which these relations are built—stereotyped notions about the family and the roles of men and women, fallacies concerning masculinity and femininity, and the economic division of labor into paid work and homemaking.

If the 1960s belonged to the blacks, the next ten years are ours.

#### THE LATE HONORABLE THADDEUS MACHROWICZ

#### HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 25, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, I was very much saddened to learn of the passing of my good friend and former colleague, the Honorable Thaddeus Machrowicz, of Michigan.

I commend his successor in this House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. NEZBI), for taking this time to permit this warm tribute to a fine legislator and distinguished Federal judge.

Judge Machrowicz was a Member of this body when I first was elected to serve in the 86th Congress. He was one of the first Members I came to know well—thanks to a prompt introduction by his senior colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, the Honorable Eugene Keogh, of New York, who since has retired from Congress.

As a Member of Congress from Michigan, Judge Machrowicz made a fine legislative record and was highly respected not only by his constituents but also by his colleagues in the House.

He was born in Gostyn, Poland, in 1899, immigrating to the United States with his family at the age of 3. He was one of the first students of Alliance College, which was founded at Cambridge Springs, Pa., in 1912, by the Polish Community of America.

During World War I, he and his brother volunteered to serve with the U.S. Army. Thad was rejected because of poor eyesight, but he managed to serve 3 years as a member of the Polish Army of Volunteers which was in Canada.

He served in many municipal and civic roles in his home community of Hamtramck, Mich., a predominantly Polish-American city, before he made his bid

for a seat in Congress in 1950. He left this Chamber in 1961 to accept an appointment by the late President John F. Kennedy to be a Federal district judge.

Judge Machrowicz was a distinguished legislator, an able and respected member of the bar and the Federal judiciary, and a fine citizen.

The Nation is the better for his devoted service and I extend my sincere condolences to his bereaved family.

#### NEWSLETTER RESULTS

#### HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to provide for the readers of the RECORD the text of my most recent newsletter. It includes commentary on many of the issues of the day that are important to my constituents and to the Nation.

It also includes a report on the questionnaire in my previous newsletter, to which over 7,000 constituents responded. I would like to draw special attention to these results, for I feel that they reflect the national viewpoint on the important issues of the day, and I know that these results will be informative and useful to my colleagues:

#### WASHINGTON REPORT, FEBRUARY 1970

#### STATE OF THE UNION—STATE OF THE ENVIRONMENT

The State of the Union message was the most hopeful in years. For the first time in history, a President has pledged the full weight of his Administration to halt and reverse the tide of pollution engulfing our nation.

We in Congress who have been fighting to protect our environment in the past know that it will take much more than verbal commitments to undo the damage to our ecology. It will take:

Vastly expanded research efforts;  
Unprecedented action by industry;  
Huge governmental outlays;  
Congress took some steps last session. We passed:

The Environmental Quality Council  
The Endangered Species Act; (both of which I co-sponsored)

New Air Pollution standards;  
\$800 million for sewage treatment  
So I look forward to a 1970 session where conservation and environmental protection issues get much more attention than in the past.

I expect to play an even more active role, in view of my experience and committee assignments, in this fight to protect our world from ourselves—and for ourselves, and our children.

#### STAMPS: HONORING THE PILGRIMS

Extraordinary national recognition of the Pilgrims' 350th anniversary came recently, as the Post Office Department announced plans to issue a special commemorative stamp for the occasion.

Date, design and place of issuance are still undetermined, and both Provincetown and Plymouth are vying for the honor of being the issuance site.

Both towns played significant roles in the Pilgrim saga, and I am urging that both be part of stamp activities.

#### AND THE WHALERS

The Post Office is also issuing a commemorative cachet, in honor of Herman Melville and the whaling industry, on March 7.

Their decision to issue it in New Bedford brought forth protests from Nantucket, Martha's Vineyard, and—of all places—Pittsfield.

Locally, I have not taken sides: all these ports in my District have valid historical claims to recognition. But I will defend the claims of any and all of them against the Pittsfield partisans. Any whaling memorial, in my view, unquestionably belongs to Southeastern Massachusetts—historic home of the whaling fleet.

#### MERCHANT MARINE: REVIVAL AHEAD?

After years of stagnation there is now some hope on the horizon for our neglected merchant marine fleet. Last month the Nixon administration sent to Congress a program calling for 300 new vessels to be built over the next 10 years.

Much of the credit for the innovative new program must go to Andrew Gibson, the energetic new Maritime Administrator, who got his start at the Massachusetts Maritime Academy, in Buzzards Bay.

And speaking of Merchant Marine, I am particularly proud that it was a 12th District man—Captain Donald B. Graham of Falmouth—who skipped the *Manhattan* on her historic voyage through the frozen Arctic to the Alaskan oil fields.

These are the kind of men who will save the industry and I am proud of their association with our District.

#### DIG NOW—PAY LATER

The recent idea to mine 25 million yards of sand and gravel from the seabed off Marshfield and Plymouth caused a storm of opposition from South Shore residents.

I have been a long-time opponent of such apparently heedless development and recently told a committee of state legislators that, "Any large-scale exploitation of this undersea resource should not be permitted—not until we know much more than we do now about the interrelationships in the environment that surrounds us."

The possible danger to the shellfish and shorelines near the proposed removal sites is great—but there is no law currently on the books to prevent it.

This is further evidence of the need for implementation of my "Marine Sanctuaries" concept—at the state level, and ultimately nation-wide.

#### NOMANS DECLARED "WILDLIFE REFUGE"

As any sports fisherman knows, just south of Martha's Vineyard lies an intriguing island called Nomans, deserted except for the bird and animal life that abounds there. This unspoiled gem will soon join the Cohasset annex, the Cape Cod National Seashore, and (hopefully) Monomoy Island in our area's growing inventory of protected sanctuaries.

After a series of meetings with my office, and with interested Vineyarders like Henry Beetle Hough and James Reston, the Navy and Interior Departments have drawn up an agreement giving Nomans "Wildlife Refuge" status.

Beyond that, the Navy will make certain improvements recommended by the Interior Department, to enhance the island's attractiveness to all forms of wildlife. All forms of wildlife, that is, except man—because of the unexploded shells on the island, it will remain "off-limits" to civilians.

#### QUESTIONNAIRE: 7,000 RESPONSES PRODUCED SIGNIFICANT RESULTS

More than 7,000 constituents completed the questionnaire I sent out in the last newsletter. The monumental job of analyzing this mass of data was ably completed by vol-

unteers from throughout the District, under the direction of Alice Gretsch of Falmouth, Mildred Arsenault of South Dartmouth, and Charlie Black of Hingham.

**Priorities:** The poll on priorities produced some surprises. Inflation was first, and space last, and the others came in this order: 2, education; 3, poverty; 4, housing; 5, defense; 6, conservation; 7, oceanography. The high rating for poverty was very much on my mind when I voted to continue the Office of Economic Opportunity, and opposed efforts to dissolve the anti-poverty agency.

**Inflation:** An overwhelming majority of those who answered rated inflation as the nation's No. 1 domestic problem. A partial solution to inflation is to control government spending. President Nixon has promised a \$1.7 billion budget surplus for this next year, and I support this goal unreservedly. Without it, the dollar will continue to decline in value.

**Space:** No one put space first, second, or third on their list of priorities, and the majority placed it last. As soon as the results came in I telegraphed President Nixon urging a drastic cutback, in line with this expression of opinion.

**Social Security:** 66.6% of those who answered favored the idea of an automatic cost-of-living increase for Social Security recipients. The President has announced his support of the concept, and the Ways and Means Committee has agreed to take up my bill and others on this subject shortly.

Recognizing the harm that inflation has already done to those on Social Security, I joined the majority of my colleagues in support of a 15% increase in benefits, to take effect in April. In view of the surplus in the Social Security trust fund, it was a fiscally responsible action—and certainly a necessary one.

**Conservation:** While the 1971 budget was cut back in almost every area, one that was expanded was money for parkland acquisition—proof of the Administration's commitment to conservation. I am pressing for funds to complete payment for the remaining Cape Cod National Seashore properties.

Peoples' priorities are changing, and we who represent you in Congress are taking actions which reflect that change. We are moving too fast for some of you and too slowly for others. But we are moving—and if my questionnaire results are any indication, it is in a direction the majority wants to go. In the second session of the 91st Congress, which we are just now beginning, we will be debating these matters—and moving even further in the directions you've indicated.

**Questionnaire**  
[In percent]

**Vietnam: Do you favor:**  
An increase in our military effort in Vietnam ..... 5.7  
Gradual withdrawal as South Vietnam takes over ..... 70.3  
Immediate withdrawal of all U.S. forces ..... 23.8

**Space: Do you favor:**  
Increasing appropriations for space exploration ..... 5.3  
Keeping space at its current level ..... 39.7  
Reduction of funds for space activities ..... 55.0

**Social security: Do you favor: (Bearing in mind that employer-employee contributions would have to go up to meet any increase):**  
Keeping Social Security benefits at present levels ..... 7.9  
Increasing benefits by 10% (the Nixon proposal) ..... 25.3  
Increasing benefits at the same rate living costs rise ..... 66.6

**Welfare: Do you favor his plan:** The President's plan provides minimum payments to families with dependent children and for

financial incentives and extended job-training programs for those able to work.

Yes ..... 86.3  
No ..... 13.5

How would you judge President Nixon's performance?

Good ..... 57.0  
Fair ..... 32.4  
Poor ..... 10.5

The results were meaningful.

**DRUGS: GROWING PROBLEM**

Once confined to the inner city, the problem of drug abuse is today a very real one even for some of the towns in my District. Concerned citizens from Weymouth to Nantucket are asking the same questions—why is it happening here, and what can we do about it?

They are finding that there are no easy answers. And they are finding too that nobody really knows much about many of the drugs that they view with such alarm—especially the most popular drug—marijuana.

To remedy that lack, I have filed a bill creating a Presidential Commission on Marijuana. It will, if acted upon favorably, authorize a comprehensive study of all aspects of the drug and recommend changes in the law.

Our towns need knowledge—much more than exists now—if they are to face intelligently the drug abuse problem. The Federal role must be a much more positive one than in the past.

**1969: ACHIEVEMENT AND CHANGE**

It's been an exciting year, one of challenge and change. Among the highlights are:

**BOO—HEW:** After 6 years of service as my personal secretary, Judy Licata left us for the secure 9-6 hours at HEW. We all miss her and wish her well. . . . **WORKING GIRL:** my younger daughter Carolyn is now an employment counselor in Boston, and Helen is living on the West Coast where her husband Rusty is in the service . . . this summer I turned in my 1966 Pontiac with 85,000 miles—most of it logged between Washington and the District. . . . **ROLL—CALL:** I was recorded on 97% of the House votes, compared with the average Congressman's 86%. . . . **MOVING UP:** I now hold the #1 Republican position on the Coast Guard Subcommittee, #2 on the Fish & Wildlife Conservation Subcommittee, #3 on Oceanography—as well as being the senior Republican on the Commerce & Finance Committee. . . . thanks also to the seniority system, I was able to move my office to larger quarters in the Rayburn Building . . . and Tillie Sylvia, and I entered our 12th year of service to the 12th District in 1970.

It's been a productive and enjoyable tenure, and I look forward to continuing to serve you in the exciting years that lie ahead.

**UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS INTERNATIONAL EX-STUDENTS' ASSOCIATION**

**HON. J. J. PICKLE**

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, yesterday all over the world, graduates of the University of Texas gathered to celebrate March 2, Texas Independence Day. Here in Washington, a group of several hundred met to hear one of our long-time friends explain the truly interna-

tional character of the university ex-students efforts.

Edward Clark, the colorful former Ambassador to Australia and one of our most distinguished alumni, outlined plans for the International Ex-Students' Conference to be held May 13-16. At this affair, UT exes will gather in recognition of the many, many foreign students who come to the university for their education. This will be the first major conference of any university to bring back to the campus those foreign students who returned to their native lands after graduating from the University of Texas. Over 10,000 UT exes from other nations are scattered all over the world. During "International Education Year—1970" the University of Texas will lead the way in recognizing the great value of the ex-students to our school—and to the preservation of peace and progress throughout the world.

Let me name just a few of those who will participate in the meeting next May; the Honorable U Thant, Secretary General of the United Nations; McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation; Mrs. Lyndon Johnson, our gracious former First Lady; Fernando Belaunde, former President of Peru—truly, this will be an international conference.

But the inimitable Edward Clark tells the story better than I can and I include his remarks in the RECORD:

**REMARKS OF AMBASSADOR EDWARD CLARK**

This is the first opportunity that I have had to return to Washington to make a report of any kind since I reported to President Johnson at the close of my wonderful tour in Australia, and I am delighted to be back in this great capital city and to have a specific assignment again.

I am especially pleased that you have asked me to make a report to you on the state of our great University of Texas, because the role of our University in education today is not unlike the role of the United States in world affairs.

Time and again during the years that I was privileged to serve as President Johnson's ambassador to Australia, I was forcefully reminded of the way that other nations look to the United States for leadership. And since I have returned to Austin and become active again in The ex-Students' Association as chairman of one of its committees, I am just as forcefully reminded that other colleges and universities, both within Texas and without, look today to the University of Texas for leadership in many areas of education.

If this makes me sound like a provincial braggart, I plead guilty on both counts. As many of you know, I was born and reared in the "Cradle of Texas," San Augustine, and I'm proud to be an East Texan. I'm also proud to be an alumnus of The University of Texas, and I admit to a prejudiced, provincial favoritism about it.

When I speak as an alumnus of The University, I am reminded of the time when I was County Attorney. I was prosecuting an old boy for theft and his lawyer brought in the Justice of the Peace as a character witness and he gave the defendant an excellent character recommendation. I was astonished and cross-questioned: "Is it not true that defendant has been hailed into your court for assault on the school principal with an axe handle? Wasn't he caught stealing chickens and watermelons several times?" He replied: "Well, yes-s-s." "Then how can you now say that he is of good



character and reputation?" He replied: "Well, he's average for San Augustine."

Well, when it comes to talking about my University, I'm about average as a Texas Ex. As an average ex, I can tell you that The University of Texas that you knew doesn't exist anymore. It's true that most of the same buildings (and a lot of new ones, probably) are there and probably some of your old professors are still around. But The University of Texas, even as it existed four years ago, simply isn't there anymore. The changes in curriculum and the knowledge explosion have been that rapid.

Secondly, your University today is a turbulent place—much more so that when you knew it. It probably is fair to say that all universities are turbulent today, and that this may be because they mirror the turbulence of the world about them. However, it is also fair to say that much of the unrest on campus today stems from The University itself. This is neither a new thought nor is it meant to be a critical one, because universities have been a source of turbulence for at least 700 years. And I, as one interested alumnus, do not see the stress on the campus today as a serious threat to the future of The University of Texas or to any university. I may disagree with most of the motives behind the demonstrations and abhor most of their causes, but I am confident enough in our system of government and our system of higher education to believe that both will survive and even be strengthened by the testing to which they are being subjected today.

One of the reasons for the stresses and strains that irritate The University of Texas today is size. This spring, there are almost 35,000 students on a campus that hasn't expanded much in acreage since enrollment was half this number. Another factor affecting The University is the age of today's student body as compared with the average age of students ten or thirty years ago. Most of us were still adolescents when we were in The University, whereas more than half of the students enrolled at The University today are old enough to vote. The average male student today is 23.2 years old, and the average age of the females is 22.5 years. This means that university administrators are no longer dealing with children, but with men and women whom the law recognizes and defines as adults. They may be immature adults, in some cases, but they are old enough to vote. Hence their rights cannot be abridged without some real concern about the rights of all of us, and their privileges cannot be taken away without the privileges of all of society being affected.

This is a fact that many of us among the alumni, remembering those good old days, fail to consider when we hear that students want to have beer in the Texas Union and the right to come and go as they please in the dormitories. Most of them today are adults who want the same rights and privileges granted any other adult, and they can't see why a college campus should have rules and regulations that are any different from the mores and laws of society as a whole.

The demands of today's students for equal rights remind me of one of the stalwart citizens of San Augustine, Confederate Captain Thomas William Blount. He was the son of one of the signers of the Texas Declaration of Independence and was my grandfather's friend—and mine. I used to drive Captain Blount and Grandpa about the country, and I remember him as the very picture of the Southern colonel—black hat, string tie, white Van Dyke beard. No more arrogant man ever lived.

He and Grandpa used to play dominoes, and whenever the Captain made some points and Grandpa was able to make the same number of points in his play, he would say,

"Likewise." This dated back to the days when the Captain ran for the Legislature and didn't get enough votes to make him mad. But he did not take it that way. Next morning, he and my grandfather were at the saloon, and the saloonkeeper, Mr. Ed Smith, offered his sympathies. The Captain muttered an obscenity against those that voted against him. Mr. Ed said, "Well, Captain, what about all of us who voted for and supported you?" "Well, sir," said the Captain, "you may do likewise."

That's how it is with today's students—they just want to do likewise.

Now what about The University of Texas as an educational institution. Is it as good as some of us say it is? Most educators who know whereof they speak agree that it is a good institution on its way to being a great one. It is the best institution in a radius of 800 to 1,000 miles, and any recent objective value judgment by educational rating organizations lists The University of Texas as among the best 20 institutions of higher learning in the U.S. Ten years ago, The University of Texas wouldn't have appeared on the list at all.

Those of us who are alumni of The University of Texas can be justifiably proud of that fact. We can be proud, too, of our Ex-Students' Association, and it is to that organization—and to one of its projects that is a particular interest of mine—that I want to devote a moment or two now.

As you know, 1970 has been designated as International Education Year. While most of the colleges and universities around the world are paying lip-service to this fact, and some are publishing long professorial treatises about it, your University is doing something so practical and so wonderful that I believe that we are going to make a really significant contribution to world friendship in this International Education Year.

Like many of you, I do not think that the United States can be the sole contributor to the world's economic welfare and military security. When I was serving as Ambassador to Australia and had an opportunity to meet and talk with many world leaders as well as thousands of ordinary citizens, I found that the people with whom I spoke understood this. They do not expect the U.S. to play such a role. What they do expect from us, though, is the kind of personal involvement that confirms that we as individuals recognize our responsibilities: first, as American citizens; and second, as world citizens.

I mean the kind of involvement that comes about when you or I say, "Look, this issue or that one is important to me and I'm going to do something about it." I mean the kind of involvement we have when citizens from all walks of life, regardless of personal pressures, find the time to lend a hand in the day-to-day process of governing. Doctors, lawyers, engineers, teachers, businessmen—the man-in-the-street who believes that we can have a better world and who is willing to help make one.

Last summer, your Ex-Students' Association recognized in International Education Year an opportunity to bring together for the first time on the campus at Austin—and maybe for the first time anywhere—a group of educated people from around the world to discuss questions and problems of significance to all of us. These are the 10,000 foreign nationals who are graduates of The University of Texas—men and women of all faiths and virtually all cultural and racial backgrounds, who live and work in more than 100 countries of the world. Each year, The University has about 1,000 foreign nationals among its student body, and it sends several hundred of these home each June with a degree and a lasting friendship for the state and the nation that gave them their education. But until now—until your Ex-Students' Association decided to do some-

thing about it—this large body of alumni has been largely ignored.

I was delighted when the plans for an International Ex-Students' Conference, to be held May 13-16, 1970, were outlined to me, and flattered when I was asked to become chairman of the Committee to plan the event. Since last fall, I have given more of my time to this activity than I have to my law practice and only wish that I could have given more. Working with me has been a wonderful group of Texas Exes—people like our gracious former First Lady, Mrs. Lyndon Johnson; Walter Cronkite, the CBS commentator; Bob Dorsey of Pittsburgh, president of Gulf Oil, and many others including three wonderful alumni from Washington, former Secretary of Commerce C. R. Smith, William S. White, the columnist, and my dear friend, Mrs. Everett Hutchinson.

Our Committee has met many times in many places, and sub-committees have met many times in between. And I am delighted to tell you tonight that the International Ex-Students' Conference which your Ex-Students' Association is staging is now attracting attention all over the world. Alumni from more than 20 countries already have registered for it, and these include men and women who are ambassadors, cabinet ministers, business leaders and top-flight professionals in their own lands. They are coming to Austin, not only to renew their ties with an institution and a city that they have come to love as a second home, but to sit down with their American counterparts for a meaningful dialogue about problems that are of concern to peoples everywhere.

To give you some idea of the kind of interest the International Ex-Students' Conference has attracted, I can tell you that U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, will be one of the speakers. So will McGeorge Bundy, president of the Ford Foundation, and Fernando Belaunde, former president of Peru and the only graduate of The University of Texas to be elected head of state. An invitation also has been extended to the President of the United States, and I hope that we can announce his acceptance soon.

I have dwelt at length on the International Ex-Students' Conference for two reasons: First, it illustrates better than any other example that I know, the kind of projects and programs that are being undertaken by your Ex-Students' Association today. Alumni—at least, the alumni of The University of Texas—can no longer be accused of organizing only for class reunion beer-busts and bun-throwing dinners. Your Ex-Students' Association, as evidenced by programs like the International Conference, is a full partner with The University of Texas in the educational enterprise. It deserves your active support and your membership dues, because it is doing an outstanding job.

My second reason for dwelling on the International Conference, however, is to point up the fact that the reason your Ex-Students' Association is doing an outstanding job is because it can count on Texas Exes like you to give of your time, talent and money when there is a job to be done for The University of Texas. Our Association is blessed with an outstanding and unusually competent staff, but that staff can only be as good as the volunteer alumni who work to make our Association the going concern that it is. Texas Exes just like you—in fact, some of you—were the people responsible for getting men of world renown to agree to journey to Austin for the International Conference.

This year, more than 4,000 Texas Exes in 50 states and many countries of the world are working for our University through The Ex-Students' Association by serving on committees, as officers of the more than 80 Texas Exes Clubs or on special projects ranging from helping Darrell Royal recruit athletes to

raising money for an outstanding scholarship program. If you are not already actively working in the broad program of The Ex-Students' Association, I urge you to do so.

I said in the beginning that I have a provincial attitude about our University, and I'm sure that if you had any doubts about that statement, you do not now. The University of Texas is, as your notice of this meeting stated, a ONE-derful institution and it is that whether the Longhorns finish first or fiftieth in the national rankings. I'm proud that I'm a Texas Ex, and I know that you are, too.

MILFORD LABORATORY CLOSING

HON. ROBERT N. GIAIMO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. GIAIMO. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Marine Biological Laboratory at Milford, Conn. is scheduled to be closed as part of an overzealous effort to economize. Although the laboratory operates on a budget of only \$336,000 per year, the returns on this modest investment are incalculable.

One aspect of the research work carried on by the Milford laboratory is predator control. Starfish and oyster drills almost killed the oyster industry a decade ago. Pioneering work by the Milford laboratory in the field of predator control has been responsible in large part for the economic revival of this once dying industry.

Mr. Speaker, a recent article by George Ralston in the Milford Citizen describes this aspect of the Milford laboratory's work. I include Mr. Ralston's excellent article in the RECORD at this point:

MILFORD LABORATORY CLOSING

(By George Ralston)

"To dismantle that whole organization would be very detrimental to the whole oyster industry in Connecticut."

The words came from John Mulhall, manager of the New Haven office of New England Oyster Farms, Inc., in the wake of the announced closing of the Bureau of Commercial Fisheries laboratory on Rogers Ave. by May 1.

Mr. Mulhall is a commercial oysterman, and in the business for the profit, not the theory of it. He is the first to say that the federal lab in Milford is irreplaceable if the state shellfish industry is going to survive.

"We don't have any kind of state facilities that can take over the work being done by the Milford lab," Mr. Mulhall said. "We'd be entirely abandoning any scientific program in Connecticut."

Word of the closing reached the public last week, and the alleged reason was federal budget cutbacks.

The reason is ironic, because the lab is a unique facility that has already paid for itself in hard cash earned by the Connecticut commercial oystermen using techniques developed and recommended by the lab staff.

Anyone who knows the shorefront will admit the state oyster industry has been in serious trouble for a long time. Only a few companies now operate beds in the Long Island Sound waters that used to be crowded with commercial vessels.

Over-harvesting that denuded the natural beds at the end of the 19th century was followed by the growing pollution of the waters in the 20th. Starfish and drills, oyster pred-

ators, took their toll and the industry began to die.

The starfish invasion of the Sound just a decade ago almost killed the industry, but oystering has struggled back onto its feet.

The Milford lab, Polystream and lime are three of the big reasons.

Polystream was discovered by work done in the Milford lab by a young researcher named Clyde McKenzie. The chemical kills off 85-90 per cent of the oyster drills on the beds without harming any other forms of life.

Without treatment, an oyster bed infested with drills suffers a 75 per cent mortality rate among the shellfish. The increased yield is astronomical when Polystream eliminates 90 per cent of the drills.

Polystream is already being used by Long Island Oyster Farms and other operators, and is being tried out experimentally in other sections of the country.

The voracious starfish are attacked by dumping lime (calcium oxide) on the beds which creates lesions on the starfish and kills them. The Harvester, out of New Haven, is rigged with a hopper that carries 15 tons of lime for bed treatment.

The other two vessels in the permanent "starfish patrol" are rigged for "mopping". Frames with mops attached are dragged along the beds, entangling the starfish who are lifted to the surface and dipped in vats of boiling water, killing them. This is the traditional method.

Mr. Mulhall estimates that Long Island Oyster Farms used 3,000 tons of lime last year in fighting starfish, to a point where they are "controllable."

Lime has been an old weapon against the starfish scourge, but again Mr. Mulhall credited the lab with determining the quantity of the applications needed to fight the predators to a standstill.

Mr. McKenzie is a unique researcher who has become the "eyes" of the oyster industry by becoming the first scientist to skindive on the beds and really see what the oyster farms look like. He makes one or two dives a week, all year round.

"He's one of the leading people who understands the oyster and the industry," Mr. Mulhall said.

"As a result of his diving, and feeding us information, we feel we are able to raise more oysters by reducing our mortality."

BLIND FARMING

"It's just like a blind man trying to farm an agricultural crop when he can't even feel it," Mr. McKenzie said recently about the oyster industry techniques.

"Every tool used on the oyster beds was designed and used back in the 1800s. The techniques belong in a museum; they can't do the job."

After a few explorations, Mr. McKenzie found that 75 per cent of the bottom was barren, unable to "utilize" the millions of spat looking for a place to grow.

"The amount is now up to 2,000 bushels, and it could go up to 5,000," Mr. McKenzie said.

Mr. McKenzie sees a tremendous potential in the shellfish industry in Connecticut and New England which, he estimates, is being managed at 1 per cent of capacity.

"The average person in New York City in 1865 ate 11 bushels of oysters per year," Mr. McKenzie illustrated.

The "wet labs" and tidewater facilities are actually easily convertible to the study of water pollution, which was given a high-priority rating by President Nixon in his speech on the environment last week.

The government statement concerning the closing of the laboratory said that, hopefully, the projects could be farmed out to universities for continued study.

But its not a realistic approach. The studies underway at the lab are, for the most

part, pioneering efforts in a field that has been an information vacuum until recent years.

The program heads are, in many cases, the experts in the field of experiments carried on at the lab. There's no one better who understands the problem or the possible solution more than these people, who have worked and directed these unique programs for the past several years.

Clyde McKenzie was calm as he discussed ending all his programs with the commercial oystermen by May 1.

"They're not going to turn us out into the street," he said about the government. "They'll try to position us in other federal labs. But we won't be hired to continue the programs we've developed."

PETER LISAGOR EXAMINES MR. NIXON'S MESSAGE ON THE STATE OF THE WORLD

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, recently, one of the Nation's outstanding foreign affairs observers here in Washington, Mr. Peter Lisagor, bureau chief of the Chicago Daily News, analyzed President Nixon's ponderous dissertation on the state of the world.

Because Mr. Lisagor is one of this Nation's most highly respected observers in the field of foreign affairs, I am placing in the RECORD today Mr. Lisagor's recent column in which he comments on the President's report.

Mr. Lisagor has performed a notable public service by giving us this in-depth analysis of the President's report.

His column follows:

A NIXON JAB AT SOVIET 'GOD'

WASHINGTON.—If a man of piety were told that his faith had been grievously misdirected and that he was moving steadfastly toward perdition rather than eternal grace, he would be understandably upset.

So it must be with the Russians, who have been advised gratuitously by the President of the United States that their god, Karl Marx, has failed them. An aging hippie of his time, old Karl got caught in the historical switches somewhere along the line; he has turned out to be a bum prophet and a worse guide, according to the President's world view.

Mr. Nixon's message was conveyed to the Russians in his report to the Congress on America's strategic designs, a document of such Teutonic thoroughness and weightiness that even Marx, a pretty ponderous fellow himself, might have had trouble digesting it.

The word "Teutonic" is used advisedly, for the President was voicing the gospel of his conceptual adviser, Henry Kissinger, the German-born scholar and former Harvard professor whose ideas on the nature of the world, complex and convoluted as they are, will find little favor in the pool halls and beer parlors of the land.

The Russians weren't told simply that Marx has led them down the garden path or betrayed them en route to the classless society. They were given the word in a tone of commiseration, but as diplomatic language goes, it was a devilish thrust:

"If we have had to learn the limitations of our own power, the lessons of the last two decades must have left their imprint on the leadership in the Kremlin—in the recognition



that Marxist ideology is not the surest guide to the problems of a changing industrial society, the worldwide decline in the appeal of ideology, and most of all in the foreign policy dilemmas repeatedly posed by the spread of communism to states that refuse to endure permanent submission to Soviet authority—a development illustrated vividly by the Soviet schism with China."

The 94-word sentence is a mouthful in any language. It is a mischievous reminder that the Soviets haven't really hacked it with the Czechs, the Romanians, the Poles, and, of course, the Yugoslavs, who broke the traces years ago.

In effect, the President asks the Russians to bury their dogma and get on with negotiations. But nobody expects the irreverent slap at Comrade Karl to produce a reassessment in the Kremlin of Soviet foreign policy.

In other respects, the President's report rambles over the globe dropping dicta that are sometimes contradictory and often ambiguous. To change the imagery, it is, in some ways, a bit like a coach distributing his game plan in advance to the opposition. It could provide a scenario for skulduggery, in that crafty tinpot czars might look for strategic loopholes through which they could get away with a bit of freebooting, believing that it does not impinge upon America's interests when in fact it does.

A disconcerting fact about the 40,000-word report is that it suggests that the interplay among nations on this planet began to be altered and redirected only after Mr. Nixon reached the White House.

For example, he makes it sound as if America still insisted upon playing a dominant role in Europe, still believed that communism was a monolith, still felt that Red China and its hordes could be forever isolated, still failed to recognize the dangers of nuclear power, still resisted negotiations as the only rational course—until he rolled up his sleeves and redefined the world as it really is.

The continuity of American policy is somehow denied. The truth is that many of the assumptions in the Nixon primer were being made as far back as the Eisenhower administration. U.S. policy has been remarkably resilient and has evolved to meet changing circumstances in a reasonably steady line.

Still, if the President's voluminous document is not hailed as an all-wise, brilliantly conceived, imperishable guide to the future, it is nonetheless useful. In the bureaucratic web of tension, the troubled functionary can now turn to it and say, with some confidence, "Let's find out what the boss thinks."

#### REMARKS OF STATE SENATOR VINCENT MASSARI, OF COLORADO

#### HON. FRANK E. EVANS

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. EVANS of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, Colorado State Senator Vincent Massari of Pueblo, Colo., recently made some strong comments on the floor of the State senate regarding a planning study recently published by the State planning office. As this study was funded in part by Federal funds I thought that Senator Massari's comments should be of some interest to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF STATE SENATOR VINCENT MASSARI

Mr. President, Members of the Senate: I beg your indulgence this morning if I take part of your valuable time to defend once

more the honor of Pueblo and the Southern part of Colorado.

I resent very much and I protest when taxpayers money and part of the federal money is used to vilify a part of the State as done with the publication of "The Colorado Front Range Corridor," that was put on your desk or mailed to your home.

Responsible? The Colorado State Planning Office.

Mr. James N. Miles, State Planning Director, tried to shield the responsibility of the defamations statements against one of the most important parts of the State by declaring that the pages of the book incriminated were written in Pueblo. I hold him responsible as the head of the office. The writers of those pages are also tax-eaters, but that should not be an excuse for Mr. Miles for not evaluating the content and refusing to print it, or ask for additional and more truthful facts. I quote from page 18:

"Communities such as Pueblo, situated under more than one governmental jurisdiction, are frustrated in their attempts to manage the best allocation of resources because no single unit has authority."

Who is to blame? Aren't all first class cities, with the exception of Denver, governed in the same manner? If they have in mind that a stronger mayor-form is better, why not suggest it, or why not act rather than talk?

The first paragraph on page 19 I will explain at the end of my observations.

I quote again:

"The region is not now equipped to handle the problems of new towns, satellite cities, or mountain subdivision."

Probably Mr. Bill White made a mistake in taking over the new Colorado City in Senator Taylor's senatorial district and the McCulloch Corporation is wasting part of their accumulated millions in developing Pueblo West.

Again, I quote another paragraph:

"The area suffers from insufficient economic support and enriched community growth to support an enriched community life. Past trends, especially down, indicated continued economic decline in Southern Colorado, including Pueblo."

Yes, I will agree that we lacked state and federal cooperation until we start to raise our voice. Also, I agree that Pueblo lacked philanthropists like Phipps and Boettcher in Denver and Penrose in Colorado Springs. Our millionaires were interested only in leaving their heirs rich and they never contributed anything to our colleges, local institutions or community projects. It seems that they would rather give thirteen million dollars to the Inheritance Tax Commissioners than leave something to be remembered by, not only by their heirs but also by the people of the town that made them rich. But the middle class and the working people devoted their time, energy, and yes, even little hard earned cash to support our town.

Again, I quote from another paragraph: "The region is made up largely of working people."

Yes, and we are proud of those working people who have shown their love for the town they prefer to remain to the old age. I am one of them I started working in the coal mines with my father in Las Animas County. I worked in the steel mill, then as a printer.

I had many good offers from other communities, especially from Rochester, New York, where I was called to help establish an Italian newspaper, but I declined the offer and returned to Pueblo.

The report talks about the low level of education. This statement re-opens an old wound. You old time legislators remember how hard we had to fight to convert Pueblo Junior College into a four year college. All the northern part of the state, who enjoyed over a half-dozen colleges were opposed, and

so were many groups and entity. Go back to your newspaper files and see how many editorials they dedicated to me personally as a Log Roller, or worse. Pueblo didn't need a college, they said, there was plenty of space in the existing colleges. The trouble was that the sons of our farmers, steelworkers and other laborers didn't have the money to send their children out of town.

We had a Dixon Line a few miles past Colorado Springs. We were second class citizens for the rest of the state. Pueblo was not part of Colorado. The same problem we had with our Fryng-Pan Arkansas. One governor told me that the population of Colorado was only around here, and he motioned with his hand.

In spite of everything, the uneducated people of Pueblo furnished a member for the cabinet of President Hoover, Dr. Work, and another one, Dave Packard, for Nixon's cabinet. Two outstanding United States Senators came from Pueblo: Alva B. Adams and Gordon Allott. Three governors: Adams, Peabody and Walter Johnson came from Pueblo and I could go on and on in mentioning natives of Pueblo in important positions: military, scientists, professors, etc.

It is reported that gambling is prevalent. Thank God we haven't the monopoly on gambling. I read in the local papers of the arrest of gamblers time and again, but you haven't read of any arrest in Pueblo for some time. I have great confidence in the law enforcement officers of Pueblo, as I have for those of Denver and surrounding areas.

The reports cast suspicion on our Courts, too. I am surprised that our Supreme Court hasn't acted so far if this is the truth. The District Courts of Pueblo are in the hands of very competent, upright, honest Judges, S. Phillip Cabibi, Matt Kikel, Hubert Glover and Jack Seavy. If the writers of these pages have better information, about gambling and judge prevaricators they should report it to the proper channels. In one word, as I said in this hall six years ago, put up or shut up.

But let's skip the rest of the tripe to get to an important one, the first paragraph on page 19:

"In the region there are possibly two 'Italian' organizations or factions that may or may not be 'Mafia.'"

"That may or may not—" here is where the writers show their high ignorance.

We have in Pueblo only one national, fraternal, mutual benefit organization, with Lodges all over Colorado and all over the United States: the Columbian Federation of which I have the honor of being the National President since 1937. Our national secretary, John M. Mauro, also lives in Pueblo and he is the head of a Post Office branch in Bessemer District. There are few other non-affiliated fraternal societies, none of them in any way under the direct or indirect control of criminal elements.

The Federation scrutinizes any and all applications to insure that only law-abiding citizens, whether native born or immigrants, are admitted. It may well be said that the Columbian Federation constitutes the temple of Italian spirit in the New World. Through the Columbian Federation, the Italian-American express their patriotic, political, economic, social, spiritual and charitable characteristics. The membership of our Federation is composed of people who have remained true under adverse and fortunate experience—undismayed by distress, unchanged by the change of fortune. The Columbian Federation is not an accident. It is a purposeful organization founded by American citizens of Italian descent, on the principle of individual excellence. It is dedicated to the task of preparing the individual to exercise the right and duties of American citizenship intelligently, courageously and unselfishly.

The Italian Immigration to America dates

back to Christopher Columbus, but the bulk is more recent. There are few Italians who have been here more than two centuries. Unfamiliar with the language and most lacking in special training, they found employment in the performance of tasks which required brawn, muscle and perseverance. They dug in the mines, made the beds and laid tracks of transcontinental railroads, built and painted bridges, factories, and smoke stacks (which Senator Birmingham wants to tear down) and fed the glowing furnaces of the coke ovens and steel mills. A most valuable asset was their great respect for small beginnings.

Among a group of immigrants who came to Colorado and stopped at Breckenridge at the time the Rio Grande was building the tracks around the mountains, was a young student, Adolfo Rossi, newly arrived from Italy and Hector Chiariglione.

Adolfo Rossi wrote his experience in a book entitled "An Italian in America" in which he dedicated three chapters to Colorado and his experiences in our state. He later became the first Italian Consul of Denver, then in a contest for Immigration Commissioner of Italy, he was the highest in the examination. He was Commissioner of Immigration for many years and died in Buenos Aires as Ambassador from Italy. Hector Chiariglione who was the father of the late prize fighter, Jim Flynn, the only one to defeat Jack Dempsey (many Italians in those days took Irish names) became a newspaper man in Pueblo and became my boss. Later I bought his paper when he retired. An immigrant was also Mother Cabrini, the name of which is very popular in Colorado.

Realizing the need of help in case of illness (the welfare rolls show very few Italian-Americans) or death, and in order to acquire more knowledge and understanding about American history and traditions, more about the governmental machinery and civic customs, the Italian immigrants fostered the organization of the Columbian Federation which was organized by a small group of Lodges at Chicago, Illinois in October 1893, to help them achieve this end.

Let me quote in part from the Chicago Tribune of October 12, 1893:

"A convention of delegates of all the Italian societies of the United States was held during the last two days. One hundred and twenty-eight delegates were present, representing 45,000 members, 6,000 of which belong to Illinois Societies. A platform was drawn up by a committee of ten and adopted at the convention, which among other things set forth a strong recommendation that it be—

Please note—  
"one of the principal aims of the society to foster and advocate the spirit of loyalty and patriotism to the constitutions and laws of the United States and all American institutions."

Their faith in the efficiency of organized cooperation has been justified. Through the patriotic, civic and social activities of the Columbian Federation, the Italian immigrants have become fully acquainted with every phase and concept of American life. Through it, they have been able to take and keep their proper place in the ranks of a useful citizenry and to raise their families in the American traditions.

Not only was the Columbian Federation a fraternal organization, but it also stood for the defense of human rights at any and all times. Overwhelmingly composed of sincere lovers of the democratic way of life, the Columbian Federation went on record against dictatorship as early as 1923, at which time, I introduced a resolution at the national convention held in Kansas City condemning fascism and protesting against any attempt to introduce fascist ideologies in the United States, under any disguise, any form or for any purpose.

In 1925, House Speaker Raney used one of

my editorials in the United States Congress as an argument against making Mussolini a loan. In those days most of our Congressmen were friendly with the Italian dictator who made trains run on time and even desired a Mussolini in the United States, so Raney failed in his attempt.

On June 10, 1940 when Italy entered the war against the democracies, the Columbian Federation did not hesitate to take a clear stand by heartfully endorsing President Roosevelt's policies in regard to the European conflict stating:

"This organization, being interested in a better world order and being convinced that a decent world is tragically threatened by forces of reaction and violence now sweeping Europe, urges upon you, the President and Congress, the removal of all restrictions to furnish assistance and material to the allied democracies in their desperate efforts to defend civilization."

Let me quote from the Congressional Record of March 11, 1942:

"There is the Columbian Federation which believes that to be a good Italian in this country one must first become a good American."

In his book "Patriot True" Judge Minter L. Wilson of the Tenth Circuit Court of West Virginia has this to say:

"Good American citizens do not affiliate themselves with any organization that has in it aliens who want to wave the flag of our enemies. But let me make it clear that what I have said has no reference to the Columbian Federation, which I have found, after a careful study, to have been for many years a loyal and patriotic organization."

The greatest compliment paid our organization was by the late Monsignor Giuseppe Ciarcocchi, Editor of the Voce del Popolo. He said in his speech before the 20th quadrennial convention during the Second World War:

"I praise the Columbian Federation for two principal reasons: for its fidelity to the principles of liberty, Americanism and democracy, during a time when even in America the fascist regime was heavily felt, and other Italian-American societies were turning in favor of the regime, with the exception of the leftist organizations.

This attitude cost the Federation and the members of the Administration headed by its national President, Vincent Massari, many sacrifice, but it served to give a name to the Federation and make it appreciated by the Government of the United States, an example to all the Italian groups in America.

"I am expressing the hope that the Federation will continue to follow its same line of conduct and thus prove itself worthy of the glorious name of Columbus which it bears.

"The courage and the work of President Massari, with the cooperation of his weekly newspaper L'Unione, were necessary for the development and well being of the Federation and continue to be necessary in the difficulties that are being experienced today.

"The financial condition of the Federation deserves a note of praise for its soundness, but the moral character of the Federation, constantly maintained, was that which distinguished it from other similar organizations and brought honor to the Columbian Federation not only among the Italian-Americans, but also among the American element and the spheres of government.

"It would have been easy for the Federation—Monsignor Ciarcocchi concluded—to imitate the other societies and put itself behind the coattail of Fascism, which was reining over our communities, and thus obtain immediate success. But, by so doing, it had to renounce the principles of Americanism, democracy and liberty which to-day, instead, constitutes its glory."

I could go on for hours, but I don't want to impose any longer. This is the organiza-

tion that the Colorado State Planning Office stated that may or may not be "Mafia."

Now I can appreciate why Senators Brown and Cisneros requested a study of the history of their race in public schools. Lots could be learned of the Italian contributions from Columbus to Enrico Fermi, if our history would be taught.

AMERICA'S FREEDOM IS STILL APPRECIATED

HON. GLENN R. DAVIS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, annually, a Voice of Democracy Contest is sponsored by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States and its ladies auxiliary.

One winner from each State is brought to Washington, D.C., each year to compete in the final judging. I was pleased to note that this year, Wisconsin will be represented by a youth from the Wisconsin Ninth Congressional District.

A fine essay on the great tradition of America's freedom was written by Mark J. Gichert, 17, son of Mr. and Mrs. Fred J. Gitcher, 4420 North Brookfield Road, Brookfield, Wis. He shows an understanding of the challenges America faces during an era when other less understanding young people do nothing but complain about society because they are unable to face those very challenges.

Here is what he has to say:

FREEDOM'S CHALLENGE

(By Mark Gichert, Brookfield East High School, Brookfield, Wis.)

At a prisoner of war camp in Germany during World War II, an incident occurred which gave the Germans a small insight into the spirit of the American people. Word got around the compound that the few Jewish soldiers in the group of American prisoners were to be separated from the remainder of the prisoners and were to be given an especially difficult and backbreaking work detail. That night the boys talked it over among themselves; the Jewish soldiers urged their buddies not to stick their necks out. The following morning the commandant ordered all soldiers of Jewish blood to take one step forward, and the entire American population of the camp stepped forward.

The American soldiers experienced a common conflict. They had the freedom to remain silent and safe, or to take sides with their comrades. They had the freedom of choice, and their choice created a challenge for them. In the true American spirit they used their freedom, not for their own benefit alone, but for the benefit of others.

The lesson is a simple one, but a very timely one. We as Americans have freedoms in abundance; we have, in fact, more freedom than any other people. Our option comes in how we use our rights and freedoms. Do we use them for ourselves only, or do we use them to help others? Do we hoard our liberty, or extend its blessings to all men? Freedom challenges each of us to use our rights and liberties fully, and this means more than just serving ourselves. This is an American tradition, reflected in our foreign policy, our vast aid programs, and our extensive charity organizations at home.

Our American heritage is composed of a set of the finest natural resources that any land can boast. But the most precious resource we have is the heritage of our free-



dom. With this resource we shape our nation's future. But, like all resources, it too can become polluted. If we use our freedom without discretion and practice no conservation; if we do and act for ourselves only, without regard for the future well-being of our freedom; if we seize our rights without fulfilling our responsibilities; then we are polluting our greatest natural resource. Unfortunately there can be no anti-pollution laws to safeguard our freedom. No law can say that a citizen must be honorable in his intent, or use freedom in an unselfish way. But each day we face a personal challenge to use our freedom in the best way possible. We help meet this challenge each time we vote, read a newspaper, or take time to discuss politics. The success of this generation will be measured by how well we meet this challenge, by how well we conserve our freedoms for the future, and by how well we use our freedoms to help others to be as free as we are.

We see, today, dissent within our country. This is, as has often been observed before, a common and very natural thing in a democracy. But let us also heed the words of President Woodrow Wilson who said:

"Let us show ourselves Americans by showing that we do not want to go off into separate camps or grounds by ourselves, but that we want to cooperate with all other classes and all other groups in a common enterprise which is to release the spirits of the world from bondage."

Woodrow Wilson realized that a free nation found its strength in unity, not division, and that we, with our heritage of freedom, have a responsibility not only to ourselves, but to all men. History shows us that when the people of a free nation have used their freedoms only to satisfy their own needs, they have been quick to lose their freedoms. Often before we have been torn from within, and we have always returned a united people to face the challenges of freedom. The uniqueness of our nation lies in our diversity, but our strength lies in our unity.

We are a free people—free not only to seize the rights and privileges of our democracy for ourselves, but free also to use our freedoms for others; free to use our rights that others might maintain dignity, and free to conserve our liberty for our posterity. This is the meaning and the strength of our democracy. The success of this generation in history will be measured by how well we meet freedom's challenges. When we are certain that we have shared the blessings of our liberties to their full potential, and at the same time secured them to posterity, then will we be able to say to our sons and to our forefathers that we have met freedom's challenge.

PREPARING THE WAY FOR A NEW  
ERA OF ADVANCEMENT IN EDU-  
CATION

HON. ALBERT H. QUIE

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. QUIE. Mr. Speaker, because of my deep concern over the direction this Nation will take with regard to the education of America's youth as we enter the 1970's, I would like to share with my colleagues and other interested parties an excellent address by U.S. Commissioner of Education James E. Allen, Jr.

The address was given before the first general session of the annual convention of the American Association of School

Administrators at Atlantic City, N.J., on February 14, 1970.

The address follows:

PREPARING THE WAY FOR A NEW ERA OF  
ADVANCEMENT IN EDUCATION

(Address by James E. Allen, Jr., Assistant Secretary for Education and U.S. Commissioner of Education)

Change, unrest, criticism, relevance, complexity, reform—these are the words that are being used in connection with education today—and they constitute in many ways an accurate appraisal of the conditions of the great enterprise that unites us and that has brought us together from across the Nation.

But though the conditions of our enterprise may be unsettled and uncertain, the objective remains unchanging—to provide the best in education for all those entrusted to our care. This may seem too simple or too obvious to need restatement, but it is, I believe, important to remind ourselves that for every educator at every level, this is, and ever more shall be the task, inescapable and unaltered—and no difficulties, changing situations, social upheavals can excuse us from its responsibilities.

Amidst all the present clamor, the diversity of opinions as to ways and means, the doubts and confusion surrounding education, this basic task continues to be the only ultimately really important consideration, and the answer that we ourselves can honestly give to the question of "How well are we carrying it out?" is the standard by which we must consistently and unsparingly judge our actions.

There is much on the educational scene today that can give us satisfaction, that points to a job well done.

The immediate post-war years of the late 1940's and the entire decade of the 1950's saw education confront successfully the immense challenges of quantity. Between 1945 and 1969, the numbers in our public elementary and secondary schools increased from 23.3 million to 45.8 million, an increase of 95.7 percent.

Nearly all local systems were faced with the multitude of problems involved in providing enough teachers, books and classrooms for this unprecedented rise in student population. These problems were met with determination and success and although they still exist in some measure, they are less pressing, and as a result we are now in a situation where it is possible to direct more of our attention and our resources to quality.

With a growing public awareness of the terrible social and economic waste that results from the existence of poverty in a Nation of affluence, from discrimination and racial segregation, from deprivation, education bore the brunt of implementing most of the corrective measures proposed in the decade of the 60's to help the disadvantaged.

School systems and school administrators still struggling to cope with the student population explosion found themselves on the receiving end of well intentioned but underfunded and late funded programs. All of you know all too well the problems and complexities involved in unscrambling the flood of regulations and guidelines, in finding space, in recruiting personnel, and last but certainly not least, in compiling reports.

But, despite the obstacles, the programs have been implemented and under extremely difficult conditions, education has scored a number of outstanding and promising successes. Let me mention just a few of the many significant accomplishments of these recent years.

The drop-out rate has been cut. There are more drop-outs in numbers because there is an overall larger student population, but the rate has been reduced.

There has been a significant increase in

early childhood programs—not just paper programs, but real programs—put into action and carried on, in many cases, more as a result of personal effort and dedication than through easy-to-follow, step-by-step directives.

There has been an immense expansion of facilities for continuing education largely because of the understanding that in the technology advanced society we have created, learning—the acquisition of new skills and the upgrading of old ones—has become a lifetime endeavor and not merely a childhood and adolescent pursuit.

For the better part of two decades, our local school systems have been at the heart of the drive to integrate American life and to secure racial justice.

It is to education's everlasting credit that it increasingly is rising to the obligation and the task of school desegregation. In system after system, despite physical human and financial obstacles, the job has been attempted with significant success. I might add that some of the best leadership in this difficult task is coming from southern educators, many of them here in this audience.

Educators have demonstrated the courage to endure controversy in a continuing effort to provide better education for all children. But racial segregation still exists and continues to constitute an indefensible barrier to the achievement of equality of opportunity.

Every school administrator committed to the principle of equality of educational opportunity will not rest until integration is a universal reality in our Nation.

While speaking of racial justice, I should like to recognize that the responsibility of education in the drive for racial justice does not lie only in the schoolroom. Economic factors also strongly inhibit the equity of minority groups. Education is second only to defense in spending and this gives great economic power and leverage to the educational purse.

I call upon you and your boards of education to support formally and actively the national policy of economic equity for members of minority groups. One telling way this support can be demonstrated is by your implementation of the equivalent of a "Philadelphia Plan" for all contracted educational expenditures. Guidelines, regulations and laws may be required to achieve this—but your moral and political leadership can play a vital role in making this national policy work.

Much of the educational progress that I have been citing is due to the fact that educators have been measuring their efforts with greater objectivity and severity, facing up to what has not been well done and doing a great deal to improve it.

It is this same kind of critical judgment that underlies the acknowledgement that more improvement is needed.

It must be acknowledged at the same time, however, that this improvement is not going to be easily achieved. I know that these are troubling times and that you are carrying on your jobs amidst new problems and harassments, and an atmosphere of doubt and disquietude, that are unfamiliar in the traditional role and experience of the school administrator.

Perhaps most troubling of all are the expressions of disillusionment with our schools and with those elected or appointed to manage them. This disillusionment runs the gamut from transient disappointment to real alienation, with causes as varied as its manifestations, but, whatever its nature, it is sufficiently widespread to be of real concern.

This criticism should not evoke a defensive reaction but rather more objective evaluation with a subsequent determination to correct deficiencies.

Despite the trials of these times, there is, as we begin the Seventies, good reason to be optimistic.

Knowing that I would soon be addressing this and other nationwide educational organizations, I recently sought a special meeting with the President. In our lengthy discussion of educational needs and the outlook for the future, I found the President deeply concerned and sympathetic with the difficulties and the problems currently besetting education in our country. He specifically asked me to convey to the American Association of School Administrators his appreciation for your efforts and his determination to create new conditions in which the quality of learning can be enhanced throughout our country.

There is commitment to education in this Administration.

We might as well face up to the fact, however, that this commitment is not in the very near future going to be expressed in terms of large sums of additional money.

Knowing the enormous needs of education this is not an encouraging prospect. But, on the encouraging side, I am convinced that the Administration is prepared to commit itself to substantial increases in Federal aid to education—to give education the high priority it deserves—when present fiscal constraints are relaxed and when we have taken steps to put ourselves in a better position to assure maximum results. Let us therefore lose no time in taking the necessary steps.

It is fortunate that the Administration is committed to giving immediate and vigorous support to actions that have long been needed to assure a more productive return for future investments.

For some years we have been indulging ourselves in speculation about change in education—a rather pleasant period in a sense, when it was possible to enjoy the excitement of an atmosphere of newness without really plunging into the manifold difficulties, the struggle, of making change a reality in our educational system. Of course, change has taken place, but not even the most optimistic advocate can assert that it has been either of sufficient degree or of the basic nature required.

This period of somnolence is fast ending: first, because of the sheer pressure of need—we simply can no longer afford not to have equal educational opportunity in America; second, because of the growing readiness of the profession to accept and promote change; and finally—and perhaps most significantly—because of a new tougher attitude toward education that increasingly emphasizes accountability, and refuses to accept promises, demanding performance.

What the future holds, I believe, is a recasting of the entire educational system in the United States, in line with the new perspectives of our national purposes. The challenges fall on everyone from the President and the Congress through the States and localities to every part of the vast complex of organizations and activities that make up education in America.

We need to seek a broader interpretation of education that discards rigid structuring for a freer adaptation to differing needs, timing and goals—an interpretation that encompasses the total life and environment of the young.

This concept of change recognizes that life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness in the last third of the Twentieth Century are more than ever dependent upon a truly equal educational opportunity for each boy and girl—an opportunity too long denied to millions across our land.

To achieve this objective will require far more dependable knowledge than we now have about how children learn, about how teachers teach, and about what education is; far more than can be expected from the pres-

ent relatively meager, fragmented, haphazard efforts we make to obtain such knowledge. After all, effective educational reform and renewal can hardly be expected in an educational enterprise that devotes less than one-half of one percent of its annual budget to research and development.

#### A NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

It is time this short-sighted policy be corrected, and this Administration proposes to take the initial step by urging that the Congress create a National Institute of Education whose purpose will be to undertake the serious, systematic search for new knowledge needed to make equal educational opportunity a reality in our country.

This new agency, to be located within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, under the Assistant Secretary for Education, would be manned by a staff of outstanding scholars from such disciplines as psychology, biology, the social sciences and humanities as well as education. It would concentrate the same degree of skill, attention, and resources on educational research that the National Institutes of Health have brought to medical research.

More specifically, the National Institute of Education would do such things as the following:

It would provide the capacity for directed research and experimentation aimed at filling gaps in our understanding of human learning.

It would place strong emphasis upon helping State and local school systems to solve their most pressing problems, to reform their educational practices on the basis of the best available research.

It would experiment with alternative educational models—from revolutionary staffing patterns to technologically-assisted teaching.

It would concentrate attention on improving our ability to evaluate and assess educational programs, and on enhancing the capacity of Federal, State and local agencies to measure and analyze the results of their own activities. *The strengthening of the concept of accountability in our educational system is imperative.* It is in large measure our inability to substantiate results that has generated disillusionment and a lack of confidence in our schools.

The National Institute of Education would train educational researchers and practitioners by offering a range of fellowships and traineeships designed to attract outstanding young scholars into educational research and by giving them opportunities to work with senior scholars from many fields.

It would serve as a focus for educational and social science research throughout the Federal Government and would bring some central direction to that complex and uncoordinated enterprise.

It would enrich and enliven other Federal educational programs by stimulating creative, vigorous thought and thus serve as an intellectual resource for the Nation. Careful arrangements would be made to ensure cross-fertilization between the National Institute, the Office of Education and other agencies.

It would build on and add strength to the present national system of educational laboratories and R and D centers and would eventually assume the administration of the cooperative research programs now administered by the Office of Education.

The time has come to lift educational research and development to the highest levels in our national priorities. The Administration's proposal for a National Institute of Education is the way to start.

#### A NATIONAL COMMISSION ON SCHOOL FINANCE

A second Administration proposal to prepare the way for a more efficient and productive educational system is the establish-

ment of a National Commission on School Finance.

A major barrier to the achievement of fundamental reform in American education is the high degree of instability, uncertainty and inequity in the financial structure for education.

We have no comprehensive, purposeful plan for the support of public education. The pattern of finance as it now operates is a complex and confusing process that has evolved erratically over the years. It perpetuates inequalities in educational opportunity; it is unresponsive to changing needs; it encourages waste and inefficiency in planning and operation; and it is inequitable in its treatment of taxpayers. The facts are well known. It is time for major reforms in the methods of financing educational expenditures.

I hardly need to emphasize this point with this audience. Many of your communities are threatened with the prospect of curtailed school years, with taxpayer revolts, with the continuance of resources totally inadequate even to maintain the minimum essentials of an educational program.

The National Commission on School Finance will seek to accelerate the process of reform in school finance and to initiate national planning as to how we shall meet the revenue needs of public education in the Seventies.

The Commission will be asked to report periodically to the President on such matters as—

Future revenue needs and fiscal priorities for elementary and secondary education, including the financial consequences of declining enrollments in non-public elementary and secondary schools.

Different approaches to reducing disparities within and among the States.

Sources of funds to meet educational needs, including a major review of alternatives to the heavy current dependence on the property tax.

The feasibility of proposals to shift the major share of the cost of operating education from the local to the State level.

Cost efficiencies in public education, including those related to organizational change.

Despite the tremendous power of the Federal Government, it must not be forgotten that the loci of decisions about educational finance are mainly in State capitals and local school districts. The Federal Government may assist with certain critical problems; it may exert leverage; and at times it may exercise moral and intellectual leadership; but it alone cannot solve the problems of finance. A major role of the proposed Commission, therefore, will be to encourage the kinds of change that need to be made in State and local school finance patterns and to promote coordination among the three levels of Government which is needed to provide acceptable solutions. For these reasons, it will be important for the National Commission to include representatives from State and local Government and to be closely associated with the Education Commission of the States, an organization uniquely able to be of assistance because it is composed of key political and educational leaders at the State level.

It is not the President's intent that this Finance Commission be just another study group whose report is received and filed. It will be, rather, an action-oriented Commission, working to bring about those changes in finance that are necessary to enable the Nation to meet its educational needs.

#### THE RIGHT TO READ

This National Commission on School Finance and the National Institute of Education will deal with the very fundamental areas of increasing our knowledge about how



to educate and of securing the necessary fiscal resources. A third area in the Administration's program deals with a glaring weakness in our schools where the attack can be launched with the knowledge and skills we already possess. I refer to the indefensible and intolerable situation of a school population with one out of every four students having significant reading deficiencies.

Last October I began the attack by proclaiming the Right to Read as a goal for the 1970's, stating that by the end of this decade, no individual should be leaving our schools without having acquired the skills and desire to read to the full limits of his capabilities.

I made it clear at that time that the achievement of this goal would require a massive nationwide effort, involving a new partnership of all levels of Government and the private sector of our society. I indicated that while the primary responsibility for seeing to it that all children learn to read is a State and local one, the Federal Government would help by providing the coordination of effort, the marshaling of forces and resources on a nationwide basis, the provision of the technical, administrative, and financial assistance required.

The President has strongly endorsed the Right to Read goal and has pledged his full support of efforts to achieve it. Earlier this week I presented to him a comprehensive plan to put out national resources to work for those who need help. I expect the President to announce in the very near future the first steps in implementing this plan.

I hope you will enthusiastically and unequivocally adopt this goal as your own, for the school administrator is a key figure in opening the way for the kind of intensive attack required.

Let me assure you that the "Right to Read" is no mere slogan as some cynics have implied: Let us say rather that it is a call to action that will be pursued vigorously with unremitting determination to eliminate this shameful blot on our national education record.

These are, of course, not the only actions relating to education being contemplated or undertaken by the Administration, but they do indicate the general nature and direction of present plans.

No matter what the future course of education may be, our task is, as I said at the beginning, the same basic one of providing the best education for all those entrusted to our care. If we are faithful to this responsibility, we shall succeed no matter how troubling the times or how overwhelming the problems.

Once again may I express my admiration for your accomplishments and my confidence in your continued dedication. I pledge that I shall seek to match my dedication to yours in an unremitting effort to advance our common cause.

EDITORIAL BY WCBS-TV

**HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN**

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, busing students to schools outside their home communities will not eliminate segregation. It is at best forced and temporary integration. I would like to place in the RECORD an editorial statement, "Northern Hypocrisy," by WCBS-TV, New York, which was broadcast on February 12:

EDITORIAL BY WCBS-TV

Senator Abraham Ribicoff is known for blunt talk. It was Senator Ribicoff who spoke up in tough terms about Mayor Daley and Chicago's police-state tactics at the Democratic National Convention in 1968. And it was Senator Ribicoff, who earlier this week, was refreshingly candid when he told the Senate that the "North is guilty of monumental hypocrisy in its treatment of the black man."

The Connecticut Democrat was speaking favorably about a bill sponsored by Senator John Stennis of Mississippi that would enforce school desegregation uniformly throughout the Nation, eliminating any distinction between segregated schools growing out of Jim Crow practices in the South and segregated schools growing out of residential patterns in the North. The plain fact is, as Senator Ribicoff put it, that school segregation in the North is little different than school segregation in the South. And the attitudes of white racism that have fostered these segregated school systems vary little North or South.

The question, of course, is what to do about segregated schools in the North, schools that are segregated by residential patterns, by the fact that most suburban areas are all-white, and most central city areas are predominantly black. Busing from city to suburb is one way, but it is integration by transportation. It is a temporary expedient, and it does not build racial harmony and integrated communities.

The answer, as Senator Ribicoff suggests, is to integrate communities, to provide places in our suburbs for low-income and moderate-income housing, housing that can accommodate more people from the lower rungs of the economic ladder, more people of both races.

To speed the process of creating truly integrated suburban communities—integrated socially and racially—Senator Ribicoff has suggested that the federal government give financial aid to those suburban communities that open their lands to development for families of modest incomes. He also suggests that communities that fence out low-income families should be denied certain forms of federal aid.

Many of the suggestions made by Senator Ribicoff are already embodied in an excellent bill drafted by New York's senior Senator, Jacob Javits. The bill—S. 3025—would go far toward encouraging sharing in suburbia.

#### SPACE AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY

**HON. JOHN W. WYDLER**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. WYDLER. Mr. Speaker, the effect of the space budget on our national economy is one of concern to all Americans.

Recently, the president of the Aerospace Industries Association spoke on this important topic, and I think his speech should be read by all Members of Congress and weighed because of its importance to our Nation's financial stability in the future.

The speech follows:

SPACE AND THE NATIONAL ECONOMY  
(Remarks of Dr. Karl G. Harr, Jr.)

So much has happened in the very short period of time that comprises our space age; and so much has been said and written about what has happened as we have moved

along, that some major elements of the forest have been obscured by the trees.

One of these elements has been the interplay between our national space effort and our overall national economy. Fully to understand this interplay let us briefly review the past, particularly the way in which our space effort began, 13 years ago, and how it has evolved.

In the beginning economic considerations played virtually no part at all. Scientists of many nations, including the United States and the Soviet Union, in the course of programming for the International Geophysical Year, declared that the orbiting of artificial satellites was possible, and these two nations undertook the accomplishment of this novel and interesting, but relatively small scale, scientific feat.

Both the amounts budgeted and the objectives of the program were so modest as to involve no real economic considerations, either in terms of resources allocated or returns expected.

Once the Soviet Union preceded the United States in the successful launching of such a satellite, however, things escalated very fast. Implications which had been only dimly seen in advance within both societies became crystal clear with the event. And the Soviet achievement was exploited to its fullest by those who found it in their interest to do so, not only in the international political arena, but also in domestic politics, as a presidential year approached.

From almost every important point of view, it soon became apparent that our national interest dictated the initiation of a meaningful space effort.

Enter now economic considerations of both the obvious and the not so obvious kind.

Obviously, as a first step, the processes of the government of the United States had to make a quantum judgment, in general terms at least, as to the size of our national effort. At a time when there was wide disagreement as to the shape any national space program should take, and when there was only a vague idea as to the applicable scientific and industrial resources available to us, i.e., how fast we could usefully proceed no matter how much money was available, a rough cut evaluation of the priority that should be accorded our national space effort had to be made.

Gradually in the late 50's as scientist, politician, foreign policy expert and comptroller argued, refined and reargued his case, such an evaluation emerged as a working hypothesis for starting our national program.

As we moved from consideration of a wide and varied range of competing programs to primary focus on a manned landing on the moon, this evaluation was refined, became much more valid and could become firm.

We had committed ourselves to a national space effort; we had undertaken the logical major first step; we had supplemented this with a balance of other lesser space programs to help us develop a comprehensive space capability, and we were underway.

It was now, really, as we moved into the early 1960's that the fundamental economic effects began to appear. The obvious ones, such as the many thousands of jobs involved in the establishment, operation and management of the communities that became our national space base; and the many thousands of jobs created by the tooling up of industry, were accompanied by indirect economic effects, such as the growing pressure to effect the wide range of scientific and technological breakthroughs necessary to achievement of our space objectives.

This latter pressure had its impact everywhere—in universities, research labs and industry, at all levels. It permeated virtually every scientific and technological discipline and its impact ranged from pure scientific research to the most mundane manufactur-

ing technique. Everything that became a part of our space program had to be viewed anew and against different standards.

Here too, as in the case of employment, tangible economic effects began to be felt early. Industry, for example, had to upgrade itself to meet the cruel requirements of space. Manufacturing tolerances were reduced by orders of magnitude just as reliability requirements were commensurately upgraded. Standards described as "man rated" and "zero defects" began to creep into industry language and practice. New alloys, materials and processes had to be developed, discovered or invented to meet the design requirements for space. This is the point at which industry, in response to the national decisions about space, began to generate the myriad new practices, products and procedures which comprised our space effort's second economic legacy. And with the growth of our national investment in space came a corresponding growth in this economic return.

Mercury and Gemini placed man and then men in space, and as we moved into the middle 1960's the cumulative effects of this effort on all sides began to be felt throughout our economy. It was clear that American universities, industry and government were fully embarked on an organized technological reach of unprecedented scope. More important it was becoming clear that they were solving the managerial problems of integrating this massive effort into a system comprehending unprecedented complexities and unprecedented numbers of people.

The process, of course, was not entirely smooth. Multiple teams of highly skilled people representing different perspectives engaged in an effort wholly unprecedented both as to size and nature, require some shaking down before they can operate in optimum fashion. But this process too was accomplished without affecting the achievement of our space objectives. Vast new ground was broken in the techniques of systems management. And that was our space effort's third economic legacy.

All this could be done because the American people had seen the necessity to support such a national effort. That support in turn resulted in the creation of a national asset in the form of technological and managerial capability (for whatever application desired) unlike anything ever known before.

A fourth important economic legacy from our space effort was one about which you have heard much in the course of the day. This is the direct economic benefits of the programs themselves; improved communications, navigation weather prognostication, earth resources control and inventory and the like. I will not dwell further on these.

By the time we were able to land men on the moon and return them, American industry had come just about as far in that short time span as had the space program itself. Technological capability and managerial capability had quantum jumped in step with space attainments. They had had to. And in so doing they had upgraded our total national economic capability. For technological advance is largely inseparable. You either opt for it or you don't. The junkyard of history is full of nations who rejected the major challenge of their times. And there is no question that space is the major challenge of our times. As Sir Bernard Lovell, director of Britain's Jodrell Bank Observatory, has stated: "You will find that only those communities that had been prepared to struggle with the nearly insoluble problems at the limits of their technical capacities—those are the only communities, the only times, that civilization has advanced.

"The Roman Empire decayed when it ceased to be progressive in this sense, and there are other examples. To a certain extent, you see the beginnings of it in the

United Kingdom today, but fortunately not in the United States and certainly not in the Soviet Union."

Now you don't spend billions on a space program merely to give jobs to people in Huntsville or Houston or Southern California or anywhere else. You don't do it either to produce a better frying pan for the housewife, or a new way to cure cancer or heart disease. Nor do you do it to make quantum technological jumps, per se.

Fundamentally you do it to explore space—the universe in which we live. If you are partially goaded into action by international competition for prestige, if you are partially motivated by national security implications and the like, these are secondary to the true justification.

But whatever the motivation or combination of motivations, the economic impact is the same. By reaching to the utmost you forge new muscle and sinew throughout your society and reap the whole range of benefits accruing to a people who, given a chance to opt for the future, has chosen to do so. Nothing even compares to our space effort in terms of offering so great a challenge to so great a segment of our society.

Here is where we come to the most significant conclusion about space and our national economy today. All of us recognize that both the economic and social environment are different from what they were in 1961 or even 1966. In purely economic terms the ravages and dangers of inflation and the heightened competition of other compelling national needs require accommodation.

The point however is this. We cannot afford to sell the day to profit the hour. Our national space effort has for a decade stood so far out in front as the pacesetter of our national technological advance as to be virtually alone. It has given us in a decade new capabilities to address to all our problems that otherwise must have taken many times as long to develop. It has been a primary factor in keeping this nation with its tiny percentage of the world's population in a technological position to remain both free and prosperous at a time when both are becoming increasingly difficult.

Above all it has given us a new way of doing things. In joining to accomplish the most difficult feat ever undertaken by man, government and industry have forged a new problem-solving capability adapted to our present huge and complex society and all its problems. This is the final and most important legacy. The need for this capability has never been more acute.

In short, in terms both of our economy and our ability to meet pressing social needs, we must acknowledge one lesson that the sixties have taught us; i.e. over the long run to have a healthy growing economy we need a vigorous space effort just as having a vigorous space effort depends on a healthy growing economy.

Should our people and our government fail to realize this special relationship between space and technological advance on the one hand, and technological advance and national well being on the other, we will have not only deprived ourselves of one of our greatest national assets, we will also have heavily mortgaged our ability to solve our other problems.

We cannot opt out now. We have come too far along the road to the future to make that mistake. Those nations whose resources or inclination have prevented them from partaking of this adventure bear the most convincing witness to the wisdom of our course. Without exception, they attribute the "technology gap" and the "brain drain" to our space effort and acknowledge that we have never made a better investment. Even a few years ago, one foreign finance minister judged that each dollar spent by us on space would return four-fold within ten years.

We have forged in this short span a national economic asset unrivaled in any other place or at any other time in the history of mankind. It is the base from which we can explore the universe, yes. But it also is a principal driving force in our overall economic advance here at home.

In a free society there are no sacred cows. Our national space effort cannot and should not stand immune from the pragmatic judgments involved in ordering national priorities.

But to be properly judged it must be seen for what it is. It must be seen as a source of national advance on all fronts. It must be understood to be an ally rather than an adversary in the campaign to solve other national problems.

The world has never seen a greater single challenge than that offered by the opportunity to explore the universe. The United States has been in no way more blessed than in having been in a position to accept the challenge. We have made the hard choice—we have paid the full price—and we have reaped all the rewards.

Now we must look to the future.

Suppose, in 1960, we had been able to assume the vantage point of today, 1970, to help us arrive at the hard decisions we then had to make. Would we have opted for the Mercury, Gemini and Apollo manned program culminating in landings on the moon? Would we have undertaken the Ranger, Surveyor, Mariner and other unmanned probes that have so developed our knowledge of the universe? Would we have launched the series of orbiting earth resource satellites, or the communications, navigation and meteorological satellites that were pressed directly into man's service in that decade? Have we been afforded such hindsight there never would have been any question. Involved was not only the total recoupment of national prestige and spirit, not only the total removal of apprehensions about threats to our national security from this quarter. (Incidentally in this connection General James Ferguson, Commander of the Air Force Systems Command, points up the real possibility that "the technical capability demonstrated by the United States in landing a man on the moon may have been the final step necessary to convince the leaders of the Soviet Union that they cannot win the arms race.") Clearly involved also was the radical upgrading of our overall national technological capability and hence our entire economic base.

As, in 1970, we look back at the previous decade we can answer for the decisions made with pride and conviction. They were worthy of both the opportunity and the nation.

No one need apologize to anyone for our national will and vision in that decade.

Let's suppose that now, in 1970, we were able to assume the vantage point of 1980 to help us make today's and tomorrow's decisions. Will we in 1980 be able to look back to a decade in which we continued our advance? Or will we look back on one in which we faltered, and in so doing dissipated everything we worked so hard to accomplish?

To an important degree, I think, the answer lies with organizations such as yours. This question is so big, is so vital to our national future, is so complex and has been so rapidly thrust upon us that it must be a subject of continuing national debate. Important as the experts are in guiding us through these complexities, the basic decisions are too vital to our national future to be left entirely in their hands. A democratic society must manage its own future, and we can all recognize that space is an important key to that future.

You know how vital, of course, I and the other speakers regard this effort to be. We feel that the merits are so obvious and compelling as to convince any who are exposed to them. But whether that is so or not, it is essential that our society as a whole participate in



these decisions—and that means that the matter be discussed and debated as widely and as continuously as possible.

Obviously organizations such as yours have a key role to play in bringing that about. So do each of you as concerned individual citizens.

## POPULATION AND THE ENVIRONMENT

### HON. DON. H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about population in America and its effect on and relationship to our total environment. For several years now I have been advancing the idea that, while population growth is indeed a serious problem here and elsewhere throughout the world, there is far too little attention or concern being given to population distribution.

Today, we are faced with the fact that approximately 73 percent of this Nation's total population, live on less than 2 percent of the land. In my own home State of California, more than half of our citizens live within a 10-to-15-mile radius of the city of Los Angeles and this represents about 5 percent of California's available land.

Is it any wonder, then, that our major metropolitan centers in this country are suffering most and experiencing the worst effects of polluted air, dirty water, overcrowded conditions, and an ever-increasing loss of personal identity and individualism.

For some time now, in an effort to recognize and help resolve some of the compelling problems of both urban and rural America, I have been advancing what I call a "Positive Program of Decentralization" which I am convinced will achieve a more balanced population pattern in America and establish a positive trend toward more balanced economic growth. This, in my judgment, is the direction in which we should be moving to provide the kind of environment for future living that we all seek. Toward this goal, I have introduced legislation in the Public Works Committee.

Recently, I have been extremely pleased and gratified by certain reactions to the concept I am advancing. Certainly, the President's appointment last year of a Rural Affairs Council was a very meaningful step in the right direction, since one of the tasks assigned to this council will be a study of population migration and distribution.

More recently, on February 24, Secretary Maurice H. Stans of the Department of Commerce delivered an address at American University that I believe spells out the relationship between population distribution and the need to revitalize rural America. Together with a recent editorial from the Wall Street Journal on this same subject, I insert Secretary Stan's outstanding remarks in the RECORD for the benefit of those who seek an in-depth look into this matter of utmost concern:

ADDRESS BY THE HONORABLE MAURICE H. STANS,  
U.S. SECRETARY OF COMMERCE

It is indeed a pleasure to join in this continuing discussion of the relationship between business and government.

We all know that a strengthening of this relationship is of transcending importance if we are to solve our mounting social and economic problems. The harsh experience of the 1960's demonstrates that government fails when it attempts to solve them alone. Billions of dollars have been spent on countless programs, but the problems remain, as vexing as ever.

The fact is that government's neglect to develop a viable, working partnership with the private sector is one of the root causes of this trouble. Government can guide by setting priorities and providing incentives. But only business has the managerial, organizational and technical skills required to get the job done. The Nixon Administration is dedicated to enlisting the full range of these talents in attacking our problems.

So this series of lectures, which is shedding new light on the evolving business-government relationship, has our warmest endorsement. The sponsors, American University and the firm of Hill and Knowlton, are to be commended for this public service undertaking.

#### SECRETARY'S RESPONSIBILITY

As Secretary of Commerce, I especially welcome the new insights these lectures are providing. For the man in my job has the primary responsibility for nurturing the business-government relationship. He must guide it along constructive lines and enlist business' greater involvement in public problem solving. He must help prevent business from committing abuses and from being abused. Above all, he must see to it that the interaction between these two great segments of society contributes to the advancement of the free enterprise system, which has given us everything we have and can give us everything we want.

I also appreciate the opportunity to discuss the topic of this year's lectures—"Private Enterprise and the Urban Crisis."

For one thing, I am personally involved in seeking solutions to urban problems as a member of the President's Urban Affairs Council, Rural Affairs Council and the Cabinet Committee on the Environment, all Cabinet-level bodies.

Second, the subject has just taken on a new timeliness and significance. It was only a month ago that President Nixon made a historic proposal that for the first time offers hope for a comprehensive and lasting solution to our urban problems.

#### NATIONAL GROWTH POLICY

"I propose," the President said in his State of the Union Address, "that before these problems become insoluble, the Nation develop a national growth policy. Our purpose will be to find those means by which federal, state and local government can influence the course of urban settlement and growth, so as positively to affect the quality of American life."

The President's far-sighted proposal recognizes that there is not just one urban crisis, but two.

The first has been tearing the fabric of society for a decade.

It is compounded of the long-festering problems of slums, crime, unemployment, air pollution, traffic congestion, and substandard schools and health facilities.

Many efforts, public and private, are underway to solve these problems. Among the outstanding programs of the private sector is that of the National Alliance of Businessmen in hiring the hard-core unemployed. In the area of equal opportunity, many business corporations and associations have joined our recent efforts to help minority members to become owners of their own busi-

nesses. American business has also addressed itself in many other voluntary and unheralded ways, as a matter of social responsibility, in dealing with problems of pollution and assuring the consumer fair value.

This first urban crisis is of enormous dimension, but we must not conclude that there is something suddenly wrong with the historic concept of the city.

#### CITY'S IMPORTANCE

From time immemorial, cities have represented the highest achievements of civilization. They are our most visible symbols of wealth and power. They are the centers of art, culture, commerce, finance, science, industry and government. And it is to the cities that men have always flocked in search of the good life. This was true when Athens was the "mother city"—the metropolis—during the Golden Age of Greece, and it has been true in our own time. Has something suddenly changed all this?

The answer is no, but there are some new factors in the equation that we must take account of.

#### POPULATION CONCENTRATION

The first is the degree of urbanization.

In 1790, ninety-five percent of America's 3.9 million population was rural.

Today about 73 percent of our 205 million people live in urban areas.

This means that these 73 percent, or about 150 million, live on just slightly more than one percent of the land.

The other 27 percent, or about 55 million, are rattling around over the remaining 99 percent of the land.

It's as though we owned a vast mansion, with hundreds of rooms, but most of us have decided to live in the closets.

To make matters worse, we like to move around a lot, most of us in our own personal vehicle—the automobile. In some places we provide this device with more space than we allot to people. For example two-thirds of downtown Los Angeles is said to be given over to streets, highways, parking lots and filling stations.

But that isn't all. We also have the problem in cities of extreme concentrations of waste products of an advanced industrial society.

Together, all these things have placed a burden on land, air, water, man-made facilities, and human beings themselves, that is all but intolerable. We are engulfed by noise, congestion and pollution of every kind.

#### MIGRATION OF BLACKS

Another new factor in the equation is the new concentration of poor black people in our great cities. During the past 20 years, more than 3 million Negroes have migrated from rural to urban areas, mainly to the inner core of the metropolis. Displaced from their farm jobs by rapid mechanization, they came looking for new opportunity, but they were equipped with little education and few skills. Instead of opportunity, they found the bitterness and frustration of the slum that finally erupted in rage and riots.

They found that many of the jobs in the inner city, like those on the farm, had disappeared under the impact of technological change. Industries once housed in the lofts of the central business district had been attracted to the suburbs by improved transportation facilities and ample space for more efficient one-story plants.

At the same time the poor blacks were moving in, the more affluent whites were moving to the suburbs. Their higher skills enabled them to get the better-paying jobs in the newly-established industries there, while patterns of housing discrimination helped to keep out the blacks.

#### TAX REVENUE DOWN

Compounding the problem was the loss of revenue to city government as industry and

the affluent whites moved beyond its tax jurisdiction. In 1932, for example, municipalities collected 25 percent of all tax revenue; today they collect 6 percent. This is why President Nixon wants to share some of the Federal Government's tax revenue with cities and states. Because the more the problems of the inner city have grown, the less financially able has been the city to cope with them. Until today, as the President said, "the violent and decayed central cities of our great metropolitan complexes are the most conspicuous area of failure in American life."

The Administration's programs on food and nutrition, family assistance, housing, crime, transportation and education are all designed to deal with the problems of this first urban crisis. I believe they can go far toward remedying most of today's difficulties. But even if they are all successful in alleviating today's crisis, there still remains the impending second urban crisis.

#### TIME BOMB

This second crisis is less spectacular at the moment. But it is a time bomb ticking away with the ominous potential of producing a chaotic urban growth whose problems would dwarf those of the present.

We are alerted to this danger by a single basic statistic: In the next thirty years, more than 100 million people will be added to the population.

As President Nixon said about the children making up this increase: "Where they grow up—and how—will more than any one thing, measure the quality of American life in the years ahead."

It is to defuse this second urban crisis and help assure these children the best life that any Americans have ever had, that the President has called for a national growth policy. And it is on this long-range problem that I would like to focus primarily tonight, with emphasis on how business and government can develop new patterns of cooperation to cope with it.

The solution to future urban problems will only be found if overwhelming population pressures on our present metropolitan areas can be avoided. And this can only be done through the better urban-rural balance that a national growth policy would achieve.

#### MEGALOPOLIS

By the year 2000, eighty-five percent of our population of 300 million will be urban.

Picture, if you will, four gigantic clusters of metropolitan areas in the Nation—what the urban scholar Jean Gottmann so aptly called Megalopolis. There's BosWash, an unbroken stretch of people, homes, factories, highways, railroads and power lines from Boston to Washington; there's ChiPitts, a solid belt of heavy industry from Chicago to Pittsburgh; there's SanSan, from San Francisco to San Diego, and there's JaMi, the fourth megalopolis along Florida's east coast from Jacksonville to Miami.

Each will constitute a new phenomenon on this earth—a human agglomeration of a size, density and complexity never before known. And in combination these vast megalopolis will have the potential of posing megaton problems that will make solving our present difficulties look like child's play.

It is not very pleasant to contemplate what such an anthill society would mean to this Nation.

#### THREAT TO CHARACTER

What, for instance, would it do to the American people?

What would dirt, congestion, polluted air and water, traffic jams, noise, slums, crime, and violence—on a scale never before experienced—do to the American existence?

Will we fear increasingly to walk our streets? Will this fear turn into hate, divisiveness, polarization?

Will our young people feel even more all-

enated, rootless? Reared in great metropolitan areas, will they lose entirely their sense of belonging, and therefore their sense of loyalty, duty and obligation to society?

Frederick Jackson Turner said in 1893 that it was the challenges and opportunities offered in the advancing frontier that had imparted the dynamic quality to the American character.

What quality will the pressures, frustrations and congestion of megalopolis impart to the character of future Americans? Will they be the same productive, optimistic, friendly, outgoing, dynamic people who have traditionally populated this Nation?

#### MEGALOPOLITAN GOVERNMENT

Next, what kind of government would megalopolis require?

Would our extreme concentrations of population make it impossible for government to provide adequate and reliable public service? Would our trash collection stoppages, breakdowns in fire and police protection, power failures, water shortages, substandard education and health facilities all be multiplied?

To try to cope with these mounting problems, would megalopolitan government grow even larger, with topheavy administration costs and a vast and unmanageable bureaucracy? Would countless government agencies, many with overlapping jurisdictions, each with its own separate budget, its own narrow mission, its own set of criteria, be demanding more and more funds? Would countless regulations and reams of red tape engulf us?

Would the opportunities for graft and corruption mushroom, and organized crime flourish as never before?

Would the result be steadily worsening government at an ever-increasing cost—government for which our citizens would have only contempt?

Would a complete disintegration of authority be an ever-present menace? Would the only way to govern such an anthill society be through a megalopolitan government with sweeping powers approaching those of a police state?

#### FREE ENTERPRISE SYSTEM

Finally, how would the free enterprise system fare in megalopolis?

Would it become so enmeshed in governmental regulations that it would lose the creativity that is the heart of the system?

Would the skyrocketing cost of public services drain so much tax revenue from the private sector that we would have virtually a state-controlled economy?

President Nixon warned against such a development in a recent press conference, when he said:

"Approximately 35 to 37 percent of the total income of the United States goes to taxes—that is, federal, state and local taxes. I believe that amount is high enough. I believe that when a Nation takes a substantially larger portion of the national income than that for taxes, then that Nation loses its character as a free private enterprise economy and turns over and becomes primarily a state-controlled and oriented economy."

Can there be doubt that other costs, as well as those of public services, will go up in megalopolis, that land prices will soar, and the cost of labor rise because of the higher costs of living and the intensified use of labor, which increases bargaining power?

All this raises the question of the future productive efficiency of American industry and its ability to compete in the world market in the years ahead. Will inefficient patterns of urban growth have the effect of locking industry into an obsolescent and unproductive nationwide layout?

Under all these conditions, will our manufacturers be able to compete in an integrated

world market as well as with foreign imports in our own domestic market?

#### ALTERNATIVES

All of these questions boil down to one. The overriding question before the Nation is this: Shall we let haphazard and chaotic urban growth create almost insoluble problems for our people, for government and for industry? Or shall we adopt the President's farsighted proposal for a national growth policy?

Under the first alternative, every man is for himself, without regard to the effect on others or to the total effect that the combined actions of all have on us all.

Under the second alternative, business and government at all levels—federal, state and local—cooperate under fair rules equitably applied, to build an urban system that is not only productive, but also enhances the quality of life for our people and their children into and beyond the year 2000.

We know which of these crossroads to take, and the President has suggested ways government can help lead.

"In the future," he said, "government decisions . . . should be made with a clear objective of aiding a balanced growth."

"In particular, the Federal Government must be in a position to assist in the building of new cities and the rebuilding of old ones."

The policy thus recognizes that the disadvantages of megalopolis clearly do not apply to cities of viable, manageable size. Such a modern metropolis could offer society opportunities for intellectual, cultural and material progress obtainable nowhere else.

The key words here are "cities of viable, manageable size," and that is something quite different from what we can expect if things are allowed to continue on the past course.

#### ADVANTAGES OF METROPOLIS

Consider what the good qualities of life can be if future cities do not grow beyond such "viable, manageable size."

Through personal contacts, its residents benefit from the exchange of ideas and experiences. As consumers, they enjoy greater freedom of choice in products, and as workers they have a wider choice of occupations. And they can enjoy a greater variety of cultural and recreational facilities.

For business, the metropolis offers a wide range of specialized skills and services unobtainable in small towns. Business can draw on a pool of talent in management, law, accounting, marketing, science and technology. All are essential for business success in the increasingly complex industrial process.

To preserve these advantages of the city without incurring the liabilities of megalopolis, we will not only build new cities from the ground up but also undertake to expand our present small cities into much larger entities. We cannot assume that there will be a need for keeping very many people back on the farm. And we should not want to have the large cities get larger.

A report by the National Commission on Urban Growth has suggested the creation of 100 new communities averaging 100,000 people each, and ten new cities averaging at least one million persons. That's a total of 20 million people—only one-fifth of the 100 million we expect in the coming 30 years. If we built new cities for all those 100 million, we'd have to build a city of 250,000—about the size of Tulsa, Oklahoma—every month between now and the year 2000.

#### PLANT LOCATION

In dealing with where industry chooses to locate new plants, we come to the very heart of the urbanization process. For the modern city will remain, above all, an economic unit organized by the commercial and industrial process. It is a gigantic labor saving



device which vastly increases man's productive capacity. As it grows, it is held together by many other social and cultural forces, but its primary focus is as a place to produce or to provide services.

As far as I know, it has never been decided which comes first—whether people go where the jobs are or industry locates where the people are. But we do know that the two go together—and the policies of both public and private agencies must be coordinated to bring them together on a common meeting ground that is best for them, as well as the Nation as a whole.

#### GOVERNMENT ASSISTANCE

Now how can government contribute toward this end? What are some of the policy instruments it can use to influence the location of people and industry so as to develop a healthy pattern of urbanization?

Already, several government programs promote such a development. Our Commerce Department's Economic Development Administration helps through loans and grants to build industrial parks and to help industries get started in selected growth centers. So do its Regional Commissions, with somewhat wider concepts of economic development. The Small Business Administration also provides assistance to business in developing areas.

Realistically, if we are to expect business to help achieve population dispersal, government should help assure it an opportunity to make a fair profit in such locations. Possible new incentives include investment tax credits, liberalized depreciation allowances, and man-power training supplements. Business expenditures for new plant and equipment even now are running at an annual rate of early \$80 billion. If such incentives could channel an increasing portion of future investment into areas that would help achieve a better balance in urban growth, the whole Nation would benefit. The incentives themselves would constitute a national investment in higher productivity that would pay handsome dividends indefinitely.

Another important assist is highway building, which serves the transportation needs of both industry and employees. Our great Interstate System, begun under the farsighted leadership of President Eisenhower, has already helped in dispersing industry. And its impact will grow, as it is completed in the next four years. Extension of the System in conjunction with other transportation facilities will probably need to be a basic part of the Nation's future urban growth policies.

Third, government might locate its own facilities and buildings so as to influence healthy urban growth. Many government activities have already been decentralized, and this trend should continue according to a carefully drawn plan.

#### NEW COMMUNITIES

Finally, there is the exciting potential for government assistance in the building of entirely new communities. The Administration has recently made its first move of this type in Jonathan, Minnesota.

In the beginning of our history, the settlers developed a strong tradition of building carefully planned communities. Here on this virgin continent was the opportunity to correct the accumulated mistakes of centuries of unplanned city building in Europe. William Penn in Philadelphia; General Ogelthorpe in Savannah, Georgia; George Washington and Thomas Jefferson in our Nation's Capital, were among the farsighted men who ordered the development of streets and parks and living space according to master plans.

But during the last century and a half, this tradition was allowed to lapse, and most of our cities grew without design. Today, our mushrooming population has stimulated a revival in this long-dormant art of city

planning and building. There are several notable recent examples in California and around Washington, D.C. I am convinced that this movement to construct entirely new communities offers great promise in achieving balance in the Nation's development. Government should encourage its acceleration in every way possible.

#### POLICY DIRECTIONS

These, then, are the three directions in which our national growth policy should develop:

First, the building of new cities away from today's great metropolitan areas.

Second, planned expansion of our present small cities in ways that will not result in their linking up to form additional unwieldy concentrations.

And third, discouragement of further growth of present large cities so that they can be modernized to meet the needs of the next century.

In combination, these three developments will enable us to provide constructive answers to many of the questions I have raised about the consequences of unplanned megalopolitan growth.

We can more easily contain crime and make our streets safe for all our people.

We can restore in our young people a sense of pride in America, a feeling of community and belonging.

We can preserve open spaces for recreational purposes.

We can more readily cope with air and water pollution.

We can ease traffic congestion.

We can develop strong, responsive, and efficient local government that can better provide adequate public services such as fire and police protection, waste disposal, power and water facilities, schools and health facilities.

We can prevent the wasteful diseconomies of unmanageable local government, and hold tax collections within reasonable bounds.

We can better preserve the creative character of the free enterprise system by preventing its entanglement in the red tape of bigger regulatory agencies.

And we can enhance the competitive ability of American industry by maximizing our productivity potential through a more efficient distribution of the industrial process.

#### BUSINESS RESPONSIBILITIES

In making these tasks, there are unprecedented challenges and opportunities for American business.

The first—and probably foremost—is business' contribution to the building of new cities and renovation of old ones. Urban development offers a wide and growing market for new corporate starts, and new directions for established companies which are seeking additional opportunities. Some of this is already taking place.

Second, to meet the challenge of city building, business should emphasize more than ever the values of research and technological development. Its major thrust should be in the field of civilian technology, concentrating on systems and products which will be required for quality in urban living.

Third, business must expect to be more cognizant of the necessities for protecting the environment from pollution, and from a depletion of our minerals and other natural resources. The wise location of new industrial plants can make a major contribution in this area.

Fourth, business should be more keenly aware that its many new products for the consumer must maintain the highest standards of safety and reliability, always within a price range that the consumer can afford. A balance must be struck, of course, in order to prevent unrealistic standards from defeating the needs of both the consumer and the producer.

Finally business should engage in longer

range planning to cope with a shifting economy. Annual budgets and five-year plans are inadequate in an age of such complexity and change. Today's rocket speed requires that our foresight illuminate the future not years but decades ahead.

Nowhere is this foresight more urgently needed than in planning for a balanced distribution of the 300 million Americans in the year 2000. In his bold proposal for a national growth policy, President Nixon has placed this among our highest priorities. Now it is up to business and government at every level—federal, state and local—to implement and carry forward this farsighted policy.

#### ATHENIAN OATH

Can we accomplish this challenging and critical task? That depends on whether each of us individually and collectively in his own city, is willing to make this resolve:

"We will ever strive for the ideals and sacred things of the city, both alone and with many; we will unceasingly seek to quicken the sense of public duty; we will revere and obey the city's laws; we will transmit this city not only not less, but greater, better, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

The men of Athens who took this oath two thousand years ago had as their objective the building of one city. In accomplishing it, they also created the Golden Age of Pericles and laid the foundation for Western civilization.

#### CONCLUSION

Our objective is also city-building. We know that science and technology have multiplied our strength a thousand-fold over that of the Athenians.

But do we have the wisdom, the resolve, the capacity for cooperation, the love of country, that will not only enable us to build the city—the livable city—but to light the way for the march of civilization into the third millennium?

That is the principal question before America today. It can be answered only by the full collaboration of enlightened government and the constructive potential of American business.

[From the Wall Street Journal, March 2, 1970]

#### DANGER: ANTHILLS AHEAD

In this time of talk about national priorities, we ought not to forget one that should be very high on the list: Preventing the nation from degenerating into an anthill society.

That phrase has just been revived by Commerce Secretary Stans in an exceedingly grim warning of what could happen to America in the next 30 years or so. Assuming the population is not decimated by such traditional specters as war or plague, the total will be some 300 million Americans by the year 2000, 85% of them urban.

So if nothing is done, Mr. Stans said, the prospect is a sprawl of "vast megalopolis" whose problems may well dwarf present urban worries. "It is not very pleasant to contemplate what such an anthill society would mean to this nation."

Among other likely evils: Sharp increases in congestion, pollution, crimes and youthful alienation. In addition, local governments might become increasingly unable to deliver services and even disintegrate, leading to "megalopolitan" government with powers approaching those of a police state. Skyrocketing costs of public services, moreover, could drain so much tax revenue as to produce practically a state-controlled economy.

Perhaps the worst is implied in a question posed by the Secretary: "What quality will the pressures, frustrations and congestion of megalopolis impart to the character of future Americans?"

There is already enough congestion and related ills in some urban areas to provide an inkling of the answer. As tempers fray in the

anthill, mutual hostility could reach dangerous levels. As the simplest activities become increasingly difficult, life may come to many to seem not worth living. The ideal of man as a creature capable of nobility (along with his innate evil) may gradually become but a dim memory.

While the warning is grave, Mr. Stans does not believe this nightmare future is inevitable—nor do we, although we are not overly sanguine that governments, businesses and individuals will bestir themselves to do enough of the things necessary to prevent further deterioration. Yet in theory at least, even if one accepts the extrapolation of a 300-million population by 2000, there are ways to avert the catastrophe. (Some demographers, incidentally, are beginning to suspect that the growth may not be that large.)

Our approach is to develop an urban policy based on the concept of cities of "viable, manageable size," cities that could avoid the mammoth problems of megalopolis but still offer intellectual, cultural and material opportunities. In this policy, the further growth of present large cities would be discouraged, so that they could try to modernize to meet future needs.

But would not all this entail an unacceptable degree of governmental compulsion? Not necessarily, in the Stans formulation anyway.

Government, for example, could furnish incentives like investment tax credits, liberalized depreciation allowances, highways that tend to disperse population, planned decentralization of government facilities and continued assistance to new communities. Businesses should be urged to participate in the construction of new cities, to develop systems and products that will be required for quality in urban living and, of course, to vigorously pursue pollution control.

We would add that the individual and the family plainly have a heavy responsibility too. The hope ought to be to make that prediction of a 100-million accretion by 2000 not come true; failing that, the family should be concerned not to build the base for huge new population increases after that date.

The responsibility falls especially on the growing numbers of younger people, the family-makers of the years ahead. Many of them profess to be deeply perturbed about the damage being done to the environment (whether this attitude is just one more fad is hard to say). If they are concerned, they should think carefully about family size, in the hope of mitigating the excessive population that is at the root of most of the existing and threatening urban and environmental ills.

The more pessimistic Americans believe that nothing will avail, that society is headed on a suicidal course. It need not be so, but if increasingly intolerable conditions are to be avoided, a considerable and conscious effort will be needed. We still have time, but not much, to reject the anthill society.

SPEECH BY THOMAS P. TURCHAN

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, in the trade bill sent up to the Congress last November and in the recent report to the Congress on U.S. foreign policy for the 1970's the administration has proposed repeal of the American selling price method of customs valuation on certain chemicals in the expressed hope "its elimination might open the door to fur-

ther reductions of barriers to U.S. exports." The use of the term "might" indicates that hope would be an extremely weak reed upon which to rest our country's economic interests.

Let us look at the record. In the Kennedy round negotiations the United States consented to lower tariffs 50 percent in the chemical sector in return for which our European industrial competitors reduced their tariffs by only 20 percent. The reduction on their part was subsequently negated to a large extent by an increase in border taxes which has in actuality added to the landed cost of American chemical products in European markets. It is, after all, the landed cost of U.S. products in those markets which greatly affects the ability of American producers to compete.

Now the Congress is being asked to worsen the competitive disadvantage of U.S. chemical manufacturers by removing the American selling price valuation of imports and further reducing tariffs beyond the 50-percent limit authorized by the Congress in the Trade Expansion Act of 1962.

In return, the nebulous and tenuous hope of trade concessions by our European industrial competitors is being offered as reason for the Congress to act. This is certainly unconvincing grounds for exposing American producers and thousands of our workers to probable damage from import competition.

Further, European producers are able to rationalize production and achieve economies of scale with attendant competitive advantages through cartels and other practices prohibited by U.S. anti-trust laws.

The Kennedy round's separate agreement in the chemical sector was a bad bargain for the United States. Ratification of the separate package will not only worsen an already one-sided deal but it may do irreparable harm to the American benzenoid industry which is the seedbed of new products and whole new industries. Its importance as a fountainhead of new technology and new industrial growth goes far beyond the economic parameters.

Rather than weakening this vital industry, we should be working to strengthen it. For one thing, its growth would improve employment opportunities for minorities. In New Jersey, for example, many Negroes are employed in gainful jobs in the production of dyes and other benzenoid chemicals. It makes little sense to spend public money to train and widen employment opportunities for minority workers on one hand while pursuing a course which will shut down plants which can and do provide work for minority groups.

I believe in and have worked for a prospering trade with our world neighbors. As President Kennedy so aptly put it: "A rising tide lifts all the boats." Liberalized trade which insures fair and equal access to markets buoys the world economy.

I submit, however, that the surest way to turn the nations of the world against continued liberalization of trade is to strike bar bargains which will do injury to our industries and workers or those of

our industrial competitors. The separate agreement is not equitable, as Mr. Thomas P. Turchan, president of the Synthetic Organic Chemical Manufacturers Association, clearly pointed out in a recent speech at the Chemical Forum here in the National Capital.

Mr. Turchan's remarks to the Manufacturing Chemists Association will be of great interest to my colleagues in the House of Representatives because of their relevance to legislation which may receive congressional consideration. The text is included in full:

SPEECH BY THOMAS P. TURCHAN, PRESIDENT OF THE SYNTHETIC ORGANIC CHEMICAL MANUFACTURERS ASSOCIATION, AT MCA CHEMICAL FORUM LUNCHEON, FEBRUARY 17, 1970

I was indeed pleased when Jim Morton asked me to speak on the ASP separate package agreement at your luncheon meeting today. SOCMA and MCA have been working together for some time now in opposing this unreciprocal agreement.

All of you, I am sure, recognize that decisions in the international trade area are of critical importance to the United States chemical industry. Many of you, in fact, are probably spending a considerable portion of your time on the more important trade issues facing our industry and our nation in the decade ahead—feedstocks, export incentives, rules on foreign investment, non-tariff barriers, and so on.

If one looks at all of these in a broad sense, it is clear that their objectives are to put us on a more nearly competitive basis with other major nations in the international marketplaces of the world. The practical equity and reciprocity we are seeking are absolutely essential and are required now if we are to have any chance of stemming the very serious downturn in our commercial trade balance and in our balance of payments. Instead of looking to see what more the United States can give away, I am convinced that we have long since passed the point where we must not only ask for but must insist on equity and reciprocity in any dealings with our international trading partners.

Our \$7-billion balance of payments deficit last year was the worst in America's history. Our deficit position has become a chronic one and one which will continue into the foreseeable future unless this country can, among other things, find some way of strengthening its competitive trade posture. We must find a way to turn last year's \$2-billion commercial trade deficit into the type of surplus our nation once had. Remember that we had a commercial trade surplus of over \$4-billion as recently as 1964.

Just last month, Chairman Wilbur Mills of the Ways and Means Committee noted that:

"Somewhere along the line we seem to have dropped the word reciprocal in describing the trade agreements program. The approach that has been taken in dealing with some of the foreign trade problems of our domestic industries in recent years has led me to believe that we sometimes forget the need for adhering to the idea of reciprocity."

I can assure the Chairman that if our trade negotiators had listened to the Congress and had not forgotten the importance of requiring reciprocity, we would not be facing the serious trade and payments problems which are plaguing this country today.

More importantly, there would be no ASP separate package agreement and therefore no need for my being here today to speak to you.

Unfortunately, there is such an agreement and it will be taken up by the Congress within the next few weeks. I hope today to



give you a brief picture of what the separate package is all about. Please keep in mind that the issue before Congress in 1970 is not whether to retain ASP but whether or not a specific trade deal—the separate package agreement—is good or bad for the nation.

As the former U.S. Special Trade Representative, Ambassador Roth, told the Ways and Means Committee in 1968, and I quote, "we said both the Kennedy Round has to be balanced and reciprocal and this package has to be balanced and reciprocal . . . It has to be judged on its merits."

I have to admit to some difficulty in understanding how the Kennedy Round deal can be considered balanced and reciprocal—with us cutting tariffs by 50% and getting only 20% cuts in return. In fact, here I should point out that even the 20% reduction which the Common Market has already made has not resulted in any real benefit for most of our chemical exports to them. A table released by the Common Market actually shows that because of the EEC's harmonization process the average tariff on chemicals entering Germany and the Benelux countries turns out to be higher after the so-called 20% reduction than it was before. This is particularly significant when you recall that Germany and the Benelux countries account for over 70% of U.S. chemical exports to the Common Market and about half of our exports to all of Europe.

My predecessor as President of SOGMA, Jim Mahoney of Monsanto, expressed hope before the final Kennedy Round negotiations began that the United States would not again trade a horse for a hare. Our trade officials promised him that they would not only get us a horse but that it would have a tail as well. Well, we got the tail all right, but it doesn't seem to be attached to anything.

We do agree, though, with the position that the separate package agreement must be considered on its merits—is it truly balanced and reciprocal and what effect will it have on our industry and on the nation? Surprisingly, our *new* Special Trade Representative, Carl Gilbert, appears to disregard the merits, or lack of them, of the agreement in urging the Congress to pass it on the basis of its "symbolic importance." Such reasoning or, more properly, such lack of reasoning helps explain why our international trade position has deteriorated so badly in recent years.

But let me get back to the agreement itself and in the short time I have this afternoon, try to cover some of the most important reasons we believe Congress should firmly reject the separate package.

First, let me point out that our negotiators agreed to this deal with no authority whatsoever from the Congress. The Trade Expansion Act was quite explicit in limiting their authority to tariff reductions alone and even then they were not authorized to make reductions of more than 50%. Our negotiators exceeded both of these limits in the separate package. Even worse, they acted directly in the face of Senate Concurrent Resolution 100 which specifically told them not to do exactly what they did do—negotiate an "ad referendum" agreement on ASP and then ask Congress to approve it.

Our trade officials had the authority to cut tariffs by 50%—and they used every bit of this authority to cut the protection for benzenoid chemicals in half. Since a reasonable period of time has elapsed, we can begin to judge the real effects of these cuts, rather than theorize on them. We find that benzenoid imports have jumped 50% in just two years as the first two 10% cuts were made. You can imagine what imports will be by the time the remaining three reductions are in effect.

What is frequently overlooked, despite our best efforts, is that passage of the separate package agreement will not only eliminate ASP, but will also further reduce tariff pro-

tection for most benzenoids far beyond the Kennedy Round's limit of 50%. Indeed, the tariff for most benzenoid chemicals produced in the United States would be reduced by more than 60% and some would be cut by more than 80%. In fact, this is one reason the AFL-CIO opposes approval of the separate package. They do not believe any American industry should be forced to live with tariff reductions of more than 50%.

Strangely enough, the package would actually raise some tariffs—on benzenoids *not made* in the United States. Here, where we obviously need less protection and where our government could have been more generous in offering duty cuts, tariffs will be increased by as much as 50% if this deal goes through. So what do we have—significant new reductions where we need the protection and higher tariffs where we do not. What kind of economic sense does this make?

The effects of these additional tariff reductions will be far reaching for many segments of the chemical industry. Imports will certainly increase even more rapidly than they are increasing today. The larger companies will be forced to make some hard decisions with respect to those chemicals they can no longer profitably make in the United States. Some products and product lines will be dropped. Others will be imported from company plants abroad. And, in some cases, the market will simply be turned over to foreign producers. There will be increasing pressures on decisions about new capital investment. Investment in non-profitable benzenoids will simply not be made and, in some cases, investments will be made in plants abroad, rather than in the United States.

Smaller companies, particularly those producing a limited line of benzenoids, will have much more trouble adjusting. We are certain some simply will not be able to adjust and will disappear. Others will become distributors in order to survive, buying chemicals abroad and reselling them in the U.S.

Most importantly of all, a good part of the incentive for growth and investment in benzenoids in this country will disappear. We believe this is particularly harmful in view of the benzenoid industry's recognized role as a seed-bed of new products for the total American chemical industry.

By the way, when we talk about injury to our industry, we believe our trade officials have evidence that strongly supports our own economic analysis. More than three years ago, the U.S. Tariff Commission provided our negotiators with its best judgment of the injury which would occur if ASP were eliminated and tariffs reduced by 50%. Yet in Congressional hearings in 1968, the Office of Special Representative for Trade Negotiations persisted in its refusal to release the Commission's findings and conclusions. I fail to understand how the STR office thinks it can convince Congress to approve the separate package agreement without making public the Commission's views as to the economic effect of such action. Nevertheless, our negotiators are still keeping this report under lock and key.

Another clear indication that we know what we are talking about can be seen in the comments made abroad when the deal was announced. Business Week reported that "Germany's big chemical makers are rubbing their hands in anticipation." One spokesman even commented that "we feel like a little boy who has been promised an electric train for Christmas."

A leading British trade analyst noted that "the effect of the EEC's chemical cuts will be marginal, of Britain's relatively small . . . The real difference to world trade is likely to arise from the offers, absolute and provisional, made by the United States. If Congress agrees to the necessary legislation, the prospects in the United States market for

British and Continental producers of benzenoid chemicals will be revolutionized."

In fact, even the chief EEC negotiator could not restrain his satisfaction when he told reporters, "the U.S. finally gave way on chemicals for which we, of course, had to give a few concessions. But all in all, we are particularly happy about the outcome in that particular sector."

Our Association went beyond studying just the impact on U.S. markets. We specifically asked our members whether the 30% reduction in European chemical tariffs was worth the abolition of ASP and further reduction in excess of 50% which would be required under the separate package.

Facing up to this issue, our member companies studied the separate package very carefully and came up with the answer. It was clear, it was unequivocal. The answer was an emphatic no and the reason was simple. A 30% reduction by foreign nations would not begin to generate as much additional export trade for the United States as our further duty reductions would provide for additional imports into the United States.

In this context, it is important, and significant to note that the separate package agreement is opposed by the AFL-CIO, the International Chemical Workers Union, the Oil, Chemical and Atomic Workers, District 50 of the United Mine Workers, SOGMA, MCA and the Dry Color Manufacturers Association, dozens of union locals, individual chemical producers, state and local officials, and others. These are the people our trade officials say the agreement will benefit—yet they are unanimous in their belief that it is unreciprocal and will hurt far more than it will help.

There are several other concessions the United States has offered in the separate package which do not involve ASP. For example, there are a reasonably large number of non-benzenoid chemicals which will have their duties reduced an additional 30% if the deal goes through. In addition, there are several other products where Europe wanted cuts of more than 50%. These were added to this agreement because our negotiators had no authority to make cuts of that size. These also are chemicals not involved in ASP.

Let me just take a minute to summarize our part of the deal. If the separate package passes, ASP will be eliminated, tariffs on benzenoid chemicals made in the United States will be further reduced, tariffs on benzenoids not made in the United States will be increased, and additional tariff reductions made on a number of non-benzenoid chemicals.

In exchange for this, we get the reduction abroad currently being held "hostage" by our trading partners—the remaining 30% we have already paid for with our 50% across-the-board cut in the Kennedy Round.

In addition, our negotiators claim to have obtained concessions with respect to several foreign non-tariff barriers. But these are far from what they seem.

One such concession—on the automobile road tax—is illegal under GATT and the Trade Expansion Act prohibited our negotiators from paying compensation for the removal of such illegal barriers.

On the concession with respect to the Commonwealth preference on tobacco, even the Agriculture Department's representative had to testify in 1968 that there is now a seller's market in the UK because of the sanctions against Rhodesia. He admitted that once the British remove these sanctions our tobacco exports to the UK will fall 50% irrespective of this alleged concession.

Finally, our negotiators were so embarrassed by an alleged concession offered by the Swiss that they purposefully neglected to mention it in their testimony before the Ways and Means Committee. It was hardly a concession and could be more easily interpreted as being a rather unpleasant and, I

might add, unjustified threat against American fruit packers.

Our trade officials have failed in their efforts to demonstrate that there are more benefits than detriments in the separate package agreement. Indeed, just last week in an interview with Chemical Week, our chief negotiator acknowledged that retention of ASP was in the interests of our entire industry in the short term. Given a few more months our negotiators may even come to agree with us that it is in the long term interest as well.

However, unable to demonstrate reciprocity, our negotiators have now begun to take a different approach. In a speech before the National Foreign Trade Council, Mr. Gilbert has called for elimination of the American Selling Price system because of its "great symbolic importance" to our trading partners and in order to get the Europeans to believe "the United States is really interested in negotiating the reduction of non-tariff barriers." Our efforts to remove foreign non-tariff barriers can hardly succeed if we plan to negotiate on such a basis.

Surely our trade negotiators must be aware that, since the Kennedy Round, our principal trading partners have adopted border taxes, variable levies and other non-tariff barriers which have thoroughly undermined the value of the tariff concessions for which we paid so dearly in the Kennedy Round. Yet the foreigners have now somehow been able to convince our trade negotiators that, because of ASP's "great symbolic importance", we must eliminate it before they will even sit down with us to negotiate on these issues.

But we, too, can put it in terms of symbols—the separate package agreement has become a symbol of the failure of our negotiators to obtain reciprocity in the Kennedy Round. The late Senator Dirksen was quite prophetic in pointing out the symbolism in the ASP issue in hearings before the Finance Committee a couple of months before the negotiations were concluded. He said:

"I am concerned by all of these factors that indicate we are not going to be able to obtain reciprocal concessions out of the Common Market in these negotiations. But our failure to stand up to the Europeans on this ASP issue simply goes one step too far. It is fast becoming the symbol of the extent to which we are allowing ourselves to be out-bargained in these negotiations."

I can assure our trade officials that American Selling Price is of more than great "symbolic" significance to our industry and its over 125,000 workers. Moreover, I am sure that these officials and our trading partners are well aware that Europe's variable levies, border taxes and export rebates are of much more than "symbolic importance" to our farmers and our manufacturing industries.

I believe it is important that we obtain a meaningful reduction in these significant foreign non-tariff barriers. From a tactical standpoint, however, I find it difficult to believe that anything meaningful can be accomplished if we commence negotiations by "giving away" the principal item of interest to our trading partners simply in order to get them to agree to sit down and talk with us. The United States clearly has little to gain and much to lose if negotiations are conducted on such a basis. Our important trade and payments balances can no longer afford this one-sided type of bargaining.

If we can just get our message across to Congress, if they can be helped to understand the real issues in this matter, I fail to see how serious consideration can be given to an agreement as unreciprocal as this one. It will, however, take hard work on the part of our industry to see that the real issues are understood and we look forward to working with you to see that they are.

In closing, I would like to leave you with this thought. There can be no liberalization of trade without reciprocity. Our balance of

trade and balance of payments cannot stand it. Strong as we are, we cannot be expected to compete with the rest of the world while we have one hand tied behind our back. Our country's trade record over the last five years proves this.

Thus, the issue presented by the separate package is not an issue of free trade versus protectionism. The issue which the Kennedy Round and these chemical "deals" poses is whether we can afford to make trade concessions without reciprocity; whether we can afford to liberalize trade when our trading partners are doing just the opposite. We believe that the answer to both of these questions is "No"! The only way our industry, its workers and the Congress are going to get reciprocity is by demanding it. There can certainly be no better place to start than by rejecting the separate package agreement.

I appreciate the opportunity of being with you here today.

#### UNDERSTANDING THE SILENT MAJORITY

### HON. DON. H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently I received two letters from my district which, in my judgment, contribute immeasurably to a better understanding of the so-called silent majority.

One, from Mrs. Ruth Barrong of Eureka, Calif., defines the silent majority in clear and unmistakable terms. After reading this letter no one should doubt that there is indeed a "silent majority."

The second, which I received from Mrs. Richard Kinney of McKinleyville, Calif., depicts the feelings of many regarding demonstrations.

I am including both of these letters in the RECORD so that my colleagues might have a clearer understanding of the thoughts of this group called the silent majority.

The material follows:

NOVEMBER 17, 1969.

Congressman DON CLAUSEN,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CLAUSEN: As a member of the "silent majority" I no longer wish to remain silent. This letter is prompted by a remark made by Senator Edmund Muskie while delivering a speech in Los Angeles that there is no such thing as a "silent majority"—it is a "mythical" creation.

I am a 48 year old working wife and mother of three who, together with my husband, has worked hard to provide for our family. We are striving to make honest, useful citizens of our children. We love our country and appreciate how fortunate we are to have been born here. We have deep respect for our flag and deplore the actions of those who would desecrate it. We try to respect the rights of others, even though their ideas may differ from ours, but we do not feel that the riots, dissension, destruction so prevalent in our country today was intended as a "freedom" guaranteed by our Constitution. We do not condone the Vietnamese conflict any more than any war our country as been engaged in, but we try to back our Presidents (regardless of political affiliation—my husband and I are of separate political parties). We feel President Nixon is sincerely striving to bring about an honorable solution to the

present strife and we are at least willing to give him ample time to do so.

We are thankful that at last we have someone in public office who has the "guts" to stand up and say in public what so many of us are unable to say—what needs to be said. Thank you Mr. Vice President. We support you in your views on the dissenters and the news media.

Because we are so busily engaged with our jobs, home and families that we and countless others like us have little time left over for demonstrating, rioting, etc., aren't we "members of the silent majority"? I would say so.

Respectfully,

Mrs. RUTH MAXENE BARRONG.

McKINLEYVILLE, CALIF.,

February 16, 1970.

Congressman DONALD H. CLAUSEN,  
House Office Building,  
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN CLAUSEN: Thank you for your letter of February 11, 1970. I am deeply pleased that you used the letter from the young soldier in the text of your Veteran's Day speech. I, too, found it deeply moving and am not ashamed to admit that I found tears flowing as I read it. Your entire speech was very moving, and I shall share it with all of our friends.

As a follow-up to the peace march, in which there was some local participation, there were letters in the local newspaper both pro and con. One was from a young man who was perturbed because the Eureka City Council refused to allow some segment to fly a Viet Cong flag. He wrote to the paper about it, feeling somehow that a right of his had been violated. His letter was just too much for this old gal to stomach! The following is a copy of my letter to the newspaper, which they printed:

"Re: Peace marches, demonstrations, moratoriums.

I do not have to believe in the war in Vietnam or any other war for that matter, but as long as there is one American soldier defending my peace anywhere in the world, he has my vocal and prayerful support!

Those of you who say we do not belong there—perhaps boundarywise we do not, but God taught me that I am my brother's keeper—if a man falls, I offer him a lift; if a man is threatened, I offer him my protection. Those of you who are so quick to yell for peace—peace at any price—don't include me or mine in your cut-rate deals. Peace comes high, and it is priceless!

For those of you who still do not understand my position, let me clarify it: I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America, and to the republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

Needless to say, my letter brought a reaction, not from the first young man, but from another. I am sorry I do not have a copy of his letter, but the essence of it was that since I was not doing anything to help out the war in any way, why didn't I just keep my mouth shut. Not in those words, of course, but the message was clear! I pondered his letter for several days; at first I was angry, but then I decided on my answer, which was also printed in the local paper. The following is a copy of it:

I read with much interest and quite a bit of confusion the letter from the young man in Arcata who apparently did not share my views on peace marches, etc. After reading his letter a couple of times it occurred to me that due to his young age, he did not understand what I had written. Both of us want the young men brought home from Vietnam. However, I believe that the peace marches and moratoriums and the like give the North Vietnamese the finest type of propaganda for



their cause. I do not support them for this reason.

The young man wondered what I was doing to support the young men in Vietnam, since it occurred to him I was doing little or nothing. Son, there is not a whole lot I can do, but I do the one thing that I believe has more power than any peace march or anything else along those lines. I pray to God for His protection for the soldiers; for His divine guidance for those whose job it is to get this atrocity of a war ended. And one more thing—I am raising—trying to raise my 12 year old son in such a manner that if he is ever called upon to face a similar situation to what these young men of draft age face now, he will undertake his duty with courage. I hope that he will face his tasks with faith in God and a loyalty to country that will make his father and I proud to call him son. All of you who support the peace marches and moratoriums, this is your choice, and thank God you live in a country where you are free to make that choice. Just be careful not to hide your heads in the sand when danger approaches."

I did not receive an answer to this letter. Perhaps I gave him food for thought; or perhaps he just decided there was no way to reach me. He was most assuredly right—I can listen to their point of view, but for every would-be reason they can offer me, I can offer them three on why their way will lead us deeper into conflict. I am proud that I received over 40 phone calls on my letter, plus all the people I've spoken to personally about it. My pride is not in that I wrote the letters, but in that there were so many people who felt the same way, and wanted to take the time to tell me that they agreed with me. Forgive me a little vanity, but I feel that I feel American. I feel a deep kinship with the young soldier who wrote that most moving letter. There is not now, nor will there ever be, a generation gap between those of us who love America and the freedoms she offers first, and life second.

Sincerely,

Mrs. RICHARD K. KINNEY.

#### RELIGION AS A COLD-WAR WEAPON

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in too many quarters it has become fashionable to assume an ostrich-like posture toward the cold war, as though it does not exist in all its expanding ramifications and depth on all continents of the world. The refusal to face facts and to delude oneself are conditions long associated with the human race. The great danger of these for a national body is that the Nation stands to lose its independent head if this illusion were to become standard and generally accepted.

A very revealing article on the Russian use and manipulation of religion as a cold-war weapon appears in the winter issue of the Ukrainian Quarterly. Authored by Dr. Lev E. Dobriansky, of Georgetown University, the article is titled "Religion as a Cold-War Weapon" and documents the propaganda play of the controlled Russian Orthodox Church in the Consultative Conference on Arms Limitation held in St. Louis last fall. For those who still can face facts and

have not lost the courage to deal with them, I most heartily commend this eye-opening article for their studied reading:

#### RELIGION AS A COLD-WAR WEAPON (By Lev E. Dobriansky)

Although some consider it unfashionable nowadays to speak of the Cold War, the clear fact is that we are more intensely in it than ever before. The reality of the Cold War need not always be punctuated by tense international conditions, unremitting propaganda outbursts, and loud and vociferous threats and counterthreats. In fact, these and similar phenomena considerably warm up the Cold War and could lead to an excessively hot war. Thus, logically, the reduction or avoidance of such warming-up conditions is itself an operation of the Cold War, where the goals and intentions are the same, the warlike spirit is coldly undiminished, but more subtle methods of infiltrating, sowing seeds of confusion, capitalizing on ignorance, and no doubt gaining some measure of agreement and consent from those who have fallen prey to the calculated maneuver are employed. These techniques are by far more dangerous and actually typify the best instruments of Cold War play since the victims of the effort aren't even aware of being taken in. What colder operation in the Cold War could possibly be performed than this? Its intensity is, therefore, greater than ever before, with all its characteristics of cool deception, intellectual predation, and even obvious objective.

For a number of years now, under cover of the "peaceful coexistence" strategy, this approach has been Moscow's main thrust toward the West and particularly the United States. It has been reflected in all spheres, the political, economic, diplomatic, cultural, athletic, scientific and also the religious. The last is a solid case in point, and at that not a new one. In the 1930's Soviet Russian propaganda made deep inroads into the Protestant clergy in the United States, with its spurious perversions of Christian teachings in the mould of so-called Marxian idealism. The formidable Roman and other Catholic Churches were scarcely penetrated by this maneuver in that period. Today, the situation has changed markedly and considerably. Not only have numerous sections of Protestantism been again easily swayed by substantially the same operation, but also the firm anti-communism of the Roman and other Catholic Churches has been systematically undermined. What has been the strong, impenetrable moral fortress against the mythology of communism has itself fallen into disarray as a result of skillfully executed maneuvers by Moscow staged in circumstances of a refreshing ecumenical movement.

#### RUSSIAN ORTHODOXY AT WORK

Doubtlessly, the first reaction to this overall interpretation is one of skepticism, this despite much proof that exists in connection with Pope John's *Pacem in Terris*, the "cultural" conferences held on the encyclical, the meanderings of the World Council of Churches, and naive Protestant clerical participation in certain anti-Vietnam war demonstrations, detoured civil rights agitation, and youth disturbances. It is not my intention here to enumerate with explanation the evidence existing in each of these areas. For it to be treated in depth would require a brochure, not an article. Nor is it necessary to cover the waterfront when one pungent example, properly documented and examined, will reveal the nature of the beast.

Through a source I have given the presentations of representatives of "Christian Churches in the USSR" who participated in what was called "The Consultation on the Christian Concern for Arms Limitation" held in St. Louis, Missouri during the pe-

riod of September 29-October 9, 1969. American Protestant and Roman Catholic representatives made up the bulk of participation, and quite a few evidently were moved by the Russian presentations. The USSR delegation consisted of the following: Bishop Juvenaly of Tula and Belyev, vice chairman of the department of foreign relations of the Moscow Patriarchate and head of the group; Pastor Ilya Mikhailovich Orlov, vice chairman of the department of foreign relations of the Baptist Union of the USSR; Pastor Ludvig Sidrevics of the Evangelical Lutheran Church of Latvia; Archpriest Livery Arkadevich Voronov, professor at the Leningrad Theological Academy; Alexy Sergeevich Buyevsky, secretary of the department of foreign relations of the Moscow Patriarchate; Archpriest Matthew Savulich Stadnyk, secretary to Archbishop Jonathan, Patriarchal Exarch of North and South America; Father Vladimir Sorokin, inspector of the Leningrad Academy and Seminary; Vasily Dmitrievich Sarychev, professor at the Moscow Theological Academy; and Vladimir Petrovich Kotelkin, translator.

In analyzing the papers delivered it would not be a harsh speculation to state that the key man of this delegation was Buyevsky, the so-called secretary of the department of foreign relations of the Moscow Patriarchate. In fact, on the basis of the usual format of USSR delegations, he was probably the state security officer of the group, for aside from all the religious trimmings his paper could well have been prepared in the Kremlin. The three significant papers were delivered by the Russians of the group. It is interesting to note that the visitors publicized themselves as "The Representatives of Christian Churches in the USSR," whereas the official program prepared by the American clerical hosts has the caption "Russian Participants in USA-USSR Consultation on Arms Limitation." The Latvian is made into a Russian, and the American sheep are prepared for the dialectical slaughter. This in itself is an indication of the level of knowledgeability demonstrated by some of the American "consultants," divided into six "Protestant Participants" and ten "Roman Catholic Participants."

What is of prime concern to us is the line of trained argumentation revealed by the Russian Orthodox papers. Any one in the least familiar with the Russian Orthodox Church in the USSR knows that it has been and continues to be an important tool of the state. It was so under the autocratic Tsars, it has been and is so under the Red Kremlin. Entering into "consultation" without this basic knowledge would be the height of naivete. Having this basic knowledge, one can then readily deduce the type of arguments that would be offered even in the area of arms limitation, which is a crucial field for the Russian totalitarianism who seek nuclear superiority and thus America's striking disadvantage in the titanic struggle enveloping the world. Before I had even read the papers, this tentative conclusion dominated my thoughts. What remains in such a "consultation" is the wishful consideration that somehow, somewhere, an impact will be made through personal contacts for what our clerics deem "the good," which is tantamount to political daydreaming in this contest for the stakes of the world, with or without a global hot war. Now for the exemplifying evidence.

#### CHURCH AND WORLD PEACE

Of the three selected papers the least obnoxious from an ideological point of view is the one delivered by Sarychev of the Moscow Theological Academy or Graduate School. The reason being that the paper is studded with innocuous theological quotations, biblical phrases, and generalities that hardly serve to meet the problem of arms limitation. Under the sub-chapter of "How to in-

tensify the defence of the international peace, the professor begins with this exhortation, "Overwhelming love for earthly goods has led to self-flattery, self-devotion, and self-alienation from the same creatures, and it has become the content of sin and cause of sufferings of all the mankind since the times of the first man."<sup>1</sup> The translations were poorly done, but the papers are nevertheless intelligible. As one can expect in this vein, the professor informs his American counterparts that "the monstrosity of war is in the light of the Christianity the most clearly seen, as far as not only the sufferings involved are concerned but the complete perversion of the relations among men proclaimed by Christ. War, as mass murder and violence, is an act of extreme disobedience of the commandment of love as the true basis of life in the world."<sup>2</sup>

Much of the presentation is filled with this theological rhetoric. Not strangely enough, the rhetoric is not applied specifically, though its field of application would be the greatest for the Soviet Union itself. However, the professor does slip in several political and socio-economic notes that obviously gives away his supposedly elevated theological stance. For example, he says, "At present the Christians must intensify their social activities, to meet the needs of mankind and genuine progress—liquidation of ignorance, diseases, economical backwardness, and mainly, to strengthen the peace. Certainly, the Church can not be indifferent to these problems by its essence, and we see the efforts of some Churches to solve these problems."<sup>3</sup> Who are they in particular? Why, of course, those in the USSR. "In particular," he stresses, "there was held a conference of representatives of all religions in the USSR for cooperation and peace among nations, in July, this year, in Zagorsk."

No sooner was this said, immediately we are told: "We support and hope for a support of all the Christians the decisions of the Stockholm Conference on Vietnam, and we believe that the future Conference on European Security will be a success, as far as these two problems and the problem of settlement in the Middle East, arouse concern and trouble of those who understand and worry about the significance of human personality, justice and peace."<sup>4</sup> The slant of all this and more is that the Soviet Union itself is not responsible for Vietnam, the gravity of the Middle East problem, and the threat to Western Europe. These are ostensibly just self-engaging problems that must be settled peacefully. The fact is that in each case the Russian problem, involving the goal of world domination, basically underlies each of these problems.

Repeated experience has shown that when a Russian leader, Christian or otherwise, in the USSR makes "a fraternal appeal," at the very least be on guard. If you can't be guided by experience, then you deserve the consequences. After landing the otherwise irrelevant presentation with a few politico-economic generalizations—enough to indicate his anticipated position—the professor virtually concludes with this: "That is why we address the Christians of the United States particularly with a fraternal appeal to unite our efforts for making the part of the Christian in the struggle for maintenance and strengthening peace more significant."<sup>5</sup> As concerns the subject of "the consultation," this paper is almost completely worthless. Theologic rhetoric has its worthwhile place, but it can offer no concrete solution to the problem. A Russian willingness to allow inspection and neutral control for arms limitation and reduction would practically solve the problem. But such rhetoric is like the wind in the USSR. Moreover, the paper obviously shows the professor's hand when the misleading Stockholm Conference on Vietnam is involved. Peace in Vietnam would have been

realized several years ago if the major Russian material support had not been given to the totalitarian North Vietnamese aggressor. The professor calls for "solidarity" of all Christians, but on what practical terms? He intimates totalitarian Russian terms.

#### PEACEMAKING PATH OF THE RUSSIAN ORTHODOX CHURCH

The next paper by Bishop Juvenaly brings us closer to home as to the real line taken by the delegation and the dominant motives of the group. The bishop of Tula and Belyev, it will be recalled, is vice chairman of the department of foreign relations and the ostensible or nominal head of the delegation. The paper is a series of historical untruths and distortions that the bishop felt he could get away with since the usual American audience is either unfamiliar or indiscriminating when it comes to Russian history, whether religious or otherwise. The effect intended is the reception of a fantastic image of a church long-suffering and completely devoted to peace. Unless the institutional death of others is construed as peace, the paper is clearly deceitful and actually an insult to the American consultants, whether they realize it or not.

An overstatement of the year initiates the bishop's historical presentation when he begins with, "It is impossible to embrace in a comparatively short report the whole peacemaking path of the Holy Russian Church."<sup>6</sup> Of course, many in that church, leaders and faithful alike, have sincerely and courageously prayed for and sought a true Christian peace throughout the world. No one can deny this, nor is this the issue at hand. If realism has any meaning, certain salient facts must be squarely faced. One is the powerful fact that the Russian Orthodox Church, as an institution, has been a tool of the imperial state, whether white or red, and as such has been deeply involved in religious genocide, Russification, and the expansion of Russian imperial power. Two, during the centuries of the Third Rome mania, the institution scarcely contributed to "peace" with its view of Western Catholicism and Protestantism as representations of the anti-Christ. Third, the church and its monastic branches held for centuries vast lands in the empire and could have on a net basis done far more to advance social justice, peace, and the happiness of the people than it did. The last general fact to be borne in mind is that to the very present the Russian Orthodox Church is riddled with state security men whose prime purpose is to manipulate religion as an efficient Cold War weapon. All of these overall facts are conveniently set aside as the bishop offers both fiction and half-truths to his American listeners.

In writing this piece I cannot help but recall the words of Professor George Fedetov, my old brilliant teacher and Russian scholar on Russian ecclesiastical history, "Be patient with individuals from Russian society but always be on guard with those who identify it with the traditional state." This wisdom of Christian realism applies here fully. A few representative examples of the distortions indulged in by the bishop will show the depth of this wisdom.

At the very start, the American consultants are treated to this fiction: "Since the times of the Grand Duke Vladimir (X century) the Russian Orthodox Church participated in reconciliation service and believed these activities as being an essential part of the Church mission of salvation."<sup>7</sup> Now this poppycock, suggesting a form of religious Russian imperialism, is clearly contradicted by known fact. At the time of Vladimir there wasn't even any formal body known as the Russian Orthodox Church. There wasn't even a political body known as Russia, which came into being many centuries later. Rus was not Russia. But our imperialist-minded bishop, who doubtless is familiar with the controversy on this point, presents his state-

ment as one of definitive fact. He continues his fiction by saying, "It is known that the history of ancient Russia presented a grievous picture of independent principalities when during a long period it had no political unity." If he's talking about Muscovy, which is the origin of Russia, there is little need to quarrel with this statement. If he has in mind Rus and later Ukraine, as no doubt he does, the statement is nonsensical.

That we're dealing here with an ecclesiastic who, on the one hand, preaches fraternal "love" and "peace" (or more accurately, piece—and, on the other hand, fully—subscribes to official and forced Russian imperial historiography, can be seen from numerous other passages. For instance, "In the XIII century the Russian lands were invaded, first, by Swedes from the North West, then by German knights, and by the Tatars from the East."<sup>8</sup> What "Russian lands?" Lithuania, Ukraine, etc.? The bishop would be hard pressed to produce an original map for that and other countries, showing "Russia" or "Russian lands." On page after page, he identifies Russia, by which he obviously now means Russian Empire, with "our Motherland." Thus, in the service of the state, the Russian Orthodox Church in 1812 "supported the people's heroic deed of struggle with Napoleon" and the "Orthodox clergy widely participated personally in the defence of the Motherland in 1812."<sup>9</sup> This might have been commendable from the Russian point of view in resisting an invader, although carriers of the ideas of the French Revolution might also have transformed Russia into a more civilized state with long-run benefits to the Russian people and their church. From the non-Russian viewpoint, i.e. Lithuanian, Latvian, Ukrainian, etc., the unsuccessful Napoleonic endeavor was an historical tragedy. It meant their continued enslavement in the Russian Empire.

From a traditional American viewpoint, these so-called contributions to "peace" by the Russian Orthodox Church were contributions to the maintenance of despotic government, oppression of non-Russian nations, and the preservation of a tyrannical empire. Nowhere will you find in this or the other papers any reference to these crucial points or attempts by the Russian Orthodox Church to bring freedom, love and genuine peace to the subjugated non-Russian nations in the sprawling empire. Instead, as presented here, in "the war with the Germans started in 1914," the ROC served again the despotic state by taking "the most active part in the defence of the Motherland."<sup>10</sup> Again, in "the days of the WW II, the Russian Orthodox Church made everything necessary for the defence of the Soviet Motherland." For the majority non-Russian populations, both World Wars, tragic as they were, factually provided a political opportunity for manifold expressions toward national freedom and independence. The three Baltic countries managed to sustain their freedom—a word that is scarcely used in these papers—and flourished with it for two decades.

Pursuing the line of calculated vaguery, the bishop then stresses that "20 million lives have perished in that war" (World War II) and "it means that every tenth citizens of our country was killed in battlefields or tortured to death in the concentration camps."<sup>11</sup> The estimated figure is actually 25 million, and the factual and meaningful breakdown is between Russians and non-Russians who hailed from many countries in the imperial state of the USSR. USSR is no country; it is a forced state holding captive numerous countries and nations. The bishop evidently felt he could pan off the official propaganda on his unsuspecting audience and apparently did, but if you're a man of "peace," "love" and "Christianity," the credentials commence with truth first. For if truth is slighted, the others are just convenient nomers. Nowhere will the reader find in any of these papers any mention of the

Footnotes at end of speech.



Soviet Russian concentration camps which over three decades consumed lives far in excess of these deaths of World War II and easily dwarf Hitler's record before and during the war.

The remainder of the bishop's paper is a brazen indulgence in politics with interpretations slanted in favor of totalitarian Moscow. As every Christian well knows, sins of omission are at times graver than those of commission. Numerous German Christians spoke out against the barbarities of Nazism. We have yet to witness a Russian Orthodox leader condemn the far greater barbarities of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism. Instead, in this paper repeated quotations are given of the appeals made by the Russian Patriarch not only to believers of the church but also to "Christians all over the world." For example, in 1943, "The Orthodox Church fervently urges all the Christians to pray to the God . . . to give the final victory . . . in order to annihilate for ever the very memory of inhuman teaching of fascism." What of the darker deeds of Red fascism? Not a word. Another, in 1948, is an appeal by Patriarch Alexei to all the Christians of the world "to unite in a firm resoluteness to stand against all the initiatives and actions which are in contradiction to our Christian vocation and which try to make us, if we are not united, the tools of the evil forces."<sup>12</sup> What evil forces?—American imperialism, capitalist aggressors and the like? This union could be easily accomplished by courageous deeds rather than doublemeaning words. If, for example, the Patriarch had denounced Soviet Russian genocide of both the Ukrainian Orthodox and Catholic Churches, can there be any doubt about Christians the world over uniting with him in this action?

For this play on words let us consider just another quote. "So, for instance, at the III All-Union Conference of Champions of Peace held in Moscow in 1951, His Holiness, Patriarch Alexy on behalf of the Russian Orthodox Church supported the Appeal of the World Peace Council from February 23, 1951, about reduction of armaments, prohibition of all means for mass annihilation, about the end of the war in Korea and in other places, and about granting the right for self-determination to all the peoples, and about the Peace Pact."<sup>13</sup> As the record shows, the worst and almost exclusive violator of the right of self-determination sits in Moscow itself. Official Russian propaganda perverts reality by accusing others of the very crime it commits. A Christian specification of this would point with content to the numerous captive non-Russian nations in the USSR that are deprived of this right. Clearly, it is not enough for the bishop to conclude that "We, as Christians proceeding from our religious responsibility must promote the development of mutual understanding and co-operation of our countries in all possible fields . . ."<sup>14</sup> Religious responsibility, if it means anything, commences with truth. If intellectuals in the USSR have had the courage to face up to it in present circumstances, why have the spokesmen of ROC remained mute on this level?

#### THE SECRETARY PROPAGANDIZES

Really, the important member of the delegation was the secretary of the department of foreign relations of the Moscow Patriarchate. The secretaries in the Communist Parties, in the Republic governments, in Russian embassies, and on CP committees are always the cogs of the machine. So here, even with a sense of perfect equilibrium, Alexy Sergeevich Buyevsky's name appears fifth in the official list of nine. His rendition on the "Problem of Limitation of Nuclear Weapons and Anti-Ballistic Missile System" unquestionably reveals the hand of control, interweaving the prime interests of

the state and the empty theologic rhetoric of the Russian Orthodox Church as a tolerated institution. If the other papers left any doubt about the good intentions, motives and repressed feelings of their deliverers, a careful reading of this particular paper should have dispelled it completely.

In setting forth the propaganda of the Soviet Russian totalitarians, Buyevsky is actually not as subtle and discreet as one would expect. In parts his paper is crass and blunt, and spells out concretely what the other two papers pointed toward. It begins innocently enough with an enumeration of the main features of "contemporary militarism," such as costly allocations for arms resources, military blocs and so forth. Of course, the presenter fails to mention the truly militaristic character of his imperio-colonialist state since its very inception. With intellectualist overtones suggested by thirty-four footnotes, the paper than injects a few ecclesiastic quotes from Metropolitan Nikodim of Leningrad and Novgorod, and naturally cites "the late Pope of Peace John XXIII" and his "Pacem in Terris," all in the spirit of peace and against the "menace of atomic destruction of the world," which is a highly disputable fear in itself. By page three, after all the rhetorical amenities are completed, the political skids are fully and unabashedly greased up right to the end of the sixteen page dissertation which concludes with another high-sounding note of theologic rhetoric and a numerical posting of Luther-like theses.

The secretary immediately invokes the authority of A. N. Kosygin and his interview with the Japanese "Mainichi" correspondent and his view of the non-proliferation treaty as an "undoubtedly and great success of the proponents of disarmament," as "a contribution to the cause of universal peace and detente."<sup>15</sup> Kosygin, according to the secretary, underwrites "a prospective program for further development of the 'good-neighbour relations' which is the official policy of our country." Looking beyond the signing of the non-proliferation treaty, Buyevsky stresses "the removal of military bases from foreign territory." What a package deal! A close analysis of these elements shows something entirely different from this so-called trend toward disarmament. The non-proliferation treaty is in essence a species of confetti diplomacy and, from the Russian point of view, a form of nuclear potemkinism. Although the treaty has many defects and in no way contributes positively to disarmament, its values for Moscow are a near-monopoly of nuclear arms for itself in the Red Empire and the propaganda effect of appearing to seek peace. Next, behind this facade, Moscow is actually negating disarmament by shipping arms to all continents of the globe for revolutionary activity, particularly Asia, the Middle East, Africa, and Latin America. Lastly, on the fiction of "good-neighbour relations," one need only utter Czechoslovakia, not to review fifty years of successive aggression.

As though this isn't enough, our religious secretary states further that "we can appreciate the statements of the former U.S. President Lyndon Johnson concerning the cessation of bombardments in Vietnam, since despite their forced character they testify to the will for peace, for the end of the U.S. aggression in Vietnam and for the solution of the Vietnam problem by the people of the country without interference from abroad."<sup>16</sup> From this crass statement it would seem that the so-called religious secretary was working on the presumption that his American listeners, clerical and lay alike, were complete fools. The incontrovertible facts are that the aggression in Vietnam is exclusively Red totalitarian, that against this criminal action against the people of South Vietnam the American bombardments failed to go far enough toward a decisive victory, and that on the matter of

interference both Peiping and Moscow were over-involved in this Red aggression from the start. Indeed, the war in Vietnam would have been over four years ago if the heavy Russian and Red satrap support in arms hadn't flowed to Hanoi.

No sooner the fraudulent religious secretary made the above point, he then took a strong swipe against anti-communism. The paper reveals this gem: "Arms drive and the development of the ABM system are related to the corrupting influence of anti-communism which is an integral element of the imperialist policy. Since the establishment of a new social system in our country and up to date the imperialists have produced slanderous accusations discrediting our society, misinterpreting its intentions and distorting real facts. For example, an increasing might of the Socialist camp is treated as a threat to the welfare of the Western world."<sup>17</sup> Briefly, if a reader of these prevaricating remarks doesn't by now know the long record of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism since 1917, the long string of captive nations which it has created and victimized since then, well, he deserves to be hoodwinked by this brash fabrication. One of the favorite Russian techniques, which Goebbels learned and applied time and time again, is to repeat an untruth endlessly and in time the audience will begin to believe it as a truth. Not one but many Russian intellectuals and writers have characterized "Soviet society" as a "sick society," and the long record of Soviet Russian tyranny, genocide, militarism, slave labor and other barbarities more than justify this characterization. Indeed, without oversimplifying the matter, it can easily be argued that if the reality of Soviet Russian imperio-colonialism were non-existent, there would be no real threat to global peace from any source in the world, including Red China. Once you've waded through all the data, the problem is as simple as this.

There are further gems in this brash presentation which obviously assumed a basic gullibility, not to speak of other characteristics, on the part of the assembled religious listeners. The so-called secretary observes, "Distorting the principles of peaceful co-existence the Western political sinner is trying to interpret the peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union as 'a continuation of tsarist imperialist traditions,' as a policy of capture which uses the principle of peaceful co-existence in 'perfidious communist purposes' aimed at surrounding the 'civilized world' and making for the 'communist domination.'" He continues, "In terms of this interpretation average citizens in the West are made to think that anti-communist and anti-Soviet policy pursued by the USA and other Western countries is only the answer to 'a Soviet challenge.' . . . Under the guise of resistance against Communism many Western politicians consider war to be a political means and search for new versions of anti-communist strategy." The ersatz secretary then talks about Western "failures in the military intervention against Soviet Russia and in the Civil War," the peace "strategy of the Socialist camp" as "an alternative to the imperialist one," and that "Anti-Soviet slander becomes one of the means of anti-Communist propaganda." All of which leads to this theme song: "It is high time to cease slanderous accusations, to expose 'false prophets' in science who interpret real facts in such a way that they contribute to enmity and division of the mankind. For this purpose it is necessary to witness truth and estimate positive factors wherever they appear."<sup>18</sup>

Yes, by all means, let us witness the truth and appreciate the positive factors of the situation. The very statements of the make-believe secretary indicate in themselves the sensitivity with which his superiors react to the truths of the anti-communist argument

Footnotes at end of speech.

and criticism. Every one of his points can be devastatingly demolished. The notion of the "peace-loving policy of the Soviet Union" is misleading in the first instance. The policy is neither peace-loving nor of the Soviet Union. It is a typical Russian stroke of diplomatic potemkinism and is executed with equally typically deftness by the controlling Russian interest in Moscow.

In short, it is an old policy, preceding Lenin and well in keeping with "tsarist imperialist traditions"; it is a deceptive policy with perfidious pseudo-communist purposes and designed for communist domination. By allusion Buevsky is quite correct; as a first axiom in international politics, you never trust a totalitarian Russian politico. In this respect the historic Kazakh proverb applies—"Wherever you travel with a Russian, make sure you carry an ax." As for Western military intervention against Soviet Russia and in the Civil War—a thinthesis used by Stalin, Khrushchev and others—the so-called intervention was actually a minor presence of Western forces in various parts of an already vanished empire at the close of World War I. It had no definite political purpose or design, and was of threat to no one. Actually, it represented a grave historical error of omission, for it failed to permanently seal the demise of a centuries-old empire by supporting the many newly-established independent non-Russian states of Byelorussia, Ukraine, Georgia, Armenia and others. Had this been done, with knowledge and resolution, mankind would have been spared the tragic problems it faces today.

The remaining half of the pseudo-secretary's paper contains several truly comical statements. For example, to eliminate prejudices and enmity in the world, he unabashedly states "it is necessary to allay prejudices with respect to the Soviet foreign policy which really does not conceal any secret or hostile purposes." He could say this again, since Moscow has never made a secret of its goal to dominate the world. Then a series of quotes from President Roosevelt, some historian by the name of T. Bally, George Kennan, and a D. Flemming are drawn upon to buttress the general argument of the need for understanding the poor Russian totalitarians. The quotes are almost useless, having been abstracted out of context and interspersed with parenthesized phrases and excessively dotted separations.

Youth does not escape the secretary's notice. Referring to "the threat of nuclear annihilation" and its disturbing aspects, he says, "Young people of the present time realize this, that is why they are against social institutions of exploitation and oppression, against authoritarian capitalist economy, against fascist and imperialist policy, against class sociology."<sup>19</sup> This hogwash can be quickly dispensed with by simply recording the struggles of youth behind the Iron Curtain for sheer freedom above all. The threat has no meaning in terms of the mythical references made; its only relevant meaning is found in Soviet Russian strategy for world domination. The secretary's brilliant conclusion that the "reduction of nuclear weapons and ABM installations is a means for carrying out the aspirations of the youth as well as of those who are now above forty" scarcely requires comment. His further statement, "If one should speak of the guarantees necessary for the solution of this problem, first of all one should take into account the peace-loving policy pursued by the Soviet Union," is the height of rhetorical insolence.

To complete the comedy imported by the American "consultants," the obvious Russian propagandist cites Gromyko's declaration in July, 1968 of being ready to immediately sign a document prohibiting nuclear weapons. Aside from the deceptive political stance of this gesture and the habitual secretiveness of Russian arms production, what was not pointed out was the timed coincidence of this declaration with the 1968 Cap-

tive Nations Week observance. As in previous years, Moscow lost no time in its attempt to dwarf this international observance because it has been and is a deep thorn in the side of Soviet Russian strategy for world domination. Also, not by name but former Secretary of State Dulles is cursed for his "notorious strategy of 'the massive retaliation.'"<sup>20</sup> The "religious" representative even had some choice economic observations to make. For example, decrying the "integration of military and industrial circles" in the Free World, he holds that the "evidence for this is the instability of currency in the world capitalist system." Here, too, aside from the invalid association of data, one need only point to the patent inability of the ruble to measure up as an international currency, not to mention its thoroughly arbitrary value.

Finally, after having devoted most of his paper to political propaganda, Buevsky winds up with Biblical quotations and a Luther-like posting of theses. For the Kremlin mouthpiece "the most significant argument for a Christian is the words from the Holy Bible calling for beating the swords into ploughshares" and for "putting the sword back into its place." The only proper direction for the application of these time-worn admonitions is Moscow and Soviet Russia. The Luther-like theses are somewhat amateurish both in format and content. For example, point four maintains "The believers should consider the accumulation of nuclear weapons and the development of the ABM system contradictory to the religious principles of the social order and making for moral degradation, fear and isolation. Hence they should work for the limitation and the prohibition of nuclear weapons and ABM systems."<sup>21</sup> Just like that. Why nuclear weapons receive special mention in this context is not at all logically clear, though the "preacher's" motive is quite clear.

It should be evident from this analysis that the Russians are gaining considerable mileage in their use of religion as a cold war weapon. There is no limit to their propaganda temerity, the exercise of which reflects adversely on their inviting listeners. The judgment of these listeners is subject to considerable question, no matter how pure and commendable their motives. The effect of this type of consultation couldn't but harm Free World interests if it were generalized in use. Consultations are useful, but their productive conduct presupposes a level of knowledgeability which would place the counterparts on guard as to the depth and extent of the enemy's assault. And the enemy will use religion, as indeed any other discipline, to the maximum degree allowable. In this particular case, he literally went to town.

FOOTNOTES

- <sup>1</sup> Vasily Dmitrievich Sarychev, "Church and World Peace," p. 1.
- <sup>2</sup> Ibid. p. 2.
- <sup>3</sup> Ibid. p. 7.
- <sup>4</sup> Ibid. p. 8.
- <sup>5</sup> Ibid. p. 11.
- <sup>6</sup> Bishop Juvenaly, "Peacemaking Path of the Russian Orthodox Church," p. 1.
- <sup>7</sup> Ibid. p. 1.
- <sup>8</sup> Ibid. p. 2.
- <sup>9</sup> Ibid. p. 3.
- <sup>10</sup> Ibid. p. 4.
- <sup>11</sup> Ibid. p. 5.
- <sup>12</sup> Ibid. p. 6.
- <sup>13</sup> Ibid. p. 7.
- <sup>14</sup> Ibid. p. 12.
- <sup>15</sup> A. S. Buyevsky, "Problem of Limitation of Nuclear Weapons and Anti-Ballistic Missile System," p. 3.
- <sup>16</sup> Ibid. p. 4.
- <sup>17</sup> Ibid. p. 5.
- <sup>18</sup> Ibid. p. 6.
- <sup>19</sup> Ibid. p. 9.
- <sup>20</sup> Ibid. p. 10-11.
- <sup>21</sup> Ibid. p. 12.

A TRIBUTE TO GLEN LIPSCOMB

HON. CRAIG HOSMER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HOSMER. Mr. Speaker, each year, the California Congressional Recognition Program, Inc., issues a report on the performance of the California Members of Congress. Annually, the committee selects Members whose performance they believe is worthy of special recognition.

In reading the 1969 edition, I was pleased to note that the council selected for Special Commendation our late colleague, the Honorable Glenard P. Lipscomb. The report was written before Glen's untimely death. It noted his surgery and reported that he was back to work.

I especially enjoyed reading the council's tribute to Glen, and I would like to share it with the other Members of the Congress who held Glen in the same high regard that I did, personally and professionally.

The commendation follows:

HON. GLENARD P. LIPSCOMB, MEMBER OF CONGRESS, 24TH DISTRICT

Congressman Lipscomb has won an outstanding reputation for his work as ranking minority member of the vital Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations. He is regarded by his fellow Republicans as one of their leading spokesmen on all defense questions, and his statement of October 9 on the Administration's policies in Vietnam drew attention and praise from several quarters. He warned his colleagues that "the lives of American soldiers, the freedom of subjugation of the South Vietnamese people, and the preservation of the right of self-determination depend on whether the American people unite behind President Nixon's dual approach of Vietnamization and negotiation for restoring peace in Vietnam". He condemned the critics of the President's policies in the following statement:

"Some in our country would—unwittingly, I believe—undercut our President's efforts to achieve peace in Vietnam. Those who claim that the United States should unilaterally establish a formal and fixed timetable in Vietnam would remove the incentive for the enemy to negotiate in good faith. The momentum of the Vietnamization program would be disrupted by an arbitrary unilateral timetable. Such a timetable would fail to reflect the realities of the Vietnam economic and military conditions. More important, if we tell the Communists that we will pull out by a given date, they will need only to wait us out. This means, of course, that there would be no progress at the negotiating table. Carried to its logical conclusion, those who advocate what would amount to a surrender without terms should advocate bringing home our negotiators from Paris. Finally, an unrealistic timetable for withdrawal would jeopardize the lives of American troops left in Vietnam, since they would be in danger of being overwhelmed by larger enemy forces."

In 1969, as in previous years, Mr. Lipscomb carried a major burden of the extremely complex work of the Subcommittee on Department of Defense Appropriations. As usual, he took a leading part in the interrogation of official witnesses before the Subcommittee on many subjects, including ROTC programs, National Guard training and equipment, military pay raises, improved standards for intelligence personnel, "juggling" of funds and deficiency reports, management studies, and the B-52 Program. As



in the Ninetieth Congress, Mr. Lipscomb urged restrictions on trade with Communist nations and cautioned against aiding in building up the economic base on which Soviet military power depends. He warned that much recent criticism of American defense efforts has completely ignored the security threat posed by growing Russian armament and missile capabilities. In July, he welcomed the Administration's establishment of a "Blue Ribbon" panel to conduct an independent study of the Department of Defense. He urged the panel to undertake a rigorous review of the defense structure and to recommend ways to eliminate wasteful practices.

As ranking minority member of the Committee on House Administration, Mr. Lipscomb has taken a leading role in urging a comprehensive review and overhaul of election laws to update the procedures governing Federal nomination and election processes. He is the author of a bill which would create a 5-member bipartisan Federal Election Commission to receive reports and statements regarding campaign contributions and expenditures. The Commission would have full power to enforce the law, issue reports, and make information available to the public, not only with regard to general and special elections, but also primaries, conventions, party caucuses and Presidential preference primaries. Members of the House and Senate and all candidates would be required to disclose gifts of more than \$100, and personal use of the proceeds of testimonial dinners by Senators, Representatives, and Congressional candidates would be prohibited. Mr. Lipscomb's bill appears to take account of modern needs and present realities in political fund raising and campaign financing. He explained that the purpose of the legislation is "to make reporting of contributions and expenditures a present and realistic factor in the decision-making process of the voter" and to establish the principle of "full and timely public disclosure".

Several areas of the Twenty-fourth District, including Glendora, Azusa, San Dimas and Mt. Baldy Village, were hard-hit by the January and February storms. Mr. Lipscomb co-sponsored the California Disaster Relief Act and testified before the Subcommittee on Flood Control of the House Committee on Public Works urging authorization of the San Gabriel River Watershed-Western Area Project to reduce future storm damage in the area above Glendora and Azusa.

Shortly before the summer recess, Mr.

Lipscomb entered the hospital for major surgery. He returned to work in the fall and has continued to make a good recovery.

NOTE TO PMG: POD'S ZIP IS NOT PDQ

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, March 3, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article written by Mr. Tom Warden, editor of the Gasconade County Republican in Owensville, Mo.

I believe the editor has done an excellent job of describing the problems encountered by so many, and I am sure we are all in agreement that this is an area in which there is plenty of room for improvement.

The article follows:

NOTE TO PMG: POD'S ZIP IS NOT PDQ

Most everyone, at some time or another, writes an indignant letter to a public official . . . not so much in the belief that it will be read, but for the mental relief enjoyed from letting off some steam.

For several years now, I've wanted to write a letter to the Postmaster General. For three reasons, I didn't. One is that he probably wouldn't read it. Two is that I wouldn't enjoy any mental relief; and three is that it would probably get lost in the mails anyway.

When I do write that letter—and after the latest new rule manufactured by that big paper mill in D.C., I just might—my first words will be about that miracle-working, wondrous Zip Code.

I just can't forget when the Zip Code first came out. We hurried to add Zip Codes to all addresses on our mailing list because the Post Office Department said the Zip system and a new sectional center distribution system would change things greatly.

And change things it did! Greatly, verily.

In pre-Zip code days our newspapers, mailed here Thursday, reached Rosebud—six statute miles to the east—the next day.

The Zip Code did change all that.

Now, that same newspaper mailed Thursday, travels some 60 miles to Jefferson City; another 100 or so miles to St. Louis; and then about 80 miles back to Rosebud. Sometimes it

makes the round trip the next day, Friday. Sometimes it is Saturday . . . or the next Monday.

That's not really the point. It is those 244 extra miles—that we as taxpayers and mail patrons must finance—that really irks me.

Dear readers, do not complain to us when your newspaper does not arrive as usual. It is mailed here faithfully every Thursday . . . sometimes earlier because of holidays. Write the Postmaster General.

There are a few other things which wrought great dissatisfaction upon my brain, your honor Mr. Postmaster General sir.

Newspapers must fill out a mailing form, detailing number of copies to various zones, their weight and percentage of advertising so the post office knows how much to charge us. This service by the editor, by the way, is free of charge.

Weights formerly were figured by utilizing the weight of a single copy carried two digits. Apparently, such simple arithmetic did not take enough time, so some mickey mouse club member in the POD decided it must be carried six digits. For many newspapermen—not acquainted with such depths of mathematics—that meant buying a new seven-digit adding machine.

And now to compound what was a relatively simple chore, a new rule states that the division is to be written upon the applicable newspaper—not via adding machine—so the POD, like the first grade math teacher, can see if our division is correct. They don't care what the answer is . . . they want to see how we arrive at it!

There is, in fact, so much of this mickey mouse busy work that it cannot be itemized here lest more pages increase the cost of delivery.

It is my firm belief that these kindergarten rules do no more than to establish another section in the POD sectional centers where they can double-check our arithmetic!

Let me state here that we have sympathy for the postmasters, postal clerks and letter carriers who must live with such a system. They are only doing a job.

One more complaint, Mr. Postmaster General. The next time you ship pre-stamped envelopes for use by our commercial printing department, send them via United Parcel Service. Our last order was shipped about a month ago and apparently has been lost in the mails.

I do not know who invents rules in the Post Office Department. But I hereby volunteer to buy him a tinker-toy set to keep his mind otherwise occupied, that he may leave alone what was once a pretty good system.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES—Wednesday, March 4, 1970

The House met at 12 o'clock noon. The Chaplain, Rev. Edward G. Latch, D.D., offered the following prayer:

*Why art thou cast down, O my soul? and why art thou disquieted within me? Hope thou in God.—Psalm 42: 5.*

O Thou whose presence underlies all that we do, whose power overarches all that we say, and whose peace surrounds all that we think, we bow at the shrine our fathers founded and lift our spirits unto Thee in prayer. As we offer unto Thee the devotion of our hearts, may the fruits of Thy spirit—love and joy, gentleness and goodness, patience and peace—come to new life within us.

We pray for our country and for our people in every section of our land. May the hungry be fed, the ignorant receive knowledge, the fearful find faith, and the weary come to rest at eventide.

Grant that we may do all we can that children be raised to walk in right and good paths, that youth discover high ideals for clean and creative living, and that adults in body become adults in mind.

Abundantly bless our President, our Speaker, Members of Congress, and direct them in all Thy ways—to the glory of Thy holy name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Arrington, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of

the House to a bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 2701. An act to establish a Commission on Population Growth and the American Future.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 3427. An act to increase the authorization for appropriation for continuing work in the Missouri River Basin by the Secretary of the Interior.

APPOINTMENT AS MEMBERS OF BOARD OF VISITORS, U.S. COAST GUARD ACADEMY, 1970

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication: