

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

FIGHTING INFLATION: MASS BRIEFINGS ARE NOT ENOUGH; IT IS TIME TO GET TOUGH ON PRICES AND WAGES

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, a look ahead to 1970 indicates that it will be a painful year for the American economy. The battle against inflation is far from won. The administration has limited its attack to tight monetary policy coupled with continuation of the income tax surcharge. This approach is now undergoing its sternest test. The prospects for success are not bright.

The only clear effect of the tight money policy so far has been the most extraordinary rise in interest rates in our Nation's history. These high rates have proven a severe blow to specific segments of the economy—housing and the timber industry, small business, farming.

The darkest predictions made earlier this year for a slump in the housing industry are transpiring. The rate of new starts is down by more than 20 percent from last spring, and still declining.

Beyond high interest rates, we still have rising prices, moving upward at the rate of 5 percent a year. The administration points to a number of economic indicators that it says show that the rate of inflation is slowing down. But the price of food or a new car continues to rise too rapidly. Until this trend reverses, we are experiencing unacceptable inflation. Many economists expect that prices will increase next year at only a slightly reduced rate.

Wages—the companion to prices on the inflationary spiral—are also on the increase. The cost per unit of work in American industry is up more than 7 percent this year compared to 1968. Labor contracts in such major industries as autos and construction expire next year and must be renegotiated. It is safe to assume that the unions involved will press for substantial wage increases.

The only other visible change in the economic picture, in fact, is the growth of unemployment. Now pushing toward a 4-percent level, unemployment will almost certainly go higher next year.

On top of all this, the administration is persistently demanding that the tax surcharge be renewed, calling it a necessary weapon if we are to beat inflation. It wants the surcharge continued at a 5-percent level for the first 6 months of next year. Already there is talk within the administration about the possible need to extend the surcharge even longer.

I have been skeptical about the worth of the surcharge as an anti-inflationary device. I voted against the 10-percent surcharge extension last summer, and I am opposed to the inclusion of the 5-percent surcharge in the tax reform bill.

I was therefore surprised only by the source the other day to read that my skepticism is shared by a top administration economist, Herbert Stein, of the Council of Economic Advisers. At the close of these remarks, I am including a copy of Mr. Stein's comments on the surcharge.

For the reasons I have mentioned, I am concerned that we are headed for deeper economic trouble. Instead of an end to inflation, we may see it continue unabated. Or unemployment may skyrocket and we will drop into a recession. Or worst of all, we may get both at once.

There is not much time left to avoid these very real possibilities. I am urging that the administration introduce a new flexibility into its present inflation policy, relying less completely on tight money. In addition, the administration must get tough with business and labor about price and wage increases. Mass briefings encouraging restraint are not adequate. The situation is urgent enough to give serious consideration to wage and price guidelines.

The economy is at the crossroads. We face rough going in any case. It would be tragic, however, to discover next year that all the months of restriction and sacrifice were in vain.

The following is Herbert Stein's address, mentioned above, given before the Tax Institute of America Symposium at Princeton, N.J.:

TAXES, STABILITY AND GROWTH

(By Herbert Stein)

There is in the government an interagency committee called the Troika, comprising the Treasury, the Bureau of the Budget and the Council of Economic Advisers. A short-hand description of the division of labor among the three agencies is that the Treasury has the taxes, the Budget Bureau has the expenditures and the Council of Economic Advisers has the deficit or, rarely as at present, the surplus. Recognizing this role I am going to talk about the relation between taxes and expenditures, rather than about the specific form of the tax system. That is, I am going to talk about how high taxes should be, especially from the standpoint of the stability and growth of the economy.

About twenty-three years ago I gave a talk on approximately the same subject I am discussing today, at a meeting of the National Tax Association. Probably no one in this audience was present then, and surely no one remembers. So it would be convenient for me to give the speech again. However, I unfortunately cannot. That is not because I have learned so much since then but because I have unlearned so much. I started, I think, with relatively modest ambition for the contribution of tax policy to economic stability and growth, especially to stability. But after two decades it seems to me that even these modest ambitions were excessive and we shall have to settle for an even lower level of folly-avoidance.

At an earlier date we could believe that a policy like the following would put little strain on our political or economic competence. We would set tax rates so that they would yield a constant moderate budget surplus when the economy was operating at high employment. In the event of a serious, confidently-forecast departure from the

high-employment condition we would make a temporary change of tax rates—down for recessions and up for inflations.

This policy was believed to have a number of advantages. By keeping the relation between receipts and expenditures constant most of the time we would keep the budget from becoming an unstabilizing force, sometimes pushing in an inflationary direction and sometimes in a deflationary direction. By requiring taxes to be kept in line with expenditures we would enforce a certain discipline on the expenditure decisions. The surplus that would be generated at high employment would contribute to rapid economic growth. Reduction of the government debt would increase the funds available for private investment by those who had held the debt. Moreover, the program would retain as an emergency option the possibility of a temporary change in tax rates to counter a serious recession or inflation. However, these would presumably be required infrequently if at all, and their utility would not depend on a very high degree of success in economic forecasting since they would be reserved for the cases of clear need.

In the course of the years experience has revealed many difficulties in this policy prescription.

Although the policy was intended to minimize the need for changes in tax rates it still would require a change if the rate of growth of expenditures departed significantly from the rate of growth of the yield of the existing tax system. This has proved very difficult to get in a timely fashion and appropriate amount. Given the existing and then expected rates of expenditure, the policy would have called for tax reduction in 1960, but we didn't get that until 1964. The policy would have required in 1966 the tax increase we finally got in 1968.

The problem is not only to get timely tax changes. It is also to avoid untimely tax changes. For example, on any reasonable expectation of what Federal expenditures will be, or of what Congress intends them to be, 1972 and 1973 will not be good years for tax reduction. But we are apparently about to decide on substantial tax reductions for those years.

This difficulty of getting the tax action or inaction the policy calls for is not accidental. Neither is it, I think, the result of rejection by Presidents or Congresses of the idea that there ought to be a fairly stable relation between receipts and expenditures. The simple fact is that Presidents and Congresses have wanted other things more. They have wanted to have their way about spending programs or tax structure or simply to avoid the onus of raising taxes or reap the credit for cutting them. These are not things that politicians are likely to surrender easily.

The policy prescription outlined above placed considerable reliance on the effectiveness of a temporary tax change as a way of restraining or stimulating the economy in the event of serious inflation or recession. However, subsequent analysis suggested that a temporary tax change would have little effect on private spending, by either businesses or households. This view has apparently been confirmed by experience with the temporary tax surcharge enacted in 1968. The rise of business investment which followed the enactment of the surcharge was so big that one can hardly expect to detect any repressive effect of the surcharge on the corporate profits tax. Microscopic analysis may yet discover some effect of the surcharge on consumption. But in any case we are going to have to say that the effect was small and late.

In fact, the final analysis of the 1968 episode may yet reveal that the net effect of

the surcharge was inflationary. Evidently the enactment of the surcharge helped to convince the Federal Reserve that mid-1968 was a good time for monetary expansion. The inflationary effect of this outweighed whatever anti-inflationary effect the surcharge had. A similar consideration is relevant to the decision to continue the surcharge for the second half of calendar 1969 and the first half of 1970. There was a danger that the shift in the fiscal position attendant upon the expiration of the surcharge would convince the Federal Reserve of the need for a degree of monetary restriction that would turn out to be excessive. Yet this particular interrelationship between fiscal and monetary policy is surely not a good continuing basis of operation. We should be able to find a more efficient way of reaching a desirable monetary policy than by using massive tax charges as signals.

The earlier version of policy counted on the maintenance of a budget surplus as the government's contribution to the supply of savings and through that to economic growth. But it now appears that the political process abhors a surplus. We may from time to time generate a surplus accidentally and unnoticed. However, the argument that expenditure increases or tax reductions should be held back in order deliberately to create a surplus does not carry much weight. Economists have disabused the public of the idea that a deficit is a sin, an idea on which no one acted very much for a long time anyway. They have noted yet persuaded the public that a surplus is anything more than a useless ornament on a budget, which can be given up whenever it is inconvenient to keep it.

Moreover, the case for a surplus of any particular size is difficult to make. The difficulty is compounded by the variability in the composition and definition of the expenditure side of the budget. We start with the proposition that we need a surplus as an addition to the private savings available to finance investment. The surplus should be big enough so that when added to private saving it will finance the desired investment. However, this ignores the amount of investment that is done directly through the budget, in the form of Federal spending or lending. The amount of investment in the economy is equal to private savings plus the budget surplus plus the amount of investment in the budget. A decision on the proper side of the surplus should then depend on the amount of investment that is in the budget. Even if we concentrate on private investment we must recognize that there is a good deal of private investment financed within the budget, mainly by loans and largely for housing and related activities. Moreover the amount of such financing in the budget is quite variable, not only as a result of changes in real programs but also as a result of changes in legal forms and in the definition of the budget. For example, when FNMA became private the amount of private financing in the budget was substantially reduced. Thus, the appropriate size of the surplus depends on the composition and definition of the budget.

The foregoing rationale for determining the size of the budget surplus depends on our being able to reach some opinion about the desirable rate of investment. Without that it seems to me everything we might say about the size of the surplus, and therefore about the level of taxes, is arbitrary. We are not used to thinking in these terms, even though they are the terms in which the question of the surplus was classically discussed. This is a large part of the reason for the surplus appearing to be a mere ornament in the budget.

The problem of defining the budget, to which I have already referred, is also relevant to the use of taxation as a discipline on expenditures. The idea is that if we require

expenditure increases to be matched by tax increases, the decision-makers will not be inclined to increase expenditures unless the value of doing so is great. There is a good deal to this. But imposing this requirement, or a ceiling on expenditures in some other way, also creates a strong incentive to get government programs financed outside the budget. A great deal of this has been done in recent years of budgetary stringency. The disciplinary effect of the limitation on budget expenditures is not entirely nullified by this. But there is a great deal of leakage. Moreover, the leakage is uneven, all programs not being equally able to get outside the budget. This causes a distortion in the pattern of spending.

I have spent a good many minutes here explaining why I am not encouraged about our ability to determine what the proper level of taxation is or to get it if we could determine it. Still decisions will be made and an attempt must be made to influence those decisions, if only by dragging one's heels and grumbling over the course of events. It should be clear enough that I don't see any simple rules that are satisfactory or enforceable, and I don't think we are prepared to promulgate sophisticated rules. But a few things may be said about the directions in which we should lean.

Prudence suggests that we should try to avoid large swings in the budget surplus or deficit position. On the whole present opinion assigns less destabilizing significance to such swings than was formerly expected, and some would assign a zero weight. But still the more extreme versions of this new view are unproven, and it would be rash to act as if we could absorb large abrupt changes in the fiscal position without risking inflationary or deflationary consequences.

At the same time, we should not allow ourselves to be frightened by small changes which, with almost any conceivable procedure, are inevitably anyway. I have the impression that many people now see a magical significance in a shift of a few billion dollars in the budget position, especially if the shift crosses the line between surplus and deficit. In a trillion dollar economy this is hard to understand, especially after our recent experience with the limited significance of the budget shift between a \$25 billion deficit in fiscal 1968 and a \$3 billion surplus in fiscal 1969. Preoccupation with small changes in the budget position leads to bad forecasts by the private economy and bad policy by the government.

To avoid large shifts in the budget position we shall have to rely primarily on stabilizing the rate of growth of expenditures so that it keeps pace, approximately, with the growth of the revenues from the existing tax system—as it will be after the legislation now pending is enacted. I expect that this legislation will satisfy the hunger for tax reduction for a while and that no one will want to open the Pandora's Box of tax reform for some time. On the other hand, barring a crisis, there is no taste for tax increases. So for some years we will have to tailor our expenditures to the existing tax system.

After a while we may have a freer choice about the levels of both revenues and expenditures. The revenue decision should then be made with a view to our longer-range plans and ambitions, with respect not only to government expenditures but also to private consumption and investment. Neither the Administration nor the Congress was prepared to do this in 1969. However, in the Administration we have been focusing a great deal of attention on the problem of laying out the claims on the national product for several years ahead and specifying the tax requirements for achieving whatever allocation of the national output is chosen. I would hope that by the next time we can make a major tax decision this kind of in-

formation and this way of looking at things will help to guide the outcome.

One implication of regarding the tax and budget problem as a problem of allocating the national output is that taxes serve to finance not only government expenditures but also the desired excess, if any, of private investment over private savings. Attention has been directed to this fact by the existence of a national housing goal, incorporated in legislation, for the construction of 26 million houses in a decade. Except insofar as these houses are directly financed through the Federal budget, they will have to be financed through private savings and the Federal surplus. Our preliminary calculations suggest that this will require a very large surplus. One consequence is that the advocates of housing, within the Administration and to some extent outside it, have become strong supporters of a budget surplus.

The point about housing is illustrative only. It does, however, suggest the possibility of putting some real content into the claim of the budget surplus as a use for the Federal revenue. It also suggests that if this is done support for a surplus will emerge to compete with the ever-present claims for increased expenditures and reduced taxes.

Recent experience warns against relying on quick temporary tax changes to cope either with expenditure variations or with changes in the economy. We are unlikely to get them in time and they are unlikely to be very effective if obtained, at least with the present tax system. One can conceive of kinds of taxes that might be varied more effectively. For example, changes in the rate of a value-added tax or general sales tax might cause some acceleration or deferral of expenditures. However, this is not sufficient reason for installing such a tax if there are not other important reasons.

We have a great deal of learning to do before we are prepared to give a good answer to the question, how high should taxes be. We have a good deal of education to do before we can get that answer, once learned, translated into action. However, I think there is a hopeful sign in the fact that we are awakening from our earlier illusion that we knew the answer.

DANGEROUS TOYS AT CHRISTMAS-TIME

HON. JAMES G. O'HARA

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. O'HARA. Mr. Speaker, last week I pointed out that unwary parents may unknowingly buy dangerous toys for their children in the mistaken belief that as a result of passage of the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act all unsafe toys have been taken off the store shelves.

This, of course, is a false assumption.

The Child Protection and Toy Safety Act does not go into effect until January 5, 60 days after its signing by the President.

Until that time, parents are on their own. There is no governmental protection offered this Christmastime against toys which pose an electrical, heat, or mechanical hazard to children.

This, I believe, was not the intention of the Congress. The Child Protection and Toy Safety Act, as approved by the Senate in June, included the provision that it was to take effect 60 days after its signing by the President.

When the House passed its version of this legislation on September 4, many of us assumed that the differences would be quickly resolved in conference and the bill would be approved in time for its provisions to be in effect during the Christmas shopping season when toy purchasing is heaviest. However, the conference committee did not agree on the bill until late October and it was not signed by the President until November 6.

Mr. Speaker, in order to offer our children the protection of the act this Christmas, 18 Members of the House last week introduced a joint resolution providing that the Child Protection and Toy Safety Act take effect immediately.

Some might argue that even if this resolution were passed and the act became effective before Christmas, we could not assure that all unsafe toys would be removed from sale.

This is true. In fact, whenever the act takes effect, there will still be unsafe toys on the market.

But this act does provide a mechanism for removing hazardous toys. And this mechanism is not operating now.

There are toys now on the market which have been identified as hazardous by the National Product Safety Commission.

At this moment, nobody has the authority to order them off the store shelves.

The Child Protection and Toy Safety Act will—when it takes effect—authorize the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to prohibit the sale of these toys.

This resolution would give him this power now.

Unsafe toys will still be purchased. Parents must remain alert. But if as a result of this resolution but one dangerous toy is removed from sale, and one child is saved from a fatal or maiming injury this Christmas, it will have been well worth the effort.

Mr. Speaker, the New York Times recently discussed the problem of toy safety in an article "Toy Safety Is Added to Santa's Woes." I include that article in the RECORD:

TOY SAFETY IS ADDED TO SANTA'S WOES
(By Peter Millones)

The adult world has begun its holiday trek to the toy counters, with the difficult task of selecting gifts from objects that go ma-ma, bang, boom, whizz and whir.

The emphasis on toys that are educational as well as entertaining has made choosing harder for many adults, as has the continuing concern over war toys and their affect on children.

This year, an additional factor is attracting widespread attention—the safety of some toys.

Two weeks ago, President Nixon signed a bill that gives the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare the right to ban the sales of toys for children that present electrical, mechanical or heat hazards.

This enlarged the powers of the Federal Government, which already could ban toys that were too easily flammable, too highly pressurized or chemically dangerous. But the new legislation does not take affect until early January.

DANGEROUS TOYS CITED

"This Christmas the public is on its own," is the way the National Commission on Product Safety puts it.

The commission, set up during the Johnson Administration, has been investigating the safety of various products, including toys, and has found items of considerable potential danger, especially to children.

After hearing earlier this year, the commission showed examples of some toys that had been injurious or lethal to children. These included:

A child's stove that produced temperatures of 660 degrees Fahrenheit in the oven and 300 degrees on the top.

A bazooka gun that made a loud noise when fired and could permanently affect a child's hearing.

A plastic doll for infants that contained a hair ribbon that when pulled out, exposed a dangerous pin-like protrusion.

A slingshot with a missile whose razor-sharp tip was enclosed in a flimsy plastic sheath.

Presumably these and other toys with equally obvious harmful potential are removed from the market once the dangers are called to the attention of manufacturers and distributors. But since some of the toys did not violate any existing law, they or similar playthings could be on store shelves.

A more difficult problem are the toys that do not appear to be dangerous, but when given a tug or slam by a child easily break and expose sharp points or cutting edges. Other misuses could also easily pose a danger.

For example, the national commission found a rather harmless looking blow-gun was, in fact, dangerous because children tended to put the wrong end of the gun in their mouths and ingested the darts that it fired.

Safety experts advise adults to avoid toys with sharp edges and protrusions, although the age of the child and the normal way the toy is used are factors.

The commission on products safety has recommended that the Government pretest toys for safety, much as it does with drugs, before allowing them on the market. But Congress did not accept that recommendation in its latest legislation.

The toy industry, with sales of about \$2-billion a year, did not generally oppose the widening of Government policing of the industry, but it did object to Government pretesting of products.

Once an adult has satisfied himself on toy safety, educational and entertainment value, he will find that toys, like virtually everything else, cost more this year.

One unusual factor discovered by Sidney Margolius, a consumer writer and adviser to labor unions, is that "some manufacturers have adopted the trick employed in the food business—they have kept the prices the same, but have reduced the sizes or number of pieces they give you."

He noted that one construction set had gone down in price, but "you get 165 pieces instead of 208."

"In the toy food-mix sets, a 130-piece product that was \$8.99 is now \$9.99 for 125 pieces," he notes. "A set that was \$4.99 last year is the same price, but now you get 42 pieces instead of 45."

Mr. Margolius adds: "Some of the dolls not only have gone up in price, but have also shrunk in size." He found one popular doll that went up \$1 and was reduced in size an inch.

His advice to union members, which is not likely to sit well with the industry, is: "As before, we suggest not buying early. Price cuts get bigger as Christmas draws closer."

A COLLEGE PRESIDENT MAKES HIS COVENANT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the November 23 issue of the Chicago Tribune carried excerpts from the inaugural address delivered recently by Dr. Thaddeus Seymour, who this year assumed the office of president of Wabash College at Crawfordsville, Ind. For a number of reasons the inaugural remarks of Dr. Seymour are worthy of our attention and refreshing, to say the least. Associated with larger institutions of learning during his academic career, the new president of Wabash has retained time-tested values which have been forsaken by others in the educational field. For the past 10 years he had been dean of Dartmouth College, having earned his bachelor's degree at the University of California at Berkeley and his doctorate in English at the University of North Carolina.

In fair but firm terms Dr. Seymour promised that disruptive tactics on campus, experienced by too many institutions recently, would not be tolerated at Wabash:

There is no place here for any student or any faculty member who is unwilling or unable to accept the principle of free expression in the context of community order.

Referring to the trend toward increased dependency on public funds, he noted that:

Increasingly we see bills proposed which would pull on the invisible strings attached to government money. I am proud that we have stood on our own feet, refusing to trade private independence for public dollars.

And finally, expounding on a theme expressed too infrequently these days, Dr. Seymour stated:

Let me come right out and say it: The liberal arts campus can be accused of being too liberal, a form of political coercion which denies the student a chance to choose, to hammer out his own beliefs. To assure a fair exposure to new and old ideas, to guarantee balance, we must always include on our faculty, as a matter of policy, distinguished teachers who stand for limited government, a free market, and private property.

It is certainly to be hoped that more educators of similar persuasions follow Dr. Thaddeus Seymour to positions of leadership on the campuses of our educational institutions.

I insert at this point excerpts from his recent inaugural address in the RECORD: [From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 23, 1969] A COLLEGE PRESIDENT MAKES HIS COVENANT (By Thaddeus Seymour)

This is the time for me to covenant with the Wabash community, to tell you where I stand, what I believe, and what I aspire to for Wabash college in the decade of the '70s and beyond. My beliefs and my aspirations can be set forth together in a simple, declarative sentence. I want to see Wabash continue to excel as a small, independent,

undergraduate, liberal arts college for men. . . .

No single change has strained our national purpose more than the breakdown of community identity and participation, whether in the quality of neighborhood life, in national and local government, or in our great social and economic institutions. Empty anonymity has sapped individual will and self-respect; has produced alienation, disjointedness, and apparent aimlessness at every level of American life. At Wabash we have a unique tradition of community, and we have the opportunity to enrich our own experience by sharing it together. . . . We begin by remaining a small college. I agree with the sentimental formula that our student body should never be larger than the capacity of this chapel.

But community is not measured by mere numbers. I aspire to a renewed spirit of participation which engages all elements of the college, students, faculty, staff alumni and trustees, in a collaborative effort to shape the quality of our future life together. I believe that we become a true community when all have a stake in the place. . . .

Wabash has always steered an independent course. It is basic to our heritage that we were established free of church or governmental control. Today we can see the wisdom of this policy, as private institutions become increasingly independent on public funds and thereby subject to public regulation. Increasingly we see bills proposed which would pull on the invisible strings attached to government money. I am proud that we have stood on our own feet, refusing to trade private independence for public dollars.

This year there are 7 million students on American campuses; one study conservatively predicts 14 million by 1985. Sheer force of numbers has produced an educational process which is more process than educational. At the same time, too much professional concern, what I can only call the "graduate school mentality," has promoted the concept of "publish or perish." It has been effective, creative classroom teaching which has perished in the process. Not so at Wabash. I do not need to tell this audience how the Wabash faculty daily demonstrates its commitment to the intellectual and personal development of the individual. The willingness of our teachers to invest themselves in the lives of their students is found in the close relationship, often close friendship, of students and faculty members both in and out of the classroom. We must preserve and promote this undergraduate spirit, for it is the real justification for our size and the case for our independence. . . .

Our society is best led by men of comprehensive understanding and vision, men with a broad exposure to the substance and method of the sciences, humanities, and the social sciences. As the needs of our society become more complex and specialized, men must more than ever before develop an outlook which leads them to ask not simply "How?" but "Why?" Our concern must always be not merely with what a man shall know, but with what a man shall become. . . . We must always stay loyal to the goal of the liberal arts—to liberate minds and to set men free. . . .

To be truly free, to offer the student a free and fair exposure to all points of view, we must live by a clearly articulated policy that our faculty and curriculum will fairly represent all political and economic points of view. Let men come right out and say it: The liberal arts campus can be accused of being too liberal, a form of political coercion which denies the student a chance to choose, to hammer out his own beliefs. To assure a fair exposure to new and old ideas, to guarantee balance, we must always include on our faculty, as a matter of policy, distin-

guished teachers who stand for limited government, a free market, and private property.

Free inquiry requires a free forum. I count it my most solemn duty to assure you and future generations at Wabash that you will be free to hear all points of view and that you will be free to speak and write within the bounds of decency on any subject without abridgment. I will defend that freedom. At the same time, I stand unambiguously opposed to any act which denies the right of any person to speak or to be heard, to listen and not to listen, to go about the orderly process of pursuing his education. . . . Wabash will continue to respect orderly processes. There is no place here for any student or any faculty member who is unwilling or unable to accept the principle of free expression in the context of community order. . . .

I believe in the positive values of learning in an environment of men. I am the product of such an experience myself, and for the last 15 years I have watched good men flourish in that setting at Dartmouth. At its best, the male community develops self-sufficiency thru independence, stretches with competitiveness, and binds men in fellowship.

So there you have it. I believe in Wabash. Some places are not as good as they claim to be; Wabash is a much greater place that it lets on. I believe it with all my heart, and I am anxious to get on with the job. I ask God's help and yours.

REPRESENTATIVE DON FRASER SPEAKS ON THE AMERICAN INDIAN IN TODAY'S WORLD

HON. ROBERT W. KASTENMEIER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. KASTENMEIER. Mr. Speaker, American Indians want the right to be Indians, to preserve their tribal identities and tribal lands, to make their own decisions and to have a say about their destiny.

One of the leading congressional advocates of a policy of Indian self-determination is my good friend and distinguished colleague, Congressman DON FRASER of Minnesota, who has long been interested in improving the social and economic conditions of the American Indian. Congressman FRASER believes, as I do, that through a policy of self-determination, with Indian participation at every level, ways will be found to better the existence of the Nation's 600,000 Indians, to improve their health, their education, their economic conditions, both on and off the reservation and without destroying their identity as Indians.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following speech delivered by Congressman FRASER on today's American Indian before the 13th Annual Minnesota AFL-CIO Institute on Human Relations on November 2. This year's institute theme was "The Indian in Today's World":

"THE AMERICAN INDIAN IN TODAY'S WORLD"

(By Representative DONALD M. FRASER)

It is a pleasure for me to be here today with so many old friends. This is an important week in Minneapolis for Indian affairs. First, the National Conference on Indian

Education and Now this Thirteenth Annual AFL-CIO Institute on Human Relations with its theme "The Indian in Today's World."

I want to commend the Minnesota labor movement for its leadership in focusing attention on the needs and concerns of American Indians. I know that the Minnesota Labor Committee for Human Rights, under the leadership of its executive director Lou Lerman, was involved in Indian affairs long before many of the rest of us were actively concerned about this issue.

Today's conference is particularly timely because we are now in the middle of a new period of Indian awareness—especially in Minnesota. I say this for myself as a public official with 7 years experience in the U.S. Congress and 8 years experience, before that, in the Minnesota state legislature. Somehow it was always too easy for us not to think very much about Indians before. For the most part, Indian people in Minnesota weren't very visible. We didn't hear from them very much and, besides, Indian problems were something for the BIA to worry about—not us.

But all that is changing. Indian people are no longer suffering injustices in silence. They are speaking out and making their concerns known. Groups like the American Indian Movement here in Minneapolis have done much to bring about this new awareness in the general community.

This is all to the good. But we must add a note of caution. In our new enthusiasm for Indian affairs we must be careful that we don't fall all over ourselves in an effort to impose all sorts of elaborate new programs on the Indians.

Indian problems have been "discovered" before but somehow Indian conditions have not improved very much. Their problems—poor education, poor health care, high unemployment—are still severe. And we will only cause more disappointment if we go over to Franklin Avenue or up to Leech Lake with exaggerated claims about the benefits that will occur if only the Indians will accept this or that new program.

Many Indians are suspicious about new programs, particularly if these are government programs, and they have every right to be. After all, the white man has been making promises to Indian regularly for hundreds of years—and breaking these promises just as regularly.

The United States government and its colonial predecessors have signed more than 380 treaties with Indian tribes. Many of these treaties have been broken outright. The Spirit of many others has been cruelly violated. We are often ashamed of our nation's early history in this area but many of us don't realize how strongly Indians feel that their treaty rights are still being violated today. The controversy over the wild rice harvesting regulations at White Earth is a good case in point.

More than 300 land claims against the Federal Government—some dating back to colonial days—are pending before the Indian Claims Commission in Washington. Several weeks ago, I visited briefly a session of the Indian Subcommittee in the House. At this session a band of Indians from the State of Washington was trying to gain title to land that should have belonged to the tribe according to an early treaty. But somehow title had been denied them because of a mistake by a government surveyor in 1890!

The number of complicated disputes over Indian hunting, fishing and water rights is growing. The basis for these disputes, of course, is the growing pressure for the economic exploitation of Indian land. Everyone from the National Park Service to California citrus growers has a good reason why they should have Indian land and water—or at least why they should control the use of this land and water.

Until recently, large economic interests didn't pay that much attention to Indian land. After all, the most desirable land had already been gobbled up in the 19th century when the reservations were created. But, today, as our natural resources become depleted there is going to be increasing pressure to use Indian land for purposes that might not be acceptable to the Indians who now live on the land.

Certainly the most dramatic example of this new economic pressure is the discovery of oil on the north slope of Alaska. The oil discovery is promoting efforts to exploit millions of acres of land claimed by Alaskan natives. Since these claims have not yet been settled, there is a very real danger that the natives will lose many of their land and mineral rights because their land suddenly has become so attractive.

This whole issue of Indian property rights is illustrated by a little story that Vine Deloria tells in his new book, *Custer Died for Your Sins*. Several years ago a white man was introduced to an old chief in New York City. Taking a liking to the old man, the white man invited him to dinner. The old chief hadn't eaten a good steak in a long time and eagerly accepted. He finished one steak in no time and still looked hungry. So the white man ordered another steak. As they were waiting for the second steak, the white man said, "Chief, I sure wish I had your appetite." "I don't doubt it, white man," the chief replied. "You took my land, you took my mountains and streams, you took my salmon and my buffalo. You took everything I had except my appetite and now you want that too. Aren't you ever going to be satisfied?"

The next time we go to talk to Indians about our new schemes to "uplift" them maybe now we'll understand why they want to talk to us, first, about their treaty rights.

If progress is going to be made by Indian people, I am convinced that it is going to be through the efforts of the Indian people, themselves, and not because of any new programs dreamed up in Washington. Our earlier "grand designs" for the Indians—the termination policy of the early 1950s, the relocation emphasis of more recent years—have been disastrous at worst and ineffectual at best. These early policies were not successful in part because they were predicated on the assumption that "the Indian problem" could be solved only if Indians were assimilated into the dominant white culture—only if Indians left their reservations and gave up their "Indian-ness."

Only now are we beginning to realize that Indian people have unique cultures that should not be violated. With their emphasis on the importance of the community and the need for harmony with nature, these are cultures that the rest of us can well envy.

Two new reports, both issued during the past month, should help us understand these intangible factors. The first report, prepared by a private non-profit organization, the Citizens Advocate Center, provides a thoughtful analysis of the conflicts between Indian culture and Indian government programs. This report is entitled "Our Brother's Keeper, the Indian in White America." It should be available in Minneapolis book stores soon if it is not available already.

The second report, by the Senate Subcommittee on Indian Education, of which Senator Mondale is a member, dramatically documents the failures in Indian education resulting from the neglect of Indian culture by the agencies responsible for the education of Indian children. Hopefully, these reports will encourage the long overdue reform of many existing programs designed to aid American Indians.

Our awareness of Indian culture should make us sensitive to the derogatory image of the Indian that is often created in the mass media. How many of us still associate

the word "Indian" with the blood-thirsty savage circling the wagon train or with the "heap big chief" who will sell you a used car for "very little wampum." If you are of Scandinavian descent, think how you would feel if every Scandinavian on television was portrayed as an illiterate Viking with two horns coming out of his helmet? The National Congress of American Indians and local groups here in Minnesota have embarked on a campaign to notify newspapers, advertisers and television producers about portrayals of Indians that they feel are offensive. Certainly this kind of effort should be encouraged until the image of the Indian is developed in the mass media with more sensitivity.

It is easy for us to criticize Indian programs of the past, but what of the future? I know that some people in Washington who have a real concern for Indians feel frustrated because they can see no clear directions for new policies. Because the Federal Government burned its fingers so badly with termination, there is almost a reluctance to try anything new for fear of getting burned again.

Most everyone concerned with Indian affairs has adopted the slogan of Indian self-determination. No one is exactly sure what this means, however. To some, self-determination is just another road to termination with the Federal Government absolving itself of any responsibility for Indian affairs by saying to the Indians—"Here, you take care of yourself, don't bother us anymore."

In the past, self-determination has often meant that the Indian could decide for himself whether to stay on the reservation and starve, or go to the city and take his chances in an alien environment. But if self-determination is going to be a way of improving conditions, support from the general community will be required—both financially and morally—for new programs that Indians have developed themselves.

In Minneapolis, Project STAIRS, Indian Upward Bound and the Indian teen centers are examples of Indian-directed programs that need support from the general community. Hopefully, there will be a new Indian center in Minneapolis soon.

On the national level, the Senate Indian Education Subcommittee has recommended the creation of Indian school boards with the authority to operate Federal Indian schools. In States like Minnesota, where there are no Federal schools, the subcommittee recommends that Indians participate in the planning, execution and evaluation of programs which make use of Johnson-O'Malley funds. These are the Federal funds available to local school systems to help defray the cost of educating Indian children. Currently these funds are only available to school districts which encompass or are adjacent to reservations. Hopefully, the Johnson-O'Malley program will be expanded before too long to make funds available to cities like Minneapolis and St. Paul where there are significant concentrations of Indian children.

On the reservations, we might want to take a look at the way basic public services are provided. In recent years, tribal councils have been able to receive direct grants from the Federal Government to operate their own community action programs under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Using the community action program as a model, tribal councils might want to provide certain public services directly—road maintenance, schools, etc.—or contract with other Government jurisdictions to provide these services for them, rather than have the services provided directly by Federal employees of the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

The BIA is now able to contract with tribal councils to provide some public services on a limited scale. Certainly this contract procedure could be improved. A proposal has been made that Indian communities be given the opportunity to assume local administra-

tion of any program now administered by the BIA provided that the local community requests this opportunity and that a decision to assume local control is made at a reservation-wide referendum. Block grants to finance these programs would then be available to the tribe—similar to the block grants now available to State and local governments for certain purposes.

Many of the proposals I have just discussed can be implemented, I feel, without a massive reorganization of Federal Indian programs. The Bureau of Indian Affairs has borne much of the brunt of the criticism of Government paternalism—and certainly much of this criticism is justified. But there is no reason to make the BIA the scapegoat for all the problems facing the American Indians. Indian problems will not be solved merely by abolishing the BIA, as some have proposed. Neither will the problems be solved just by taking the BIA out of the Interior Department and placing it in HEW or in the Office of the President as others have recommended. While reorganization is important, this issue alone should not distract us from other important work that has to be done.

What we really need are new ways for Indians to make their concerns known and felt. The establishment in 1968 by President Johnson of the National Council on Indian Opportunity is one step in the right direction. The Council is headed by the Vice President. Its members include the heads of cabinet level departments and six Indian leaders. Its function is to coordinate Indian programs in the various Federal agencies and to insure that any new programs reflect the needs and desires of the Indian people themselves. Currently, the six Indian leaders are selected by the President. However, we might want to consider expanding the Indian membership of the Council and making Indian membership an elected rather than an appointed position. Election districts could be set up to coincide with the regions served by the 11 BIA area offices.

While the National Council may provide a vehicle for Indian self-determination on the National level, it is even more important for us to think about ways to improve self-determination at the grass roots level. Just last week, I met with members of the American Indian Task Force, an ad hoc group of Indian leaders, to discuss this very issue. Included in the group were Clyde Bellecourt and Dennis Banks from Minneapolis and Simon Howard from the Leech Lake Reservation.

The task force recommended the establishment of all Indian boards of inquiry to be established in the eleven areas served by BIA area offices. The 11 boards of inquiry would be broadly representative of the tribal councils, private Indian organizations and off-reservation Indians in each of the areas. Each board would conduct hearings, receive grievances and generate recommendations for new programs and policies. In order to make this a continuing process, each board would hire a circuit rider or "ombudsman" who would regularly visit Indian communities in the area to hear complaints and to make recommendations about solutions.

Each panel would convene a "red ribbon grand jury" composed entirely of Indians to investigate and report upon deprivations of rights, charges of inaction or unresponsiveness by officials and the lack of effectiveness of public services. In appropriate situations, "grand jury" findings could lead to legal action.

Hopefully this process will produce the new programs that the Indian people themselves feel they need. In the months to come, I hope that the National Council on Indian Opportunity, headed by Vice President Agnew, will give serious consideration to the development of this new process. The National Council is ideally suited to assist

with the implementation of the Indian boards of inquiry.

I want to conclude with a story, widely circulated by now, from Vine Deloria's book. Some years ago at a congressional hearing someone asked a council member of the Cheyenne River Sioux "Just what do you Indians want?" and the council member replied, "A leave-us-alone law."

Few Indians, I suspect, would interpret this literally to mean "leave us alone to starve." Maybe what this Indian leader really means is that his people should be left alone to develop their own solutions to their problems. They don't want anyone in Washington, to tell them that they should relocate to the cities or that they must industrialize their reservations.

After Indian goals have been developed, Indians will need our encouragement to help them achieve these goals. Resources from the public and private sector will be needed to enable Indians to establish more meaningful lives for themselves on their reservations, if this is what they want. At the same time, other Indians may need help to establish new Indian communities in our cities.

Our support and encouragement of Indian self-determination will, I am sure, enable the American Indian to become a full participant, on his own terms, in today's world.

AGREEMENT OF THE CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES IN VIETNAM, JULY 20, 1954

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, in the debates on the rule for House Resolution 613 this afternoon, I suggested that our chances for a negotiated just peace in Vietnam might be enhanced by a firm congressional declaration in support of a peace based on the 1954 Geneva accords.

The President's historic speech on May 15 of this year specifically conceded that this country would accept reunification of Vietnam; the President's last point in that speech was, and I quote: "all parties would agree to observe the Geneva Accords of 1954."

In the debates which have occurred over the past several weeks, there has been little discussion of what President Nixon meant when he referred to the two documents which comprised the Geneva accords.

The first of those documents was entitled "Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities in Vietnam." It was signed by two parties, representing the two forces which had been fighting in Vietnam for some 8 years, the French Union Forces and the forces of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. There were not then two Vietnams. There was one Vietnam, and the agreement provided for its temporary division "pending the general elections which will bring about the unification of Vietnam."

The agreement provided that:

The signatories of the present Agreement and their successors in their functions shall be responsible for ensuring an observance and enforcement of the terms and provisions thereof.

The successors to the French were the South Vietnamese.

The second document which came out of the conference at Geneva, on the following day, July 21, 1954, was entitled "Final Declaration of Geneva Conferences, July 21, 1954."

This document specifically referred to the hope that Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam would play their part, in full independence and sovereignty, in the peaceful community of nations.

Note that the declaration referred to Vietnam, one nation, not South Vietnam or North Vietnam.

The declaration further provided "general elections shall be held in July 1956, under the supervision of an international commission."

While the United States did not sign this declaration, nor did any of the other participants at Geneva, President Eisenhower issued a separate statement on the same date, July 21, 1954, in which he stated "the United States will not use force to disturb the settlement."

For ready reference in the debates ahead, I append at this point in the RECORD the text of the Geneva Accords of 1954 and President Eisenhower's accompanying statement:

AGREEMENT ON THE CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES IN VIET-NAM, JULY 20, 1954

CHAPTER I—PROVISIONAL MILITARY DEMARCATI-ON LINE AND DEMILITARIZED ZONE

Article 1

A provisional military demarcation line shall be fixed, on either side of which the forces of the two parties shall be regrouped after their withdrawal, the forces of the People's Army of Viet-Nam to the north of the line and the forces of the French Union to the south.

The provisional military demarcation line is fixed as shown on the map attached (omitted).

It is also agreed that a demilitarized zone shall be established on either side of the demarcation line, to a width of not more than 5 kms. from it, to act as a buffer zone and avoid any incidents which might result in the resumption of hostilities.

Article 2

The period within which the movement of all the forces of either party into its regrouping zone on either side of the provisional military demarcation line shall be completed shall not exceed three hundred (300) days from the date of the present Agreement's entry in force.

Article 3

When the provisional military demarcation line coincides with a waterway, the waters of such waterway shall be open to civil navigation by both parties wherever one bank is controlled by one party and the other bank by the other party. The Joint Commission shall establish rules of navigation for the stretch of waterway in question. The merchant shipping and other civilian craft of each party shall have unrestricted access to the land under its military control.

Article 4

The provisional military demarcation line between the two final regrouping zones is extended into the territorial waters by a line perpendicular to the general line of the coast.

All coastal islands north of this boundary shall be evacuated by the armed forces of the French Union, and all islands south of it shall be evacuated by the forces of the People's Army of Viet-Nam.

Article 5

To avoid any incidents which might result in the resumption of hostilities, all military forces, supplies and equipment shall be withdrawn from the demilitarized zone within twenty-five (25) days of the present Agreement's entry into force.

Article 6

No person, military or civilian, shall be permitted to cross the provisional military demarcation line unless specifically authorized to do so by the Joint Commission.

Article 7

No person, military or civilian, shall be permitted to enter the demilitarized zone except persons concerned with the conduct of civil administration and relief and persons specifically authorized to enter by the Joint Commission.

Article 8

Civil administration and relief in the demilitarized zone on either side of the provisional military demarcation line shall be the responsibility of the Commanders-in-Chief of the two parties in their respective zones. The number of persons, military or civilian, from each side who are permitted to enter the demilitarized zone for the conduct of civil administration and relief shall be determined by the respective Commanders, but in no case shall the total number authorized by either side exceed at any one time a figure to be determined by the Trung Gia Military Commission or by the Joint Commission. The number of civil police and the arms to be carried by them shall be determined by the Joint Commission. No one else shall carry arms unless specifically authorized to do so by the Joint Commission.

Article 9

Nothing contained in this chapter shall be construed as limiting the complete freedom of movement, into, out of or within the demilitarized zone, of the Joint Commission, its joint groups, the International Commission to be set up as indicated below, its inspection teams and any other persons, supplies or equipment specifically authorized to enter the demilitarized zone by the Joint Commission. Freedom of movement shall be permitted across the territory under the military control of either side over any road or waterway which has to be taken between points within the demilitarized zone when such points are not connected by roads or waterways lying completely within the demilitarized zone.

CHAPTER II—PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURE GOVERNING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PRESENT AGREEMENT

Article 10

The Commanders of the Forces on each side, on the one side the Commander-in-Chief of the French Union forces in Indo-China and on the other side of the Commander-in-Chief of the People's Army of Viet-Nam, shall order and enforce the complete cessation of all hostilities in Viet-Nam by all armed forces under their control, including all units and personnel of the ground, naval and air forces.

Article 11

In accordance with the principle of a simultaneous cease-fire throughout Indo-China, the cessation of hostilities shall be simultaneous throughout all parts of Viet-Nam, in all areas of hostilities and for all the forces of the two parties.

Taking into account the time effectively required to transmit the cease-fire order down to the lowest echelons of the combatant forces on both sides, the two parties are agreed that the cease-fire shall take effect completely and simultaneously for the different sectors of the country as follows:

Northern Viet-Nam at 8:00 a.m. (local time) on 27 July 1954.

Central Viet-Nam at 8:00 a.m. (local time) on 1 August 1954.

Southern Viet-Nam at 8:00 a.m. (local time) on 11 August 1954.

It is agreed that Peking mean time shall be taken as local time.

From such time as the cease-fire becomes effective in Northern Viet-Nam, both parties undertake not to engage in any large-scale offensive action in any part of the Indo-Chinese theatre of operations and not to commit the air forces based on Northern Viet-Nam outside that sector. The two parties also undertake to inform each other of their plans for movement from one regrouping zone to another within twenty-five (25) days of the present Agreement's entry into force.

Article 12

All the operations and movements entailed in the cessation of hostilities and regrouping must proceed in a safe and orderly fashion:

(a) Within a certain number of days after the cease-fire Agreement shall have become effective, the number to be determined on the spot by the Trung Gia Military Commission, each party shall be responsible for removing and neutralizing mines (including river- and sea-mines), booby traps, explosives and any other dangerous substances placed by it. In the event of its being impossible to complete the work of removal and neutralization in time, the party concerned shall mark the spot by placing visible signs there. All demolitions, mine fields, wire entanglements and other hazards to the free movement of the personnel of the Joint Commission and its joint groups, known to be present after the withdrawal of the military forces, shall be reported to the Joint Commission by the Commanders of the opposing forces;

(b) From the time of the cease-fire until regrouping is completed on either side of the demarcation line:

(1) The forces of either party shall be provisionally withdrawn from the provisional assembly areas assigned to the other party.

(2) When one party's forces withdraw by a route (road, rail, waterway, sea route) which passes through the territory of the other party (see Article 24), the latter party's forces must provisionally withdraw three kilometres on each side of such route, but in such a manner as to avoid interfering with the movements of the civil population.

Article 13

From the time of the cease-fire until the completion of the movements from one regrouping zone into the other, civil and military transport aircraft shall follow air-corridors between the provisional assembly areas assigned to the French Union forces north of the demarcation line on the one hand and the Laotian frontier and the regrouping zone assigned to the French Union forces on the other hand.

The position of the air-corridors, their width, the safety route for single-engined military aircraft transferred to the south and the search and rescue procedure for aircraft in distress shall be determined on the spot by the Trung Gia Military Commission.

Article 14

Political and administrative measures in the two regrouping zones, on either side of the provisional military demarcation line:

(a) Pending the general elections which will bring about the unification of Viet-Nam, the conduct of civil administration in each regrouping zone shall be in the hands of the party whose forces are to be regrouped there in virtue of the present Agreement;

(b) Any territory controlled by one party which is transferred to the other party by the regrouping plan shall continue to be administered by the former party until such date as all the troops who are to be transferred have completely left that territory so as to free the zone assigned to the party in question. From then on, such territory shall be

regarded as transferred to the other party, who shall assume responsibility for it.

Steps shall be taken to ensure that there is no break in the transfer of responsibilities. For this purpose, adequate notices shall be given by the withdrawing party to the other party, which shall make the necessary arrangements, in particular by sending administrative and police detachments to prepare for the assumption of administrative responsibility. The length of such notice shall be determined by the Trung Gia Military Commission. The transfer shall be effected in successive stages for the various territorial sectors.

The transfer of the civil administration of Hanoi and Haiphong to the authorities of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam shall be completed within the respective time-limits laid down in Article 15 for military movements.

(c) Each party undertakes to refrain from any reprisals or discrimination against persons or organizations on account of their activities during the hostilities and to guarantee their democratic liberties.

(d) From the date of entry into force of the present agreement until the movement of troops is completed, any civilians residing in a district controlled by one party who wish to go and live in the zone assigned to the other party shall be permitted and helped to do so by the authorities in that district.

Article 15

The disengagement of the combatants, and the withdrawals and transfers of military forces, equipment and supplies shall take place in accordance with the following principles:

(a) The withdrawals and transfers of the military forces, equipment and supplies of the two parties shall be completed within three hundred (300) days, as laid down in Article 2 of the present Agreement;

(b) Within either territory successive withdrawals shall be made by sectors, portions of sectors or provinces. Transfers from one regrouping zone to another shall be made in successive monthly installments proportionate to the number of troops to be transferred;

(c) The two parties shall undertake to carry out all troop withdrawals and transfers in accordance with the aims of the present Agreement, shall permit no hostile act and shall take no step whatsoever which might hamper such withdrawals and transfers. They shall assist one another as far as this is possible;

(d) The two parties shall permit no destruction or sabotage of any public property and no injury to the life and property of the civil population. They shall permit no interference in local civil administration;

(e) The Joint Commission and the International Commission shall ensure that steps are taken to safeguard the forces in the course of withdrawal and transfer;

(f) The Trung Gia Military Commission, and later the Joint Commission, shall determine by common agreement the exact procedure for the disengagement of the combatants and for troop withdrawals and transfers, on the basis of the principles mentioned above and within the framework laid down below;

1. The disengagement of the combatants, including the concentration of the armed forces of all kinds and also each party's movements into the provisional assembly areas assigned to it and the other party's provisional withdrawal from it, shall be completed within a period not exceeding fifteen (15) days after the date when the cease-fire becomes effective.

The general delineation of the provisional assembly areas is set out in the maps¹ annexed to the present Agreement.

¹ Department of State Bulletin, Aug. 2, 1954, p. 163.

In order to avoid any incidents, no troops shall be stationed less than 1,500 metres from the lines delimiting the provisional assembly areas.

During the period until the transfers are concluded, all the coastal islands west of the following lines shall be included in the Haiphong perimeter: meridian of the southern point of Kebao Island—northern coast of the Ile Rousse (excluding the island), extended as far as the meridian of Campha-Mines—meridian of Champha-Mines.

2. The withdrawals and transfers shall be effected in the following order and within the following periods (from the date of the entry into force of the present Agreement):

Forces of the French Union

	Days
Hanoi perimeter.....	80
Haiduong perimeter.....	100
Haiphong perimeter.....	300

Forces of the People's Army of Viet-Nam

Ham Tan and Xuyenmec provisional assembly area.....	80
Central Viet-Nam provisional assembly area—first installment.....	80
Plaine des Jones provisional assembly area.....	100
Point Camau provisional assembly area.....	200
Central Viet-Nam Provisional assembly area—last installment.....	300

CHAPTER III—BAN ON INTRODUCTION OF FRESH TROOPS, MILITARY PERSONNEL, ARMS AND MUNITIONS, MILITARY BASES

Article 16

With effect from the date of entry into force of the present Agreement, the introduction into Viet-Nam of any troop reinforcements and additional military personnel is prohibited.

It is understood, however, that the rotation of units and groups of personnel, the arrival in Viet-Nam of individual personnel on a temporary duty basis and the return to Viet-Nam of individual personnel after short periods of leave or temporary duty outside Viet-Nam shall be permitted under the conditions laid down below:

(a) Rotation of units (defined in paragraph (c) of this Article) and groups of personnel shall not be permitted for French Union troops stationed north of the provisional military demarcation line laid down in Article 1 of the present Agreement, during the withdrawal period provided for in Article 2.

However, under the heading of individual personnel not more than fifty (50) men, including officers, shall during any one month be permitted to enter that part of the country north of the provisional military demarcation line on a temporary duty basis or to return there after short periods of leave or temporary duty outside Viet-Nam.

(b) "Rotation" is defined as the replacement of units or groups of personnel by other units of the same echelon or by personnel who are arriving in Viet-Nam territory to do their overseas service there;

(c) The units rotated shall never be larger than a battalion—or the corresponding echelon for air and naval forces;

(d) Rotation shall be conducted on a man-for-man basis, provided, however, that in any one quarter neither party shall introduce more than fifteen thousand five hundred (15,500) members of its armed forces into Viet-Nam under the rotation forces.

(e) Rotation units (defined in paragraph (c) of this Article) and groups of personnel, and the individual personnel mentioned in this Article, shall enter and leave Viet-Nam only through the entry points enumerated in Article 20 below:

(f) Each party shall notify the Joint Commission and the International Commission at least two days in advance of any arrivals or departures of units, groups of personnel

and individual personnel in or from Viet-Nam. Reports on the arrivals or departures of units, groups of personnel and individual personnel in or from Viet-Nam shall be submitted daily to the Joint Commission and the International Commission.

All the above-mentioned notifications and reports shall indicate the places and dates of arrival or departure and the number of persons arriving or departing.

(g) The International Commission, through its Inspection Teams, shall supervise and inspect the rotation of units and groups of personnel and the arrival and departure of individual personnel as authorized above, at the points of entry enumerated in Article 20 below.

Article 17

(a) With effect from the date of entry into force of the present Agreement, the introduction into Viet-Nam of any reinforcements in the form of all types of arms, munitions and other war material, such as combat aircraft, naval craft, pieces of ordnance, jet engines and jet weapons and armoured vehicles, is prohibited.

(b) It is understood, however, that war material, arms and munitions which have been destroyed, damaged, worn out or used up after the cessation of hostilities may be replaced on the basis of piece-for-piece of the same type and with similar characteristics. Such replacements of war materials, arms and munitions shall not be permitted for French Union troops stationed north of the provisional military demarcation line laid down in Article 1 of the present Agreement, during the withdrawal period provided for in Article 2.

Naval craft may perform transport operations between the regrouping zones.

(c) The war material, arms and munitions for replacement purposes provided for in paragraph (b) of this Article, shall be introduced into Viet-Nam only through the points of entry enumerated in Article 20 below. War material, arms and munitions to be replaced shall be shipped from Viet-Nam only through the points of entry enumerated in Article 20 below;

(d) Apart from the replacements permitted within the limits laid down in paragraph (b) of this Article, the introduction of war material, arms and munitions of all types in the form of unassembled parts for subsequent assembly is prohibited;

(e) Each party shall notify the Joint Commission and the International Commission at least two days in advance of any arrivals or departures which may take place of war material, arms and munitions of all types.

In order to justify the requests for the introduction into Viet-Nam of arms, munitions and other war material (as defined in paragraph (a) of this Article) for replacement purposes, a report concerning each incoming shipment shall be submitted to the Joint Commission and the International Commission. Such reports shall indicate the use made of the items so replaced.

(f) The International Commission, through its Inspection Teams, shall supervise and inspect the replacements permitted in the circumstances laid down in this Article, at the points of entry enumerated in Article 20 below.

Article 18

With effect from the date of entry into force of the present Agreement, the establishment of new military bases is prohibited throughout Viet-Nam territory.

Article 19

With effect from the date of entry into force of the present Agreement, no military base under the control of a foreign State may be established in the regrouping zone of either party; the two parties shall ensure that the zones assigned to them do not adhere to any military alliance and are not

used for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy.

Article 20

The points of entry into Viet-Nam for rotation personnel and replacements of material are fixed as follows:

Zones to the north of the provisional military demarcation line: Laokay, Langson, Tien-Yen, Haiphong, Vinh, Dong-Hoi, Muong-Sen;

Zone to the south of the provisional military demarcation line: Tourane, Quinhon, Nhatrang, Bangoi, Saigon, Cap St. Jacques, Tanchau.

CHAPTER IV—PRISONERS OF WAR AND CIVILIAN INTERNEES

Article 21

The liberation and repatriation of all prisoners of war and civilian internees detained by each of the two parties at the coming into force of the present Agreement shall be carried out under the following conditions:

(a) All prisoners of war and civilian internees of Viet-Nam, French and other nationalities captured since the beginning of hostilities in Viet-Nam during military operations or in any other circumstances of war in any part of the territory of Viet-Nam shall be liberated within a period of thirty (30) days after the date when the cease-fire becomes effective in each theatre.

(b) The term "civilian internees" is understood to mean all persons who, having in any way contributed to the political and armed struggle between the two parties, have been arrested for that reason and have been kept in detention by either party during the period of hostilities.

(c) All prisoners of war and civilian internees held by either party shall be surrendered to the appropriate authorities of the other party, who shall give them all possible assistance in proceeding to their country of origin, place of habitual residence or the zone of their choice.

CHAPTER V—MISCELLANEOUS

Article 22

The Commanders of the Forces of the two parties shall ensure that persons under their respective commands who violate any of the provisions of the present Agreement are suitably punished.

Article 23

In cases in which the place of burial is known and the existence of graves has been established, the Commander of the Forces of either party shall, within a specific period after the entry into force of the Armistice Agreement, permit the graves service personnel of the other party to enter the part of Viet-Nam territory under their military control for the purpose of finding and removing the bodies of deceased military personnel of that party, including the bodies of deceased prisoners of war. The Joint Commission shall determine the procedures and the time limit for the performance of this task. The Commanders of the Forces of the two parties shall communicate to each other all information in their possession as to the place of burial of military personnel of the other party.

Article 24

The present Agreement shall apply to all the armed forces of either party. The armed forces of each party shall respect the demilitarized zone and the territory under the military control of the other party, and shall commit no act and undertake no operation against the other party and shall not engage in blockade of any kind in Viet-Nam.

For the purposes of the present Article, the word "territory" includes territorial waters and air space.

Article 25

The Commanders of the Forces of the two parties shall afford full protection and all

possible assistance and co-operation to the Joint Commission and its joint groups and to the International Commission and its inspection teams in the performance of the functions and tasks assigned to them by the present Agreement.

Article 26

The costs involved in the operations of the Joint Commission and joint groups and of the International Commission and its Inspection Teams shall be shared equally between the two parties.

Article 27

The signatories of the present Agreement and their successors in their functions shall be responsible for ensuring and observance and enforcement of the terms and provisions thereof. The Commanders of the Forces of the two parties shall, within their respective commands, take all steps and make all arrangements necessary to ensure full compliance with all the provisions of the present Agreement by all elements and military personnel under their command.

The procedures laid down in the present Agreement shall, whenever necessary, be studied by the Commanders of the two parties and, if necessary, defined more specifically by the Joint Commission.

CHAPTER VI—JOINT COMMISSION AND INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION FOR SUPERVISION AND CONTROL IN VIET-NAM

28. Responsibility for the execution of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities shall rest with the parties.

29. An International Commission shall ensure the control and supervision of this execution.

30. In order to facilitate, under the conditions shown below, the execution of provisions concerning joint actions by the two parties, a Joint Commission shall be set up in Viet-Nam.

31. The Joint Commission shall be composed of an equal number of representatives of the Commanders of the two parties.

32. The Presidents of the delegations to the Joint Commission shall hold the rank of General.

The Joint Commission shall set up joint groups the number of which shall be determined by mutual agreement between the parties. The joint groups shall be composed of an equal number of officers from both parties. Their location on the demarcation line between the regrouping zones shall be determined by the parties whilst taking into account the powers of the Joint Commission.

33. The Joint Commission shall ensure the execution of the following provisions of the Agreement on the cessation of hostilities:

(a) A simultaneous and general cease-fire in Viet-Nam for all regular and irregular armed forces of the two parties.

(b) A re-groupment of the armed forces of the two parties.

(c) Observance of the demarcation lines between the regrouping zones and of the demilitarized sectors.

Within the limits of its competence it shall help the parties to execute the said provisions, shall ensure liaison between them for the purpose of preparing and carrying out plans for the application of these provisions, and shall endeavor to solve such disputed questions as may arise between the parties in the course of executing these provisions.

34. An International Commission shall be set up for the control and supervision over the application of the provisions of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam. It shall be composed of representatives of the following States: Canada, India and Poland.

It shall be presided over by the Representative of India.

35. The International Commission shall set up fixed and mobile inspection teams, composed of an equal number of officers ap-

pointed by each of the above-mentioned States. The fixed teams shall be located at the following points: Laokay, Langson, Tien-Yen, Halphong, Vinh, Dong-Hoi, Muong-Sen, Tourane, Quinhon, Nhatrang, Bangai, Saigon, Cap St. Jacques, Tranchau. These points of location may, at a later date, be altered at the request of the Joint Commission, or one of the parties, or of the International Commission itself, by agreement between the International Commission and the command of the party concerned. The zones of action of the mobile teams shall be the regions bordering the land and sea frontiers of Viet-Nam, the demarcation lines between the re-grouping zones and the demilitarized zones. Within the limits of these zones they shall have the right to move freely and shall receive from the local civil and military authorities all facilities they may require for the fulfillment of their tasks (provision of personnel, placing at their disposal documents needed for supervision, summoning witnesses necessary for holding enquiries, ensuring the security and freedom of movement of the inspection teams etc. . .). They shall have at their disposal such modern means of transport, observation and communication as they may require. Beyond the zones of action as defined above, the mobile teams may, by agreement with the command of the party concerned, carry out other movements within the limits of the tasks given them by the present agreement.

36. The International Commission shall be responsible for supervising the proper execution by the parties of the provisions of the agreement. For this purpose it shall fulfill the tasks of control, observation, inspection and investigation connected with the application of the provisions of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities, and it shall in particular:

(a) Control the movement of the armed forces of the two parties, effected within the framework of the regroupment plan.

(b) Supervise the demarcation lines between the re-grouping areas, and also the demilitarized zones.

(c) Control the operations of releasing prisoners of war and civilian internees.

(d) Supervise at ports and airfields as well as along all frontiers of Viet-Nam the execution of the provisions of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities, regulating the introduction into the country of armed forces, military personnel and of all kinds of arms, munitions and war material.

37. The International Commission shall, through the medium of the inspection teams mentioned above, and as soon as possible either on its own initiative, or at the request of the Joint Commission, or of one of the parties, undertake the necessary investigations both documentary and on the ground.

38. The inspection teams shall submit to the International Commission the results of their supervision, their investigation and their observations, furthermore they shall draw up such special reports as they may consider necessary or as may be requested from them by the Commission. In the case of a disagreement within the teams, the conclusions of each member shall be submitted to the Commission.

39. If any one inspection team is unable to settle an incident or considers that there is a violation or a threat of a serious violation the International Commission shall be informed; the latter shall study the reports and the conclusions of the inspection teams and shall inform the parties of the measures which should be taken for the settlement of the incident, ending of the violation or removal of the threat of violation.

40. When the Joint Commission is unable to reach an agreement on the interpretation to be given to some provision or on the appraisal of a fact, the International Commission shall be informed of the disputed question. Its recommendations shall be sent di-

rectly to the parties and shall be notified to the Joint Commission.

41. The recommendations of the International Commission shall be adopted by majority vote, subject to the provisions contained in article 42. If the votes are divided the chairman's vote shall be decisive.

The International Commission may formulate recommendations concerning amendments and additions which should be made to the provisions of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam, in order to ensure a more effective execution of that agreement. These recommendations shall be adopted unanimously.

42. When dealing with questions concerning violations, or threats of violations, which might lead to a resumption of hostilities, namely:

(a) Refusal by the armed forces of one party to effect the movements provided for in the regroupment plan;

(b) Violation by the armed forces of one of the parties of the regrouping zones, territorial waters, or air space of the other party; the decisions of the International Commission must be unanimous.

43. If one of the parties refuses to put into effect a recommendation of the International Commission, the parties concerned or the Commission itself shall inform the members of the Geneva Conference.

If the International Commission does not reach unanimity in the cases provided for in article 42, it shall submit a majority report and one or more minority reports to the members of the Conference.

The International Commission shall inform the members of the Conference in all cases where its activity is being hindered.

44. The International Commission shall be set up at the time of the cessation of hostilities in Indo-China in order that it should be able to fulfill the tasks provided for in article 36.

45. The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Viet-Nam shall act in close co-operation with the International Commissions for Supervision and Control in Cambodia and Laos.

The Secretaries-General of these three Commissions shall be responsible for co-ordinating their work and for relations between them.

46. The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Viet-Nam may, after consultation with the International Commissions for Supervision and Control in Cambodia and Laos, and having regard to the development of the situation in Cambodia and Laos, progressively reduce its activities. Such a decision must be adopted unanimously.

47. All the provisions of the present Agreement, save the second sub-paragraph of Article 11, shall enter into force at 2400 hours (Geneva time) on 22 July 1954.

Done in Geneva at 2400 hours on the 20th of July 1954 in French and in Viet-Name, both texts being equally authentic.

For the Commander-in-Chief of the People's Army of Viet-Nam

TA-QUANG BUI,
Vice-Minister of National Defence of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam.

For the Commander-in-Chief of the French Union Forces in Indo-China
Brigadier-General DELTEIL.

ANNEX TO THE AGREEMENT ON THE CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES IN VIET-NAM

I. DELINEATION OF THE PROFESSIONAL MILITARY DEMARCATION LINE AND THE DEMILITARIZED ZONE

(Article 1 of the Agreement: Reference Map: Indo-China 1/100,000)

(a) The provisional military demarcation line is fixed as follows, reading from east to west: the mouth of the Song Ben Hat (Cua Tung River) and the course of that river (known as the Rao Thanh in the mountains)

to the village of Bo Ho Su, then the parallel of Bo Ho Su to the Laos-Viet-Nam frontier.

(b) The demilitarized zone shall be delimited by Trung Gia Military Commission in accordance with the provisions of article 1 of the Agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam.

II. GENERAL DELINEATION OF THE PROVISIONAL ASSEMBLY AREAS

(Article 15 of the Agreement: Reference Maps: Indo-China 1/400,000)

(a) North Viet-Nam

Delineation of the boundary of the provisional assembly area of the French Union forces

1. The perimeter of Hanoi is delimited by the arc of a circle with a radius of 15 kilometres, having as its centre the right bank abutment of Doumer Bridge and running westwards from the Red River to the Rapids Canal in the northeast.

In this particular case no forces of the French Union shall be stationed less than 2 kilometres from this perimeter, on the inside thereof.

2. The perimeter of Halphong shall be delimited by the Song-Van-Uc as far as Kim Thanh and a line running from the Song-Van-Uc three kilometres northeast of Kim Thanh to cut Road No. 18 two kilometres east of Mao-Khé. Thence a line running three kilometres north of Road 18 to Cho-Troi and a straight line from Cho-Troi to the Mong-Duong ferry.

3. A corridor contained between:

In the south, the Red River from Thanh-Tri to Bang-Nho, thence a line joining the latter point to Do-My (South-west of Kesat), Gia-Loc and Trien Kieu;

In the north, a line running the Rapids Canal at a distance of 1,500 metres to the north of the Canal, passing three kilometres north of Pha-Lai and Seven Pogodas and thence parallel to Road No. 18 to its point of intersection with the perimeter of Halphong.

Note: Throughout the period of evacuation of the perimeter of Hanoi, the river forces of the French Union shall enjoy complete freedom of movement on the Song-Van-Uc. And the forces of the People's Army of Viet-Nam shall withdraw three kilometres south of the south bank of the Song-Van-Uc.

Boundary between the perimeter of Hanoi and the perimeter of Haiduong

A straight line running from the Rapids Canal three kilometres west of Chi-ne and ending at Do-My (eight kilometres south-west of Kesat).

(b) Central Viet-Nam

Delineation of the boundary of the provisional assembly area of the forces of the Viet-Nam People's Army south of the Col des Nuages parallel

The perimeter of the Central Viet-Nam area shall consist of the administrative boundaries of the provinces of Quang-Ngai and Binh-Dinh as they were defined before the hostilities.

(c) South Viet-Nam

Three provisional assembly areas shall be provided for the forces of the People's Army of Viet-Nam.

The boundaries of these areas are as follows:

1. Xuyen-Moc, Ham-Tan Area

Western boundary: The course of the Song-Ray extended northwards as far as Road No. 1 to a point thereon eight kilometres east of the intersection of Road No. 1 and Road No. 3.

Northern boundary: Road No. 1 from the above-mentioned intersection to the intersection of Route Communale No. 9 situated 27 kilometres west-south-west of Phanhtiet and from that intersection a straight line to Kim Thanh on the coast.

2. Plain des Jongs Area

Northern boundary: The Viet-Nam-Cambodia frontier.

Western boundary: A straight line from Tong-Binh to Binh-Thanh.

Southern boundary: Course of the Fleuve Antérieur (Mekong) to ten kilometres south-east of Cao Lanh. From that point, a straight line as far as Ap-My-Dien, and from Ap-My-Dien a line parallel to and three kilometres east, and then south of the Tong Doc-Loc Canal, this line reaches My-Hanh-Dong and thence Hung-Thanh-My.

Eastern boundary: A straight line from Huong-Thanh-My running northwards to the Cambodian frontier south of Doi-bao-Vol.

3. Point Camau Area

Northern boundary: The Song-Cai-lon from its mouth to its junction with the Rach-Nuoc-Trong, thence the Rach-Nuoc-Trong to the bend five kilometres north-east of Ap-Xeo-La. Thereafter a line to the Ngan-Dua Canal and following that Canal as far as Vinh-Hung. Finally, from Vinh-Hung a north-south line to the sea.

[Senate Committee on Foreign Relations, *supra*, 66-74]

12. FINAL DECLARATION OF GENEVA CONFERENCE, JULY 21, 1954¹

Final declaration, dated July 21, 1954, of the Geneva Conference on the problem of restoring peace in Indo-China, in which the representatives of Cambodia, the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam, France, Laos, the People's Republic of China, the State of Viet-Nam, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom, and the United States of America took part.

1. The Conference takes note of the agreements ending hostilities in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam and organizing international control and the supervision of the execution of the provisions of these agreements.

2. The Conference expresses satisfaction at the ending of hostilities in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam; the Conference expresses its conviction that the execution of the provisions set out in the present declaration and in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities will permit Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam henceforth to play their part, in full independence and sovereignty, in the peaceful community of nations.

3. The Conference takes note of the declarations made by the Governments of Cambodia and of Laos of their intention to adopt measures permitting all citizens to take their place in the national community, in particular by participating in the next general elections, which, in conformity with the constitution of each of these countries, shall take place in the course of the year 1955, by secret ballot and in conditions of respect for fundamental freedoms.

4. The Conference takes note of the clauses in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam prohibiting the introduction into Viet-Nam of foreign troops and military personnel as well as of all kinds of arms and munitions. The Conference also takes note of the declarations made by the Governments of Cambodia and Laos of their resolution not to request foreign aid, whether in war material, in personnel or in instructors except for the purpose of the effective defence of their territory and, in the case of Laos, to the extent defined by the agreements on the cessation of hostilities in Laos.

5. The Conference takes note of the clauses in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Viet-Nam to the effect that no military base under the control of a foreign State may be established in the regrouping zones of the two parties, the latter having the obligation to see that the zones allotted to them shall not constitute part of any military alliance and shall not be utilized for the resumption of hostilities or in the service of an aggressive policy. The Conference also takes note of the declarations of the Governments of Cambodia and Laos to the effect that they will not join in any

agreement with other states if this agreement includes the obligation to participate in a military alliance not in conformity with the principles of the Charter of the United Nations or, in the case of Laos, with the principles of the agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Laos or, so long as their security is not threatened, the obligation to establish bases on Cambodian or Laotian territory for the military forces of foreign Powers.

6. The Conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the agreement relating to Viet-Nam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary. The Conference expresses its conviction that the execution of the provisions set out in the present declaration and in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities creates the necessary basis for the achievement in the near future of a political settlement in Viet-Nam.

7. The Conference declares that, so far as Viet-Nam is concerned, the settlement of political problems, effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity and territorial integrity, shall permit the Viet-Namese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot. In order to ensure that sufficient progress in the restoration of peace has been made, and that all the necessary conditions obtain for free expression of the national will, general elections shall be held in July 1956, under the supervision of an international commission composed of representatives of the Member States of the International Supervisory Commission, referred to in the agreement on the cessation of hostilities. Consultations will be held on this subject between the competent representative authorities of the two zones from 20 July 1955 onwards.

8. The provisions of the agreements on the cessation of hostilities intended to ensure the protection of individuals and of property must be most strictly applied and must, in particular, allow everyone in Viet-Nam to decide freely in which zone he wishes to live.

9. The competent representative authorities of the Northern and Southern zones of Viet-Nam, as well as the authorities of Laos and Cambodia, must not permit any individual or collective reprisals against persons who have collaborated in any way with one of the parties during the war, or against members of such persons' families.

10. The Conference takes note of the declaration of the Government of the French Republic to the effect that it is ready to withdraw its troops from the territory of Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam, at the request of the governments concerned and within periods which shall be fixed by agreement between the parties except in the cases where, by agreement between the two parties, a certain number of French troops shall remain at specified points and for a specified time.

11. The Conference takes note of the declaration of the French Government to the effect that for the settlement of all the problems connected with the re-establishment and consolidation of peace in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam, the French Government will proceed from the principle of respect for the independence and sovereignty, unity and territorial integrity of Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam.

12. In their relations with Cambodia, Laos, and Viet-Nam, each member of the Geneva Conference undertakes to respect the sovereignty, the independence, the unity and the territorial integrity of the above-mentioned states, and to refrain from any interference in their internal affairs.

13. The members of the Conference to consult one another on any question which

may be referred to them by the International Supervisory Commission in order to study such measures as may prove necessary to ensure that the agreements on the cessation of hostilities in Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam are respected.

13. THE CEASE-FIRE AGREEMENTS IN INDOCHINA:

Statement by the President, July 21, 1954¹

I am glad, of course, that agreement has been reached at Geneva to stop the bloodshed in Indochina.

The United States has not been a belligerent in the war. The primary responsibility for the settlement in Indochina rested with those nations which participated in the fighting. Our role at Geneva has been at all times to try to be helpful where desired and to aid France and Cambodia, Laos, and Viet-Nam to obtain a just and honorable settlement which will take into account the needs of the interested people. Accordingly, the United States has not itself been party to or bound by the decisions taken by the Conference, but it is our hope that it will lead to the establishment of peace consistent with the rights and the needs of the countries concerned. The agreement contains features which we do not like, but a great deal depends on how they work in practice.

The United States is issuing at Geneva a statement to the effect that it is not prepared to join in the Conference declaration, but, as loyal members of the United Nations, we also say that, in compliance with the obligations and principles contained in article 2 of the United Nations Charter, the United States will not use force to disturb the settlement. We also say that any renewal of Communist aggression would be viewed by us as a matter of grave concern.

As evidence of our resolve to assist Cambodia and Laos to play their part, in full independence and sovereignty, in the peaceful community of free nations, we are requesting the agreement of the Governments of Cambodia and Laos to our appointment of an Ambassador or Minister to be resident at their respective capitals (Phnom Penh and Vientiane). We already have a Chief of Mission at Saigon, the capital of Viet-Nam, and this Embassy will, of course, be maintained.

The United States is actively pursuing discussions with other free nations with a view to the rapid organization of a collective defense in Southeast Asia in order to prevent further direct or indirect Communist aggression in that general area.

(This unilateral declaration by the United States Government sets forth its position with regard to the Geneva Accords, which it did not sign.)

14. STATEMENT BY THE UNDER SECRETARY OF STATE² AT THE CONCLUDING PLENARY SESSION OF THE GENEVA CONFERENCE, JULY 21, 1954²

As I stated on July 18, my Government is not prepared to join in a declaration by the Conference such as is submitted. However, the United States makes this unilateral declaration of its position in these matters:

DECLARATION

The Government of the United States being resolved to devote its efforts to the strengthening of peace in accordance with the principles and purposes of the United Nations takes note of the agreements concluded at Geneva on July 20 and 21, 1954 between (a) The Franco-Laotian Command and the Command of the Peoples Army of Viet-Nam; (b) the Royal Khmer Army Command and the Command of the Peoples Army of Viet-Nam; (c) Franco-Vietnamese Command

¹ Walter Bedell Smith.

² Department of State Bulletin, Aug. 2, 1954, pp. 162-163.

and the Command of the Peoples Army of Viet-Nam and of paragraphs 1 to 12 inclusive of the declaration presented to the Geneva Conference on July 21, 1954 declares with regard to the aforesaid agreements and paragraphs that (1) it will refrain from the threat or the use of force to disturb them, in accordance with Article 2(4) of the Charter of the United Nations dealing with the obligation of members to refrain in their international relations from the threat or use of force; and (2) it would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security.

In connection with the statement in the declaration concerning free elections in Viet-Nam my Government wishes to make clear its position which it has expressed in a declaration made in Washington on June 29, 1954, as follows:

"In the case of nations now divided against their will, we shall continue to seek to achieve unity through free elections supervised by the United Nations to insure that they are conducted fairly."

With respect to the statement made by the representative of the State of Viet-Nam, the United States reiterates its traditional position: that peoples are entitled to determine their own future and that it will not join in an arrangement which would hinder this. Nothing in its declaration just made is intended to or does indicate any departure from this traditional position.

We share the hope that the agreements will permit Cambodia, Laos and Viet-Nam to play their part, in full independence and sovereignty, in the peaceful community of nations, and will enable the peoples of that area to determine their own future.

THE PRESIDENT'S PROPOSED PUBLIC DEFENDER ACT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I want to call attention this afternoon to the President's proposed Public Defender Act for the District of Columbia which has been pending since July 11. It is essential that we act immediately on this legislation.

In 1960 we created a Legal Aid Agency for the District with a small staff and limited jurisdiction. It was an experiment and a highly successful one. Since then, however, crime has increased dramatically, the criminal law has been changed radically by the courts, the backlog of court cases has risen and the problem of providing adequate representation to indigent defendants has increased accordingly.

Moreover, since 1960, we have realized that professional defense services in adult criminal cases is not all that is needed. There are increasing demands for court appointed counsel in serious misdemeanor cases, but the Legal Aid Agency has no express authority to take such cases. Counsel is required in probation and parole revocation but the Legal Aid statute is silent on this. Counsel is obviously needed in narcotic addict commitment and mental commitment cases—where the defendant also faces incar-

ceration—but there is no direct authority for the Legal Aid Agency to take such cases.

The Public Defender Act would expressly authorize representation in all these areas and would provide sufficient staff. I might also add that it would provide sufficient staff pay to get the type of competence necessary to handle such cases.

The legislation proposes no radical departure or novel idea. Essentially it would bring the District's criminal justice system up to date so that it is capable of facing the problems before us. We must act promptly on this legislation. We cannot afford to fall further behind.

YALE MEDICINE BULLETIN COMMENDS WEST HAVEN, CONN., VA HOSPITAL

HON. JOHN S. MONAGAN

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. MONAGAN. Mr. Speaker, the fall 1969 issue of Yale Medicine which is the alumni bulletin of the school of medicine, Yale University, contains a fine article on the West Haven Veterans' Administration hospital located in West Haven, Conn.

From my own experience in working with veterans in Connecticut and the Veterans' Administration, I am aware of the outstanding work done for many years at the West Haven hospital and which is currently continuing under the directorship of Mr. David Anton, a very able and dedicated administrator, aided by a loyal and efficient staff.

I insert the article for the information and consideration of my colleagues:

THE VETERANS ADMINISTRATION HOSPITAL

When Dean Francis Blake accepted the Newington Veterans Administration Hospital as an affiliated hospital in 1946, it was only as a temporary liaison, since a new hospital was to be built in West Haven, about 35 miles closer to the medical school.

The new hospital, built on the site of the former William Wirt Winchester Hospital, consists of a 500-bed General Medical and Surgical Building and a 400-bed Tuberculosis Building. The older buildings linking the two new structures were refurbished and became the Administration Building. The whole complex, set in 43 acres, rose above a commanding hill, dominating West Haven "like a colossus."

In April, 1953, the West Haven Veterans Administration Hospital opened the doors of the Tuberculosis Building, and immediately began its association with Yale, guided by a Dean's Committee. The General Medical and Surgical Building opened in September, 1953. With changing times and disease patterns, these two major clinical buildings are referred to simply as Buildings No. 1 and No. 2.

The hospital is headed by David Anton, the fourth director in its 16-year history. The non-professional side of the hospital operates under the assistant hospital director, Calvin Chandler. Professional programs are the responsibility of the chief of staff, Dr. Raymond Yesner, who has been chief of the Laboratory Service at West Haven since the hospital's inception, and who is an associate professor of pathology at the

medical school. As chief of staff, he has an advisory group, consisting of the various chiefs of services. He is supported by an associate chief of staff for administration, Paul Eule, and an associate chief of staff for research, Dr. Robert Green, professor of medicine. It is expected that another position, that of associate chief of staff for education, will be filled at some time in the future. Dr. Yesner is also an associate dean of the medical school, with the responsibility for Veterans Hospital affairs.

The Medical Service at the VA Hospital has a model relationship with the Department of Internal Medicine at Yale and plays a major role in its training programs. There are 68 medical beds for acutely ill patients plus a six-bed intensive care unit and a four-bed coronary care unit. Last year 1,709 patients were admitted to the acute medical service. Staffing is provided by eight full-time Yale faculty members and two part-time staff physicians. The chief of the Medical Service is Dr. Thomas T. Amatruda, Jr., associate professor of medicine.

Yale-New Haven Medical Center house staff members are assigned in rotation to the Medical Service during their internship and residency training. In addition, there are specialty training programs in metabolism and endocrinology, hematology and oncology, gastroenterology, dermatology, and cardiology which complement similar programs at the Yale-New Haven Hospital.

During the academic year, approximately half the third- and fourth-year medical students are assigned to West Haven for their clinical clerkships on the acute medical wards. Under the new curriculum, many second-year students will also receive their initial clinical experience there.

FIRST HEMODIALYSIS IN STATE

In December of 1966, the first successful hospital-based hemodialysis program in the entire State of Connecticut was started at the West Haven VA Hospital. In May of 1968, a modern nine-bed dialysis unit was opened for out-patient chronic hemodialysis; at present 16 patients are involved in the program. In the near future it is hoped that the hospital-based unit will be supplemented by a home dialysis program to aid in the management of some patients who currently travel as far as 85 miles twice a week for their dialysis.

In addition to the responsibilities of patient care and teaching, the full-time staff are actively engaged in clinical and laboratory research in the areas of infectious diseases, metabolism and endocrinology, renal disease, cardiovascular disease, liver disease, gastroenterology, oncology, and hematology.

The Surgical Service has a 179-bed capacity. Approximately 100 of these beds are for the various surgical specialties. Each of the specialty services is under the direction of the head of the specialty section at Yale.

The General Surgical Service has a new chief, Dr. Edward Storer, professor of surgery, and two full-time and three part-time surgeons who have faculty appointments.

The VA surgical program functions as an integral part of the Department of Surgery at Yale. There is complete integration of the intern and resident training programs, and an active student teaching program has been established. Staff members devote a major part of their time to the teaching of residents, interns, and medical students. The Surgical Service also has frequent consultations with university surgeons for both teaching and patient care, and surgeons from the medical school attend on the wards on a rotating schedule.

A new operating room recovery room and a ten-bed intensive care unit has recently been completed and are in operation. The intensive care unit, which has two isolation cubicles, is equipped with modern monitoring devices.

The Pathology Service is a centralized operation combining pathologic anatomy and clinical pathology in one department; thus the residency training program leads to combined Board certification. In addition to Dr. Yesner, there are four full-time pathologists and a research associate. Pathologic anatomy is very well equipped with double-headed teaching microscopes, cryostats, and excellent new electron microscope suite, histology and histochemistry laboratories, and closed circuit television for autopsies and the tumor clinics. The clinical pathology workload has been growing steadily at about 25 per cent per year and now stands at well over a million tests annually. This is handled by extensive automation, with 20 analyzer channels operating continuously in chemistry and a 7-channel analyzer in hematology. The bacteriology laboratories are among the finest in the country and receive many students for training. The tuberculosis bacteriology laboratory has contributed much original research and is scheduled to become a regional laboratory, along with two others in the country, to do definitive identification work on typical and atypical isolated organisms. Blood banking, serology, mycology, and parasitology laboratories complete the spectrum. Residents are also trained in the use of radioisotopes and selected residents may spend six months in the clinical chemistry laboratory at Yale-New Haven Hospital.

COMMUNITY MENTAL HEALTH SERVICE

The Psychiatry Service has been an integral component of the Yale department since 1953. Under Dr. Louis B. Fierman, associate professor of clinical psychiatry, it now consists of 123 beds, four acute treatment wards, a day hospital and mental hygiene clinic, and a staff of eight psychiatrists. It functions as a community mental health service and processes annually over 800 applicants for admission, of whom about half are referred to other community facilities. There are no locked or chronic wards.

The Psychiatry Service provides a first-year residency training program in cooperation with the Yale Department of Psychiatry. Second- and third-year residency training is also available. Since 1953 the Psychiatry Service has trained 193 residents and, in collaboration with the Veterans Administration Psychology Service, 119 psychology trainees. In addition, the Psychiatry Service is available to Yale medical students for clerkships and elective clinical courses. Training opportunities have also been offered to student nurses from the University of Connecticut and the University of Bridgeport, and ongoing professional training has been provided for social workers and nurses. Psychosomatic teaching has been conducted in collaboration with the Medical and Surgical Services.

The psychiatric research program has had a strong clinical orientation, in psychotherapy, schizophrenic language, the uses of humor, social structure of psychiatric populations, and patient government. Basic research in neurophysiology has also been conducted in collaboration with the Psychology Service on cerebral-sensory-evoked potentials.

The Psychology Service is divided into clinical, counseling, and research sections. The clinical section provides consultation and treatment and assists the Psychiatric Service in its treatment programs. The counseling section is primarily engaged in vocational guidance, rehabilitation counseling, personal adjustment counseling, and retirement counseling. It also utilizes community resources to help the discharged veteran make a successful vocational and social readjustment. The service is strongly research-oriented, four members spending a major portion of their time in research. The staff is involved in the supervision of graduate and medical students' theses and the residents' projects. Students from universities

throughout the country come to this hospital for training in counseling and neurophysiological, social, and experimental psychology.

REHABILITATION FOR ORTHOPEDIC PATIENTS

The Physical Medicine and Rehabilitation Service is under the direction of Dr. Frederick Dugdale. It is comprised of five therapy sections—physical therapy, occupational therapy, corrective therapy, educational therapy, and manual arts therapy—that contribute to overcoming physical, educational, and vocational handicaps.

In recognition of the frequent need of orthopedic patients for rehabilitation and the need for orthopedic surgeons to be better versed in the prescription of rehabilitation procedures, the service participates actively in the training program for residents. In addition, the surgical residents are invited to attend monthly prosthetic clinics, which provide an opportunity for the resident to correlate his knowledge of amputation surgery with the latest developments in prosthetics and the relationship of both to the patient's ability to walk again.

The Chest Disease Service, headed by Dr. Nicholas D'Esopo, associate clinical professor of medicine, includes a non-tuberculosis medical chest ward, a surgical chest ward, two tuberculosis wards, an emphysema unit, an active out-patient clinic, a pulmonary physiology laboratory, an immunology laboratory, and an inhalation therapy department. A one- or two-year training and research program, principally located at the VA Hospital but closely coordinated with Yale-New Haven, offers a balanced and flexible program in which a trainee or fellow can become an accomplished chest physician and pulmonary physiologist.

When the hospital opened, 400 tuberculosis beds were assigned. Due to the nation-wide decrease in tuberculosis, there are now only two tuberculosis wards, consisting of 96 beds, staffed by full-time staff physicians. The chief of the service is chairman of a cooperative chemotherapy trial involving 26 other VA hospitals, and the service has been continuously active in chemotherapy trials since 1953.

The Intermediate Service is under the direction of Dr. William Braisted. It occupies four wards with a total bed capacity of 168 and has a full-time staff of six physicians. Patients with complicated, usually multisystem and progressive chronic disease, too chronic for acute wards and too sick for nursing homes, are given chronic hospital care, to provide maximum efficiency and pleasure in living within the limits of disability. The Service coordinates physical, corrective, occupational, speech, educational, vocational, psychological, and social therapies.

The chief of the Dental Service is Dr. John Weimer. He is assisted by an oral surgeon and two staff dentists in operating a general six-chair clinic and a tuberculosis two-chair clinic. Both are equipped with the most modern dental equipment from high speed units to the panorex x-ray machine, supported by a complete dental laboratory. There is an approved rotating internship and a training program for dental assistants affiliated with the Eli Whitney Technical School.

Dr. Dorothea Bradford is chief of the Speech Pathology Service, which evaluates and treats language, speech, and voice disorders by acoustic amplification and speech reading. A training program is conducted in communicative disorders.

The Department of Radiology, under Dr. Mary F. Keohane, associate professor of clinical radiology, was completely reorganized five years ago. A full-time staff of five diagnostic radiologists and one radiographer is provided, on a contract basis, by Yale. Four residents from Yale-New Haven Hospital rotate through the department at three-month

intervals. In diagnostic radiology, the case load has doubled in the last seven years, to 30,000 examinations per year. More than 5 per cent of these are special studies. Four new diagnostic rooms, to be completed by August, 1970, will contain all of the most advanced and sophisticated equipment available. Complete right and left cardiac catheterizations, transseptal catheterizations, and selective coronary angiography are now routinely done in our special diagnostic suite. In spite of the marked increase in both routine examinations and special procedures, our radiologists conduct 30 hours of teaching-work conferences weekly for the interns, residents, and medical students from all services. An active research program is maintained with project participation in both the Departments of Medicine and Surgery, as well as those areas of particular interest to the radiologist.

Among the exciting new developments in the Department of Radiology is the successful establishment of a School of Radiologic Technology presently training 18 students.

Recently the Eastern Blind Rehabilitation Center for the visually impaired veteran was established at West Haven, under the supervision of George M. Gillespie. This center provides basic adjustment to the losses associated with blindness for veterans from the east coast of the United States. Included in each patient's individualized 18-week program is medical care; training in orientation, mobility, manual skills, and communications; and social and vocational counseling. Upon leaving the center the veteran is guided toward academic and vocational training or returns to the positions he held prior to the onset of his blindness.

EASTERN RESEARCH SUPPORT CENTER

Another major regional activity in the Eastern Research Support Center under Dr. Alvan Feinstein, professor of medicine. This center provides assistance to Veterans Administration investigators throughout the east in such areas as experimental design, editing, and computer assistance.

The Neurology Service, headed by Dr. Lewis L. Levy, associate clinical professor, has recently been separated from the Medical Service. New Stroke and Epilepsy Centers will shortly be operative.

Under the direction of Arline E. Burns, the Nursing Service provides quality nursing care and services to patients, both on an in-patient and out-patient basis. There are 20 nursing units for the Medicine, Surgery, Intermediate, Pulmonary Disease, and Psychiatry Services. In addition to these, there are specialized units, such as those for coronary care, medical and surgical intensive care, post-anesthesia, hemodialysis, day hospital (psychiatric service), mental hygiene clinic, operating room, and the Blind Rehabilitation Center. The Nursing Service personnel assigned to the Out-Patient Department provide nursing care and services to patients for pre-admission, in-patient clinics, post-hospital care, and the community home-nursing referral program. Throughout the academic year clinical experience is provided for nursing students from the University of Bridgeport and the University of Connecticut.

The research program at the West Haven VA Hospital commenced with the activation of the institution in 1953, when many of the staff and projects originally at the Newington VA Hospital moved to West Haven. Since then, the number of active research projects has increased by 45 percent; the amount of research space available has more than tripled; and publications have increased sevenfold. Concurrent with these gains, there has been a significant increase in both VA research funds and non-VA grant funds. These assets, coupled with the proximity of the excellent academic, patient care, and research facilities at the Yale-New Haven

Medical Center, have enabled this VA Hospital to attract not only established, independent investigators, but—equally important—young, eager, intellectually responsive researchers whose future scientific contributions will no doubt help mold the shape of patient care in the future.

TAX SHARING IS DANDY, BUT TAX CREDITS ARE SLICKER

HON. AL ULLMAN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. ULLMAN. Mr. Speaker, the debate over the administration's plan to begin sharing Federal revenues with State and local governments is capturing wide public attention. The need to help our financially impoverished States and cities is incontestable. The question is how best to extend this help.

The Nixon administration proposes a system of tax sharing that would be returning about \$5 billion a year in Federal tax revenues to State and local governments by the mid-1970's.

My bill, H.R. 13663, would instead authorize a tax-credit system that would allow the taxpayer to claim 40 percent of the income taxes he pays to State and local governments against the tax bill he owes to Washington. State and local governments could then pick up this revenue saving in their tax schedules.

As a contribution to the debate, I am inserting herewith in the RECORD the text of an address given recently by Mortimer M. Caplin before the Tax Institute of America symposium on "Tax Incentives" held at Princeton, N.J. Mr. Caplin is a former Commissioner of Internal Revenue and is currently in private law practice.

Reviewing the pro's and con's of both approaches, Mr. Caplin concludes that the tax-credit approach is favorable for several reasons—it is more in line with traditional concepts of States rights and independence, it is simpler to administer, and it is "more familiar to tax legislators and more readily acceptable to Congress from a political and budgeting standpoint."

I commend these arguments to the attention of the Congress:

FEDERAL-STATE TAX SHARING VS. STATE-LOCAL INCOME TAX CREDITS

(By Mortimer M. Caplin)

Politics, it's been said, makes strange bedfellows. True this is for political groups as well as for political ideas and economic views. And true this is for the current interest in shifting both financial resources and decision-making responsibility from the national government in Washington to our numerous state and local governments.

Economist Milton Friedman was one of the early voices to call for federal-state tax sharing. Critical of the sprawling patchwork of federal grants to the states for specified purposes, he viewed his new system as a substitute for the old.

Later, Walter Heller, in conjunction with Joseph Pechman of Brookings Institution, sponsored a revenue sharing plan which would complement the federal categorical grants-in-aid program.

In 1964 the Democratic Party platform pledged "development of fiscal policies . . . (to) provide revenue sources to hard-pressed state and local governments." And a few days before the 1964 election, first President Johnson and then Barry Goldwater endorsed federal fiscal policies to strengthen our state and local governments.

Today, in the name of shifting "the balance of political power away from Washington and back to the country and the people", President Nixon is giving his full support to a "taxback" plan which would turn over to the states and localities, without any strings, over \$500 million in fiscal 1971 and over \$5 billion annually by 1976.

FISCAL SQUEEZE ON STATES AND LOCALITIES

Whether the label attached is "creative federalism", "new federalism" or just plain "old federalism", the fiscal squeeze on the states and localities is apparent to all. A soaring population, rising levels of affluence, inflation, rapid urbanization, and confrontations in our cities, have all added to the sharp growth in responsibilities and costs of state-local governments.

During the period 1948 to 1967, state outlays more than quadrupled (reaching over \$34 billion in 1967), while local expenditures multiplied more than five times (passing \$59 billion in 1967). At the same time, federal grants-in-aid were multiplying rapidly: \$7 billion in 1960, \$21 billion in 1969, and an estimated \$25 billion in 1970.

Today, federal grant programs provide about 18% of state and local revenue, and their matching requirements call for state-local expenditures of close to \$1 for every \$2 of federal grants-in-aid.

Both the fiscal crisis and the need for better financing of state and local governments are urgent problems. Workable solutions must be found for keeping up with present demands on state and local governments, meeting the anticipated growth of these demands, and facing the new responsibilities arising from any shift of responsibility from the federal to the state and local level.

FEDERAL ASSISTANCE TO STATES AND LOCALITIES

Students of public finance are well aware of the vastly superior revenue capacity of the federal government in contrast to states and localities. Relying chiefly on a progressive income tax structure, federal revenues increase faster than the national economy thus creating a large automatic revenue growth capability—which is currently throwing off a growth dividend of over \$10 billion a year. At the same time, federal expenditures for current programs (except under wartime conditions) are likely to rise more slowly than the economy.

The contrast is sharp for states and localities: With heavy reliance on sales and property taxes, their revenues are unable to keep pace with the rate of growth of the national economy—while their expenditure requirements for existing programs tend to rise more rapidly than the economy.

Kenneth Galbraith highlighted this fiscal mismatch under our federal system when he noted that "U.S. prosperity seems to give Washington the revenues and the state and local governments the problems".

Traditionally fiscal assistance has been given to state and local governments in three principal ways:

- (1) Federal income tax deductions for state and local taxes;
- (2) Federal income tax exemption for interest on state and municipal bonds; and
- (3) Outright federal grants for specific purposes (so-called categorical grants).

Although 13 states still have not adopted an income tax—and 12 others have been described as "anemic users"—the loss of federal revenue from deductions of state and local individual income taxes amounted to

almost \$1.5 billion for 1968, and probably will reach close to \$2 billion for 1969.

For the state and municipal bond exemption, the loss of federal revenue is over \$2.6 billion annually, although the aid to states and localities is estimated to be under \$2 billion—represented by the savings achieved through lower interest rates.

As for the outright federal grants, the dollar amount being spent today is about \$25 billion a year, spread over some 420 separate grant authorizations.

In brief, these three accepted routes are costing the federal government about \$30 billion a year, and yet our states and localities need more funds as they assume additional responsibilities. The old forms of intergovernmental assistance have been found lacking for one reason or another, and the current demand is for new approaches.

Ample room for increased state-local support was believed to exist in the annual \$10 billion "growth dividend" built into our federal income tax system and in the budgetary "peace dividend" anticipated after the end of the war in Vietnam. The Vietnam estimate, however, has been reduced sharply from the original \$19 billion projection; and the remaining balance will have to meet competing priorities of increasing Social Security benefits, unavoidable increases in normal domestic programs, federal pay raises, as well as President Nixon's new welfare reform and mass transit programs. Further, under the Tax Reform Act of 1969, long range revenue losses could run at the rate of \$4 billion a year.

Nevertheless, despite these factors—and the need to maintain fiscal restraint to combat the inflationary forces in our economy—discussion continues on relieving the fiscal plight of our states and localities.

Should the federal government assume increased responsibility for welfare and education?

How about block grants for broad categories of expenditures?

Should there be sharing of a percentage of federal income tax revenues?

Would it be better to have a federal income tax credit for state income taxes?

Which direction shall we follow?

PRESIDENT NIXON'S TAX-SHARING PLAN

On August 13, 1969, President Nixon presented a tax sharing plan aimed at strengthening state and local government so that "by the end of the coming decade, the political landscape of America will be visibly altered, and state and cities will have a far greater share of power and responsibility for solving their own problems." To accomplish this, four major features are proposed in the draft bill which was forwarded to Congress on September 23, 1969:

1. *Size of fund:* the fund to be shared is a stated percentage of "personal taxable income"—the base on which federal individual income taxes are levied. Today this base is about \$300 billion, and it continues to rise with our growing economy. To ease the budget impact, the percentage for the first fiscal year of the plan (1971) is set at only 1/6 of 1% (\$500 million). In subsequent fiscal years there are phased increases until a permanent 1% is reached in fiscal 1976—estimated to yield over \$5 billion a year by then.

2. *Distribution formula:* The distribution is made on the basis of each state's share of national population, with an adjustment for the State's revenue effort. A state, therefore, which taxes its citizens more than the national average will receive a proportional bonus. (Revenue effort is defined as the ratio of total general revenues collected by a state and its local governmental units during a given fiscal year to the total personal income of that state.) Thus, a state whose revenue effort is 10% above the na-

tional average is provided with a 10 percent bonus above its basic per capital portion of revenue sharing.

3. *Local "pass-through"*: The distribution within states to the local government units is established by a prescribed formula. The total pass through corresponds to the ratio of total local government general revenues raised to the sum of all state and local general revenues raised in the state. In turn, the amount which an individual local government receives corresponds to its share of all local government general revenues raised in the state.

4. *Administrative requirements*: The only requirements imposed on the states are (a) local sharing, (b) quarterly reporting and accounting, and (c) maintenance of existing state aid to localities. No other strings or limitations are imposed on the use of these funds.

On the pass through of funds to the localities, the Nixon plan contains an optional provision. To provide local flexibility, a state, working with its local governments, has the option of developing an alternative distribution plan. Any alternative, however, must receive sufficient support from both the state and the local government.

If we accept the view that unfettered block grants are the solution for the deep financial trouble of state-local governments, then the administration's tax-sharing plan has much to commend it from the standpoint of simplicity and fairness. Also, it is a modest plan with an ultimate 1% tax-sharing formula—as compared to the Heller-Pechman proposal, which calls for an eventual 2% of the federal individual income tax base.

The question remains, however: Is tax sharing what we as a nation want or, more directly, what Congress will enact?

THE TAX CREDIT APPROACH

On August 19, 1969, Congressman Al Ullman of Oregon proposed that individuals be permitted to claim a credit against federal income taxes for 40% of state and local income taxes paid. This was the first bill to use the tax credit approach alone to alleviate current state and local fiscal needs. The Muskie-Goodell bill introduced on June 25, 1969 took a more comprehensive and complex approach, including a plan which combines both tax sharing and tax credits.

The Muskie-Goodell *Intergovernmental Revenue Act of 1969* was introduced at the request of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR), which has long been a champion of tax credits. Its views are bottomed on the strong conviction that the income tax—even if not necessarily the best type of tax in all situations—is a highly desirable and fair tax, and one that is readily adaptable to state and local needs. With an eye to encouraging state-local adoption of income taxes, ACIR has been supporting a federal income tax credit of some 30% to 50% of income taxes paid at the state levels. The credit would be optional, with the federal deduction of 100% of state-local income taxes paid still being available to taxpayers whose marginal tax rates exceed the 30%-50% figure. The credit would reduce the net income tax payable to the federal government and the states would thereby be stimulated to pick up the difference by raising their own income tax rates.

The interplay of tax sharing and tax credits are found under the first two of the five titles of the Muskie-Goodell bill:

Title I permits federal distribution of general support payments to state and local governments on the basis of population adjusted for tax effort—in accordance with the following:

a. It sets aside federal revenue equal to the average of 1% of the federal taxable income base and 25% of state income tax collections.

b. Population dominates as the distribution factor, but the adjustment for tax effort would shift about 25% of the funds to high-effort states and encourage state-local maintenance of the tax effort.

c. Special fiscal needs of big cities and counties are recognized in two ways: (1) only cities and counties with populations over 50,000 are assured a share, and (2) in determining their shares, double weight is given to their own receipts.

d. State alternative plans for the use of funds are permitted under conditions acceptable to the cities and counties.

Title II allows taxpayers the option of either itemizing their state income tax payments or claiming a credit of 40% of such payment against their federal income tax liability.

Title III authorizes the U.S. Treasury to collect state personal income taxes for states under terms mutually agreeable to the Secretary of the Treasury and the individual states.

Title IV enlarges and restructures the federal tax credit for state death taxes, provided a state adopts an estate-type tax and increases its death tax rates.

Title V permits states and their localities to tax the personal property of private individuals located in enclaves under exclusive federal jurisdiction.

In support of the bill, ACIR testified that while conventionally tax sharing and tax credits have been "strong competitors" for reinforcing state-local fiscal independence, "only by joining together their unique virtues is it possible to reach several other important intergovernmental fiscal objectives":

"Federal tax credits stand out as the instrument of choice for creating a less competitive intergovernmental tax environment thereby strengthening the revenue generating power of state and local governments. However, this approach can aggravate interstate fiscal disparities by providing the greatest benefit to jurisdictions with the highest personal income.

"Revenue sharing on the other hand gets the highest marks when it comes to enhancing the budgetary discretion of state and local officials while reducing intergovernmental fiscal disparities. However, it is vulnerable to the charge that it divorces tax and expenditure responsibilities."

According to ACIR, it is only by linking these two aid approaches that we can "both harness their strengths and minimize their weaknesses".

As might be expected, the administration takes sharp issue with many of the approaches of the Muskie-Goodell bill, particularly the dollar costs. The administration would release \$500 million in 1971, reaching the \$5 billion level after five years. In contrast, Muskie-Goodell would cost the federal government in revenue foregone \$5.4 billion in the first year (1970), \$7.1 billion in 1971 and almost \$10 billion in 1972.

CONCLUSION

Where do we go from here? My own view is that—particularly in light of current budgetary pressures and the level of our presence in Vietnam—we are still a long way off from blank check grants to the states and localities.

Aside from federal fiscal demands, revenue sharing plans question our most fundamental views of federalism and challenge the crucial spending-control roles at different levels of our federal-state hierarchy. Categorical grants have kept these controls in the hands of the Congress and administrators at the federal and state-local levels. But if revenue sharing or tax credits were adopted, an important shift of power would occur in the direction of state governors and city mayors. Former Budget Director Charles Zwick—in addition to his concern

over the impact on federal spending priorities—poses the issue in the following fashion: "Through what channels of government do we want public resources and priorities to flow and thereby strengthen or weaken the several elements of the federal system?"

That Congress is sensitive to this issue is reflected in the recent remark of Congresswoman Martha Griffiths of Michigan at a symposium on tax sharing: "I would like to predict that it will be many years before the states get any unencumbered money out of the federal government."

And Congressman Wilbur Mills, Chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, has been quoted as asking whether the states and localities would be willing to pick up part of the federal deficits as well as sharing in the federal surpluses. A true partnership arrangement, indeed!

On the other hand, if Congress should move in this new direction, I believe it is more likely to prefer tax credits to tax sharing.

For one thing, the tax credit is more consistent with traditional concepts of states' rights and independence; for there would truly be no strings attached to the new revenue flowing into state-local coffers and almost total independence from the federal government in revenue planning and use. The credit device thus bears the esthetic (and perhaps too idealistic) feature of carrying through to its logical end the apparently growing belief that states and localities should begin to bear the principal burden of handling and resolving domestic problems that beset the nation. Within this setting, it would also allow for differences among the states with respect to particular local needs, and would permit relatively simple adjustments at the state level to meet any special or sudden crisis or condition.

Again, the administrative simplicity of the tax credit plan has great practical appeal. Any plan in which revenue flows into and out of one pocket before reaching its final destination in another is bound to prove more costly than a similar plan under which revenue is collected directly by its intended final recipient.

Finally, I believe that use of tax credits is more familiar to tax legislators and more readily acceptable to Congress from a political and budgeting standpoint. For despite our recognition of the budgetary concealment and other weaknesses of this form of "backdoor spending", tax credits still have a practical appeal that must be taken into account. Will Congress be willing to make a long-range commitment of over \$5 billion a year in direct blockgrant aid to the states and localities? Or is it more likely to accept an indirect revenue loss of the same amount by authorizing a credit against federal income taxes for 40% of state and local income taxes paid? Congressman Ullman's recent criticism of the administration's tax-sharing plan and his strong support of a tax credit may suggest what the answer will be.

Plato defined democracy as "a charming form of government, full of variety and disorder, and dispensing a sort of equality to equals and unequals alike."

Much later, Carlyle cynically said: "Democracy is, by the nature of it, a self-canceling business; and gives in the long run a net result of zero."

From a dollar standpoint, a shift in revenue from the federal government to the states and localities may seem merely "a self-canceling business". But democracy is also "based upon the conviction that there are extraordinary possibilities in ordinary people". And if we are to solve our urgent domestic problems and make vital and tangible improvement in our environment, a revitalized federal system may be our best hope

for the synergistic force to accomplish what is so badly needed. The how's and why's of this important endeavor lie as much in the field of taxation as in that of political science and sociology. And I commend the Tax Institute of America and all of you here today for the time and effort that you are devoting to the achievement of this important goal.

TELLING IT LIKE IT IS

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, in the hue and cry over the newly explosive quality of life on many of our campuses, it is occasionally difficult to hear the voices of reason. The loudest commentators tend to be either wild-eyed radicals bent on toppling our institutions or at the other extreme self-righteous stand-patters who dread any change, even when it is for the better.

In today's atmosphere of fear and truculence, a calm and detached assessment of the situation at our universities can stand out like a beacon in the darkness.

Such a statement was made October 28 by William J. McGill, the distinguished chancellor of the University of California at San Diego, in a speech to the San Diego Kiwanis Club.

In his talk, he carefully weighs the requirements of what he terms "two mutually opposed principles," public order and personal freedom. He warns against "compartmentalized" thinking on these principles, and appeals for understanding to permit both to flourish.

I believe Dr. McGill's eloquent remarks are worthy of study by anyone interested in the relationship of our universities to their public, and I include the speech at this point in the RECORD:

THE PROBLEM OF FREEDOM IN THE UNIVERSITY

We live in a time when men seem more interested in the images of things than in the things themselves. Recently television has been severely criticized for its role in introducing a new level of violence into our lives, but the difficulty goes much deeper. Television is a limited medium. It concentrates on visual action, not on abstract ideas. In the same sense the newspapers are a limited medium. They concentrate on newsworthy events rather than on the intricate tapestry of causes that generate the events.

The difficulty is not so much violence on television or action-reporting in the newspapers. It is the pace of our lives which has accelerated so rapidly that we have come increasingly to depend on these limited media for our understanding of the world around us and the forces that move it. We read less, write less, and think less. The sins of television and newspaper coverage are not so much a concentration on violence as they are a concentration on superficiality. If ever there was a time when thoughtful men needed to penetrate deeply into the problems that afflict society, this is the time.

Today I wish to speak to you in this rational vein. I would like to pose two fundamental problems for which there are no easy solutions. I want to indicate the nature of the problems and the nature of the difficulty in finding solutions. These problems bear on the basic question of what is called academic freedom, and I am seeking to put before you the elements of a deeper understanding of the difficulties universities face in this complex and sensitive area. I am fully aware that the term "academic freedom" is almost an obscenity in the lexicon of the general public and almost a cliché among university people.

It is precisely for this reason that I want to approach the topic in the rational, analytic manner that thinking men must apply before they adopt any position, positive or negative, on any complex question.

The genius of the American concept of freedom has been our ability to find a solution to the requirements of two mutually opposed principles. One principle deals with the public order. We must have an orderly environment or we cannot function in the highly technological and interdependent social order that we have constructed. The other principle is our constitutional commitment to personal freedom as enunciated in the Bill of Rights. We must keep our society free of unreasonable incursions into the personal lives of its citizens. Such incursions are typically thought of as coming from the Government but the principle applies equally well to interference with our personal freedom arising from any other element of society.

Most of us tend to think about freedom and order in separate compartments. When crime in our cities and unrest on our campuses develops to the point of national concern, we want law and order. When the raw power of the Government or when external threats make us fearful of restrictions on our fundamental rights, we want freedom. Our thinking is compartmentalized. Thus it is not wholly adequate to an understanding of the fundamental problem of freedom and order because it is a fact that the two principles are opposed. Where personal freedom increases, the orderliness of society must decrease. Where law and order is on the increase, personal freedom diminishes. There is no way to escape this opposition. Ask any prison inmate. He will tell you that law and order is maintained at the expense of his personal liberty. The resolution of this problem is something that our society has always been able to achieve with spectacular success. We have been able to generate suitable compromises between personal freedom and public order so that the freedom of most citizens is maintained as fully as possible. The nature of the compromise is not stable from generation to generation. It swings in dynamic balance with the changing problems which confront our society. The balance, of course, is maintained by the courts. The courts determine in any era of our history whether American society is to be considered as permissive or repressive. They make this determination by setting the limits that public agencies must observe in dealing with individual citizens.

Many people have been critical of our courts during the last two decades because of their increasing stress on personal freedom and on the rights of the accused.

The courts themselves have taken the position that they were restoring personal freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution, and hitherto encroached upon by some States and some police practices in order to maintain purely local conceptions of public order. As I observed, this position of the courts is not dogmatic. It is subject to change as society comes to view the consequences of increased personal freedom and increased permissiveness. I think we are now beginning to witness still another swing of the delicate balance back in the direction of increasing concern for the rights of society.

The Romans once conquered the European and the Mediterranean world, and for a period of time beginning in the reign of Caesar Augustus the world enjoyed a "Pax Romana," a Roman peace. It was an uneasy peace con-

stituted out of fear that violations would bring swift and deadly justice meted out by Roman legions. Most Americans would reject the concept of a Roman peace for our society, but they do not want anarchy either. The balance must be struck between freedom and order in such a way as to permit our society the necessary order to function smoothly and yet at the same time to permit us the necessary freedom to experiment and to undergo peaceful change. The genius of the American way has been our ability to move this pendulum back and forth to deal with the unpredictable problems that confront our restless and changeable people. We have thus far been able to accomplish this without destroying the stability of government; without moving all the way to total anarchy which is the ultimate in personal freedom, or to total repression which is the ultimate in an assured public order.

The problem that I wish to put before you is the problem of how much personal freedom our society ought to manifest, and I urge you now to avoid thinking of this question in the compartmentalized boxes that we typically employ. We are all committed to the preservation of the public order, to law and order, and to the smooth functioning of our society. But how far are we prepared to go in this commitment? Do we repress dissent ruthlessly in the manner of the Roman legions? If we do not, how much dissent can we tolerate and in what form? Do we attempt to control dissidence in our society by legal punishment or by public criticism? What forms of dissent are protected by the Bill of Rights? For example, can students picket an administration building as an extension of free speech, dramatizing their dissent against the university administration? None of these questions has an easy answer because each one has subtle consequences that are by no means easy to forecast in detail. We proceed with changes in our reaction to dissent in little steps so that we can examine the consequences and thus avoid well-intentioned actions designed to protect the social order which instead seriously damage our own freedoms. We may agree that the protections of the right of free speech do not extend to such forceful acts as blocking the entrances to an administration building, but do we then also insure an orderly campus by arresting students who demonstrate quietly in the free speech area? One intrusion is clearly more serious than the other, but often the less serious act leads to the more serious one. Do we then ban both or draw the line between them?

The problem of freedom and order, opposed principles which push the common attitudes of our society in opposite directions, is a fundamental question with very subtle difficulties for deciding just how much freedom is too much. Americans have generally drawn the line so as to allow a great deal of personal freedom. In recent years, however, as violence and conflict have become increasingly prominent in American society, we have begun to wonder; to criticize the courts and the libertarian attitudes of our schools.

It is regrettable that the critics of our social order ordinarily approach the problem of freedom and order from a base that is almost entirely moralistic. These critics seem to know just how our society should be constructed. At least they know which elements of society must prevail in order to meet the demands of their dogmatic convictions. Hence, in the full assurance that they are in the right and those who disagree with them are wrong, these visionaries would proceed to impose their conceptions on you and me without benefit of our advice or acceptance. They would deny to their opponents the rights of free speech and free advocacy which they demand for themselves. The basis of this inverted logic lies in the irrational but absolute conviction that they

are right and their adversaries are wrong. So it has always been with the zealous who know what is best for the people and who will force it upon them whether the people want it or not.

I have had many occasions during the last two years to debate with the radicals on my campus. I find them singularly unable to entertain even the thought that their analysis of society may be faulty. The campus new left has become ideologically frozen in dreary and discredited Marxist economic dogma. Its loud sophomoric protagonists manifest that complete conviction of moral rectitude that is the distinguishing mark of intellectual folly. One young man told me with absolute self-assurance that students would become interested in their science classes at UCSD only if there were a complete revolution of the political, economic and social system. How much that fellow still has to learn about human nature, and how blind his moralistic self-assurance makes him to what is patently obvious!

The problem of freedom and order is the first of the two fundamental problems which I seek to review for you. It is fundamental in the sense that there is no easy solution if one approaches the opposed principles of freedom and order in depth rather than compartmentally. In fact, the balance of the rights of the individual against the rights of society probes at the heart of the American constitutional and legal system. Thus the opposition of freedom and order characterizes a whole series of conundrums that arise in the more restricted context of the modern American university. The restricted context provides the setting for my second problem.

It deals with the logical conflicts we confront in attempting to maintain individual freedom at an institution supported by taxpayers. Again there are two opposed principles. The first principle is obvious. In a tax supported institution, those who pay the bills must have some voice in determining how their tax funds are spent. The second principle, equally obvious, is that no university can generate new knowledge unless its professors are free to express heretical views.

The opposition of these two principles has led to much agony for universities in recent times. The issue generally arises when a professor engages in some activity or expresses some set of views which are a source of outrage and objection to the public. I can cite numerous examples. The case of professor Marcuse and his Marxist analysis of the revolutionary forces in a technological society springs almost immediately to mind. But the professor is only the most recent and the most locally prominent of many examples.

A few years ago a professor at the University of Illinois attracted severe public disapproval for advocating free love in a letter to the student newspaper.

I also remember a professor of history at Rutgers University who proclaimed at an open convocation several years ago that he would welcome the victory of the Viet Cong. So much outrage was generated by this episode that it became the focal point for a contest between two candidates for the U.S. Senate in New Jersey.

There are many more examples. Only recently I read of a misguided population biologist at the University of New Hampshire who proposed sterilizing all women with an airborne virus in order to control the population explosion.

The common denominator of all of these extraordinary and outrageous pronouncements is that each one originated in a university supported by the taxpayers. Life is difficult enough for the ordinary citizen in these days of harsh governmental demands on his pocketbook, but it must be exceptionally hard for him to bear the revelation that his hard-earned tax dollars are being spent

to support the heretical pronouncements of a Marxist philosopher, or the immoral preachments of an advocate of free love, or the ugly appeal in behalf of a deadly adversary who has no compunction about murdering and maiming women and children, or the crackpot advice of a visionary who would wipe out much that is beautiful in life, love and family, using an invisible airborne virus.

The taxpayer has a right to demand that if he is paying the bills, his money should not be used to support subversion, immorality, treachery, or madness. The argument is so simple and so plausible that it occurs to many agonized taxpayers as they read newspaper accounts of what some professors do or say. I receive hundreds of letters that begin approximately as follows: "Now look here, Chancellor, I am not a crank or a crackpot, but you must understand that I do not want my tax money used for such purposes."

There is, however, an opposed principle. A university cannot function unless there is free inquiry. Not every taxpayer remembers that a university has a special creative role to play in society. It is not just a repository for the ancient knowledge of civilization's past. It is not just a memory bank providing a record of our knowledge of nature and the cosmos. It is not just a center in which the literature and art that we have come to revere is transmitted to new generations. A university does all of these things but they do not characterize the central role that every vital university plays in generating new knowledge, new physical understanding, new literature and art.

The creative role of the university in society turns on the university's capacity to generate new knowledge and to develop new modes of thought. Because it must serve this creative role, a university is not just a school. Creativity is almost always painful and often unattractive. Moreover, the sensitive and restless people who are most effective in generating new knowledge and in experimenting with new modes of thought, are not especially comfortable to live with.

When Hemingway was learning how to write English sentences that were, as he described them, both simple and true, he worked in a kind of creative agony. He tells us that he would sit for hours in a freezing hotel room or in a steaming cafe in the Latin Quarter of Paris, and nothing would come. Then he would go in the late afternoon, frustrated after having written only a few words, walking in the cold air of the Luxembourg Gardens to Gertrude Stein's house in order to be told rather archly that he belonged to a lost generation.

Creative work is often extremely frustrating. You sit there pondering on an objective that you conceive only in the dimmest way. The problem is not so much to find the answer to a particular question, but to find out which question is the right one to ask.

The creative process leaves its mark of tension and anxiety on those who engage in it most effectively. Moreover, people and especially professors are by no means creative all the time. Some of their ideas are crackpot. One of the most remarkable talents a thinker can have is the ability to tell which of his ideas are good and which are best forgotten. The famous cosmologist Kepler comes down to us from the Middle Ages historically revered as the man who determined finally and conclusively that the planets travel in elliptical orbits around the sun. He did this by establishing that the motions of the planet Mars across the night sky from season to season were completely predictable if Mars traveled in an elliptical orbit around the sun. It was a brilliant discovery, but it was mixed in with other work claiming the mystical occurrence of certain numerical ratios in the motions of the

planets, work that was the purest kind of crackpottery without any redeeming value whatever. It is interesting to wonder whether Kepler ever understood which part of his work we would remember and which part we would smile at.

The nature of the creative process and the obvious linkage of universities to the production of new knowledge then argues for our second principle which is that universities must sustain free advocacy, free expression, and the free inquiry, these are all essential to the preservation of the university's creative role. Moreover, it is perfectly clear to us that unless a university sustains these freedoms it becomes corrupt and quickly dies as a center of learning. We witnessed the fate of the great German universities during the Nazi era. They were systematically converted by the Nazi state into centers of ideology for the development and propagation of the Teutonic mythology which Hitler and his subordinates sought to substitute for genuine learning in order to buttress their own power. Many professors left Germany because they felt they could not work in such an atmosphere, and those who remained were in no sense the cream of the creative spirit of the German universities of the early Twentieth century. Hitler destroyed the universities in Germany in less than ten years simply by robbing them of their integrity. Thus universities must be free institutions or they cannot survive in recognizable form. When freedom disappears everything that the university teaches is cast into doubt.

Many of you will recall the scandal of Lysenkoism in Russian genetics during the postwar Stalinist era. Trofim Lysenko was a Russian geneticist who simply tried to falsify genetic experiments in order to establish that Soviet Marxism could create better wheat, better cattle, and a better race of men. In so doing he sought only to improve his own status in the Soviet scientific hierarchy by telling the Stalinist Government what it wished to hear. Thus Lysenko achieved power and eminence as the protégé of that strange and powerful despot, but in the process Stalin and Lysenko destroyed Russian genetics for nearly twenty years. This was at the time when genetics in Western science was making unparalleled strides by discovering the code in which nature tells cells how to make templates so as to construct other cells just like them.

The argument is perfectly plain and perfectly plausible. Unless the university is free it cannot play its creative role. It cannot tell reason from nonsense. It cannot express the heretical view that proves in the long run to be fundamentally insightful.

I hope you see again that these two principles, the principle of ultimate control by the taxpayer and the principle of free inquiry are in opposition. Free inquiry at a university is expanded by diminishing the taxpayer's right to control what may be taught. Making the faculty and the curriculum of the university directly responsible to the taxpayers implies inevitable limitations on what may be taught and who may teach.

Obviously the opposition of the principle of taxpayer-control and the principle of free inquiry in the university is formally similar to the opposition of order and freedom in society at large. But our American genius in dealing with the complexities of an orderly, free society has not been manifested with equal effect in resolving the university's problems.

In universities there is nothing equivalent to the majesty of the courts for maintaining the delicate balance between the rights of taxpayers and the rights of professors. Boards of trustees and boards of regents are groups of lay persons, exceptionally successful in life and serving in an honorary capacity. Because of this essentially unrewarding service, the turnover on such boards is usually high, and

thus the board members are not often well-equipped to deal with the subtleties of balancing the rights of taxpayers against the problems posed by free inquiry. It has been my experience with the Board of Regents of the University of California that these fine men and women, seeking to serve not only the University but the people of the State without recompense and often without appreciation, are almost always caught in the immense gap between what is publicly damaging to the university and what is reasonable and proper to do. Similarly, the university chancellors, faced with the widening gap between the attitudes of the taxpayers and the freedoms that are traditional in academic communities, find themselves making decisions that please no one at all. I spend much of my time teetering on the delicate brink between the rights of the bill-paying public and the freedom of expression that I must sustain if we are to be a vital and effective university. In this balance there are no easy solutions. There is also no peace and no easy way to fend off the demands of those who would demand the full rights of the taxpayers on the one hand, or those in the university who demand full freedom of expression on the other.

Thus the opposed principles of freedom and order present insoluble problems to our society, but we have handled them rather well despite the inherent difficulties. The opposed principles of taxpayer-control of public universities and freedom of inquiry present roughly the same logical problems, but public universities seem to have handled them rather badly. My own view is that the chancellor or the university president, playing a role supposedly like the courts in society at large, has not been able to build up either the public understanding or the public support that affords him the freedom to adjust the delicate balance between his university and the community that sustains it. It is probable that such men, overburdened and overworked, cannot give sustained attention to the subtleties of these problems and thus make ill-thought-out compromises. Presidents too often are bound up in fending off budget slashes and in dealing with the immediate imperatives of profound student unrest. What we need most in universities these days is time—time to conceptualize our difficulties, time to think through sensible courses of action, time to work with the critical sensitive and occasionally hostile general public. We have no time and we are not going to get any.

It seems clear to me that much of the structure of human society operates in the dynamic balance of pairs of opposed principles: freedom and order; the rights of the taxpayer and the freedom of the professor; and similar oppositions. The quality of freedom in a society must somehow be derived from the manner in which the balance is set between the extremes of such polarizations. There is no textbook and no dogma telling us how we should set these balances. Moreover, there is no way to escape the conflicts generated by opposed rights. No moralistic precepts assure us of a monopoly on right answers. We are forced to find freedom's equilibrium condition in the crucible of the problems we face. The problems of each generation are partly historic but mostly unique. It is almost always true that the solutions which worked for an earlier generation do not apply with equal force or effect to the problems we confront today. Thus in attempting to set the balance between the rights of the individual, and the rights of society, we must find the compromise which balances these rights in a condition of quasi-stability during our time. That search for compromise is very difficult for a university administrator. Universities are idealistic

communities. They do not admire compromise.

I do not for a moment maintain that all understanding must come from the taxpayers. Professors tend to be absolutists where freedom of expression and inquiry are concerned. They view such principles uncompromisingly and hold me accountable for their maintenance. The solid center of the academic senate regards freedom of expression as something sacred, and believes that the public should be grateful to have a university at all. Similarly, I suppose, there must be groups of taxpayers who will demand that they control the university totally or there will be no university at all. The balancing of these opposed demands must be achieved by the regents and the administration. It must be accomplished so as to guarantee freedom from harassment for professors who pursue truth as they see the truth. On the other hand the academic senates must moderate their absolutist position on freedom or face a public disavowal. One major step that should be taken soon is an effort by the academic senate on the University of California to write a code of ethical behavior for its membership. Thus its legitimate demand for academic freedom can be buttressed by a parallel commitment to ethical conduct. It is a fact that very few divisions of the academic senate are prepared to agree even on simple matters such as the definition of disruption of classes. In this respect the senate is hesitant to discipline its own membership and thus ties up administrators in petty legalisms when administrators attempt to act in the public interest. This irresponsibility must stop and I believe it will be stopped as the academic senate becomes aware of the public consequences of unbounded permissiveness accorded to its membership.

I see freedom in the public university operating in the same dynamic equilibrium as governs freedom in society at large. Absolutism in academic freedom is equivalent to anarchy in society. It is intolerable. But so is the destructive demand for total conformity. Creativity withers in such an atmosphere. The delicate balance between the freedom of professors and the rights of society must be maintained. The university will then flourish as a free institution. This requires reason and responsibility from advocates of each side in the conflict of opposed rights.

I must listen to the academic community with one ear and to the taxpayers with the other. Sometimes the dissonance of those disparate inputs is extraordinary, but if a public university is to function today in a climate of freedom while still maintaining its public support, those disparate, dissonant voices must be heeded.

THINGS NEVER SEEM TO CHANGE FOR THE AMERICAN TAXPAYER

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, I would like to highly commend one of my Republican colleagues from the State of Ohio, a former member of the distinguished Ways and Means Committee, for his outstanding statement on the need for tax reform. This Ohio Republican stated:

I believe that this income tax, as now administered, is the very essence of injustice. There are men who have no other capital

than their hands and brains, who are taxed more than men worth sixty, seventy, eighty, and a hundred thousand dollars. I can give examples by the dozen of precisely such instances from the working of the income law of last session. A captain in the Army with a family to support, and with no wealth but his salary, pays more income tax to the Government than many a man who has \$50,000 invested and lives comfortably without labor or risk.

Mr. Speaker, this mode of taxation is the very soul of injustice.

Unfortunately, this speech was delivered in this Chamber 104 years ago, on February 16, 1865 by the Honorable James A. Garfield.

Yet what he said 104 years ago is still true today.

And, unfortunately, Congressman Garfield—later President—seems to have been one of the last Republicans to advocate tax reform. The Republican President who occupies the White House today advocated cutting back the tax relief provided to individuals by the House and giving corporations a better tax break; this administration has taken the "Wall Street line" on capital gains; this administration has failed to take a strong stand on cutting back oil depletion.

Well might the American taxpayer ask, "How much longer?"

SHILOH JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
PARMA, OHIO, SUPPORTS COUNCIL
ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, when H.R. 12549 came before the House last September 23 I took the floor to give vigorous support to this measure which would establish a Council on Environmental Quality. The House and Senate are meeting tomorrow in conference, I am told, to try to resolve differences in the two versions of this urgently needed legislation. I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues who are serving as conferees a petition written and signed by more than 900 students and adults at Shiloh Junior High School in Parma, Ohio, which I have the honor to represent.

I am proud to serve such alert and thoughtful constituents and I urge the conference to quickly resolve its differences so that this vital legislation can be enacted.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I wish to insert the following letter and petition from Shiloh Junior High School; as well as an explanatory article from the Plain Dealer:

[From the Plain Dealer, Nov. 12, 1969]

PARMA PUPILS BACK POLLUTION FIGHT

More than 860 pupils and 76 adult employees at Shiloh Junior High School, Parma, have signed a petition endorsing remarks made by U.S. Rep. William E. Minshall Jr. (R-23) calling for establishment of a national council on environmental quality.

Minshall based the need for such a council to combat increasing air and water pollution as well as use of pesticides.

Science classes at the school prepared the petition. In addition to the pupils, signers included 50 teachers, guidance counselors, teacher aides, secretaries, cafeteria workers and cleaning staff.

Copies of the petition have been sent to Rep. Minshall, President Nixon, federal, state and local officials.

SHILOH JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL,
Parma, Ohio, November 16, 1969.

Congressman WILLIAM E. MINSHALL,
Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN MINSHALL: We at Shiloh Jr. High School want to commend you on your concern for the environment in which we live. Your remarks given September 23, 1969, before the House of Representatives concerning bill H.R. 12549, to establish a Council on Environmental Quality were presented by the Science teachers to their students and a discussion followed. As a result, a petition was drawn up supporting your views and 862 students signed it as well as 76 adult employees of Shiloh consisting of 50 teachers, guidance counselors, teacher aides, secretaries, cafeteria workers and cleaning staff.

A copy of the Staff's signatures is enclosed as well as the signatures of the students.

Please continue your efforts in these vital areas which affect the welfare of all humanity.

Very truly yours,

ADAM D. WYSOCKI.

We, the undersigned, from Shiloh Jr. High School, wholeheartedly endorse the remarks of Congressman Minshall in support of H.R. 12549, to establish a Council on Environmental Quality, which were presented to the House of Representatives on September 23, 1969.

We are concerned about Air Pollution.

We are concerned about Water Pollution.

We are concerned about the indiscriminate use of toxic pesticides, and especially urge the banning of DDT.

We are concerned about the destruction of topsoil in strip mining.

We are concerned about the environment in which we live.

We, therefore, urge all levels of government to hasten action in these areas.

Russel Repenning, biology teacher, Lakewood, Ohio.

Robert J. La Cross, history teacher, Parma.

Ruth Dicken, mathematics teacher, Parma.

Janet Bacon, music.

Robert J. Sibel (English teacher).

Wm. E. Furman, history teacher, Cleveland.

Adam D. Wysocki, physical science teacher, Parma, Ohio.

George P. Buchholz, physical science teacher, Parma Hts.

Glenn L. McFarland, art teacher, North Royalton, O.

Glenn Buchanan, Ind. Ed. teacher, Parma.

Dianne F. Detore, instructor of biological sciences, Parma Hts., O.

Doug Patte, instrumental supervision, Parma Hts.

J. Mark Hyps, counselor, Parma.

Arleen Kolby, social studies teacher, Parma.

Mary L. Krisher, English instructor, Parma.

Linda Johnson, math teacher, Parma, O.

Gall Hoover, German/math teacher, North Royalton, O.

Diana Buchanan, library assistant, Parma, O.

Ruth Ingersoll, secretary, Parma Heights, Ohio.

John G. Root, custodian, Parma, Ohio.

Steve Zydiak, assistant custodian, Parma.

Paulette Fenda, English teacher, Parma Hts., Ohio.

Michael Kloppeola, Jr., Science Teacher, Garfield Hts.

Marie E. Myers, Teacher Aide, Parma, Ohio.

Marcelle L. Moremann, Teacher Aide, Parma, Ohio.

Juanita McGinnis, Teacher Aide, Seven Hills, Ohio.

Jim Hinkle, Ind. Educ. Teacher, Parma, Ohio.

Dick Barella, Ind. Educ. Teacher, Parma, Ohio.

Ron Annes, Guidance Counselor, Cleveland, Ohio.

Gerald Dolcini, English, Middleburg Hts, Ohio.

Dolores Verosko, Special Education, Parma, Ohio.

Lois Kasper, Secretary, Parma, Ohio.

Mary Maloney, Librarian, Broadview Hts.

Evelyn Shambaugh, Lib. Asst., Parma.

Lois Malley, Nurse, Parma.

Joyce Kolidge, Teacher, Parma, Ohio.

Doris Wheeler, Span. and Eng. Teacher, Brooklyn Hts, Ohio.

George Reiland, Math. Teacher, Cleveland, Ohio.

Cheryl Hahr, Science Teacher, Euclid, Ohio.

John Ohman, Sp. Education EMR, Parma.

Sharon Sharp, Mathematics Teacher, Parma, Ohio.

Sharon Masterson, Physical Education, Brooklyn, Ohio.

Rick Aiks, Industrial Education Teacher, Brunswick, Ohio.

Joseph F. Hadir, Jr., Teacher of Biology, Parma, Ohio.

Elleen Schroeder, Latin-English teacher, Parma, Ohio.

Bruce R. Giles, music educator, Parma, Ohio.

Linda Weber, art teacher, Parma, Ohio.

Linda Parobek, music education, Cleveland.

Diane P. Erpino, English teacher, Broadview Heights.

Marceda George, math. teacher, Barberton.

C. W. Moore, reading, Parma, Ohio.

M. J. Toomey, language teacher, Parma, Ohio.

Ellen Molnar, English teacher, Independence, O.

Frieda D. Kould, Science teacher, Parma, Ohio.

Mildred Merkle, Social Studies, Parma Heights, Ohio.

Joanne Boros, math. teacher, Parma, Ohio.

Rosemarie A. Miller, Home Economic, P.E., Berena, Ohio.

Robert Dobos, math. teacher, Lakewood, Ohio.

Rose Padovani, music educator, Brooklyn, Ohio.

Donald J. Reppa, English, Parma, Ohio.

June Strashan, Typing, Parma, Ohio.

Eleanor Jira, guidance counselor, Parma, Ohio.

Ruth Glisman, teacher aide, Parma Ohio.

Cathy S. Basen, History, Parma Heights, Ohio.

Ruth C. Allen, Huffman Rd., Parma Hgts., Ohio.

Mary Markivka, Grantwood, Dr.

Stella Lado, Parma.

Carol Wilhelm, Wetzel Ave., Cleveland.

Paula Stagd, Fortune Ave.

Susan Schlemmer, Dartmoor Ave.

Marian Stankiewicz, Chestnut Rd., 7 Hills.

Mary L. Krivas, Ann Arbor Dr., Parma, Ohio.

Frances Kostebrik, Wales Ave., Parma.

Pauline Bogdanski, Hillsdale Ave., Seven Hills.

Katherine Robotthor, George Ave., Parma.

Kathrin Fechko, Norris Ave., Parma.

Elizabeth Messich, Williamsburg, Parma.

Frances Buzinski, West 10 St., Cleve.

Helen Kerecman, Jamestown Dr., Parma, Ohio.

Julie Jandziszak, Keystone Rd., Parma, Ohio.

Chris A. Azzarello, Sandy Dudas, Debbie Kish, Kenneth Kovacs, Russ Panzone, Marilyn Bodrock, Joan Franks, Cindy Guerra, Rose Mary Fenchak, Keith Relicka, Karen Kutis, Marilyn Ponomosne, Frank Russo, Frances Menacore, Susan Chifolo, Craig Darasko, Loretta Huszal, Sandy Noran, Terry Sevchek, Len Soltys Jr., Pam Hill, Judy Carson.

Stan Skvarc, Scott Braun, Don Tataryn, Fran Carruth, Karen Kopecky, Joyce Johnson, Kathy Beck, Lynn Giesel, Martha Harper, Sandy Chetnik, Terri Coniglio, Michael D'Aloisio, Debbie Cummings, Dale Obracay, Candy Lubert, Denise Leissa, Val Poltawes, Linda Evans, Loni Field, Barbara Frydryk, Bob Sammon, Mike Frischak.

Debby Chernow, Pam Brooks, Judy Brake-man, Nancy Baker, Chris Rymsky, Bob Rickard, Marie Prince, Dennis Poland, Mickey Pfeffer, Nancy Majpover, Renée Ottobre, Sue Towson, Sharon Spodar, Elaine Sochacki, Tom Sherman, Lynne Kuban, Carol A. Kovacs, Don Homyk, Richard Eicher, Steve Cymbal, Dan Croyle, Denise Haller.

Nancy Drab, Cathie Ferkol, Terrie Gogan, Joanne Manko, Robert Beck, Paula Barto, Kip Coljohn, Greg Belasco, Michael Ozdowski, Allen Pawl, Anita Radtke, Denise Prescyl, Cheri Law, Petar Necak, Marianna Milenkovich, Jeanne Holop, Denise Schrimpf, Linda Czech, Sandy Cham, Bob Carney.

Teres Fiorello, Linda Fantis, Cherie Drah, Betty Eicholz, Judy Kasik, Sue Gerity, Marianne Licsak, Dan Schinke, Mike Minnich, Wayne Bogdanski, Angela Bona, Jim Diasio.

Dave Janus, Robert Hastings, Amy Sartini, Sharon Roddy, Mark Buemi, Linda Myles, Jill Darwal, Frank Scardina, Janice J. Paehlike, Marlene Gideon, Jeff Dorlanka, Ken Thomas, Pat Cummings, Donald Snowden, Dan Perog, Bara Lindsey, Rose Marie Chomyk, Curt Johnson.

Steve Goyot, John Foreman, Ron Homa, Alice Dumycz, Diane Closter, Don Grossenbaugh, Adele Amato, Tina Stevenson, Greg Kuper, Joe Lanzilotta, Amy Wachtel, Bob Hazafi, Glenn Miller, Kenny Yanda, Roseann Wojton, Debbie Skelnik, Tom Wolan, John Louderback, Celeste Welsheit, Jim Murphy, Larry Komneck, John Kenney.

Gail Assad, Marilyn Carnahan, Bonnie Balinski, Toni Clafarani, Bob Graczy, Pat Rouney, Sandie Krupar, Marianne Gedeon, Frank Petfordish, Marilyn Hlavac, Sharon Barty, Jeanne Ferraro.

Alan Bradny, Mary Kapferer, Katherine Poulos, Melody Florentz, Cheryl Bukala, Eric Burgmann, Joyce Franks, Audrey Kochemo, Nancy Rutkowski, Daria Sarabura, Linda Sedlak, Karen Thompson, Paula Daniels, Sue Shamrock.

Barb Adams, Karen Klatky, Chris Mich-nick, Rohr Sharpe, Charlene Stranding, Mike Morris, Phil Kaszar, Tom Kohan, Ed Stel-gert, Tim O'Keefe, Peggie Thomas, Rosie Douglass, Ron Kuzma.

Gary Freeman, Janice Haire, Cathy Schmini, Jeanne Weber, Clara Varga, Dianne Rizzolla, Kathy Wicelicki, Nancy Zupko, Dave Painting, Lita Marcelletti, Jane Bevington, Mary Lou Yanachid.

Fritz Kapferer, Craig Wilkof, Steve Trutza, Mark Kradab, John Hanna, Bill Kocab, Greg Grzybowski, Rickey Anthony, Pete Agood, Cathy Kelling, Jim Belardo, Frank Bish, Chris Dominick, Julie Eschmeyer.

Carol Ferek, Linda Moyer, Linda Massari, Chuck Padvorac, Karen Lewandowski, Marge Patkoski, Linda Gallagher, Mike Galloto, Dianne Gross, Ellen Karasek, Dawn Pursell, Carl Sisley, Diane Sabo, Barbara Vavrek.

Jan Schlemmer, Cindy Nakao, Kathy Hallal, Bruce Stegkemper, Lewis Plogman, Kay Ameen, Ann Schoen, Al Blaza, Vince Bonus, Ron Koss, Gary Mathis, Ken Matu-shewski, Linda Carlton, Robyn Gardner, Dianna Edwards, Vincent Seminatore, Kevin Slepecky, Michele Becka, Terry Flemming.

Paul Granks, Cella Gebro, Bob Gubanich, Jeff P. Gluvna, Marlin R. Jensch, Mark

Mooney, Chris Dembinski, David Marton, Kevin Lechert, Bill Kennedy, George Klaich, Nicholas LaVecchia, Leona Walker, John Wancock, Anatole Wrubel, Gary Wiltshire, Charlene Wachowraz, Sue Pietras, Michele Sowchlin, Cynthia Lancredi.

Chris Mack, Clayton Zak, Keith Kamps, Michael Demos, Myron Bodnar, eJan Bessick, Marie Beno, Terri Bell, Carmel Groholy, Barb Kudravi, Neal Robinson, Don Altenburger, Denise Lesniak, Brad Doi, Alan Hladis, Dave Patterson, John Swzec, Julie Buchanan, Denise Meczka, Randy Kerr, David Tompkins, Jim Sevchek, Tony Potelicki.

Rick Phillips, Mike Sharrahan, Joseph Mesalla, Jim Cramer, Brian Lovett, Allen Weber, Wayne Gellings, Nancy Maskulka, Diane Kaszar, John Barno, Eileen Kollar, Barry Wisner, Bill Schmitter, Bob Widder-shelm, Thomas Scardina, Terry Yappel, Richard Welker, Gary Beech, Bob Carpenter, Cheryl Hoehn, Sharon Dillon, Rosanne Morabito, Pat Flanagan, Rob Ondo, Jim Hamilton, Jerry Lamcha.

Elke Giehler, Sandra Farrell, Debbie D'Alo-iso, Jeff Figas, Mike Kuschmider, Mark Race, Mark DeRosa, Janet Johnston, Barb Jelinek, Jane Chychlyk, Debbie Brown, Linda Guerin, Valerie Winslow, Brian Bonus, Jeff Jamison, Ted Pankiewicz, Gary Drahos, Nick Nykulak, Louis Pallata, Lori Weber, Mary Craig, Ronald Giovanni, Terry Podany, Jim Chaya.

Carl Dillon, Donna Blasie, Judy Graf, Robert Schenning, Steve Pfeffer, Ken Turner, Greg Sell, Paul Gunn, Robert Burgess, Rein-hard Bauer, Nancy Marich, Francene Kap-tiers, Debbie Maslanka, Daria Wurst, Michael Yavatch, Steve Gale, Mark Neumann, Stan Kaydron, Brian Overholser, Felix Dubanie-wicz, Cindi Reeves, David Wolf, George Fer-tal, Perry Friedl, Gordon Titus, Terry Na-gelski.

Kris Hansen, Jon Sokol, Mike Gallagher, Debra Newell, Don Lemmer, Tom Polefko, Kevin Lunney, Dave Wiltshire, Kathy Agler, Gina Di Giorne, Wenay McClain, Judy Kadell, Diane Camp.

Donna Foreman, Mike Baker, Tom Sch-lueter, Bruce Toplek, Tom Czack, Rick Zan-zano, Doug Benzin, Lauren Slapak, Pat Konet, Marguerite Pawlowski, Bill Suredam, Ken Uertelendy.

Mary Carruth, Lori Barawsky, Nancy Mis-sal, Renate Machel, Carol Johnson, Santina Bono, Jenny Cengic, James Kusinski, Paul Cugini, Tom Sinclair, Charles Vinjord, Wile Talkcebury, Denise Benzin, Don Pawlowski, Randy Thorn, Mike Jerenc, Gary Grzybor-ski, Tom Klimek, Joe Worchelowski.

Mark Comko, Gary DiGiovanni, Andy Blas-ko, Jeanie Aschenbener, Bob Drozda, Cheryl Ericson, Dawn Fink, Beverly Graczyk, Susie Gorkoski, Judy Licsak, Sue Janus, Gary Ra-dike, Cindy Machnicki, Betty Howard, Joe Mascellino, Pot Pfeffer, John Prischak, Cheryl Waskiewicz, Mark Schneider, Daley Mikol, Nick Wasilk, Russ Sagby, Chuck Roddy, Lin-da Wilk, Jeffery Raum, Jim Sangrik, Lynne Janda, Margaret Zelany, Maura Zader, Joseph Czalkiewicz, Bill Matlack.

Charles Donald Allison, Timothy James Brody, Cynthia Cesear, Carleen Blasco, Jill Barrows, Louis Mierzejewski, Suzanne Dent, Doreen Fink, Gayle Franks, Chris Conrad, Cynthia Grife, Joe Hallal, Joan Hrapchak.

Sherry Sech, Katherine Horyn, Karen Ka-put, Phillip Kovach, Bonnie Rutkowski, Jef-fery Kin, Darrell Kolach, Greg Landi, Mary-ann Monreal, Barb Priborsky, Mary Spinelli, Kathy Pienko, John Morcelletti, Ruth Rice, Alfred Zakucia, Debbie Towson, James Ulicky, Gary Fachs, John Snowden.

Steve Florentz, Alan Fargas, Linda Gercevic, Martha Grieger, Brenda Hart-land, Kim Gumbert, Karen Hart, Christine Haynes, Cindy Ibbec, George Necak, Carter Maxin, Keith Garofalo.

David Sullivan, Joseph Shega, Carl Reese, Jim Reid, Andrea Taylor, Hugh Washelm, Leonard Tymhuo, John Warowka, Robert

Weber, Richard Pyrtko, Deborah Gerding, Kathy Welch, Joanne Bell, Michael Winslow.

Brian Buchner, David Adamany, John Beccia, Brian Billhardt, Tom Dagey, Karl Glycer, Theresa Duillia, Barbara Craig, Kath-leen Gabrielski, Evelyn Kilbertus, Alma Harner, Robbie Zenabiy, Paula Hudson.

Kevin Giesel, Dale Zanerick, Jeff Koski, Emanuel Kubik, Jim Lavey, Mark Klecam, Linda Koss, Waydene Morella, Jane Pikul, Denise Parrella, Christine Prancus, Ivan Wolfington, Dave Schillo, Charles Suran, Bonnie Smith, Scott Russell, Sue Shipka.

Ed Chetnik, Tom Bonus, Barb Balogh, Valerie Arrants, John Holz, Lynn Gentile, Wayne Fuelling, Joy Durkot, John Dom-luachy, Joseph Clark, Pamela J. Hartland, Bob Green, David Duvelius, Vicky Zizak.

David Haley, Jim Hamm, Bruce Mocny, Michelle Leland, Laurie Wooton, Dale Kor-mazes, Anne Marie Jozwiak, Vince Kasper-czyk, Rich Prochazka, Russ Prohes, Gordon Wischmeier, Lorraine Plaza, Kelly Ross, Rus-sel Bohaty, Dolores Virze, Maryann Werner, Frank Muckowske, Karen Schwartz, Rus-sell Paul Schroeder.

James Gibbons, Fred Doran, Michael Polk, Kathy Jankovic, Debbie Craftonock, Mark Nagorka, Tom Norwid, John Semachho, De-bbie Kiehl.

Mike Zader, Timothy William Smith, Lori Yadouga, Daneen Maslanka, Sue Werche-lowsky, Debbie Barnhart, Debbie Kleki, Lynn Kavalo, Denise Lucas, Jane Bednarski, Lorie Havlik, Sandra Massey, Greg Kupar.

Tony Festo, Michael Mahon, Al Guerra, Louis Bloss, Dan Rielinger, Andy Palof, Jim Hardin, Bill Ruskowski, Joe Halupnik, Bob Stralka, Jim Detsky.

Calvin Miller, Mike Mazzeo, Jeff Olson, Dawn Widlicka, Madalene Stevens, Betty Starr, Bob Thoma, Carol Gryda, James Flutz, Mark Zackery, Mary Ann Vrefolich, Andrea Lobur, Jay Macho, Don Kiler, Doug Kowalski, Toni Schlesinger, Emily Jesset, Laura Soucek, Laurie Brenner.

Dan Degyansky, Mary Brandt, Tim Bar-niak, Dave Bott, Ted Corrillo, Craig Creager, Becky Bell, Debbie Sinko, Cris Huk, Myron Halszuk, Tim Jelko, Duane Mathias, Don Gault, Bruce Cramer.

Richard Presterl, Renee Edil, Debbie Dem-ing, Michelle Pokorny, Jeanne Thuma, De-bbie Hiles, Kathi Monter, Arthur J. Rotatori, Jeff Patrick, John Trompak, Bryan Swizynski, Raymond Matyas, Dave Cesear, Alfred De-gennaro, James Breckel, Ronald Shipley, Flo Pottarec, Eileen Frederick, Wendy Fay, Vada Susak, Barb Sakaeowski, Jeanne Barno, Jeff Jandik, Susan Kish, Christian Rudziewski, Lynn Dabrowski, Candy Collins.

Mark Hassinger, Oscar Alsansis, Sue Stralka, Sharon Arnst, Lynne Marsak, Mary Ann Gambitta, Linda Saraniti, David Hallan, Raymond Schwarz, Ellen Grahovac, Laurie Kessler, Debbie Hvizd, Mark Drohk, Lee Rini, John Saxton, Mark Odabashian, Jeff Golds-berry, Keith Porty, Chuck Stegman, Dale Teadon, Mike Duliber, Lynn Hassel, Debbie Bernard.

Loren Dauth, Denise Valentine, Bob Hook-way, Connie Dean, Bill Schatz, Vicky Pote-licki, Jim Cozza, Diane Adams, Debbie Branum, Sylvia Ercivio, John Koch, Grace Palof, Jeff Waite, Anita Singleton, Wayne Gebo, Sharon Barylak, Peggy Rice, Pat Kova-chevick, David L. Sell, Sharon Sartin, Danny Harlan, Debbie Grzybowski, Ueve Gahler, Phyllis Guena, John Homola, Bettina Evan-ovich, Greg Chernow, Anita Uenta, Tom Stoop, Sharon Lowry, David Kleinschmidt, Richard Martin, Linda Arndt, Bill Seltz.

Farla Dagey, Terry King, Dan Kleinschmidt, Kathy Mormile, Guy Biondo, Dean Ianni, Louise Woodford, Darlene Zura, Joe Gam-litta, Shelly Shoenfelt, Paul Bruno, Michael Habich, Gregory Sereda, Gerard Pasela, Terry Salva, Paul Larvestze, Susan Zenisek, Micky Myles, Diane Partaglia, Cindy Primeau, Nancy Hila, Nicky Greco, Keith Coljohn, Chris Kasmarek, Jack Lofters, James Puwin-

ski, Harry Steigert, Libby Vlahakis, Sandy Korach, Tom Buehner.

Linda Mann, Regina Birth, Mark Schles-inger, Tom Baird, Joan Turso, Diane Boli-brush, Mary Ann Orito, Jim McWilliam, Chas Poltarec, Neil Carroll, Tommy Ponom-a-renkarn, R. Turner, Howard Lund, Nancy J. Lewandowski, Jim Dolan, Patricia Jarmuth, Carol Lindsey, Peggy Frank, Vicki Klonaris, Randall Ehere, Anita I. Latz, Lester Havlik, Cheri Hamzak, Jim Eschmeyer, Dian Hoag, Cheryl Buskey, Stephanie Smith, Vicki Po-well, Joe Wade, Thelma Wright, Scott Graves, Susan Grimm, Linda Schade.

Sharon Sopata, Gayle Kasmarek, Lou Arcure, Robert M. Helfrick, Karen Bronstrup, Cheryl Markowski, Cindy Colosimo, Jerry Orlando, Bob Marchuk, Gary Riontkowski, Annette Lekche, Tom Bayt, Dave Scherla, Janet McGinnis, Lorie Havlik, John Alten-bernd, Joe Salva, John Nelsen, Mike Opielo, Gary Georalljki, Bruce Danczak, Carrie Grzybowski.

Cindy Beck, Don Vallich, Doris Penberthy, Patty Klyne, Nancy Yappolo, Susan Amen-dolario, Mark Novak, Jill Lawrence, John Ferek, Eileen Crapser, Joe Birko, Kathy Wright, Lori Hawersaat, Bob Hanak, Michael Keresman, Marsha Ozdowski, Cheryl Esarey, Darlene Repko, David Snowden, Vicky BiJa, Alan Kacio, Gail Tuvcy, Jim Gervosi, Dan McGroarty, Alla Poltawes.

Erwin S. Traulhaas, Jerry Cyngier, Steve Kusmer, Joe Zapp, George Tackla, Mike Kolesar, Debbie Nellerlein, Judy Rees, Ken-neth Pacanorsky, Bruce Hiljan, Dom Grut-tadairna, Cathy Rowe, Michael Zanzano, Alan Kacic, Roseann Calo, Jim Kaufman, Douglas Chapman, Jim Solek, Becky Salados, Brian King, Joe Teonc, Cindy Zahand, Joseph Beno, Mark Lehoe, John Schweda, Sandy Anderson, Joleen Desmone, William M. Lynk, Martin Polasko.

Ken Karosy, John Lobur, Sandy Collins, John Cozza, Edward Grife, Charley Baran, Chris Urban, Dave Kolendo, Michael Lange, Ray Renzenbrink, Thomas Adam, Doug Smolik, Charles Pacanousky, Dave Pebral, Doug Zake, Deborah Skoarsanski, Deborah Zelek, Tony Landi, Steve Ludwinski, John Koncelik.

LAW DEANS' OPPOSITION TO MURPHY AMENDMENT

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, the House will soon consider H.R. 12321, the Office of Economic Opportunity author-ization bill. The Senate passed an amendment to that bill known as the Murphy amendment. This amendment would allow Governors of the various States an ultimate veto authority over legal services programs. Such an ar-rangement could spell disaster for one of the most successful programs in the history of OEO.

The groups opposing this amendment are numerous and prestigious. They in-clude the American Bar Association, the Judicial Conference of the United States, the League of Women Voters, the National Council of Churches, and the U.S. Conference of Mayors. In addition, a group of 84 deans of law schools throughout the Nation have subscribed to a statement in opposition to the Mur-phy amendment.

These law school deans are concerned with the interference with the attorney-

client relationship which might occur if this amendment is enacted. They are concerned as well with the detrimental effect that the amendment may have on the development of a sense of professional responsibility among law students to participate in programs providing meaningful legal services to the disadvantaged of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I join these law school deans in opposing the Murphy amendment. I also oppose any other amendment which might restrict the right of legal services attorneys fully to assist indigent clients. Any restriction on the legal services attorneys would in all likelihood cause the poor to view the program as a paternalistic handout meant to deceive and not to help effectively.

Mr. Speaker, I include at this point in the RECORD the statement subscribed to by the 84 law school deans as well as a resolution supporting the legal services program adopted by the American Bar Association on October 18, 1969, and a statement of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights opposing the Murphy amendment:

STATEMENT OF LAW SCHOOL DEANS

We concur with the resolution adopted on October 18, 1969, by the Board of Governors of the American Bar Association and the action of the Judicial Conference of the United States at its meeting on November 1, 1969, and voice our opposition to the amendment to S. 3016 which would give State Governors a veto over legal services programs.

As law school deans we are concerned with the possibility of interference with the attorney-client relationship and the traditional independence of the legal profession. We are especially concerned with the effect that this amendment may have on legal education and the development of a sense of professional responsibility among law students to participate in programs providing meaningful legal services to the disadvantaged.

List of law schools whose deans subscribed to "Statement of Law School Deans" submitted for the record of hearing on November 14, 1969, before Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty.

Samuel H. Hesson, Albany Law School, Union University.

B. J. Tennery, Washington College of Law, American University.

Willard H. Pedrick, Arizona State University College of Law.

Ralph C. Barnhart, University of Arkansas School of Law.

Robert F. Drinan, S.J., Boston College Law School.

Paul M. Siskind, Boston University School of Law.

Edward C. Halbach, Jr., Univ. of California School of Law, Berkeley.

Edward L. Barnett, Univ. of California School of Law, Davis.

Arthur M. Sammis, Univ. of California, Hastings College of Law.

Robert K. Castetter, California Western School of Law of the U.S. International University.

Clinton E. Bamberger, Jr., Catholic University of America School of Law.

Phil C. Neal, University of Chicago Law School.

William F. Zacharias, Chicago-Kent College of Law.

Samuel S. Wilson, University of Cincinnati College of Law.

James K. Gaynor, Cleveland-Marshall College of Law, Cleveland State University.

Howard R. Sacks, University of Connecticut School of Law.

James A. Doyle, Creighton University School of Law.

Robert B. Yegge, University of Denver College of Law.

Robert G. Weclaw, De Paul University College of Law.

Brian G. Brockway, University of Detroit School of Law.

A. Kenneth Pye, Duke University School of Law.

Ben F. Johnson, Emory University School of Law.

William Hughes Mulligan, Fordham University School of Law.

Adrian S. Fisher, Georgetown University Law Center.

Robert Kramer, National Law Center, George Washington University.

Lindsey Cowen, University of Georgia School of Law.

Lewis H. Orland, Gonzaga University School of Law.

Derek C. Bok, Harvard University Law School.

Malachy T. Mahon, Hofstra University School of Law.

Paul E. Miller, Howard University School of Law.

Albert R. Menard, Jr., University of Idaho College of Law.

John E. Cribbet, University of Illinois College of Law.

Cleon H. Foust, Indiana University Indianapolis Law School.

David H. Vernon, University of Iowa College of Law.

Lawrence E. Blades, University of Kansas School of Law.

William Lewis Matthews, Jr., University of Kentucky College of Law.

William L. Lamey, Loyola University School of Law, Chicago.

Leo J. O'Brien, Loyola University School of Law, Los Angeles.

Marcel Garsaud, Jr., Loyola University School of Law, New Orleans.

Edward S. Godfrey, University of Maine School of Law.

Robert F. Boden, Marquette University Law School.

William P. Cunningham, University of Maryland School of Law.

Frederick D. Lewis, University of Miami School of Law.

William B. Lockhart, University of Minnesota Law School.

Patrick D. Kelly, University of Missouri—Kansas City, School of Law.

Robert E. Sullivan, University of Montana School of Law.

Henry M. Grether, Jr., University of Nebraska College of Law.

Thomas W. Christopher, University of New Mexico School of Law.

William H. Angus, State University of New York at Buffalo School of Law.

Robert B. McKay, New York University School of Law.

DeJarman LeMarquis, North Carolina Central University School of Law.

Robert K. Rushing, University of North Dakota School of Law.

John Ritchie, Northwestern University School of Law.

Eugene N. Hanson, Ohio Northern University College of Law.

Ivan C. Rutledge, Ohio State University College of Law.

Ted Foster, Oklahoma City University Law School.

Eugene F. Scoles, University of Oregon School of Law.

Jefferson B. Fordham, University of Pennsylvania Law School.

John J. Murphy, St. John's University School of Law.

Richard J. Childress, St. Louis University School of Law.

Joseph A. Sinclitico, Jr., University of San Diego School of Law.

William J. Riegger, University of San Francisco School of Law.

Leo A. Huard, University of Santa Clara School of Law.

John P. Loftus, Seton Hall University School of Law.

James R. Adams, University of South Dakota School of Law.

Dorothy W. Nelson, University of Southern California Law Center.

Bayless A. Manning, Stanford University School of Law.

Richard T. Dillon, Stetson University College of Law.

Robert W. Miller, Syracuse University College of Law.

Harold C. Warner, University of Tennessee College of Law.

W. Page Keeton, University of Texas School of Law.

Richard B. Amandes, Texas Tech University School of Law.

Karl Krastin, University of Toledo College of Law.

Samuel D. Thurman, University of Utah College of Law.

John W. Wade, Vanderbilt University School of Law.

Harold G. Reuschlein, Villanova University School of Law.

Monrad G. Paulsen, University of Virginia School of Law.

John E. Howe, Washburn University School of Law.

Hiram H. Lesar, Washington University School of Law.

Charles W. Joiner, Wayne State University Law School.

Paul L. Selby, Jr., West Virginia University College of Law.

Spencer L. Kimball, University of Wisconsin Law School.

Frank J. Trelease, University of Wyoming College of Law.

Louis H. Pollak, Yale Law School.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION BOARD OF GOVERNORS, OCTOBER 18, 1969

Whereas, the adoption by the United States Senate of an amendment to S. 3016 seeks to place in the hands of the Governors of the various States a power of veto over the activities of Legal Services Programs funded by the Office of Economic Opportunity.

And whereas, such power contravenes the American Bar Association's commitment to secure full and effective legal services to the poor by providing every person in our society with access to the independent professional services of a lawyer of integrity and competence;

And whereas, enlarging the scope and effectiveness of the power to veto legal services programs is highly undesirable because experience has shown that the power to veto may be used to circumscribe the freedom of legal service attorneys in representing their clients to address issues of governmental action or omission affecting the rights of their clients, and to discourage actions which are politically unpopular or adverse to the views of the majority;

And whereas, such limitations impair the ability of legal services programs to respond properly to the needs of the poor and constitute oppressive interference with the freedom of the lawyer and the citizen;

Now, therefore be it resolved, that the American Bar Association reaffirms its position that the Legal Services Program should operate with full assurance of independence of lawyers within the program not only to render services to individual clients but also in cases which might involve action against governmental agencies seeking significant institutional change.

And, further resolved, that representatives of the American Bar Association be author-

ized to express the concern of the Association as to the effect of the aforesaid amendment.

STATEMENT BY U.S. COMMISSION ON CIVIL RIGHTS VETO POWER FOR GOVERNORS OF LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAMS

The United States Commission on Civil Rights wholeheartedly supports the American Bar Association, The United States Judicial Conference, The National Legal Aid and Defenders Association, as well as local and State bar associations and other interested groups in their opposition to the proposed amendment to the Office of Economic Opportunity authorization bill providing State governors veto power over OEO funded legal services programs. The adoption of this amendment would critically weaken the most successful and fulfilling of all of the OEO programs and undermine the concept of equal legal representation for all. It especially would jeopardize survival of legal services programs that vigorously represent Negroes, Mexican Americans and Indians.

The need for vigorous and aggressive legal representation on behalf of the poor of all races cannot be overemphasized. "Equality before the law," said former Supreme Court Justice Wiley Rutledge, "in a true democracy is a matter of right. It cannot be a matter of charity or of favor or of grace or of discretion." In many areas such as housing, welfare rights and consumer protection, legal services groups have provided the best hope for a system of effective representation for the poor—not just in providing day to day legal counsel on an individual basis—but in attending to those activities which establish legal precedents and law reform affecting large numbers of people.

In a recent speech President Nixon set for the OEO Office of Legal Services the following goal:

"It will take on central responsibility for programs which help provide advocates for the poor in their dealings with social institutions. The sluggishness of many institutions—at all levels of society—in responding to the needs of individual citizens is one of the central problems of our time. Disadvantaged persons in particular must be assisted so that they fully understand the lawful means of making their needs known and having those needs met."

Those legal services programs which have proven most vigorous, resourceful and innovative in the assistance of their clients and which have been responsible for the most far-reaching legal reforms are the very programs which are put in greatest jeopardy by the proposed amendment. The right of disadvantaged groups to have full and effective access to the courts must not be fettered by the political restrictions imposed by the amendment. Such an amendment would be a regressive step that can only serve to discourage the poor from bringing their grievances to the courts rather than to the streets.

APOLLO 11 ASTRONAUTS PRESENTED PERE MARQUETTE DISCOVERY AWARD

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI
OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, on November 8 the State of Wisconsin, the Milwaukee community, Marquette University, and the National Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission had the honor of paying special tribute to the Apollo 11 astronauts—Neil Armstrong, Buzz Aldrin, and Mike Collins.

It was my pleasure to be present on this memorable occasion and to participate as a member of the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission. As you know, Mr. Speaker, the Commission was established by Congress in 1967 to help commemorate the 300th anniversary of Father Marquette's explorations and discoveries in what is now the United States.

In recognition of their own brave and historic efforts the Apollo 11 astronauts were presented with the first "Pere Marquette Discovery Award" medals. The presentations were made at a dinner in their honor at Marquette University in Milwaukee, Wis. The Discovery Award was instituted this year by the Marquette University board of regents in memory of the great explorer whose name the university bears and in tribute to his great achievements.

Like Father Marquette, the Apollo 11 astronauts have earned the right to be called "discoverers" and assuredly enjoy a place in history. It is therefore most fitting that these three courageous men be the first recipients of this award.

Following the dinner, the astronauts were the guests of the Tercentenary Commission at the world premiere of the "Pere Marquette Symphony," which was composed and directed by Dr. Roy Harris. During the intermission of the symphony—performed by the Milwaukee Symphony Orchestra in their beautiful new home in the Milwaukee Performing Arts Center—the astronauts were each presented with a silver Pere Marquette medal, the minting of which was authorized by Congress as part of the tercentenary. The presentation was made by Mr. James Windham, able and respected chairman of the Commission.

In order to acquaint my colleagues further with the Pere Marquette Discovery Award ceremony I am pleased to insert in the RECORD at this point the proceedings from the dinner and symphony program honoring the astronauts:

FATHER MARQUETTE TERCENTENARY DINNER PROGRAM

(Invocation.)

Father RAPHAEL HAMILTON. In the beginning God, then the refulgent galaxies, then the planet earth and man. Today, America, by the combined effort of its men and women, has placed discoverers on planet moon. A great leap forward to the stars! A wonderful lesson for humanity. With the cooperation and union, great deeds are wrought in faith. With these we hope that in the end we may be brought to God. May He bless us then and now. Amen.

Mr. JAMES WINDHAM. Honored clergy, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen. As Chairman of the National Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission, on this historic night for the State of Wisconsin, the Milwaukee community, Marquette University, and the Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission, I would like to take a minute to set the stage for the events of the evening.

Due to the great importance of this dinner, I am pleased to announce that the entire proceedings are being telecast through the courtesy of WTMJ-TV, channel 4, and WVTM, channel 18.

I would like to begin by recognizing distinguished guests at the speaker's table. To my right at the front table—The Most Reverend Leo J. Brust, Auxiliary Bishop of Milwaukee... Mayor Henry Maier and his lovely wife Mary Ann... Mr. Elliot Fitch, Chairman of the Board of Trustees Marquette Uni-

versity and Chairman of the Board of the Marine National Exchange Bank. To my left at the front table—Father Hamilton... County Executive John Doyle and Mrs. Doyle... Acting Governor Jack Olson and Mrs. Olson. To my right—Mr. James Dickey, Professor of English and Poet in Residence, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina... Congressman Clement Zablocki of Wisconsin, Vice Chairman of the National Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission and more than any other man, responsible for Congress establishing the National Commission. Congressman and Mrs. Zablocki... My boss, Father John P. Raynor, Society of Jesus and President of Marquette University. To my left—Father William F. Kelley, Society of Jesus, a member of the National Commission and Assistant to the President, Creighton University, Omaha, Nebraska. I don't know what I'm doing up here with all these educators... Dr. Kenneth Shouldice, a member of the National Commission and Chancellor, Lake Superior State College... my better half and lovely wife Lorraine Windham.

It is now my privilege to introduce the guests of honor—the crew of Apollo 11—Neil A. Armstrong... Michael Collins... Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr.

In 1965, through the efforts of Representative Clement J. Zablocki and United States Senator Philip A. Hart of Michigan, a Joint Resolution of the 89th Congress established the Father Marquette Commission. The Commission includes 12 members—four United States senators, four representatives and four lay people. The Commission was specifically set up to commemorate the 300th anniversary of the advent of Father Marquette in North America. The celebration will last five years—1968–1973. Certainly tonight is and will be the highpoint of the activities of the National Commission. We thank you for sharing this wonderful time with us.

Mr. James Dickey, our next speaker, earned his Bachelor of Arts and Master of Arts degrees from Vanderbilt University. He was the Poet in Residence at Reed College in Portland, Oregon, at San Fernando State College and at the University of Wisconsin. Additionally, he has been the Consultant in Poetry for the Library of Congress. He served in the United States Air Force in Korea and was decorated with the Air Medal. He is the recipient of numerous art prizes. Tonight Mr. Dickey will read his poem, "The Moon Ground", which was commissioned by Life Magazine and appeared in Life's July 4 issue.

Mr. DICKEY. This is a poem I wrote about the Apollo 11 mission, on which it may come as news to you I was not on—except in the strange realm of the imagination. It's always trying to project yourself into the position of another person—say like an astronaut. It is always kind of a suspect thing—even dangerous, but then poets have always done that, and I tried to imagine what it must have been like to be there. I wrote this before they went actually, but that's all right—as I say, poets have always done that. I'm sure it will come as a complete surprise to the crew of the Apollo 11 that this is what they thought, but it really was. They might not admit it, but anyway... It's a poem about first touching down on the lunar surface—these two fellows with the other one circling overhead and the feeling that one has brought the whole of human culture and the whole aspiration of the human race, and all the tortuous, bloody and goriest history of humanity here—all the gods, all the things that men have ever believed in to this desolate place. They brought the human imagination—they brought poetry—they brought religion—they brought Gray's "Elegy". You know? And why not? You remember that from high school, I'm sure. It's supposed to be spoken by one of the fellows on the lunar surface to the other, or maybe just thought by him. You can have it however you like. In this particular context, they've come on

the lunar surface and they're taking these rocks up off the ground to bring them back.

Now, as I say, I wrote this before the mission was completed, and I didn't know whether they were going to bring the moon plaque back or not you know, and kill everybody on the earth—and all that quarantine—evidently not—after all, we're sitting here this evening. But anyway, I won't go on and on but, what I tried to do was to get these facts into a poem, as spoken by one of the astronauts. You can take your pick.

"You look as though
You know me, though the world we came
from is striking
You in the forehead like Apollo, Buddy,
We have brought the gods. We know what
it is to shine
Far off, with earth. We alone
Of all men, could take off
Our shoes and fly. One-sixth of our weight,
we have gathered,
Both of us, under another one
Of us overhead. He is reading the dials he
is understanding
Time, to save our lives. You and I are
in earth light and deep moon shadow
on magic ground
Of the dead new world, and we do not but
we could
Leap over each other like children in the
universal playground of stones.
But we must not play
At being here: we must look
We must look for it: the stones are going
to tell us
Not the why but the how of all things.
Brother, your gold face flashes
On me. It is the earth. I hear your deep
voice rumbling from the body
Of its huge clothes Why did we come here
It does not say, but the ground looms, and
the secret
Of time is lying
Within amazing reach. It is everywhere
We walk, our glass heads shimmering with
absolute heat
And cold. We leap slowly
Along it. We will take back the very stones
Of Time, and build it where we live. Or in
the cloud striped blue of home, will
the secret crumble
In our hands with air? Will the moon-
plague kill our children
In their beds? The Human Planet trembles
in its black
Sky with what we do I can see it hanging
in the god-gold only
Brother of your face. We are this world:
we are
The only men. What hope is there at home
In the azure of breath, or here with the
stone
Dead secret? My massive clothes bubble
around me
Crackling with static and Gray's
Elegy helplessly coming
From my heart, and I say I think something
From high school I remember Now
Fades the glimmering landscape on the
sight, and all the air
A solemn stillness holds. Earth glimmers
And in its air-color a solemn stillness holds
It. O brother! Earth-faced god! Apo-
lo! My eyes blind
With unreachable tears my breath goes
all over
Me and cannot escape. We are here to do
one
Thing only, and that is rock by rock to
carry the moon to take it
Back. Our clothes embrace we cannot
touch we cannot
Kneel. We stare into the moon
Dust, the earth-blazing ground. We laugh,
with the beautiful craze
Of static. We bend, we pick up stones."

Mr. WINDHAM. Thank you, Mr. Dickey. Father Raynor will be our next speaker.

Father JOHN P. RAYNOR. Thank you, Mr. Windham. Distinguished guests and friends of Marquette University. Our university has observed many proud milestones since its doors first opened in 1881. Tonight, as part of the Pere Marquette Tercentenary, we are celebrating another great, great milestone, which I'm sure will prove most memorable in this history of this institution. Tonight we present our first Pere Marquette Discovery Award Medals. And the honor that we pay to their recipients is a most fitting way to memorialize the work of Father Jacques Marquette of the Society of Jesus, discoverer with Joliet of the Mississippi River, and patron of this university.

Human history and human tradition are filled with the accounts of man's great achievements. Great achievements in the struggle to find answers to age-old questions. Through the centuries, brave men have, for the benefit of their fellow men, faced and accepted the challenges of nature. The challenges to make their impossible dreams come true. Father Marquette was one of these men.

He lived at the very edge of mystery. He knew the terrors of fatigue in an alien land. He kept his own mind open and he kept it deep. He kept his sense of beauty—his ability to make beauty, and, above all, his ability to see beauty. He did this in places remote and strange and unfamiliar to himself.

In memory of this great man, and in tribute to his very great achievements, we've struck a medal—and we'd like tonight to present this medal for the first time to the intrepid crew of Apollo Eleven, who like Father Marquette, explored a new world and gave us illumination and light and insight. Illumination and light and insight into the world of the unknown and into the wonders of the unknown world. Father Marquette himself proved, as explorers before him had done, and as the astronauts of today have done, that the analogies, insights and harmonies of scientific discovery can find their way into the wider life of man on this earth.

Like Father Marquette, the Apollo Eleven astronauts have earned the right to be called "discoverers" and, as a result, beloved and respected by all. And as long as heroism is prized, the names of Armstrong, Collins and Aldrin will be remembered, and the history of our nation in particular will be greatly embellished. And as long as men wish to recall the past and the development of great ideals, so long will the astronauts historic mission fascinate the imagination, enlarge the minds and enkindle the hearts of all men.

Like the astronauts, Father Marquette faced the challenges of the unknown in his explorations and discoveries in the Great Lakes and Upper Mississippi River regions. He was a man of vision—a pioneer—a discoverer in 1669, just at the astronauts are men of vision—pioneers and discoverers in a much more complex and changing world of 1969.

Like the astronauts and like Marquette, whose name we bear, this university too, through excellence in thought and scholarship, also probes the unknown and seeks to satisfy its destiny to make men free through the personal possession of truth about God's creation—about man's relation to man and about man's relation to God.

For all of these reasons we are pleased, as a university, to bestow the first Pere Marquette Discovery Award Medals on the crew of the Apollo Eleven. We are grateful that our astronauts are able to be here this evening at considerable sacrifice to accept these awards, for, as you know, they have just returned to the United States only three days ago after a very exhausting 44,000 mile world tour.

On behalf of our trustees, our faculty, staff, students and alumni, it is my distinct

pleasure this evening to present to them the Pere Marquette Discovery Award.

This medal honoring Father Marquette and his work in this very area 300 years ago, was inaugurated recently by our Board of Trustees. It was designed by our esteemed colleague and good friend, Mr. Edmund Lewandowski, who is President of the Layton School of Art here in Milwaukee.

Bearing the 16 points of the compass rose, the medal symbolizes the possibility of discovery in every direction. The ring in the center of the medal, carrying the inscription "Pere Marquette Discovery Award" surrounds a letter "M", which represents both the family name of Father Marquette and the name of the university that has been named after him. The design suggests the sunburst which symbolizes the enlightenment of mankind. This, of course, is the particular aim of Marquette University—as surely it must be of any university. This is one reason—this is the decisive reason—why these medals should be presented in this setting—in this company—on this night to men who opened up for us tremendous new possibilities for observation and experiment; new means of communication with our fellow men; new opportunities for common understanding among people who share a common purpose and who desire to work together in freedom, in truth, in trust and in peace.

As I see it, this is the meaning of the astronauts' spectacular achievement. This is the meaning of Father Marquette's achievement, and this is the essence of our work as a university.

I would like at this time to call forward, in order, our three astronauts to receive their medals, and as I call them up here, I will first read the citation or certificate which will be presented to them; then, with the assistance of Mr. Windham, Chairman of the National Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission, will put the medal around their neck.

First of all, Mr. Neil Armstrong . . . The Pere Marquette Discovery Award bestowed upon Neil A. Armstrong in recognition of his exploration aboard Apollo 11, whereby he became the first human being to set foot upon the moon on July 20, 1969. Given this eighth day of November in the Year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty nine—signed by Mr. Elliot Fitch, Chairman of our Board of Trustees and by myself.

Michael Collins . . . Pere Marquette Discovery Award bestowed upon Michael Collins in recognition of the rendezvous he made with the first men to walk upon the moon July 21, 1969. Given this eighth day of November in the Year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty nine.

Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr. . . . Pere Marquette Discovery Award bestowed upon Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr. in recognition of his exploration aboard Apollo 11 whereby he landed upon the moon July 20, 1969—given this eighth day of November in the Year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and sixty nine.

Now, ladies and gentlemen, I would like to call on the astronauts themselves for response to your congratulations and to our award.

Mr. NEIL ARMSTRONG. Father Raynor, Mr. Windham, distinguished guests. We of Apollo 11 are indeed honored to be with you here this evening and to have been chosen as the recipients of the first Pere Marquette Discovery Award medals. As you are celebrating the 300th anniversary of the great voyage of discovery by the remarkable man in whose honor these awards are named, we feel that there are a number of similarities and parallels to our own voyage of discovery. There are of course some rather striking differences. Pere Marquette's famed exploration of the Mississippi, father of waters, involved a relative handful of men, himself and his friend and companion Louis Joliet, five other Frenchmen, I believe, and a handful of In-

dian guides. Apollo 11 was a tremendous team effort, involving the dedicated efforts of thousands of persons in this country and around the world. Indeed, the Apollo program has been described as being the greatest cooperative endeavor, entirely for peaceful purposes, that has ever been engendered in the history of the world. At its peak, more than 350,000 persons in government, industry and in the university community were directly participating. Thus, we of the Apollo 11 crew accept these awards with a full appreciation of the fact that Columbia and the Eagle could never have reached the moon, and we could never have sent back the word from Tranquility base that the Eagle has landed without that great teamwork and cooperation that gave us that confidence. So, I feel that, symbolically, we are accepting these awards on behalf not only of ourselves but on behalf of those thousands of others. And just as Pere Marquette's great exploration of three centuries ago had far-reaching consequences that are still being felt today—paving the way for many events that followed—we believe that the full implication of Apollo 11 may not be fully realized for decades or even centuries to come. As you know, Mike, Buzz and myself have just returned from an extended good will tour that has taken us to 30 foreign cities in almost that many countries, in just more than a month. Perhaps you have heard of the contemporary film entitled, "If this is Tuesday, it must be Belgium". A trip to the moon seems easy by comparison. There was one thing that we became increasingly aware of during that trip around the world. Due to the marvel of modern communication, people everywhere had almost a sense of personal participation in Apollo 11. From the many comments we received, and in the warm welcomes that we received in every city around the world we visited, we like to think that our mission has helped to draw the nations of the world closer together. As President Nixon said to us in that famous and expensive long distance telephone call from the White House to us on the moon, "For one priceless moment in history, all the people on the earth are really one."

"We'd like to thank you for this great honor. I'd like now to introduce my colleague, Mr. Michael Collins."

Mr. MICHAEL COLLINS. Thank you, Neil, and good evening ladies and gentlemen. It has sometimes been said that the space program is now in approximately the same state of development that the airplane was during the early days—say in the days of the Wright brothers when they made their first small step at Kitty Hawk. I'm not sure whether this is a good analogy, but I would like to mention one case in point when the two good brothers were invited to a very important, prestigious dinner and Wilbur was called upon by the toastmaster to make a few remarks—and he sort of stammered and said, "Gee, I'm sorry—there must be some mistake, but Orville is the one that does the talking". Now Orville stood up and said, "Well, Wilbur just made the speech". So I suppose I could say that Neil just made the speech, but I would be remiss if I did not add my own thanks, which I very sincerely feel, for the great honor which has been bestowed upon us.

It's still a bit difficult I think for those connected with the Apollo program to realize just how far we have come since this nation accepted the commitment to go to the moon back in 1961—which was back in the days when we had no Saturn 5 rockets, no even rough idea of how to conduct a rendezvous, no space suits, no lunar modules—well really, not much of anything. It was even in fact before John Glenn had made the first orbital flight. As Dr. Tom Paine, the administrator of NASA said, the lunar exploration mission got under way on vision, discipline, courage and commitment. We gained the essential knowledge and understanding step by step

along the way—developing a whole new technology. Mistakes were made, but a team was forged in government, industry and the universities—very importantly the universities—all working together to anticipate obstacles and to overcome them. It is a record of achievement that this nation can be proud of; and, as we learned on our world tour, it has made the people of all other nations, at least all those other nations which we visited, proud as well. President Nixon has spoken of the spirit of Apollo, and we have had ample opportunity these past weeks to see that it really exists, and we feel most fortunate to be able to be a part of it.

You know, I wonder sometimes whether Father Marquette, whom I really admire, would have been admired in this day and age. You know, he set off in search for the Mississippi River at a time when his home parishioners, the Indians, had deep and serious troubles in the lines of education and health, and he probably should not have done that. He probably should have gotten 100% of those things sorted out before he left. But I think he was a wise man and he understood that we have to keep pushing back our frontiers, and that is what we have done on project Apollo, and I hope that that will be the way we'll continue to run this country in the future—to have a blend of solving our problems at home, while we do in fact push our frontiers forward.

I'd like now to introduce Colonel Buzz Aldrin.

Mr. EDWIN ALDRIN. Thank you very much, Mike. I couldn't agree with your words more. Father Raynor, Mr. Windham, distinguished guests, and ladies and gentlemen. The Pere Marquette Discovery Awards have a very special meaning for all of us, because without the stimulus of exploration, whether in the uncharted areas of the earth by men like Pere Marquette, or into the nature of things by explorers in their scientific laboratories, or now, in space, men's mental capabilities would tend to stagnate. Man's concept of himself and of his relation to the earth environment, and now even to the stars, could not have developed save for the broadening and deepening of his vision which this exploration brings. It forms a part of our purpose in existence—a motivation to find ourselves—which today has become a burning issue in a great numbers of the world's populations. We believe that the newest form of exploration in space is opening up the possibility of an entirely new destiny for man. We have run out of many frontiers on the surface of the earth. Mankind has opened unlimited new frontiers in space. Space technology is simply the latest tool to be used in our endless quest for understanding of man's place in the universe. But as a bonus, this tool is also serving to provide material benefits far beyond anything that we would have imagined many years ago—in areas of communications, navigation, weather forecasting, agriculture and forestry, and many other earth resources. The list is almost endless. In this respect, space exploration is following in the tradition of all previous exploration in influencing human development and adaptability—socially, politically and economically. None of us could even venture to guess what will grow out of some of these future explorations. The factor of unpredictability lies at the heart of every discovery—of every venture into the unknown. No one can really foretell in years or centuries to come what we will find. We do know from experience that characteristically, man has the tendency to be very conservative in his estimates of what will come in the future. Very shortly, Apollo 12 will be starting on its voyage to the moon and they, as we did, will make their small steps for man. But there will be many more such steps—longer and much surer than ours—we have no doubt about that.

At this time, we would like to thank all

of you for the great honor that you have given all three of us by bestowing this medal on us.

Mr. NEIL ARMSTRONG. Father Raynor, when we were on the moon we had a still camera with us, and it only had one roll of film. We're sure glad it came out—we could prove we were really there. So we'd like to present to Marquette University, and ask you to accept for them, one of the pictures off that roll.

Father RAYNOR. Thank you very much, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Collins and Mr. Aldrin for this wonderful gift to Marquette University. We know you were really there—it's recorded, and we know that you're really here and we're delighted to have you here. It's really a pleasure to listen to gentlemen like this with their varying approaches to something magnificent that together they have done. I took a special pleasure, of course in listening to Mr. Collins. He's got a good wit; but, as I was telling Neil Armstrong during the meal that he is the best physics teacher that I had anyway, because I remember his TV program—he showed me what it was like to drink water up there in the moon flight.

I want to thank all of you for participating in this tribute to three great men who forged the first link between the earth and the moon. I wish again to express my gratitude to the astronauts themselves, and to all of you who have joined us this evening. I would be remiss if I did not offer a special note of gratitude to the members of the National Pere Marquette Tercentenary Commission, to the Wisconsin State Committee and to the Marquette University Tercentenary Committee, as well as to all of those who have labored so arduously to make this celebration a truly memorable event for Marquette University and for the City of Milwaukee. I hope the example which has been set for us by the historic missions of Father Marquette and the crew of Apollo 11 will continue to inspire each of us to strive, in our own personal way, to emulate them—and to do what we can to create the brightness of a new-born day—as they have done—not for ourselves alone, but for the world, for all of our fellow men—for our country—for everybody.

Thank you very much.

Mr. WINDHAM. Thank you Father Raynor, and thank you gentlemen all. Now His Excellency, Bishop Brust, will give the benediction.

Bishop BRUST. We thank You Almighty Father for the food we have just shared—but tonight especially, our hearts are filled with gratitude for the recent lunar landing. We thank You for the intellectual genius that discovered the laws of nature and the principles of physics from which such a voyage could be conceived. In them we thank You, Almighty Father, Whose divine intellect originally devised the laws of nature and created the limited, finite mind of man designed to discover them. We thank You for the marvelous human skill that produced the machinery for the trip, for they dimly reflect the products of Your divine skill, the balanced universe and the raw material we need for our own works. We thank You for the dedication and the courage of our astronauts who risked all to give humanity a foothold in the heavens. For this reminds us, Father, that You risked sending Your Son to put His footprint and His blood on our planet. And it reminds us, too, that You continually hold out Your hand from the heavens to beckon us to join You there in our true home. Amen.

Mr. WINDHAM. I want to remind you of the arrangements for tonight. In order to facilitate moving to the Performing Arts Center on time, please leave your cars here at Marquette. Busses will be waiting in front to take you to the Performing Arts Center building. The busses will run until all have been returned. Thank you all for coming. We will see you at the Symphony and reception.

FATHER MARQUETTE TERCENTENARY INTERMISSION OF PERE MARQUETTE SYMPHONY

Father RAYNOR. Ladies and gentlemen—my name is John P. Raynor. I am President of Marquette University. You have just listened to Dr. Roy Harris' Pere Marquette Symphony. The symphony was commissioned by the National Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission as part of the five year celebration honoring the 300th anniversary of this great scholar, explorer, missionary and priest; and his arrival in this part of the world.

Among our guests helping us commemorate this evening—we would like to recognize the following: First of all—the Mayor of the City of Milwaukee, Henry W. Maier. Secondly—our County Executive, Mr. John L. Doyle; and finally—the Acting Governor of the State of Wisconsin, Mr. Jack B. Olson. We have with us also, the Vice Chairman of the National Father Marquette Tercentenary Commission, Congressman Clement Zablocki of Wisconsin.

It is my privilege now, ladies and gentlemen, to introduce the Chairman of that Commission—a fellow Milwaukeean and a very close friend, Mr. James C. Windham, President of the Pabst Brewing Company, together with the Apollo 11 astronauts whose intrepid exploits 300 years later assist us in recalling the deeds of Father Marquette.

Mr. WINDHAM. In my judgment, there will never be a symphony composed that will get that kind of an ovation. Thank you Father Raynor.

Congress established the National Father Marquette Commission in 1965. Two years later, Congress authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to furnish the Commission with a supply of bronze Marquette medals struck by the United States Mint in Washington, D.C. A small number of medals were coined in silver.

Tonight I have the privilege of presenting to the crew of Apollo 11 silver Father Marquette Tercentenary medals on behalf of the members of the National Commission.

(Medals were then presented in order to Nell Armstrong, Michael Collins and Edwin E. Aldrin, Jr.)

Mr. WINDHAM. NASA was kind enough to assist us in getting the three astronauts to join us this evening, so I had this medal enlarged and put on a plaque to send back to NASA to hang in the NASA headquarters and we will mail this to NASA. Thank you very much gentlemen.

Mr. ARMSTRONG. Mr. Windham, Father Raynor—it's a great pleasure for me on behalf of not only the crew of Apollo, but the thousands of Americans around the country who have made it possible to accept these awards. It's a particular pleasure to accept them here in this beautiful hall in this magnificent building in the City of Milwaukee. As a small remembrance of our visit here on this occasion, I'd like to present to the Tercentenary Commission a small photograph taken during the flight of Apollo 11.

Mr. WINDHAM. Thank you Neil. This shall be preserved with the records of the Tercentenary Commission, and in the end it will end up in the Library of Congress.

INITIAL TEACHING ALPHABET: TEACH THEM TO READ AT FOUR WITH HELP OF MACHINES

HON. ROMAN C. PUCINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. PUCINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week the General Subcommittee on Education heard testimony from Sir James Pitman,

developer of the initial teaching alphabet, on the overwhelming success of his method in teaching very young children to read.

The initial teaching alphabet uses 44 symbols which represent specific sounds, augmenting the present 26 letters of the alphabet. Close to half a million preschool and first grade children in America are learning to read in classes that use ITA. Almost 1½ million children are using the system in England. Surprisingly, children on both sides of the Atlantic encounter no difficulty in making the transition at about the second grade to books that utilize the 26-word alphabet exclusively.

Here in our Nation's Capital, an ITA project is meeting with highly rewarding results in teaching preschoolers to read. Under the creative leadership of Frank Ferguson, 3- and 4-year-olds are learning to read at a day-care center.

A description of Mr. Ferguson's success and the very inexpensive system he has inaugurated appeared in the Washington Post, November 30, 1969. I bring it to the attention of my colleagues today as an excellent example of a highly innovative yet uncomplicated teaching method that works.

Mr. Speaker, the article follows:

TEACH THEM TO READ AT 4 WITH HELP OF MACHINES

(By Colman McCarthy)

James E. Allen Jr., the U.S. Education Commissioner and a man of quiet wisdom, pledged the Nixon administration recently to a new national goal: assuring every citizen "the right to read."

"We should," said Allen, "immediately set for ourselves the goal of assuring that by the end of the 1970s the right to read shall be a reality for all—that no one shall be leaving our schools without the skill and desire necessary to read to the full limits of his capability."

Although the administration has been silent about this new war on illiteracy—it would have been called that a few years ago—the nation's concerned teachers know that it is high time. They see daily the choking, mumbling kids who are helpless before the printed page.

Official statistics are nearly unbelievable: one in four students have serious reading deficiencies; in city schools, up to one in two students read below expectation; one in two jobless youths is functionally illiterate; two in three youngsters tested recently by the Pentagon were below the seventh grade in reading ability.

A UNIQUE PROJECT

One educator who has converted his alarm into creative action is Frank Ferguson, a 30-year-old educational innovator. He is presently directing a Washington day-care reading project that may prove to be one of the programs capable of fulfilling Allen's goal.

Specifically, Ferguson and a skilled staff of eight local teachers are teaching 100 3- and 4-year-olds in inner-city Washington how to read through the use of a low-cost technology. Operating for the past six months on a small Office of Economic Opportunity grant, this project is the only one in the country that is teaching children this young and this poor this cheaply.

Few education programs, to begin with, have tried to teach 3- and 4-year-olds to read, and those that did dealt with middle-class children, usually in experimental classes in a university setting. Moreover, the technology was high cost; talking typewriters, the most common type of early reading technology, cost \$35,000 to \$45,000 with a high maintenance

cost. The Washington project uses audiovisual-response teaching machines that cost only \$350.

A BRITISH DEVICE

For many years, Ferguson searched for a method that would quickly, efficiently and unpressuringly allow 3- and 4-year-olds to learn to read. The only one he found that consistently produced results with children that young was the Initial Teaching Alphabet.

First used in British infant schools and now operating in 10 percent of U.S. elementary school districts (according to the ITA Foundation), it has 44 letters, each standing for a sound and covering the entire English language. It borrows 24 letters from the conventional alphabet, drops "x" and "q," adds 17 new symbols resembling combinations of standard letters and adds three new symbols.

"About the same time I came to ITA," says Ferguson, "my 2-year-old son was learning words. I noticed how confused he was when I would say 'table' and then identify one by pointing to the dining room table. Later, we'd be in another room and I'd say 'table' again, this time pointing to the kitchen table or the coffee table or the telephone table. He couldn't understand it. All those different-shaped and different-sized objects, yet all named table."

"It's the same confusion when a child begins reading with the conventional alphabet. He is taught, say, the sound 'l.' There are some 20 ways to spell it, as in eye, aye, aisle, height, cry, choir, by, bye, buy. Or the sound 'a' can be pronounced at least five ways, as in 'The fat father's fate was to fall while skating.'"

"For millions of kids, this is when the reading problem begins. They see reading as complex, furtive and frightening. If a child has other problems to cope with, as do most of the poor kids—perhaps no father, or poor health, a crowded home life—he has little stamina to persevere with reading until the system becomes figurative."

So he lags and falls behind. At this early age, he suffers a bruise that in time will swell, fester and eventually make him a social cripple. Society will call him a "functional illiterate" and hand him a broom to do its dirty work.

The reason why Ferguson in the classroom and James Allen in his speeches see early reading as critically important is that by the age of 4, a child has formed half the intelligence he will have at maturity. Well-known educators like Benjamin S. Bloom and J. McVicker Hunt have been saying for years that by the time a child begins school at 6, he has reached two-thirds of the intelligence he will have at 17.

What this means, grimly, is that for many children who do not learn to read at 3 or 4, what begins at 6 is already remedial education.

AN EASY TRANSITION

One of the fears about widespread use of ITA is that it is meant to replace the traditional alphabet. This is not true. After a child learns to read with it, he switches over to the regular alphabet. The conversion is speedy and without trouble.

Psychologically reinforced with success and confidence, the child is now ready for the complexity of the 26-letter alphabet. He does not come cold to the language barrier; thanks to the phonetic code-breaking system of ITA, the barrier has been broken.

The main criticism of ITA is that many children lose its advantages by the time they reach the second and third grades. But this has more to do with the inadequate schools they go into than with the quality of their earlier learning.

British educators take the challenge of early reading much more seriously than Americans. After eight years of trials with ITA, John Downing wrote in the London

Sunday Times: "Teachers who continue to teach reading with the conventional English alphabet and spelling can be sure that they are making it harder for their pupils to become literate. They are using a defective instrument which is a serious handicap to young children in their first steps in learning to read and write."

Locally aside from the day-care reading centers, ITA is used at the Bruce and Monroe elementary schools in the Cardozo area among first and second graders. Bruce Principal Alma Felder said recently: "Since we introduced ITA into our school, I've seen the reading ability of the children blossom almost immediately—not just in the classroom, but also in the official reading tests."

The parents of the children are so sold on ITA that they have asked the D.C. Model Schools Division to use it in the new Tubman school soon to open in the same neighborhood.

One reason why the early-reading innovations of Frank Ferguson are seen by many as among the most exciting in the country is that, aside from the ITA manuals that he and his staff wrote themselves, he is using technology. The self-operating audio-visual machines—developed by Dr. Peter Goldmark of the CBS laboratories at Stamford, Conn.—use 40 cartridges for the entire program.

The machine projects letters and pictures onto a televisionlike screen. A coordinated tape talks and asks questions appropriate to the pictures. The child responds by pushing one of four keys. The machine then advances to a new picture and question—at the child's own pace and pleasure.

"We've only begun to notice," says Ferguson, "that the first thing a child interacts with, after his parents, is television. So his early learning pattern is resoundingly audio-visual. This is why teaching ITA by means of a self-operating machine fits in to the child's life almost naturally. The letters are compatible with his comprehension and the machine, which looks like a TV, fits in with his technological culture."

"ITA works," says Dr. William Zangwell, director of educational evaluation at the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. "It makes a significant improvement in a student's reading ability. Frank Ferguson has gone a step further by packaging it simply. He has taken a good idea out of the laboratory and put it into the classroom."

A PITMAN DEVELOPMENT

Anita Metzger, who has three highly successful early-learning schools in the Atlantic City area, is responsible for bringing the Initial Teaching Alphabet to the United States. In 1962, after teaching diction, drama and corrective speech for 35 years and conducting the CBS "Children's Theater of the Air" for two decades, Mrs. Metzger went to London to study under Sir James Pitman, the educator who developed the ITA.

A year later, Mrs. Metzger "imported" the idea to this country. She began with a pilot class of six 4-year-olds and now has three schools with 60 children each.

"In my schools, the 4-year-olds usually spend a year learning to read with ITA," she says. "After they are at ease with it, we transfer them to the standard alphabet. The ITA already has 24 letters from the standard alphabet, so the familiarity is there. I have never had a child who did not make the transfer easily."

After her early successes with ITA, educators began visiting Mrs. Metzger's schools to see for themselves. Among them were representatives of the Ford Foundation.

"They offered me a large sum to spread ITA," said Mrs. Metzger. "But they wanted it to be used among first and second graders. I said it should be done earlier, at ages 4 and 5. That is when the child is eager to learn reading. Why wait just because the system finds it more convenient to begin at ages 6 and 7?"

"I wanted to keep control of my schools for another reason. I have something to prove about education: that ITA is the way to defeat illiteracy. I knew I would have to do this on my own, in the private competitive market where the public demands and will appreciate results. I would have liked to have worked in the public school system, but it has become so locked up with outdated and ineffective approaches that it is not capable of more innovation."

Mrs. Metzger will soon open more schools around the country, including one in Silver Spring for 4- and 5-year olds. They will use technology.

"If we're going to educate all the Nation's children—not just in easy reading but in nearly everything—we have to do it with audiovisual machines and computers," she says. "It is time educators got over their fear of technology. The machine won't replace them; it will help them."

DOT NEARS FIRST CYCLE

HON. SAMUEL N. FRIEDEL

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. FRIEDEL. Mr. Speaker, legislation creating the Department of Transportation was enacted a little over 3 years ago. Many changes have come about, both in Government and in industry transportation circles during the agency's initial years of existence.

Harry L. Tennant, longtime transportation writer on the Washington scene, spells out some of the effects the Department has had in the current issue of U.S. transport. I believe this well prepared analysis of DOT, covering its activities thus far shows conclusively that this Department has now won a secure place among other cabinet-level agencies and before long will supply the Congress and the executive branch with some of the answers to the Nation's complicated and troubled transportation problems.

I believe the following excerpts from Mr. Tennant's recent article will be of interest to my colleagues and I include them in the RECORD at this point:

DOT NEARS FIRST CYCLE

(By Harry L. Tennant)

Legislation creating a Department of Transportation was signed nearly three years ago but the staggering task of making sense out of the highly competitive transportation field is far from realized.

True, DOT hasn't chewed up a Secretary or two as happened at the Department of Defense. One might say the agency's achievement has been a move toward a centralized area for all of the fights that have existed among transportation mediums since the depression years.

Lyndon Johnson approved the legislation creating DOT on Oct. 15, 1966, but DOT did not come into being until the following April. Organization has been the order of the day since. DOT can boast of one achievement directly and another indirectly. It has given safety a new emphasis and it has brought a sprawling army of transportation experts to Washington in the industry sector. This has been particularly evident in the shipper and rail areas. This indirect accomplishment has been noticeable in the railroad field where a sizeable army of rail lobbyists have moved into Washington probably giving this industry its greatest Washington team.

... Too, DOT has pushed vigorously for high speed rail transportation. And in a sense it has had to drag rail heads along with the thinking. This complexity needs money and lots of it. It may well be that Mr. Volpe's shining hour will come here. If the Administration decides to support a big subsidy venture for passenger train operations, then it may well that Mr. Volpe can guide some of the thinking in Republican circles here. Some, of course, think DOT hasn't pushed as hard as it could in the high speed field, or at least its efforts haven't matched the complaints in Congress. Perhaps the Interstate Commerce Commission's study on rail passenger operations expected momentarily will prod the government into speedier action but certainly little will come out of it legislatively in this session of Congress or for that matter in the next few months.

Urban transportation does have a top priority at DOT. It is perhaps the most political of issues there and it takes a great deal of money. It seems to have more of any immediate priority than the airways-airport programs, but the wrangling in Congress over just how these projects will be financed remains the key stumbling block to faster action.

DOT has thrown in its weight behind higher truck carrying capacities and it has gone along here about as far as it can go. It's anyone's guess whether Congress will approve this.

DOT has also been active in the area of putting more teeth in regulations governing shipment of hazardous materials, both on the highways and railroads. Like most issues this one has been spurred on by Ralph Nader and more recently by the U.S. Army inadvertently. Much will come out of this effort because the States are more and more making themselves heard. This drive is unique in that it is under the jurisdiction of a unit headed by William Jennings and it can make decisions stick. The National Transportation Safety Board which is attached to DOT for administrative purposes has in recent months made its existence felt publicly. Undoubtedly more will be heard from this sector as time goes along.

There is still some evidence that the Federal Aviation Administration would like to be divorced from DOT, but the chances of this are fading. There isn't enough support in Congress and the Administration doesn't appear to be much interested.

Probably the true course of DOT will be steered by such persons as Paul Cherrington and Jim Beggs, both experts and long-time planners. Volpe depends a great deal on these individuals. If they remain, DOT may come out with some striking annual reports in 1971 and 1972. If they leave, the Department could slip back to an earlier state.

But perhaps the most noticeable advancement in Washington transportation circles has been industry reaction to setting up DOT. Numerous persons have been moved into trade and industry groups during the past two years. Practically all of these individuals are experts in one form or another.

Stan Sender, who for a number of years was Transportation Counsel for the Senate Commerce Committee, is directing Sears & Roebuck's transportation activities in Washington. Dr. William Haddon, Jr., former Director of DOT's National Highway Safety Bureau, now heads the Insurance Institute for Highway Safety. He is assisted by Ben Kelly, who directed public relations for the Federal Highway Administration at DOT. Charles Webb, former ICC Chairman and longtime transportation authority, heads the National Association of Motor Bus Owners. He is also assisted by a former DOT information head, Stan Hamilton. The Automobile Manufacturers Association enlisted the services of Lynn Mote, a mainstay on Capitol Hill, who for many years had been closely allied with

transportation. Shortly after DOT was set up the National Automobile Dealers Association picked out Frank McCarthy Jr. to help guide its legislative program. McCarthy had been a legislative liaison man at the ICC and had served for a number of years on the House Rules Committee. Ray Courage, also a top new man at DOT, moved into the job of directing problems for the Independent Natural Gas Association.

Such organizations as the Railway Progress Institute moved lock, stock and barrel from Chicago to Washington after the Department came into being. It brought along Nels Lennartson, formerly Assistant Secretary for Public Affairs at the Defense Department. Later Frank Holeman, longtime Washington and New York newsman joined this organization. More recently he has been named Manager of the newly formed organization known as the Tire Industry's Safety Council.

A very significant feature has been the strengthening of the Washington railroad picture. In recent months a number of rail experts have been moved to Washington, some of them with the title of vice president.

Such organizations as the American Trucking Association, the Air Transport Association and the Association of American Railroads have done some shifting about but they remain very much the same. The American Waterways Operators and the Freight Forwarders Institute have reshaped their organizations. Both have become considerably stronger. Reports have circulated for some time that such shipper groups as the National Industrial Traffic League may be re-done to match more the needs created by the setting up of DOT and the various congressional committees but this has not yet become a fact.

EQUAL RIGHTS AMENDMENT

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a resolution which makes me a cosponsor of the equal rights amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

Simultaneously I would like to place in the RECORD two articles which are germane to the equal rights issue. The first is by Richard E. Farson and appears in the December 16, 1969, issue of *Look* magazine. The second appears on the front page of yesterday's *Washington Post*.

The articles follow:

[From *Look* magazine, Dec. 16, 1969]

THE RAGE OF WOMEN

(By Richard E. Farson)

On July 31, ten young militants, shouting obscenities and distributing radical literature, burst into a classroom at Macomb County Community College in Warren, Mich. When one student stood up to protest the intrusion, he was pushed into his chair and struck several times in the face. Another student attempting to leave was punched, bitten on the neck, shoulder, and wrist, and taken to a hospital for medical attention. This incident may seem commonplace until you discover that the ten young militants were women, and the literature they were distributing bore the slogan, "Women Rise Up!" Then, for most people, the story seems funny. Just how much longer such episodes will amuse us remains to be seen, for the days in which laughter and ridicule will work to contain the liberation activities of women

may be about over. For many women, a long suppressed rage is now beginning to surface, and their movement for equal rights is becoming organized and gaining momentum. We are on the brink of another massive rebellion—the rebellion of women—one that is bound to have a profound impact on all of us and one that could lead to severe disruption, even a major upheaval of our society. It might actually overshadow the black revolution and the student protests, because it involves not another minority but this time a majority of Americans—51 percent. For that reason, it may force us to change where the others have not. That's not to say that members of minority groups, civil rights workers, anti-war demonstrators and student activists have had no impact on the conduct of our national affairs; they obviously have. But most Americans have not been personally touched by their efforts. By and large, we go about our lives in much the same way as we did before "the movement." Our neighborhoods and organizations are not integrated; the violence and destruction are pretty much limited to the black ghettos; we are still at war in Vietnam; the educational system continues unchanged in most important ways; major social and economic reforms have not been made.

Were it not for mass media, most of us would know little or nothing about these protests. Unless one is a politician, a personnel director, a college president or a policeman, he has probably not had to change his way of doing things or even change his way of thinking about most of these issues.

But when women revolt, all of us will change. We will not be able to escape this rebellion, because it reaches into every institution of our society and affects our most personal and intimate relationships. Unfortunately, it has been possible for society to ignore the blacks and the hippies. Mothers and wives and daughters and teachers and secretaries and girl friends cannot be ignored.

The other revolutions took us by surprise. Perhaps we shouldn't have been surprised, because clear warnings were given. But we are slow to recognize social problems and even slower when it comes to correcting them. Paradoxically, it is probably still too early to see the full potential for a women's rebellion and already too late to avoid it.

Any lead time we might have is shortened by the rebellious mood now so pervasive in our society. More than ever before, people want to take part in all aspects of life, want to determine their own futures. They want to contribute up to the level of their actual abilities, not to the level dictated by their traditional social roles. One by one, each of the groups that have been denied full participation in our society is insisting that the wrongs must be righted, that the balance must be redressed. We are getting around to women last because discrimination against them has been so thoroughly a part of our way of life. People are surprised when sociologists tell us that our prejudice against women is more deeply entrenched than that against any minority group in our society, but consider these statistics:

Twenty-nine million women are working, making up one third of our work force—yet almost none hold management or executive positions.

The median salary for women is only 48 percent of what it is for men. Women receive 10 percent less pay than men for similar jobs.

Half the women who work are paid annual salaries under \$3,700. Less than two percent of Americans earning \$10,000 and up are women.

After half a century of women's suffrage, there is only one woman in the U.S. Senate.

Out of more than 300 administrative posts filled by President Nixon, only 13 have gone to women, and three of those are White House secretaries.

Since the 1930's, women have actually received a decreasing proportion of master's degrees, doctorate and faculty appointments.

Most women professionals are in "women's professions"—schoolteachers, nurses, laboratory assistants, librarians.

Only seven percent of physicians are women, compared to 74 percent in Russia, for example.

Compelling statistics, but even they don't really reflect the many indignities that women endure. They are often denied independent credit, unable to get a mortgage to purchase a house, excluded from many bars, clubs and other social gathering places, dismissed as inferior, emotional, childlike, illogical, irresponsible, incapable of genius. In one state, a woman's clothes legally belong to her husband. Male college graduates are given management aptitude tests; females are given typing tests.

If you visit a women's career day on a college campus, the situation becomes clear almost at once. The organizations trying to recruit women for career opportunities are airline companies (for stewardesses), the Army and Navy (for nurses) and the local banks (for tellers). That's it. Real access to leadership positions in American society is not open to women.

But perhaps the greatest frustration arises out of the very situation that is supposed to bring the greatest satisfaction—family life. American society, aided considerably by Freudian psychology, has held marriage and motherhood to be the ultimate expression of femininity—the only approved road to happiness and fulfillment. To be a complete woman is to be a devoted wife and mother.

Marriage does offer a great deal, but not enough, tapping only a few of the dimensions of a multidimensional human being. Women, like men, are capable of a great deal more than family life.

The home, for many women, has turned out to be a prison from which there is no escape. The average woman, who bears her last child before age 30, is subject to 40 years or more of life when her children are in school or grown. Yet, during these years, she is not permitted to study or work or live in a manner equal to that of a man.

The ideal of the woman as homemaker is a major target of women's liberation groups throughout the country. They deplore the fact that today the only avenue to self-esteem is to be attractive enough to get a man and motherly enough to raise a family. Such American institutions as Mother's Day, *Playboy* magazine and the Miss America contest have felt the sting of their protest demonstrations. The day may come when their efforts in this direction will have succeeded to the extent that it will seem stereotyped and insulting to portray a "typical" homemaker in the mass media. It would then be as unwise to show a woman opening an oven door on television as it now is to show a black operating an elevator or eating a watermelon.

Every woman has her boiling point, when she will say to herself, "Now I understand what it's all about. I'm ready to rebel." This may happen when she suddenly realizes that she didn't get a promotion simply because she was a woman. Or when she is counseled to become a nurse instead of a doctor, or an elementary schoolteacher instead of a college professor. She may suddenly recall the times she has been treated by her husband or her boss or her lawyer as some kind of a lesser being because she is a woman. Or the way that she is trapped in the role of homemaker and exploited by countless advertisements designed to make her feel guilty or negligent as a wife and mother. The woman is caught in a web of helpless frustration—too well educated to accept anything less than identity as a full person, yet unable to achieve that identity either in the home, which is now only partially fulfilling, or in the "man's world" to which she is denied access. The difference

between what her limited roles permit her to be, and what she knows inside she *could* be, is the source of her incipient rage.

Women may be oppressed, but they seldom *feel* oppressed. It's as difficult for most women to respond to the call of these liberation groups as it has been for Negroes to join the black revolution. They tend to accept their circumstances with resignation and simply don't believe that they harbor great rage. Nobody really thought that the blacks were enraged either—least of all the blacks themselves—but we found that there was a great reservoir of rage there, just under the surface.

Rage is not impulsive; it appears as openly aggressive behavior only when such behavior is in one way or another made acceptable. We have seen how organizations can legitimize such rage.

The woman's dilemma is either to accept the humiliating role of the second sex or openly express the resentment she may feel. Most women, of course, deal with their anger in other ways. They may become stereotypically gossipy or castrating, but they are more likely to turn their rage against themselves and all women. This self-hate plagues the recruitment effort of the various women's groups for equal rights. Women who will organize to work for almost any other cause are slow to organize in their own behalf. They just don't feel that women are worth it. Since childhood, they have been conditioned to believe that it's a man's world and that their place in it is only in relation to him. If anything, women show more prejudice toward women and do more to perpetuate the stereotype of women than men do. Women who make statements such as, "I wouldn't want to work for another woman," or, "Her aggressiveness just isn't feminine," are marked as the Uncle Toms of the women's revolution and are held in contempt by the liberation groups. (What will we call them, Doris Days?)

We have all heard comments like these: "Women who know their place in the world and accept it are really happy." Or, "They don't really want to be leaders." Or, "This new rebellious attitude is just being stirred up by a lot of agitators who are sick women themselves." Doesn't that kind of talk have a familiar ring? It should, because it's almost exactly what we used to say about blacks, before we started calling them blacks.

The possibility of violence in the women's rebellion cannot be discounted. That is a disturbing thought, and it may be more threatening for women to consider than for men. It's difficult to picture a college co-ed or a middle-aged mother becoming a militant, violent rebel, but it should be abundantly clear that women are entirely capable of violence. We can look to their own suffrage movement, which was not without violence, especially in England, where it was bloody indeed. Or we can simply watch our evening TV newscast and see armed and helmeted girls clashing with police in Chicago.

One after another, the groups in the feminist movement have come to endorse more militant positions, because they feel a more aggressive posture seems to work where reason fails.

One lesson from the black revolution and the student protests is that what gains they have made, as well as what losses they have suffered, seem to have come too often from violence or the threat of it.

It is disturbing to speculate about this potential for violence because this time we're not dealing with a small minority but with the majority. They may control as much as 70 percent of the money. They are well educated and experienced in organizational life. And they inherit all the potent new techniques of protest and change that have come from the civil rights movement and from the student rebellions, techniques that are

much more powerful than any we have used in previous generations.

More and more feminist organizations are appearing, and while the largest counts no more than two or three thousand members, they are growing in numbers and strength. There are more than 35 new groups, some strongly militant. One of the best known is the National Organization for Women (NOW), headed by Betty Friedan, author of *The Feminine Mystique*. Women's Liberation Front, a sizable organization, is roughly divided between action groups that challenge basic American institutions (family structure, capitalism), and encounter groups that feel that the first step in liberation is to help women to discover in each other their plight and their potential. Women's Radical Action Project is the Chicago branch of Women's Liberation Front. Its most noteworthy protest was at the University of Chicago, over the firing of a woman professor. Add to these groups the more militant WRRH (Women's International Terrorist Conspiracy from Hell), who reportedly train themselves in defense tactics and handling firearms; SCUM (the Society For Cutting Up Men) and so on.

An endless and perhaps irrelevant argument can be held over whether women and men are different in more than genitalia. Primitivists and biologists argue that there are important differences between the sexes, in historical conditioning and in makeup. Social anthropologists, on the other hand, can find examples of cultures in which almost anything we think of as masculine is practiced by females. At this point, it matters little. Any differences that exist must not be cause for discrimination. We no longer permit any arguments about fundamental black-white differences to justify discrimination against blacks. Why should we then when it comes to women?

The new feminists seem quite prepared to accept the consequences of equality. "Protective legislation" that supposedly is designed to provide for the weaker sex (limited working hours, lounges and rest periods, etc.) is challenged by them as discriminatory; just one more way of keeping them segregated in a cheap labor pool.

What, then, do women want? Certainly it is not dominance over men. Women of all ages dread that. The now bill of rights calls for an end to all forms of discrimination on the basis of sex, access to leadership positions and equal employment opportunities—not only in legislation but in practice. For example, now wants an end to help-wanted ads that are classified under separate headings for men and women.

Another set of now demands clusters around eliminating the penalties that come with pregnancy and motherhood. Now's women demand the right to return to their jobs within a reasonable time after childbirth without loss of seniority or accrued benefits, and to be paid maternity leave as a form of Social Security or employee benefit.

They expect a revision of tax laws to permit deduction of child-care costs, provision for government-supported child-care centers and removal of laws governing abortion and birth control. Other demands have to do with guaranteeing equal opportunities in education, including graduate and professional schools, and "revision of welfare legislation and poverty programs that deny women dignity, privacy and self-respect."

Now, the push is for equality with men. Ultimately, however, women may want to become equal to themselves, to realize their own potential—again paralleling the black revolution. Who could have guessed that the blacks didn't simply want what whites have, but instead what they themselves have, their own natural way of being? Who could have predicted a few years ago that blacks would be interested in eating soul food and wearing their hair natural and taking black history courses? If we have come to see that

black is truly beautiful, what would it mean to say that woman is beautiful?

Who, for example, might the sexually liberated female be? Here we must be highly tentative because the present influence of sexual freedom groups and lesbian organizations is very difficult to assess. Compared to the mainstream, they do not represent strong currents. We can guess that with the end of the double standard, any concern for chastity will give way to concern for fulfillment. Beyond that, we are probably safe in predicting that heterosexuality is likely to persist as the dominant sexual mode. Around that norm, we may see very different trends. Sexual liberation could mean something quite different, depending upon each woman's previous personal experiences. For some, liberation will be a freedom from sexual pressures and sexual guilts. Sex for countless millions of women has been so full of pain and fear and shame and disappointment that their liberation may be to enjoy a nonsexual life. Others may tend toward lesbianism or bisexuality. In any case, women are likely to become more dominant and aggressive. And studies by Abraham Maslow show that dominant women, contrary to the popular myth, enjoy sex more than submissive women.

As long as we are exploding myths, the idea that women who work are inferior mothers is just not true. Studies show no difference in child-rearing effectiveness between mothers who work and mothers who don't, except that working mothers tend to feel guilty for working. Incidentally, the best workers are also the best mothers.

Also, research indicates that children who are reared in child-care centers, even full-time 24-hour ones such as the kibbutzim in Israel, show adjustments at least as good as those of children who are brought up at home by their parents.

The strategy that will benefit us most will be not only to meet the women's demands but to go far beyond them. We must radically change our schedules of work to enable women, even mothers of infants, to pursue careers of their choice. There is, after all, nothing magical about the nine-to-five workday, which was designed mainly for the convenience of men.

More difficult will be the redesigning of our places of work. Work centers that include child-care units, recreational facilities, even residences must become commonplace in the United States. Sweden has made significant progress along these lines with consequent improvements in the education and employment of women.

Practically everything about our way of life—our economy, our laws, our recreation, our schools, our homes and our cities—will require redesigning to permit women full participation. If this seems too much to ask, it may help to recognize that big changes are necessary to solve big problems, that big changes are relatively easier to make than small ones, and that gradualism, in spite of its rational appeal, has never really worked.

Women's liberation is a cause awaiting a mobilizing incident and a charismatic leader. The student movement needed the Berkeley Free Speech Movement episode and Mario Savio; the civil rights movement needed the Montgomery bus boycott and Martin Luther King, Jr. The women's struggle could take many forms, only depending on the incident and the leader.

There may be a magnificent outcome to all this. A new woman may emerge—a person who is more interesting to be with because she likes herself. She may have a new sexuality, a new beauty and a new relationship to offer a man. The effect on the man may be salutary indeed. Perhaps then he, too, will be liberated.

Women have always been a great humanizing force in our society, devoting an enormous amount of time and energy in their

support of social reforms, beginning with the movement to abolish slavery and continuing with their efforts on behalf of child-labor legislation, social casework, slum clearance and many other programs promoting health and welfare. Now perhaps they will rechannel this energy towards helping themselves achieve full humanity. The women's revolution could lead to a genuine human revolution in which we will no longer be willing to settle for so much less than our potential, in which we will no longer allow ourselves to be exploited and deceived, in which we will no longer permit our environment to be polluted and our children endangered, in which we will no longer endure the inanity and superficiality of our human relationships, in which we will no longer tolerate war and violence as the ultimate solution to human conflict.

[From the Washington Post, Nov. 30, 1969]
POLICE WOMAN MUST NOW BE BIG AS MEN
(By Anne Hebard)

Last spring a young woman applied for a job as a policewoman on the metropolitan police force. She failed to qualify because she held only a high school diploma. Women on the force, unlike men, are required to have further education.

She filed a complaint with the D.C. Human Relations Commission citing discriminatory hiring procedures in the metropolitan police department.

The police department responded more literally than the young woman had expected.

The department removed the requirement of higher education for women but at the same time imposed an "equal" physical requirement. Washington policewomen, like men, must now be between 5 feet 7 and 6 feet 4. The minimum weight for women is 118 pounds, for men 135.

Previously, a policewoman could be as short as 5 feet 1 (but no taller than 5 feet 10) and could weigh as little as 110 pounds.

The young woman whose complaint resulted in the changed requirements still cannot get a job on the force.

She is shorter than 5 feet 7.

Chief of Police Jerry V. Wilson responded in an interview yesterday saying, "My point is that if we're going to give women the same work we give men, we've got to hold them to the same size requirements."

"If we set a lower height standard for women doing the same work as men," he said, "then we'd be discriminating against men. The human relations commission would then be getting complaints from short men."

Chief Wilson said the 17-pound difference between minimum weight for policewomen and that for policemen is "a question of effectiveness." He was referring to the difference in weight between a healthy male and a healthy female of the same height.

"It is a fact in this country that most women are shorter than 5 feet 7 inches," J. Donald Anderson, acting deputy director of the D.C. Human Relations Commission, said in an interview yesterday.

The average height of American females is 5 feet 5, according to a study made at the New York University School of Medicine.

Anderson said, too, that "when you translate the requirements you have for men into the same requirements for women, you are still discriminating against women."

Chief Wilson asked the Civil Service Commission in August to amend its regulations governing the admission of women to the uniformed police force. Then, on Oct. 28, he ordered the educational and physical requirements for women changed as part of an experiment.

The personnel director of the police department, James M. Murrey, said in an interview, "As an experiment, we want to see how many situations we can use police-

women in. We want to greatly expand her role on the force."

"We're setting a limit of 100 women for this experiment," Murrey said.

He said he did not yet know the exact length of time the experiment would be in effect. "Several months, maybe a year," he said.

The experiment is intended to add to the police force "a different kind of woman, now," as Murrey phrased it.

Until Oct. 28, the policewoman in Washington was assigned to work on crimes committed by and against women. They were, more or less, social workers within the structure of the police department.

Of the 77 women listed Nov. 25 on police personnel records, 30 are still detailed to the youth division. The youth division is the name given to the former women's bureau, which was dismantled in 1967.

The remaining 47 are detailed to squads outside the youth division, but their work still centers on women.

Officer Romaine Powell, 27, is the first and only woman on the homicide squad. A graduate of Howard University who majored in sociology, Officer Powell has specialized in abortion cases for the past year and a half. She has been on the force since 1965.

"It (an abortion) is a very personal matter and a woman feels more at ease talking to another woman about an unwanted pregnancy," she said in an interview.

In the youth division, Capt. Frances McCall, the highest ranking woman in the police department and a 21-year veteran of the force, told a reporter that the gist of her division's work concerns juvenile delinquency, its causes and prevention.

Capt. McCall also spoke of the undercover work that policewomen have performed:

"A policewoman's work can be very dangerous," she said. They have been called upon to act as decoys when a rapist or mugger is at work.

"In one particular gambling raid, we found we had to have policewomen infiltrate when the suspects became suspicious of our undercover men."

Three policewomen work on the 24-officer sex squad.

Officer Dorothy Peppers, the mother of a 4-year-old son, told a reporter, "Most victims feel more comfortable discussing sex with a woman."

Officer Shirley D. Williams, 24, describes her work in the youth division as "being out on the street every day, getting exposure to what factors go into making a youngster a criminal."

A 1968 graduate of Howard in sociology, Officer Williams said in an interview that working with mothers and children makes her job "rewarding."

Coordinator of the police department's community relations division is Officer Carolyn Charity, who has been on the force since 1954. She represents the police department in American government classes twice daily at the U.S. District Court Building.

"This job is total fulfillment," Officer Charity told a reporter. "There's no boredom and I have the chance to reach young people every day. I work in the community doing work that needs to be done."

MSGR. RAYMOND PUNDA PULASKI DAY AWARD RECIPIENT

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, it was my privilege and honor recently to attend

the annual Pulaski Day banquet of the Milwaukee Society-Polish National Alliance. It was particularly a pleasure to be present at this auspicious occasion because the guest of honor and recipient of the Pulaski Day Award was a respected friend, the Right Reverend Monsignor Raymond A. Punda.

As you know, Mr. Speaker, Pulaski Day commemorates the lasting contribution of Gen. Casimir Pulaski to our Nation. Fittingly, Monsignor Punda was chosen for special tribute because he, like General Pulaski, has so readily and selflessly served his fellow man.

At a time in history when we are confronted with trouble and violence, at a time when ideals and leaders are needed, at a time when to some more appears to be wrong than right—at times like this it is especially appropriate that we single out for distinction men like Monsignor Punda.

As a young and energetic curate, as an educator and principal of Notre Dame High School, as a devoted pastor of St. Stanislaus Church, and as a respected civic leader, Monsignor Punda has given exemplary service to his Church, his people, and his community.

In order to bring to the attention of my colleagues Monsignor Punda's efforts as an outstanding Polish American citizen, I am pleased to place in the RECORD at this point the addresses of the Most Reverend Alfred L. Abramowicz, auxiliary bishop of Chicago, and of the distinguished Dean of the Marquette University School of Speech, Prof. Alfred J. Sokolnicki:

TRIBUTE TO MONSIGNOR RAYMOND PUNDA

(By the Most Reverend Alfred L. Abramowicz)

I am honored by your invitation today. Bonds of priesthood and friendship have joined Monsignor Punda and myself for over a decade.

He has been to me a personification and an actual realization of what the American Pole should be—first and foremost an American—because this U.S.A., currently so troubled and fissured, is our native land, our fatherland for which we live and die. Under the Star Spangled Banner we have been guaranteed our dignity as a person, our opportunities for education and development, our freedom of religion and speech and a constitutional right to life, liberty and pursuit of happiness.

As an American of Polish descent, Monsignor Raymond Punda has gloried in his rich Polish heritage and made his contribution to America from the inheritance he has received.

He is a Pole who does not merely render lip service to the land of his ancestors, but has sacrificed his time, talent and finances in Poland's dark hours of need.

He is a son of Generals Pulaski, Kosciuszko and Krzywoborowski, whose battle cry was, "For your Freedom and Ours," and wavered not to volunteer his service in World War II.

He is a Pole who sees his heritage not in a folk dance, "Kielbasa and kapusta," but in the illustrious giants of science like Copernicus, who established the scientific basis for our Space Age and expeditions to the moon—Skłodowska, whose discoveries resulted in today's program of Cancer Research, and Funk, who discovered health-giving vitamins; international and immortal musicians like Chopin, Moniuszko and Paderewski; literary geniuses like Mickiewicz, Sienkiewicz, Conrad, and Reymont; freedom loving men like Paul Wlodkowicz, Andrew Frycz, Chris-

tian Post, who with their mighty pens fought for the dignity of the Jew, liberty of the Protestant and reform, abolishment of slavery and equality of all social classes.

Unfortunately, because of past American Anglo-Saxon prejudices or preferences, these names are not given the prominence they deserve in our American history books—nor are they sufficiently mentioned in our news media.

Nevertheless, such great men and women of Poland are a part of the man you honor today—Monsignor Raymond A. Punda—a great American—a great Pole—a great priest.

ADDRESS HONORING MSGR. RAYMOND PUNDA—
OUTSTANDING MILWAUKEEAN OF POLISH
DESCENT

(By Alfred J. Sokolnicki)

The Milwaukee Society of the Polish National Alliance deserves commendation for demonstrating one fine trait of the Polish character as it honors a clergyman and educator—the Very Reverend Monsignor Raymond Punda as the Outstanding Milwaukeean of Polish Descent in 1969, for his achievements, devotion, and outstanding leadership in Church, Civic, Educational and Cultural organizations and activities.

In Poland's historic tradition, men of the cloth have played a vital role in the religious, political, social, educational and cultural life of the people. Monsignor Punda's contributions in these areas continue and reflect this tradition in our modern age in our Polish-American community.

Polish priests have made outstanding contributions to the life of the church, country and learning. In honoring Monsignor Punda this evening, we also honor these great men from whose lives he has drawn a good example.

Father Jan Dlugosz, 15th century priest, was one of the first Polish historians. The 12th century missionary St. Hyacinth Odrowaz crossed Turkestan and Tibet to reach China preaching Christ's gospel on his way. Father Michael Boym, 17th century priest, brought back from China substantial knowledge of Chinese botany and medicine. Father Jude Thaddeus Krusinski, 17th century scholar, was the first known student of Persian culture and history. His book was translated into many languages. Through the initiative of Father Maximilian Ryll, who lived in the 19th century, the Central Asiatic Seminary of the Jesuits was founded in Syria. It was later transformed into a university.

Nicholas Copernicus, the famous educator and astronomer was a priest. Bishop Adam Krasinski and Father Hugo Kollataj were among the authors of Poland's famous Constitution of the 3rd of May, 1791. Father Augustyn Kordecki, superior at the Czestochowa shrine, is ever renowned as a staunch defender of that holy place during the Swedish invasions. Under Jesuit, Father Peter Skarga, eloquent orator and adviser to the Polish government, the unity between the Catholic and Greek Orthodox Churches was effected in 1596 creating the Uniate church.

While the list could be extended, we can recall other famous Polish distinguished priests, teachers, and saints as St. Stanislaus Bishop and Martyr, St. Stanislaus Kostka, St. John Kanty, and St. Andrew Bobola.

We are making history this evening as we honor an outstanding Milwaukee priest of Polish descent . . . Very Reverend Monsignor Raymond Punda—the second clergyman to be distinguished in this manner. In 1958, the first clergyman to be honored was our late beloved, Bishop Roman Atkielski.

Monsignor Punda, as the current pastor of St. Stanislaus—the first city parish for Polish speaking people in America, which founded the first elementary school under Polish influence . . . and the principal of Notre Dame High School, the only high school under Polish auspices in our city . . . deserves this honor and commendation.

Monsignor Punda exemplifies the basic motto of the Polish people—to serve God and country. He distinguished himself by volunteering his life to serve his Church, and also volunteered four years of his life to active service to his country when he was Chaplain in the Solomon and Philippine Islands.

Tonight's distinguished honor recipient was born on the northeast side of Milwaukee on February 19, 1913. He attended St. Casimir elementary school. His high school days were spent at St. Bonaventure High School in Sturtevant, Wisconsin from which he graduated with highest honors in the class of 1931. Evidence that he was destined for leadership throughout his life began here when he was elected class president, and editor of the school paper and school annual.

In 1931 he entered St. Francis Seminary and was prefect of boys there for three years. Archbishop Stritch ordained Father Punda on June 3, 1939, and a few weeks later appointed him as assistant to Monsignor Wenta, pastor of St. Stanislaus Church. The newly assigned curate did not realize that this was to be his only parish assignment as he has served at St. Stanislaus since then.

During the years 1939–1942, Father Punda was a teacher and athletic director at Notre Dame High School.

In the spring of 1942, he volunteered for military service as infantry chaplain. His service career took him to Fort Bragg, North Carolina, to the 42nd Rainbow Division at Camp Gruber, Oklahoma. He served with the 37th Division in the Solomon and Philippine Islands for two years. For bravery in action he was decorated three times being awarded the Silver Star and two Bronze Stars.

In 1942, at the request of Archbishop Kiley, Father Punda wrote a prayer booklet "Novena, to Our Lady of Victory for Victory and Peace." It was used as a weekly service in most campus and overseas stations and in thousands of churches. Over one million copies were sold as the booklet enjoyed the popularity of 13 printings.

In December of 1945, Fr. Punda returned from the service with the rank of Major. He remained in the active reserves for seven more years.

Returning to the active life at Notre Dame High School, Father Punda was appointed Principal in September 1946—a post he still holds for the 24th year. Pursuing advanced study he received a Master's degree in Educational Administration from Marquette University with a Straight A average in 1951. Exerting educational leadership, he was one of the co-founders and first president of the Wisconsin Association of Principals of Catholic Secondary Schools, in 1955. He served as president for two years.

At the beginning of the Korean War, Father Punda wrote a prayer booklet "Our Lady's Crusade for Peace," with a Homefront and Servicemen's edition. It was used during the war as a weekly prayer service. Over a million copies were sold.

The pastorate at St. Stanislaus was Father Punda's by appointment of Archbishop Meyer. In preparation for its centennial to be held in the fall of 1966, Father Punda began complete restoration and renovation of St. Stanislaus in 1959. In assuming this monumental task he felt the responsibility of preserving much of the original beauty of the church which was built as a monument to the great generosity of hard-working people whose meager means were sacrificed so that God's edifice would be the finest they could build. The renovation emphasized the basic beauty of the church . . . this was for the 20th and 21st century parishioners to appreciate the sacrifices, foresight, and devotion of the 19th century founders of the parish. The church is now regarded by many experts as one of the most beautiful in the midwest.

St. Stanislaus was selected as a National Historical Landmark by the U.S. Department

of the Interior. A deserved honor for the Mother Church of our Polonia, which was the home of the first Polish bishop in Milwaukee—Bishop Kozlowski. It was at St. Stanislaus that Monsignor Roman Atkielski was an assistant when called upon to serve our archdiocese in the Chancery.

St. Stanislaus, with its two golden spires, stands out as a landmark and monument to our Polonia. It is there too that we find the world's largest mosaic of Our Lady of Czestochowa, as the enshrined Madonna looks down at passersby on Mitchell Street . . . some kneeling there to pray. In October 1967, Bishop Atkielski unveiled this inspiring symbol of faith, as many faithful men and women held lighted candles and sang and prayed. Busy Mitchell Street, and bustling South 5th Street came to a halt, because the faithful were honoring the Madonna!

During the 30 years at Notre Dame High School, Monsignor Punda saw 5,000 students from 125 parishes graduate. The school, which is owned by St. Stanislaus parish since its founding in 1932, always maintained the lowest tuition of all the Catholic high schools, and received no financial help from the diocese or any other parish.

In 1956 the entire high school building was renovated and modernized for the silver jubilee in the fall of 1957. The school received the National Freedom Foundation award for its outstanding program of student participation in school government and activities.

Monsignor Punda identifies with the land of his birth—the United States and with the land of his parents' birth—Poland. He traveled to Poland and met with Cardinal Wyszynski, the Cardinal Primate of Poland in 1959, and in 1967. He was at the special audience Pope Paul had for the Poles when the archbishop of Krakow, Karol Wojtyla became a Cardinal. While in Rome, Monsignor Punda also met Bishop Wladyslaw Rubin, whom we remember from his Millennium visit to Marquette University and St. Stanislaus, when representing Cardinal Wyszynski.

There is a word in Polish for a true priest—evangelist—it is *kaznodzieja*. In these modern times one would think that this traditional, honorable, and faithful class of clergyman and leader of the flock would be extinct. Thankfully, in Monsignor Punda we have a "kaznodzieja."

Monsignor Punda has been honored by church and town. In 1965 he was invested a Monsignor by Archbishop Cousins.

He is a member of the Cudworth Post of the American Legion since 1946, and has served as chaplain of the post.

Academically, his credentials and accomplishments have merited inclusion in Who's Who in American Education.

He is listed in Community Leaders of America, again in recognition nationally, for his many endeavors.

In November of 1968, he was awarded the famed Citizenship Award of the Mitchell Street Advancement Association, "in grateful recognition of his untiring efforts and devotion to those ideas which contribute so magnificently to the betterment of our community."

The most recent tribute to Monsignor Punda was appointment to a seat on the Children's Court Advisory Board, identifying him as an active member of his community working for the good of her citizens and their children.

Without fanfare, in his quiet way, Monsignor Punda has worked diligently for the good of his parishioners, the students at Notre Dame High School, and the citizens of his community. In visiting St. Stanislaus parish hall, one can find there at one time—the Mazur Polish Dancers presenting a mock Polish wedding—at another time special revues of Polish artists from Poland. Tomorrow evening, the Polish revue ESKULAP will perform there.

Monsignor Punda has lived up to the true Polish tradition of giving one's self to God and country. His excellent record of achievements as a parish priest, pastor, principal of a high school, and respected member of the community, eloquently attests to his devotion to his professions in religion, education, and good citizenship.

In this era of crumbling traditions, loss of respect for the authority of God and civil society, and defiance of tradition, we must look to such leaders as Monsignor Punda for good example, leadership, and inspiration. As a spiritual leader of a parish, as principal of a high school, as a respected citizen, he has used every opportunity to show his leadership in a quiet way. He has touched many lives, and because they have touched his, they will be better lives!

In this audience this evening are leaders of our society. Each of them is an influential person—each is involved in many profound and far-reaching activities. . . . Yet, all of these leaders pause tonight to honor Monsignor Punda because they know that he has earned their great respect and commendation.

Truly, Monsignor Punda exemplifies the traditional motto of the land of his parents, Poland—*Polonia Semper Fidelis*—Poland Always Faithful. So we say tonight—truly, Monsignor Punda is Always Faithful.

SURPRISE IN THE HOUSE: JETS FOR TAIWAN

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, the following article by Warren Unna appeared in the Sunday, November 30, 1969, Washington Post.

It gives the Members of this House some background on the \$54.5 billion we authorized recently for Nationalist Chinese aircraft.

SURPRISE IN THE HOUSE: JETS FOR TAIWAN (By Warren Unna)

Last week a surprise amendment to grant Chiang Kai-shek's Nationalist China \$54.5 million for a squadron of F-4D jet fighter planes was offered during floor debate and passed as part of the House's foreign aid authorization bill.

Few congressmen knew anything about the amendment. They assumed the Nixon administration was behind the request. So a small House gathering first voted the amendment through by voice vote and then, after it was challenged and a quorum brought in for a roll call vote, the amendment passed, 176 to 169.

The Nationalist China jet squadron was not in the administration's bill, and it still is unwanted by the White House, the State Department, the Agency for International Development and at least the official heads of the Defense Department.

Its passage so angered the House's dwindling coterie of foreign aid friends that the full aid bill nearly was scuttled in its entirety.

The final vote on the \$2.2 billion bill was 176 to 163 and the close margin was attributed directly to the planes for Taiwan.

The bill still must be considered on the Senate side. The fate of the squadron for Taiwan will further hinge on foreign aid appropriations in the House and Senate. But the House action still was a considerable coup.

Rep. George Bush (R-Tex.) said later: "I wish I had known the administration was against it before I voted for it."

Pulling a rabbit out of the hat is not unknown in House floor maneuvering, but the Chiang Kai-shek squadron really started revving up just about a year ago.

Last November Rep. Otto E. Passman (D-La.), chairman of the House Foreign Aid Appropriations subcommittee, made his annual state visit to Taipei and was received by Generalissimo and Madame Chiang.

The United States had just granted South Korea an extra \$100 million in military aid following increased activity by Communist North Korea that resulted in an assassination attempt against South Korean President Park, the capture of the U.S. spy ship *Pueblo* and stepped-up infiltration into South Korea. The \$100 million included a new squadron of F-4 jet fighter planes.

Nationalist China's Chiang decided that with the improved Mig fighters Communist China was flying, he had as good reason as South Korea to get a new U.S. jet squadron.

"It was brought to my attention that they just felt that they should have a squadron and I'm a good listener," Passman said in an interview. "I think that whole part of the world is as hot as a firecracker. It was on that basis that I did some footwork."

Since the House Foreign Affairs Committee waited until this month to get the current fiscal year's foreign aid authorization bill on the House floor, Passman, understandably, had to do some running in place.

Meanwhile, another friend of the Chiangs, Rep. Robert L. F. Sikes (D-Fla.), a reserve major general and a key member of the House Defense Appropriations subcommittee, made his state visit to Taipei last August. Presumably Sikes also was told about the need for new jets.

MORGAN PERSUADED

A third friend of Nationalist China, Rep. L. Mendel Rivers (D-S.C.), chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, recently persuaded Rep. Thomas E. Morgan, chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, to quietly insert a small observation in his committee's foreign aid report.

It read: "There is danger that the number and quality of aircraft in the Nationalist China inventory may not be adequate to cope with the new and sophisticated aircraft now appearing in increasing numbers, in the armed forces of Communist China."

Then Passman, Sikes and Rivers, with their Pentagon connections, urged some high-level Air Force telephone calls to House Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford (R-Mich.) to enlist his assistance.

"There must have been some help from the Pentagon because of Jerry Ford's role," Passman observed blandly. And then he warmed up: "I think the Congress must assume some responsibility. We're not supposed to be just rubber stamps on all the bureaucrats in Washington. When my country is at war, I'm going to support it. I think we should keep our muscle taut."

There still remained the matter of actually drafting the amendment. The day before the House's floor action, Rep. Sikes tried to have the staff of the House Foreign Affairs Committee do it. Rep. Clement E. Zablocki (D-Wis.), at that moment acting committee chairman, described Sikes' request as "a bit unusual since the matter never had come before the committee and Sikes wasn't even a committee member."

Rep. Passman then stepped in. Administration officials said he summoned some Pentagon officials to his office on the morning the bill was to be considered to help him draft the amendment which Sikes, later in the day, was to introduce.

"I asked them for some help if they believed in the amendment," Passman said

later. "But not in the actual drafting. I knew all about that and just where to insert it in the bill."

Then, later in the afternoon debate, Rep. Sikes offered his amendment with these words: "If we have to give, let us give it to those who we know are with us. . . . In my opinion, Nationalist China is one of our best friends—if not our best friend—in that part of the world. . . . This is just a drop in the bucket compared to the amounts of money that they require for even a minimum defense of the Republic of China."

THE "NEED" PARAGRAPH

In quick succession, Sikes was followed by Rivers and Passman and a platoon of their allies all "associating" themselves with the amendment. Rep. John J. Rooney (D-N.Y.) had the assignment of noting the "need" paragraph that Rep. Rivers had inserted in the House Foreign Affairs Committee report.

Rep. Passman, according to onlookers, then started whispering around the debating table: "If you want to save \$200 million on the rest of the bill, you had better agree on this one."

Meanwhile, Minority Leader Ford also began lining up votes. Ford later said he had heard about the amendment only two days before—from Sikes—did some "independent checking of my own to very high-ranking responsible people in the administration" and became convinced that Chiang Kai-shek's jet squadron—which the administration hadn't sought—really was wanted.

Rep. H. R. Gross (R-Iowa), who ranks himself with Passman as the leading foreign aid opponent in the House, then jumped up.

"I believe the record ought to at least show that there were no hearings, no justification whatever—before the Foreign Affairs Committee. . . . This is too much money to add to this bill without the slightest justification except the statements of the sponsors," Gross said.

Rep. Donald M. Fraser (D-Minn.), chairman of the Democratic Study Group, noted: "There is no credible evidence that the Communist Chinese have a capability of invading Taiwan. This free use of the taxpayers' money is the reason why our program gets into trouble."

After the vote in which the \$54.5 million jet squadron authorization was approved—with no restrictive fixed-year for spending required—some of the Republican Congressmen in the Speaker's Lobby were advising a check with "the Watergate."

A Watergate Apartments penthouse is occupied by Anna Chan Chennault, widow of the Flying Tigers general and a Washington hostess who cultivates friends for Nationalist China.

"All I know was what I read in the papers, Mrs. Chennault said in a subsequent interview. "Congressman Passman was a very good friend of General Chennault's because they both come from Monroe, La., but I haven't seen him in many years. Our legislators develop their own judgment. I'm an American. Lots of people talk about Anna Chennault as a 'lobby for China.' I am the biggest lobby for America. I always try to bring about a better understanding."

For his part, Passman declared: "Mrs. Chennault? I didn't even know she was Vice President of Flying Tigers Airlines or living in Washington. She had no knowledge of this. Mrs. Chennault runs her business and I run mine."

The Senate reportedly will not go along with Chiang Kai-shek's jet aircraft amendment and, even if the matter should survive in conference with the House, the administration says it is determined to get around it.

But the implementing part of foreign aid is in the appropriations process, and this is

where Rep. Passman for years has reigned supreme. He says the original administration request for \$2.6 billion in economic and military aid should receive an actual appropriation of only around \$1 billion. It is not clear whether his \$200 million threat on the House floor meant adding or subtracting from his \$1 billion target.

It is clear that the more that is added to military aid the less is available for economic aid.

Last year, Passman sent out word that the \$30 million allotted to Nationalist China in military aid had better be raised by \$6 million or the rest of the bill would be in jeopardy.

"We therefore did right by him and he did right by us in giving us the full appropriation on the military side," one government official disclosed.

This year, the Pentagon says it has no F4-D jet fighter squadron readily available, and doubts that \$54.5 million would pay for one anyway.

But Passman said the Air Force's support "goes all the way to the top." The Louisiana congressman feels encouraged.

"I have the honor to chair a committee which gives me a little leverage," Passman said. "And even though I am a foe of foreign aid and voted against this overall bill as I always do, I'm going to do everything within my power for this little amendment."

A SPECIAL KIND OF BIAS

HON. PAUL J. FANNIN

OF ARIZONA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. FANNIN. Mr. President, Vice President AGNEW's journey into the sacred land of some journalistic opinionists has apparently pricked the ultrathin skin of some who pride themselves on being able to dish it out, but quake in the process of "taking it."

The Milwaukee Sentinel of November 21, 1969, has written an excellent editorial which makes a contribution to the discussion on this matter I consider most enlightening.

I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE SLD BIAS

What is the bias that Vice-President Agnew called into question in his speech criticizing network television news?

Agnew didn't attempt to spell it out. We do. Specifically, it is socialist, labor and Democratic, in that order.

Contrary to what Agnew suggested, this socialist-labor-Democratic bias, hereinafter referred to as SLD, is not confined to a little group of TV editors and personalities. Instead, it is characteristic of that part of the nation's news media ruled by the Washington-New York axis.

Network television merely reflects—or, more accurately, casts the shadows in advance of—the SLD bias. The reason for focusing on TV, as Agnew pointed out, is because of its tremendous national impact.

SOCIALISTS WANT A RULE BY FEW

It cannot be emphasized too strongly that the socialist bias comes first. Too many of the people who gather and present the news in America are the products of colleges where they were brainwashed to love socialism and hate capitalism. The socialists are for govern-

ment by the elite few, such as they have in the Soviet Union. They despise a free market, simply because it puts power into the hands of all the people instead of into the hands of those few who presume to know what is best for us common folk.

Therefore, the socialist conditioned reporter or commentator, whether wittingly or unwittingly, chooses the stories, words, phrases and expressions which tend to advance the collectivist cause and to impede the capitalist system and free market economy. This attitude even leads them to be soft on communism and hard on Americanism.

How does the labor bias then come in? It comes in second because the socialist minded cleverly recognize that in labor they have the voting troops with which to exercise political power in the democratic process.

Labor enjoys a special privilege in the form of compulsory unionism which gives it the money and the muscle to wield extraordinary political power. Small wonder that socialism makes labor its ally.

Thus when the labor unions serve socialism's aims, as in domestic spending programs, the SLD biased news media work hand in glove with them. But when labor unions go against the socialist minded, as they did in voting in support of the Nixon administration on Vietnam, they are given the silent treatment.

As for the Democratic bias, this is so simply because the Democrats have been the party of the labor unions and, in the north, the friend of socialism. Democrats who don't please the SLD bias are given short shrift on publicity, while any Republican who does something to please the SLD can count on the fullest national exposure, at least on one issue. One has only to check the record on publicity given senators against the antiballistic missile system or against the confirmation of Judge Clement Haynsworth to the supreme court to see the SLD bias at work.

When anyone dares to charge this Washington-New York axis with bias, it turns on two defense mechanisms. One is to raise the specter of government censorship. The other is to invoke the right of dissent.

In doing so, the SLD biased news media divert attention from the issue of their bias. They should not be permitted to get away with it, especially considering, as the vice-president said, a form of censorship already exists in the axis' own operation. And as for dissent, the SLD biased reporters and commentators seem to take the position that it is all right for them, but not for anyone else who is so bold as to challenge their prejudices.

A FOURSQUARE SOCIETY FOR A BETTER AMERICA

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, occasionally prominent lay members are privileged to deliver the Sunday sermon in congregational churches across the country. Recently at my own Brookside church in Manchester, N.H., such an outstanding lay message was delivered by Mr. Carl Noyes, of Manchester, that I am including it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for the interest and benefit of all citizens. It is a challenging, dynamic response to a sorely disturbed society.

As an example of interest to colleagues and others the following is an excerpt from Mr. Noyes' compelling address:

Other disturbing things have been happening. Non-books and non-plays are being thrown together and sold by non-writers who never bothered to learn how to write. Murky poems are being ground out by scraggly poets who have to sing them to their audience because they are unreadable. And non-actors have now confused acting with lewdness and nakedness. If you agree with these remarks, we will all definitely be branded as squares, but if we are so branded, remember that we will be in pretty good company, because our Christian world, and this country was discovered, put together, fought for, and saved by squares. It's easy to prove that Jesus Christ, Nathan Hale, Patrick Henry, Paul Revere, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin and almost anyone else you would want to claim as a hero were squares. You can prove it by thinking what anyone of them would have said if he had not been a square. For example—

Jesus Christ—What, me carry a cross up Calvary Hill so I can redeem mankind. Let them save their own souls!

Patrick Henry—Sure I'm for liberty first last and always, but let's be a little realistic. We're a pretty small outfit and if we start pushing the British around someone is going to get hurt.

Paul Revere—What do you mean—me ride through every Middlesex village and town? And in the middle of the night yet? Why pick on me? Am I the only man in Boston with a horse?

Benjamin Franklin—What we really need as an American Ambassador to France is a young man. I'm 70 years old. It's time a new generation took over.

Are you convinced now that your heroes were squares? And yet it's difficult at times for us to emulate them. The forces of conformity are still strong. Too many of us are sitting it out instead of sweating it out. Too many of us haven't got the guts to stand up straight and be square. Because the opposite of square is round and being round is so much simpler. Responsibilities and problems roll off nice and easy. Too many of us know the short cuts and too few know or care where the path leads. Too few of us dare to leave the path, because the path is always the easy way, the way most people go. But there is no path to the future, no path to greatness, no path to progress, no path to outer space or to inner satisfaction.

Think a little about this organization called S.O.S.—Society of Squares. It could have a secret handshake consisting of grabbing the other guys' hand as though you meant it and looking him straight in the eye. It would be in favor of participation, and against sitting life out, for simplicity and against sophistication, for laughter and against sniggering, for America and against her enemies, for the direct and against the devious, for education and against the pretense of learning, for building and against tearing down; for the honest way and against the short cut. Aren't you glad to be a square and wouldn't you like to join the S.O.S.?

Would that all across this great land of opportunity there might be 10,000 Carl Noyes to similarly urge Americans to stand foursquare for a better America.

The sermon follows:

We are living in troubled times. There is dissension in the ghettos, there are grave racial problems, there is unrest on the college campuses, there is great disagreement on national policy as it affects the war in Viet Nam, and people are staying away from church by the thousands because they think the church is either not relevant, or because they think the church is taking positions and stands which have nothing to do with religion. During troubled times such as these, allowing freedom of speech and permitting people to voice unpopular opinions can be

a soul searching experience for any administration, whether it be in Washington, on the college campus, in the hierarchy of the church, or even in the home where the parent finds himself at odds with his teen age children.

You may be asking at this point—what has this got to do with the church budget and the every member canvass? The connection may be more apparent if I read to you a news item in the November 7th Union Leader which reported that the Trustees of the New Hampshire Conference of United Church of Christ voted to provide financial assistance to persons wishing to participate in the current anti-Viet Nam demonstrations in Washington, D.C. I quote from the article as follows:

"Charles D. Broadbent, Conference Associate Minister, announced that Dr. Robert Moss, President of the United Church of Christ will take part in the 'March against Death' set for November 13-15 in the nation's capitol. The Board of Trustees of the N.H. Conference has considered his invitation to other churchmen who share his concern to join with him in calling for the end of the hostilities in Viet Nam and believes it should pass on this information to our people in the state. The Associate Minister said the board also believes that it shall make possible participation by those who may need some assistance in travel expense. A modest amount of support has therefore been set aside for those whose Christian convictions lead them to participate in this particular activity."

Several of our members have voiced their objection both verbally and in writing to this use of church funds in a cause which many of us do not support, however much we may agree with their right to state their opinion. This article was the subject of lengthy discussion at the last meeting of the Board of Trustees of this church, both as to the effect it might have on our present every member canvass, and as to whether we should provide funds in our budget for the Christian World Mission of the United Church of Christ. We were told that only five Trustees of the N. H. Conference out of only nine present took this action over the objection of Dr. Everett Barrows, Executive Director of the N. H. Conference and that the repercussions have been such that a special meeting of the full board was called for November 14th to consider rescinding the previous vote. We also understand that six churches in New Hampshire have threatened to resign from the conference in opposition to this vote. I think all of us agree that the war in Viet Nam is a most unpopular war and we would all like to see it over with. There are many distinguished leaders, both military and civilian who question the wisdom of the United States being involved in the war. I have a draft age son and a college daughter to whom I am sometimes unable to give intelligent answers, and I confess to being bewildered at times myself. On the other hand, I do have faith in the democratic system by which we establish national policy. I don't believe in government by referendum, nor do I think national policy should be set in the streets. I think it is a shame that patriotism is considered to be old fashioned and I object violently to having church funds used to support what I consider to be an unpatriotic cause, that has nothing whatsoever to do with religion and the proper goals of the church.

What should we do? Should we secede from the United Church of Christ? I think not. I don't think we can blame Dallas for Jack Ruby, nor Memphis for John Ray nor can we blame Los Angeles for Sirhan Sirhan. Neither can we blame the United Church of Christ for a few idealistic crackpots on the Conference Board of Trustees. With all the troubles that beset us, I suggest this is when the church most needs our support. On the other hand, the trustees of this church do

feel we should voice our disapproval in some tangible way. Accordingly, at our last meeting we voted unanimously to withhold all funds the current year's budget designated from the Christian World Mission pending some expression of opinion from the congregation at large. Unfortunately, there was not sufficient time to call a special meeting of the church for this Sunday which would comply with the By-laws of the church. I should also explain that the trustees are very much aware of the need to carry on a Christian Mission, but feel that for the time being we should perform our missionary activities in our own back yard—in places like the Goffs Falls Church and also for some of the deprived people in our own community.

At this point then I would ask you to stand if you support the action of the trustees in withholding funds for the Christian World Mission until further notice. Now, would those who oppose the action of the trustees please stand.

The Board of Trustees will be guided by the sentiments you have just expressed. While I sincerely respect the opinions of those who may disagree with us, I would like to pay those who agree with us the compliment of calling them loveable SQUARES.

A couple of years ago I heard a speech by Charles Brower, President of the advertising firm of Batten, Barton, Durstine & Osborne, Inc. in which he advocated forming a new organization called S.O.S.—Society of Squares. I'd like to relate to you my recollection of that speech, which made a great impression on me.

Back a generation or so ago, square was one of the finest words in the English language, certainly among the top ten in any printer's hit parade. You gave a man a square deal if you were honest, you gave him a square meal if he was hungry, you stood foursquare for everything you thought was right, and square against everything else. When you got out of debt you were square with the world. And, that was when you could look your fellow man square in the eye.

Something has happened in the last 25 years both in the way some of the avant garde thinks and also in the meaning of the word square. Although we have always had our share of freeloaders in this country, it is only lately that non-involvement has become an accepted way of life. When we were poor we had to sweat it out. We couldn't afford detachment from the life and fate of our country. And one of the great dangers of both personal and national affluence is that it permits such detachment. The new generation seems to have bent the word square all out of shape. Prison convicts gave it the first twist. To them a square was an inmate who would not conform to the convict code. Today, everyone knows what a square is. He is the man who never learned to get away with it. He's the character who volunteers when he doesn't have to. He's the odd ball who gets his kicks from trying to do something better than anyone else. He's the boob who gets so involved in his work that he has to be reminded to go home. He's the slob who gets all choked up when the band plays "America the Beautiful" or when the choir sings the "Battle Hymn of the Republic". That's what a square is and he doesn't fit too neatly into the current group of angle players, corner-cutters, sharpshooters and goof-offs. He doesn't want to fly now and pay later. He's burdened down with old fashioned ideas of honesty, loyalty, courage, and thrift. Aren't you glad to be a square even though you may be on your way to extinction?

Teddy Roosevelt once said, "Far better it is to dare mighty things, to win glorious triumphs, even though checkered by failure, than to take rank with those poor souls who neither enjoy much nor suffer much because they live in the gray twilight that knows not victory nor defeat". End quote. In those days

the United States was the greatest exporter of ideas the world had ever known. We sold abroad the idea of individual dignity, responsibility, and freedom. We created and sold the idea of government of the people, by the people, and for the people—and this idea is still being bought today. We exported the idea of freedom of worship, the idea of freedom of speech, and a free press—even the idea that those who are taxed should be represented. Lately, however, we seem to be importing ideas from countries that would like to do us in. We seem to have imported the idea of a strong government for a weak people. We have bought from abroad the idea of "Let Jack do it" and "What's in it for me?" We have even bought the gesture of the neatly shrugged shoulder.

Other disturbing things have been happening. Non-books and non-plays are being thrown together and sold by non-writers who never bothered to learn how to write. Murky poems are being ground out by scraggly poets who have to sing them to their audience because they are unreadable. And non-actors have now confused acting with lewdness and nakedness. If you agree with these remarks, we will all definitely be branded as squares, but if we are so branded, remember that we will be in pretty good company, because our Christian world, and this country was discovered, put together, fought for, and saved by squares. It's easy to prove that Jesus Christ, Nathan Hale, Patrick Henry, Paul Revere, George Washington, Benjamin Franklin and almost anyone else you would want to claim as a hero were squares. You can prove it by thinking what anyone of them would have said if he had not been a square. For example—

Jesus Christ—What, me carry a cross up Calvary Hill so I can redeem mankind. Let them save their own souls!

Patrick Henry—Sure I'm for liberty first last and always, but let's be a little realistic. We're a pretty small outfit and if we start pushing the British around someone is going to get hurt.

Paul Revere—What do you mean—me ride through every Middlesex village and town? And in the middle of the night yet? Why pick on me? Am I the only man in Boston with a horse?

Benjamin Franklin—What we really need as an American Ambassador to France is a young man. I'm 70 years old. It's time a new generation took over.

Are you convinced now that your heroes were squares? And yet it's difficult at times for us to emulate them. The forces of conformity are still strong. Too many of us are sitting it out instead of sweating it out. Too many of us haven't got the guts to stand up straight and be square. Because the opposite of square is round and being round is so much simpler. Responsibilities and problems roll off nice and easy. Too many of us know the short cuts and too few know or care where the path leads. Too few of us dare to leave the path, because the path is always the easy way, the way most people go. But there is no path to the future, no path to greatness, no path to progress, no path to outer space or to inner satisfaction.

Think a little about this organization called S.O.S.—Society of Squares. It could have a secret handshake consisting of grabbing the other guys' hand as though you meant it and looking him straight in the eye. It would be in favor of participation, and against sitting life out, for simplicity and against sophistication, for laughter and against sniggering, for America and against her enemies, for the direct and against the devious, for education and against the pretense of learning, for building and against tearing down; for the honest way and against the short cut. Aren't you glad to be a square and wouldn't you like to join the S.O.S.?

Let's be squares, let's meet our Christian commitments squarely, and let's show Man-

chester what kind of a job the Brookside Church can do when we all work together. Even if you shouldn't be a square, we still need your help.

Thank you.

A TRIBUTE TO VICTORIA POPKIN

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, in a time when the propriety of dissent is being called into question, we have more reason than ever to cherish the dedicated men and women who devote their full energies to guarding and protecting our traditional liberties. One such lady was Miss Victoria Popkin, who was the associate director of the Washington office of the American Civil Liberties Union. Miss Popkin died recently at the tragically early age of 27, and I rise to pay my respects to her memory.

A native of New York, Miss Popkin was a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of Goucher College, and a graduate of Stanford University Law School where she served with both the Legal Aid Society and the Law Students Civil Rights Research Council. After completing her studies, she worked with the Democratic Senate Campaign Committee and the Office of the General Counsel of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, before joining the staff of the American Civil Liberties Union.

Miss Popkin dedicated herself to the preservation and full vindication of the civil rights and civil liberties of all Americans, regardless of their particular creed or convictions. Her devotion was not to any partisan cause or ideological position, but to the fundamental rights which we all should enjoy and jealously preserve. She will be deeply missed by all of us.

I should like to include at this point a resolution recently passed by the National Board of the American Civil Liberties Union. Those who knew her better and worked closely with her can speak of her much more eloquently than I could ever hope to:

RESOLUTION ON THE DEATH OF VICTORIA POPKIN

Victoria Popkin, Associate Director of the Washington Office of the American Civil Liberties Union, died on September 15th at the age of twenty-seven.

Miss Popkin came to the ACLU a year and a half ago after having worked briefly for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. She graduated from Goucher College, magna cum laude, and from Stanford Law School where she was on the Law Review.

Her slight frame contained a tough, analytical intellect that displayed itself daily in her job of preparing legislative testimony and legal briefs. All of her work was characterized by forcefulness, sense and clarity.

But Miss Popkin had more than a fine mind. She had the courage to disregard her infirmities, the insight and wisdom of people more experienced and older than she, and a quiet strength and humor that brightened the lives of all with whom she came in contact. In her all too-brief service for the ACLU she made a remarkable contribution.

The Board of Directors of the American Civil Liberties Union extends sincere condolences to her parents, her brother and her sister.

FORMER CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN

HON. HUGH SCOTT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, on November 19, at the New York Hilton, the National Urban League Conference honored former Chief Justice Earl Warren for "historic" contributions to the cause of human rights.

The National Urban League presented its Equal Opportunity Day Award for advancing the civil rights movement through landmark decisions on school desegregation, voting, reapportionment, and individual rights.

I ask unanimous consent that the tribute to Chief Justice Warren delivered by James A. Linen, president of the National Urban League, and the remarks of former Chief Justice Earl Warren before the Equal Opportunity Day dinner of the National Urban League, November 19, be printed in the RECORD.

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

TRIBUTE TO CHIEF JUSTICE EARL WARREN (RETIRED)

(By James A. Linen)

Years ago we first asked Earl Warren, the Fourteenth Chief Justice of the United States, to share this platform with us. But such were his own stern scruples while he was in office that Chief Justice Warren has never before allowed us the opportunity to pay tribute to his accomplishments.

So it is with immense pride that I stand before you at this moment. I am proud to represent the National Urban League on this occasion, and proud also to represent Time Incorporated. The law, Henry Luce once said, is "the place where order and freedom meet." Our late Founder's concern for the rule of law in national and international affairs was profound—and so was his respect for the United States Supreme Court. "If the Supreme Court were to abdicate tomorrow," he once said, "this nation would by its very nature be erecting another spokesman of our sovereign Constitution and the supreme law of the land."

It is a considerable challenge to try to sum up, in just a few moments, Earl Warren's immense contribution to our country. For the past sixteen years, he has guided the Court through a period of activity unprecedented in its history. I need hardly remind you of the great advances these exciting years have brought in school desegregation and voting rights, in the elimination of discrimination in housing, in advocating the one-man-one-vote doctrine, and in the development of a system of criminal justice that offers better protection for the individual. The Warren Court was not afraid to tackle these tough issues—issues that critically involve personal liberties and civil rights—and make firm judgments on them.

Earl Warren himself, in a statement last spring, best described the activist spirit of the Court over which he presided. He said, "I have heard a great many people say to me: 'Well, I agree with your opinions on these civil rights all right, but don't you

think you are going too fast?' Of course, the answer to that is, 'We haven't anything to say about how fast we go.' We go with the cases that come to us; and when they come to us with a question of human liberties in them, we either hear them and decide them or we let them go and sweep them under the rug only to leave them for future generations. That has been done in this country not only long enough but altogether too long. There are problems facing us today which, if they had been solved a century ago or even a generation ago, we would not have to face today; or, at least, if we did, they would be of manageable size."

That was what Earl Warren said about his Court. He could have said the same about his own life. As a youth in Bakersfield, California, grandson of a Norwegian carpenter, he faced poverty by working as a newsboy, a freight hustler, a farm hand, and—I'm proud to say—as a cub reporter. From then on, Earl Warren was "going with the cases that came to him"—as a junior lawyer in San Francisco and Oakland, later as deputy district attorney and district attorney for Alameda County, California. In that job, though he quickly earned a reputation as a fearless prosecutor, he said he "never heard a jury bring in a verdict of guilty but that I felt sick at the pit of my stomach."

As a three-term governor of California, Earl Warren in the nineteen forties and early nineteen fifties solved problems that many states are only now beginning to confront. While California's population nearly doubled during his years as governor, Earl Warren nevertheless helped create one of the nation's greatest educational systems there. He also made long strides in health and highways. And he had much to do with the development of California's Department of Corrections, whose advanced ideas about penology have since been widely imitated throughout the country.

"Is it fair?" has been a question Earl Warren has repeatedly asked during his career. Long ago he came to the firm conclusion that America was not playing fair with her minority citizens. Soon after he took office as California's governor in 1943, Earl Warren let it be known that he would not tolerate racial discrimination in the state's various bureaucracies. He himself appointed Negroes to many key positions and saw to it that many inequities facing black and brown Californians were corrected. When Warren sought the Republican presidential nomination in 1948, and again in 1952, one of the key planks in his personal platform was "one law for all men and equal opportunity in life for all men."

With these and many other examples of his attitude toward equal rights already implanted on his record, Earl Warren went to Washington in 1953 to take over as Chief Justice. To those who had known him before, his firm and unflinching guidance of the Court came as no surprise. For they knew Earl Warren as a man of uncompromising principles... a man soon frustrated by avoidance of the issues... a man whose ability to grow from job to job destined him to achieve greatness.

So it is not only fair, but overdue, for the National Urban League to bestow on Chief Justice Earl Warren the honor we have long known he has richly deserved. It is a great privilege for me, on behalf of the Urban League movement as a whole, to present him with our 1969 Equal Opportunity Day award, Chief Justice Warren.

REMARKS OF EARL WARREN, FORMER CHIEF JUSTICE U.S. SUPREME COURT

I am very proud to accept an award from the National Urban League because I have been familiar with its work for many years—long before I had any thought of becoming Chief Justice of the United States. I re-

member this pioneer organization and the assistance it gave to me during my many years of political life in California. I am particularly happy that the Award should be your Equal Opportunity Award—not because I feel I have been particularly helpful in that area of activity, but because I know it is the cherished aim of the National Urban League. Some worthy people have organizations focus their activities on different phases of our social problems, but your organization has been known for all the years I have been acquainted with it with grass-root activities designed to bring opportunity to those who have been deprived of it principally because of racial discrimination.

In the hierarchy of human rights, there are few to compare in importance with that of equal opportunity, because so many other rights are implicit in it—the right of human dignity; the right of education; the right to a decent home; and the opportunity to obtain a useful job which will enable one to feel that he is a needed member of society. It is hard to believe in this advanced stage of our civilization and the general standards of affluence that these rights would not be afforded to every citizen in accordance with the American ideal.

What is that American ideal? It is simply and precisely stated thusly in the Declaration of Independence—

"We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable Rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the Pursuit of Happiness."

This noble language, fortified by the implementing language of the 14th Amendment, makes the picture complete—

"All persons born or naturalized in the United States, and subject to the jurisdiction thereof, are citizens of the United States and of the State wherein they reside. No State shall make or enforce any law which shall abridge the privileges or immunities of citizens of the United States; nor shall any State deprive any person of life, liberty, or property, without due process of law; nor deny to any person within its jurisdiction the equal protection of the laws."

In seven years, it will be two centuries since the Declaration of Independence became the hope of the downtrodden throughout the Western world. It has been 101 years since the 14th Amendment made equality a mandate of the United States Government, and it was 106 years ago today that Lincoln delivered his Gettysburg Address in which he said that our Forefathers had "brought forth on this continent a new nation conceived in liberty and dedicated to the proposition that all men are created equal."

Isn't it about time that it be made a reality?

But there are still thousands of public schools where black children cannot enter only because they are black and are relegated to inferior standards of education which should shock the conscience of all of us. There are thousands of voting places where a black person for the same reason is prevented from casting his vote and participating in his Government. There are many industries in which a man, regardless of his skill, cannot obtain a job or join a union to make an honest living for his family merely because of his color. There are millions of our citizens who are as confined to ghettos and the sordid conditions which exist there as though there was an impenetrable wall around them.

But what seems worst of all to me is that there are still thousands of churches in the Nation where a black person is not welcome to worship and in many where he or she would be jailed for trying to do so.

To our Nation's great injury, both at home and abroad, all of these conditions exist in defiance of the mandates of the Constitution and the laws of the United States. As a result,

the domestic problems of our country have grown to gigantic magnitude. Many of them are at the crisis stage—some at the violent stage.

The causes of our problems are many and complex, and it would serve no purpose to review them in this company which has wrestled with them for more than a half century.

Our great cities, including this one where we gather tonight, have conditions that cry out for solution—solutions which are not forthcoming even under the leadership of a great public servant like Mayor Lindsay. Neither the financial resources at the municipal level nor the national commitment to the cause is available.

While many things must be done before our cities can be restored to a healthy condition, it is quite apparent that none of our major problems can be solved until race prejudice becomes a fiction of the past and we fulfill the promise of two centuries ago that all men are created equal and are entitled to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Is this too much to ask? I think not. Can it be done? I believe it can. What does it take—adherence to the American ideal I have been speaking of.

Tonight our intrepid astronauts are walking on the moon because our Government, with the acquiescence of all of us, committed the Nation to this task. We regimented the scientific and technological forces of the Nation—tens of thousands of them with their supporting personnel—and we have spent, I believe, 25 billion dollars in accomplishing the mission. It has been a great accomplishment, and was possible only because there was national commitment to that end.

If we can do that, certainly we can commit our hearts and minds, as well as our finances to affording equal opportunity to every American.

Those who are not concerned with closing the gap between the profession of the American ideal and its performance employ the euphemistic saying that we cannot have both guns and butter. It is time to say to them, "If that is true, then let us just have the butter."

I do believe that the American people will awaken to their responsibilities to our cities and to the poor and neglected in our society, but it is very late in coming. And if this is going to be a great country for our children and their children, we must now have a massive national assault upon our urban problems, free from racial prejudice and from the last vestiges of slavery, the bill for which we are now paying in full.

I wish you continued success in your great labors.

FNMA REACHES A MILESTONE

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. MOORHEAD. Mr. Speaker, today, the Federal National Mortgage Association's president, Raymond H. Lapin, announced that the unique corporation of which he is head has passed a landmark point in its history. Mr. Lapin made public that he has been advised that his corporation has satisfied the essential requirement for the control of the corporation to pass completely into private hands. I am advised that Mr. Lapin will ask his board of directors to certify that one-third of the corporation's stock is held by individuals and companies involved in the housing and home fi-

nance business. This is the important test we set for total private control of FNMA to take place.

Mr. Speaker, when we included the legislation to allow FNMA to become entirely privately owned and controlled in last year's Housing and Urban Development Act, we all hoped that this transformation could be completed promptly. This was our hope because we recognized that a private FNMA—one completely free of the strictures of the Federal budget—could do more to help support the FHA/VA backed mortgage market. When we fixed May 1, 1970, as the earliest date at which the shift to private ownership could take place, we were setting a goal. The aim that we hoped FNMA could be ready for private status in 18 months. FNMA has surpassed that ambitious goal. They are now ready to assume their mandated role as a privately controlled corporation.

It would be well to consider why FNMA has reached this milestone so early. It has been successful in doing so because it has been able to channel an unparalleled flow of funds into the FHA/VA mortgage market. The stock has been placed in the hands of house and home finance industry people because they are legally required, as a condition to using the secondary market facilities of FNMA, to purchase FNMA stock. Because FNMA has been called upon to engage in unprecedented level of support for the FHA/VA mortgage market. It has been able to place its stock in the hands of the "qualifying owners" sooner than we could have foreseen. The stockholders have apparently decided to hold their FNMA stock: probably because the stock has proven to be such an attractive investment—its price has tripled since the authority was granted for FNMA to assume private status.

In my judgment, the record of FNMA over the last 14 months, is a testimonial to the ability of the private sector to operate in the public good. The two men most responsible for constructing this enviable record both have an admirable record of achievement in corporate leadership and public service. Both HUD Secretary Romney, and FNMA President Lapin, are to know and understand the importance of private corporation participating in programs which confer important public good. With the direction that excellent individuals have given FNMA during this formative period, I am sure that the privately controlled FNMA is on a well-fixed course of public service through support of Government-backed mortgages.

HIGH SCHOOL POLL ON VIETNAM

HON. JAMES A. McCLURE

OF IDAHO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. McCLURE. Mr. Speaker, the students of Lakeland High School in Rathdrum were polled by the school's newspaper on the subject of Vietnam. After a study and discussion of the situation

in which our country finds itself, these young people overwhelmingly gave their support to the President's plan for ending the war. Some elements of the national news media would have us believe that most students throughout the country repudiate American policy in Southeast Asia and that they are particularly opposed to Mr. Nixon's efforts to bring the conflict to an honorable conclusion.

I think the poll of Lakeland High pupils illustrates a number of things. For one, it indicates that not all of today's youth are of the sign-carrying, anti-everything variety. It tends to substantiate the recent statements of Mr. AGNEW that the national press is selling us a piece of goods as far as the war is concerned. More than that, it is further proof that Mr. Nixon and his policies enjoy the support of the vast majority of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the students and the faculty of Lakeland High and include the results of their poll in the RECORD at this point:

LHS VIETNAM OPINION POLL

What should the United States' policy be in regard to its future participation in Vietnam?

Immediate withdrawal.....	19
Staged withdrawal combined with gradual Vietnamization of the conflict.....	163
Maintenance of current strength.....	12
Sudden, major escalation to include bombing.....	33

Should the U.S. aim for a—

Unilateral ceasefire.....	19
Mutual ceasefire.....	168
No ceasefire.....	37

Do you favor Pres. Nixon's approach to the war?

Yes.....	166
No.....	68

Should the U.S. try for a—

Strengthening of South Vietnamese government.....	181
Coalition between Saigon and Vietnam.....	38
Surrender to North Vietnam.....	4

Do you think the Paris negotiations will ultimately lead to a settlement of this war?

Yes.....	32
No.....	192

Do you feel that the Moratorium helped or hindered the cause of ultimate peace?

Helped.....	69
Hindered.....	159

What is your political preference?

Republican.....	39
Democrat.....	39
American Independent Party.....	7
Independent.....	118

FRANK SURACI, SR.

HON. JOSEPH M. McDADE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. McDADE. Mr. Speaker, Frank Suraci, Sr., is a remarkable example of a fine American gentleman. Even more than that, he sums up in his life the story of what America has meant to so many

people who were born on distant shores and who came to this country to build their own lives and to build this great Nation.

In 1906 Mr. Suraci left his home in Calabria in Italy and landed in New York at the age of 12. Eight years later, when the first rumblings of World War I started in Europe, Frank and his brother Anthony opened a very small cigar business with 10 workers in the city of New York. For 4 years they worked together in the business known as the Suraci Bros. until America was caught up in that war and Frank joined the American Army as a member of the 77th Division.

When the war was finished, he went back to the cigar business which continued to grow until in 1930 the brothers decided to move out of New York City. In their wisdom they chose to come to Pennsylvania, to the city of Scranton. In Scranton they became the manufacturers of cigars under the name of the "Parodi Cigar Co." There were about 75 people working for the company at that time. The business prospered in Scranton. Over many years the firm acquired the Denobill Cigar Co.; and Parodi and Denobill cigars have been the outstandingly successful Italian-style cigars sold in America. The brothers also acquired American firms and are literally producing hundreds of brands of American cigars, the best known of which is the Blackstone. Today their cigars are manufactured in three plants, all of them in the State of Pennsylvania in the Scranton area.

As the company grew, Frank involved himself in the growth of the community around him. He became a member of all of the civic organizations which worked so hard to build new economy in the city of Scranton. He became a leader in the Roman Catholic Church in the Scranton area. He has worked closely with the Elks Club, with the American Legion, in their many philanthropies. He has given generously to educational institutions, and has created the Suraci Museum in honor of his brother Anthony at Marywood College in Scranton, Pa. He serves also as board member of the community medical center and the Clarks Summit State Hospital.

Today the Pennsylvania delegation is holding a luncheon to honor Mr. Frank Suraci, Sr. After his long years as president of the Parodi Cigar Co., he has recently assumed the office of chairman of the board and chief executive officer. Anthony, Sr., his beloved brother, is deceased or he would be with us today. We are fortunate, however, to have Mr. Suraci's two sons, Frank, Jr., and Henry, as well as his nephew, Anthony, Jr. Robert Keating, president of Parodi Cigars and the husband of Anthony's daughter Flora, is also with us today, as is Mr. Ted Cott, president of the Cigar Institute of America. Amelia, his beloved wife, is home in Scranton and I know that she joins all of us in this tribute to a fine man.

It is my privilege to introduce Frank Suraci, Sr., to the Pennsylvania delegation. They will meet a man who came to this country as a small boy and who

now, at the age of 76, has created a distinguished industrial name. They will also meet a man who never forgot the homeland from which he came. He has been the chairman of the committee for the relief of the orphans of Italy for the past 5 years. Perhaps some of those small children may follow in his own footsteps and may also find the same distinction he found among us in Pennsylvania.

We have all read about the American dream, of an immigrant boy coming to America to find fame and fortune in this land of ours. That dream lives in Frank Suraci, Sr. Because he came among us, the wheels of commerce spin just a little faster. Because he came among us, our cultural life has become richer. Because he came among us, many hands which reached for help received it.

If his own life has become a successful one through his choosing America as his home, so also America has become a finer Nation through his life. It is a memorable honor to salute such an outstanding citizen of this great Nation.

PINKVILLE AND THE PRESS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, Lt. William Calley and S/Sgt. David Mitchell have suffered the ignominy of having all combat medals and awards revoked—as a result of unprecedented trial in the news media. With all their indepth reporting, the press has failed to mention that Sgt. Mitchell of Louisiana is a Negro, possibly because he was fighting for his country and not marching against it.

Most civilized countries accord an accused the humanitarian consideration of innocence until guilt is proven beyond reasonable doubt. Both these men had already faced death in Vietnam only to return home and find themselves sentenced by the communications media to a lifetime of disgrace in the eyes of their countrymen.

One network, we now learn, has confessed to the buying of staged interviews to produce "news" for profit.

In legitimate courts, paid witnesses are regarded with suspicion—their testimony given strict scrutiny and even then regarded of questionable probative value. But trial by press offers no cross-examination, no rebuttal, nor explanation by either the accused or for the benefit of the jury, that is, public opinion.

The Pinkville massacre production follows earlier patterns of bias and contrivance to obtain an objective such as we have seen with the arranged "pot party," and the staged performance of CBS' "hunger" child. In this instance the objective is to get our forces out of Vietnam and disarm our military. Once again, the communications people have attempted to exploit the Pinkville incident and make the real defendant the military forces of our country.

The American people are daily becoming more aware that the news media is

being used as a weapon of psychological warfare against them. With their credibility at an all-time low and by flaunting any pretext of ethics or truth, the national news media again prove Vice President AGNEW's report, and are courting a massive reaction by the people.

The theory of relative honesty was also a practice in new morality by Lenin, who believed anything is good if it advances the revolution.

I include three news clippings:

[From the St. Francisville (La.) Democrat, Nov. 27, 1969]

**LOCAL SOLDIER STRIPPED OF MEDALS
IN ALLEGED DEATHS**

A St. Francisville soldier, Army S. Sgt. David Mitchell, 29, has had his combat medals revoked because of alleged involvement in the death of Vietnamese civilians.

He has been accused of assault with intent to commit murder in connection with an alleged slaughter of inhabitants of a South Viet Nam village.

Mitchell lost his two good conduct medals, Viet Nam service medal, Viet Nam campaign medal, National Defense service medal, and Combat Infantry badge. He is the son of a Baptist minister in St. Francisville, the Reverend Isiah Mitchell.

First Lt. William L. Calley, 26, of Miami, Florida, charged with premeditated multiple murder, also lost his medals and ribbons.

[From the Washington Daily News, Nov. 27, 1969]

**CBS ADMITS PAYING FOR MEADLO INTERVIEW
(By Jim G. Lucas)**

CBS News admitted today it paid an "undisclosed amount of money" to a group of free lance reporters for arranging its controversial TV interview Monday with a young Vietnam war veteran from Indiana.

The youth, 22-year-old Paul Meadlo, of West Terre Haute, asserted that he and his fellow soldiers shot 370 South Vietnamese civilians to death in an attack on Song My village last year.

Mr. Meadlo said he was following orders of 1st Lt. William L. Calley Jr., his platoon commander, whom the army has announced it will try for murder in the alleged massacre of the Vietnamese civilians.

"SUBSTANTIAL"

David Obst, general manager of Dispatch News Service (which only got around to incorporating yesterday), described the payment from CBS as "substantial" as did Michael Nussbaum, attorney for the news service.

"Now we have a little money to play around with," chortled Mr. Obst, a 23-year-old Chinese language student who studied in Taiwan and at the University of California at Berkeley. "We're on our way."

Both Mr. Nussbaum and Michael Silver, CBS news director in New York, emphatically denied that Mr. Meadlo was paid anything by CBS or the news service.

"It was stipulated in the written agreement . . . that none of the money paid would go to the interviewee," Mr. Silver said in a formal statement. "CBS news policy prohibits paying people for news interviews."

Mr. Silver said Dispatch News Service approached CBS first, and that it agreed to pay for the Meadlo interview because news service editor Seymour M. Hersh had "exclusive access" to him.

The Meadlo interview caused an immediate furore in Congress. His voice rising with emotion, Sen. Peter H. Dominick, R-Colo., charged an "ordinarily responsible network" had taken the position, apparently, that "anytime it is news one can disseminate it regardless of an individual's rights."

Sen. Dominick charged CBS had jeopardized Lt. Calley's right to a fair trial and also had failed to warn Mr. Meadlo of his rights.

CBS News rejected this contention, saying it believes the free press-fair trial issue "does not apply in this situation inasmuch as Lt. Calley will not be tried by a civilian jury but by a board of professional soldiers who are disciplined to make their decision on the basis of military law." Mr. Meadlo was "entitled to make his story public if that was his decision," CBS News declared.

Meanwhile, at Dispatch News Service's office in the National Press Building, Mr. Obst, speaking for his "editor-in-chief," Hersh, first said it was "hard to say" how many reporters the service employs.

"We have groups of investigative reporters working all over the world," he said, but then specified four in Washington and 14 elsewhere.

Three in Saigon he named as Michael Morrow, Don Ronke and Dick Berliner. Among those in Washington he named Mr. Hersh, Derek Norcross, who, Mr. Obst said, "also writes youth notes for Parade" and Richard J. Barnett.

Mr. Barnett, a 32-year-old Harvard graduate and former director of research for the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, recently visited Hanoi, where he said he had an "extended interview" with Premier Pham Van Dong. He recently declined to discuss his trip or interview because, he said, an account of it was being sold by Dispatch News Service.

While conceding that "we all have a point of view," Mr. Obst denied that Dispatch News Service is "antiwar, antiestablishment or antianthing" or that it is "connected with any organization or group."

"It was tough the first two months," he said, "getting rid of the idea we were the Liberation News Service (which serves underground antiwar papers), and of course we never were. Now we are financially solvent. We are formalizing our staff relationships setting salaries and getting newspapers to publish our stories. We have established our credibility."

So far, Mr. Obst said, Dispatch News Service has no regular clients. But he said it had 36 "one-shot" takers on its first story by Mr. Hersh on Nov. 13, disclosing that Lt. Calley was under army investigation in the Song My massacre, 32 on its second involving a couple of sergeants who said they were involved in the shootings and many more on its third, an interview with Mr. Meadlo.

"We'll be around for quite a while," he predicted.

Kingpin of the news service obviously is Mr. Hersh, a 32-year-old former Associated Press Pentagon correspondent who served briefly as press secretary during last year's race for the Democratic presidential nomination.

A nervous, fast talking man, Mr. Hersh has written a book about germ warfare, and was writing another when, he says, he got a tip on the Song My massacre from a Pentagon friend. He got a \$1,000 grant from the Phillip M. Stern Foundation for investigative journalism and began two months of traveling which eventually led to his initial story on the investigation.

[From the Manchester Union Leader, Dec. 1, 1969]

**LET'S NOT JUMP TO CONCLUSIONS
(By Ralph de Toledano)**

Some of the more zealous of our citizenry have already tried and convicted the men accused of a "massacre" of civilians in My Lai, a South Vietnamese village. To be sure, the charges against First Lieutenant William L. Calley Jr. and the other defendants are specific enough to encourage conclusion-jumping. But comments in the press have

gone far beyond this, and inflammatory photographs have contributed to the masochistic hysteria gripping some of the media.

There are, however, some dubious aspects to the case which warrant attention. For one thing, why did the Pentagon wait so long before it began investigating? The facts were known to the appropriate authorities and to members of Congress for many months. Obviously the military had looked into the circumstances surrounding the attack on My Lai. Is a panicky Pentagon now responding to a calculated propaganda campaign launched by anti-Vietnam groups?

I would hesitate to raise this point had I not heard Charles A. West, of Chicago, who served under Lieutenant Calley. His account differs drastically from the superheated stories now circulating. He has said, moreover, that he would testify for the defendants. People are being led to believe, for example, that C. Company, 1st Battalion, of the 20th Infantry, moved into My Lai with no opposition, rounded up old men, women and children, and wantonly shot them down. This, according to Mr. West, is not true.

According to Mr. West's eyewitness account, this was C Company's first combat engagement. Before moving in, the unit was read a "field paragraph" stating that My Lai harbored Viet Cong and North Vietnamese troops. It ordered C. Company to take and destroy the village—standard tactics in counterinsurgency operations. The "field paragraph" came from headquarters, which means that Lieutenant Calley and his immediate superiors had a hand in its authorship.

In moving on My Lai, says Mr. West, Charlie Company was badly bloodied—with soldiers killed and wounded by snipers and booby traps. The company was pinned down by enemy fire just outside the village and took shelter in a rice paddy. When it attacked, it was met by sniper fire. When the company entered the village, they found many dead as a result of artillery shelling and bombing from the air. The only firing into groups of old men, women and children he saw occurred when military age males deliberately ran among these civilians. Eventually, it was established that at least some of these were Viet Cong or NVA troops.

So much for the horrific story at My Lai was a peaceful village with no enemy forces in it, which was taken with no opposition. Charlie company went in shooting because it was being fired upon. "A whole lot of the kids and women were already wounded from the bombing," Mr. West said. "There were men in NVA uniforms. Our men killed some of those who were wounded. Sometimes it was a mercy, they were pretty torn apart."

In the attack, some of what Mr. West calls "yanigans"—young, raw troops—went crazy. Others, however, rounded up women and children and led them to the safety of the rice paddies. After the assault, according to Mr. West, "we rounded up everyone left in the village, and they, too, were sent to the rice paddies. The only men deliberately shot were military age males who had no South Vietnamese identification cards and who refused to answer questions. They were shot by a counter-intelligence unit—not C Company. Though he was with Lieutenant Calley for a good part of the time, he never saw him kill anyone.

Charlie Company's behavior, according to Mr. West's account: A group of men, never before tested in battle, see some of its own men killed. Acting in fear and burying that fear in anger, overreacts. There is nothing of "premeditation" to this. There is no comparison to the actions of the Viet Cong in Hue, for example, where thousands of civilians were forced to dig their own graves and then were shot or buried alive. There is even less comparison to the systematic murder of civil-

ians by the Viet Cong in remote villages, in a strategy of terror.

The questions remain. Why did the Pentagon suddenly decide to bear down on Charlie Company 20 months after the My Lai battle? And why did that battle become a national issue at a time when public opinion on the Vietnam war demonstrated itself to be strongly in support of President Nixon's policies? The answer to these two questions will explain far more than any fevered rhetoric.

DANGER IN PERMITTING EXCESSIVE LUMBERING IN OUR NATIONAL FORESTS

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, the preservation of our precious natural resources for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations is a matter of urgent national concern. That concern is cogently expressed in a recent speech given by Michael McCloskey, conservation director of the Sierra Club, before Town Hall, a civic forum in Los Angeles. Mr. McCloskey cites the danger to our national forests in permitting excessive lumbering.

Our spiralling population needs expanded park and recreational facilities. National forest areas can help to meet this demand. We must be careful not to sacrifice public land to private commercial development, where that interferes with the priority of giving increased scope to leisure time activity and improving the quality of our environment.

Mr. McCloskey has given very thoughtful consideration to this problem. I include a summary of his speech in the RECORD:

THE THREAT TO OUR NATIONAL FORESTS POSED BY THE NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACTS (By Michael McCloskey)

WHAT IS HAPPENING TO OUR NATIONAL FORESTS

The governing charter for these forests is the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960, which prescribes that various uses should be balanced, and not necessarily according to their highest economic values.

In practice, though, 90% of the national forest land has been allocated to lumbering and grazing, mainly the former. Only 10% or less has been allocated to recreation and non-commercial values.

Conservationists feel that at least another 5% should be allocated to recreational uses, such as wilderness, recreation areas, and parks.

The problem, thus, is that multiple use practices are already grossly over-weighted in favor of commercial uses of a local nature. Examples of existing imbalance can be found in controversies on the Kern Plateau and the Siskiyou's in California, in the Cascades of Oregon and Washington, and the Rocky Mountains where frequently timber sales are subsidized.

What Industry Wants: it wants the remaining old-growth cut out in 15 years. Under current practice, the Forest Service had planned to ration this out for about 100 years. The industry is proposing the National Timber Supply Acts as an innocuous appearing vehicle to enable them to achieve this goal.

WHAT IS THE CONDITION OF THE TIMBER INDUSTRY

Consumption of wood products has been static since 1910.

Per capita consumption of lumber has been declining: from 219 board feet in 1950 to 170 board feet in 1968.

The pattern of new housing starts has been static for almost two decades: there was about the same number of new housing starts in 1967 as in 1947: 1.2 million starts; this year there will be only about 1.3 million.

New housing programs should be aimed at relieving problems of central core cities. These areas need mainly multi-family units, which use only two-fifths as much wood as single-family units. Multi-family units are satisfying an increasing share of the market.

In housing construction, there is also a growing trend to substitute metals, plastics, and concrete for wood products; these substitutes are rapidly displacing wood.

Private timber lands are being over-cut: whereas only 35% of the wood inventory of the nation is in private hands, some 61% of the cut is coming off these lands; much is being cut in excess of the rate of 1 or 2% of the inventory that may be safely removed each year.

Rather than there being a pent-up demand for wood, this country has been exporting an increasing surplus of logs and lumber: about 4 billion board feet this year; this rate has doubled in the last few years.

Despite an over-all surplus, over-cutting has created shortages of logs and stumps in some West Coast localities among improvident lumbermen who have not kept reserves. As evidence of their improvidence, three-fourths of the mills in the douglas-fir subregion went out of business in the last two decades; 26 plywood mills have shut down in the last two years alone.

To the extent there are conservation problems in timber management, they consist of over-cutting private lands, of excessive soil erosion, and the need for re-forestation, principally on private lands, where 95% of the unstocked, and under-stocked sites are found.

WHAT DOES THE NATIONAL TIMBER SUPPLY ACT PORTEND?

These bills, H.R. 12025 and S. 1832, are now pending before the House and Senate Agriculture Committees. They are being urgently pressed by the timber industry, ostensibly to meet the housing shortage.

The proposal

The Act declares that there is a need to substantially increase the timber cut on the national forests.

It makes high-yield forestry mandatory on all commercial timber lands in the national forests; commercial timber lands are defined as consisting of all those lands, capable of producing commercially usable timber, which are not presently withdrawn for recreational purposes.

The Act directs that cutting rates be sharply increased—so that the old-growth will be quickly liquidated.

And the Act earmarks receipts from timber sales into a fund which will be used to promote highly intensive forestry, specifically to be used for such practices as advance road construction, fertilization, and reforestation. The object is to quickly bring back new crops of timber to replace the forests to be quickly cut.

What's wrong with the proposal?

The Act directs all the attention to the national forests, whereas the real problem is on private timber lands.

No clear need has been proven to vastly increase production of wood; in fact the industry is having to advertise heavily to shore up markets, and is expanding exports.

Of the commercial timberlands (97 million acres) that would be mandated for high-yield

forestry, some 6 to 8 million acres of them should be withdrawn for recreational use and protection; this land, which has not yet been touched, would soon be decimated.

Cutting rates should not be substantially increased; more of the old-growth should be withdrawn for protection, and the rest should be rationed out so that only 10% of the forests are disrupted at any one time, not 20 to 40% as this bill would cause to happen. The other multiple values of the public forests will be badly damaged if this happens.

Not all of the high yield techniques have been proven, particularly fertilization and breeding of special stocks. If forests are treated as row crops, with reliance on even-aged stands of single species, unstable forests may result which will be disease prone; heavy use of pesticides and fertilizers may grossly upset the ecology of forests and watersheds.

The bill will inflexibly earmark federal revenue for timber production on economically marginal sites, often on a subsidized basis. Such monies could yield a higher return in other public programs.

What then do we advocate?

That the focus of remedial action be on private land. We need another blue-ribbon investigating commission, such as the Cope-land Commission in the 1930's, to look at the status of forestry in the United States today. Perhaps its work will show we need a federal Forest Practices Act to regulate mismanaged private holdings.

We need true balance in the management of our national forests, which have already over-weighted their planning in favor of industry. We need fairer allocations, and forestry based on long rotations, mixed stands of all ages, and guidelines set by broad ecological principles.

We need an end to subsidies for uneconomic timber production on marginal sites in the national forests, such as in the Rocky Mountains.

Controls are needed over any special funding that is provided for intensive forest management on the national forests. If new funds are provided for intensive production, they ought to be usable only on lands that have been specifically identified as having their highest value for timber production (we concede there might be about 80 million such acres in the national forests), and these lands should be classified for such purposes only after public notice, hearings, and provision for appeals.

In other words, the planning and allocation process should be an open process inviting public participation, just as is provided for wilderness allocation. What is fair for one use, is fair for another, particularly as timbering is a highly disruptive use.

CONCLUSION

The National Timber Supply Act is a cloak for an effort by the timber industry to "raid" the national forests for more high quality timber—timber for which they hope to promote a new market under the guise of the Housing Act of 1968. The Act is not needed to meet the housing shortage, and it will badly impair balanced use of our national forests.

LAND REFORM IN SOUTH VIETNAM

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the fol-

lowing article, last in a series to appear in the *Record* from the Seattle Post-Intelligencer of October 5, 1969.

These informative articles were written by Mr. Frank Herbert, Post-Intelligencer staff writer who accompanied Dr. Roy L. Prosterman to South Vietnam where Dr. Prosterman was adviser to the Saigon government on the difficult problem of land reform.

U.S. MAY "BLUNDER" INTO TOTAL ABANDONMENT OF SOUTH VIETNAM

(By Frank Herbert)

The Vietnam War could be at some kind of turning point with the report that the U.S. may be attempting to work out a behind-the-scenes accommodation with Hanoi.

If this fails, however, there are other factors. One, indicated to me in conversations with U.S. officials in Saigon, could be considered a dangerous political package for sale to the American voter.

Experienced military and political analysts in Saigon disagree strongly with the way the news from Vietnam is being "managed."

In general, the problem can be described this way:

Faced with an enemy possibly committed to a long war of attrition, the U.S. also could be digging in for a long war if all attempts for reasonable accommodation fail. But the U.S. government has been presenting the possibility of such a decision to the American public in questionable terms.

BLUNDER

Those terms, Saigon informants say, could blow up in our faces, forcing the U.S. into that ultimate blunder, a complete abandonment of Vietnam—the withdrawal of which the South Vietnamese are so fearful.

Vietnamese term such a withdrawal "bugging out."

The consequences of withdrawal would be bloody: Innumerable Vietnamese who have not supported Hanoi and the Viet Cong would die in the blood purges. And the U.S. position would suffer damage over the world.

At the heart of this political package is a three-point assessment of Gen. Creighton Abrams, our military commander in Vietnam, and by Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker and his aides.

They say:

1—A purely military victory is still within our grasp and we can safely ignore problems of building a secure political base among South Vietnam's rural population.

2—Our pacification program has 80 per cent of South Vietnam's population in a "C" security classification or better. ("C" indicates dangerous at night, relatively secure in daylight.)

3—The Viet Cong infrastructure has been cleaned out sufficiently so that the enemy no longer is able to mount a Tet style offensive.

Abrams and Bunker have asserted these points with great vehemence at the White House.

At the same time, the Abrams-Bunker package could be sugar-coated with a new draft law, a form of draft roulette more acceptable to U.S. students. It could be further sweetened by withdrawals of troops from Vietnam, perhaps even up to the 250,000 figure President Nixon currently uses.

Veteran observers on the Congressional staff feel these arguments have great appeal to Nixon—he could hand the U.S. the military victory which eluded President Johnson.

There is, however, substantial disagreement with the Abrams-Bunker assessments. The disagreements are voiced by U.S. line officers and former Vietminh intelligence officers who are in the field with South Vietnamese forces.

FLED

It must be remembered that the ex-Vietminh in South Vietnam today are those Vietnamese nationalists who fought beside the communists to defeat the French. They then fled south because they could not stomach communism.

The result, however, is that these Vietminh are among the most knowledgeable people in the world when it comes to communist tactics.

The point they keep making over and over is that Hanoi adapts its moves to shifts in U.S. internal politics much the way a judo fighter uses an opponent's strength against him. A slight push here, a feint there, a tap here, and the giant topples.

They emphasize what Hanoi knows—that a crucial U.S. election is coming up, with Nixon wanting his party to capture a decisive majority of the senatorial seats which the Democrats must hazard at the polls.

At the same time, they point out, Hanoi is well aware of the propaganda power in U.S. student unrest—some of which reputedly is communist inspired. It demonstrates the classic pattern of Marxist tactics—use of any disaffection to communist ends.

It's well to note that the increasing objections to our conduct of the war in Vietnam is creating extraordinarily strange bedfellows—moderate Republican congressmen and senators, as well as liberal Democrats, all of whom say they are ready to back a severe limitation on our Vietnam involvement. In addition are formerly neutral students who are enlisting in the militant anti-Vietnam cause.

You know we're in trouble when you hear a bank president's wife say: "When we first got involved in Vietnam, my grandson was only ten. He reaches draft age next year, and I'm worried that he may be sent over there to be killed. I ask myself: For what reason?"

Knowing these things, knowing the fragility in our assessment of the Vietnam situation, what are the communists likely to do?

We have a vital known fact to throw into our answer: The communists have at least two divisions of the North Vietnamese Army's main force in the Mekong Delta.

FALLING

This has been interpreted by our Military Assistance Command-Vietnam (MACV) as meaning the communist recruiting program is falling. They say Hanoi must bring in regulars because they no longer can recruit enough local force.

Bolstering their argument, MACV spokesmen point to recent captures of Viet Cong personnel who are only 16 years old, calling this "the bottom of the barrel."

Recent U.S. sweeps also have taken rice stocks which were carried from China. MACV says this indicates the VC no longer can depend on food supplies from South Vietnam's peasants.

But U.S. line officers and former Vietminh call these dangerous assumptions when dealing with an enemy whose plans invariably prove to be extremely long range.

For example, the former Vietminh say the VC has introduced "straw cadres" into many hamlets and villages, an infrastructure put there for U.S. pacification teams to remove without actually touching any real, hard core VC cadre.

U.S. line officers say we have been capturing young VC since the beginning of hostilities and that the numbers captured recently are not significant.

These officers also are worried by an old military axiom called "economy of force." North Vietnam's General Giap has committed only five per cent of his main force in the South. But this five per cent keeps 90 per cent of the U.S. force occupied.

The rice, they say, can be explained as

a friendship gesture by the Chinese to their fellow communists in the South.

What is left?

SUPPORT

On paper, MACV can show they have removed much of the support the communists require for their operations—people to scout local and familiar terrain, porters to carry supplies and equipment, people to provide and prepare food and shelter, dig bunkers, to care for the wounded and the sick.

But let us suppose the ex-Vietminh assessment is closer to actuality. It's an assessment disturbingly supported by the poor quality of our field intelligence in many regions.

Local residents in vital areas are not supplying us with accurate information about the VC. This quality of local intelligence is a sensitive indicator of how well our civil operations programs are succeeding.

Given all these facts—political-psychological military—and keeping in mind the lesson of Dien Bien Phu where the Vietminh used porters to bring in heavy artillery to inflict a savage defeat upon the French—given all this, which nerve on the U.S. giant is Hanoi likely to push?

Suppose they mount an all-out attack on a vulnerable province capital in the Mekong Delta. This could be, my informants in South Vietnam suggested, a capital in the region south of Saigon around the provinces of Dinh Tuong, Kien Hoa, Vinh Binh and Vinh Long.

Why this region? Even on U.S. hamlet security maps, this is a region dotted by heavy concentrations of VC control. In addition to outright VC control, the region is also heavily pocked by communities rated "C" in the security classification.

NIGHT

This means they are under VC control at night. For purposes of secret VC operations, it means they are effectively in VC hands. No one is going to give us intelligence information in the day if he knows he can be killed for this action at night.

If the communists capture such a capital, many observers believe they will have a special hostage. Presence of civil population will make our artillery and bombers virtually useless.

It would be a house-to-house battle much as it was in Hue.

The communists' next move is obvious: Raise the Provisional Revolutionary Government's flag and call in the neutral and Iron Curtain press.

The fact that this would be a city under siege would insure maximum news coverage for the event all over the world, including our own press.

This is a fear voiced by Abrams, by Bunker and by many of our Embassy and Mission experts—but always in the context of too swift a U.S. pull-out from Vietnam.

It's a fear President Nguyen Van Thieu has voiced in relation to proposed partitioning of his country.

But make special note that MACV experts do not rate ARVN (Army of the Republic of Vietnam) forces in the delta very high. The 20,000 U.S. support troops scattered over the delta could be expected to carry the brunt of the counter-attack and our casualties would be high.

This is the effect Hanoi is after.

At this point, even if we recaptured the provincial capital, the political damage in the U.S. would have been done.

The weak fabric of the story we had been sold—successful pacification, military victory possible, no more Tets—would be exposed.

If this occurs at the time of the 1970 elections, it will be a major political issue here (just as Hanoi would want it to be) and it will be characterized as another costly U.S. blunder.

Given the present outcry for getting us out of Vietnam, projecting that political climate into such a 1970 election mess, we could get a Congress and an electorate which would leave the President no choice.

Nixon says he does not want to be the first U.S. President to preside over a military defeat, but he could be forced to quit the field in Vietnam, leaving Hanoi the victor, having been party to our ultimate blunder in a long tragedy of errors.

LET THEM EAT PROMISES: THE POLITICS OF HUNGER IN AMERICA

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, as people from all over the Nation gather in Washington this week for the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition, and Health, I believe it appropriate to call attention to the publication on December 1 of a book by Nick Kotz, entitled "Let Them Eat Promises: The Politics of Hunger in America."

Mr. Kotz, a Washington correspondent for the Des Moines Register, has an outstanding reputation as a Pulitzer prize-winning journalist and the publication of this eloquent and significant volume will, I am sure, bring him increased stature among all those Americans who are concerned that there are so many hungry and undernourished people in our wealthy and affluent land.

Mr. Speaker, at this point in the Record I insert a description of "Let Them Eat Promises," which contains a biographical sketch of Mr. Kotz.

I also insert several comments on his book and two reviews of the publication in the Washington Star and Washington Post:

"LET THEM EAT PROMISES"

What happens to the human body—and to the human brain—when it is denied adequate nutrition during its most crucial period of development? Why do thousands of American children grow up stunted in growth, weakened in strength, alienated by hunger? Why do politicians, government officials, and legislators stand by as the richest country in the history of the world denies food to millions of its citizens? What is the truth behind the shocking phenomenon of hunger in America?

Let Them Eat Promises is the first book to explore in depth this crucial and complex problem. With the focal point on one issue—hunger—Nick Kotz explores the faults and fallacies in our country's domestic programs. With keen insight, he tells why we never even got to the battle stations for the War on Poverty. He reveals just who are the hungry people of America; what is happening to their minds and bodies as a result of their deprivation, and how two Presidents ignored secret reports warning of those consequences. He tells the story of how politics got the hunger issue going and how politics almost squashed it, and how—behind closed doors of the White House—warring forces at the top level of government are still trying to balance economy against humanity.

A fast-moving, dramatically presented indictment of public apathy and government neglect, *Let Them Eat Promises* reveals the hidden truths behind our number one disgrace. For the first time, here are all the

secret bargains, the backroom political dealings, the broken promises and the political priorities which continue to leave millions of families hungry as America turns her back.

In awarding Nathan K. (Nick) Kotz the first Robert F. Kennedy Journalism Award in 1969, the judges cited his "continuing coverage of hunger and rural poverty in America—exposing the mismanagement of federal food programs." As a Washington correspondent for the Des Moines Register and other Cowles publications, Kotz has won many of journalism's major honors: a 1968 Pulitzer Prize, a 1966 Sigma Delta Chi Award, and the Raymond Clapper Memorial Award in 1966 and 1968, making him the first two-time winner of this recognition for outstanding Washington correspondence. Born in San Antonio, Texas, Kotz, 37, graduated magna cum laude from Dartmouth College where he was elected to Phi Beta Kappa. He attended graduate school at the London School of Economics, served as a Lieutenant in the Marine Corps, and became a newspaper reporter in 1958. He has been a Washington correspondent since 1964 and lives there with his wife, Mary Lynn, and son, Jack Mitchell.

"Hunger and malnutrition will be critical issues for years. By showing us the rocky road already traveled, Nick Kotz prepares us for the way ahead. His book should be read by all who enlist in this most humane struggle."—U.S. Senator Jacob K. Javits, Ranking Republican Member, Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

"The book is a gripping, upside-down detective story—a classic who-didn't-done-it-to-the-malnourished poor. It is crammed with clues as to why hunger continues to exist in the United States long after everyone has agreed that not eating may be hazardous to your health. . . . If Mr. Kotz had his way, the solution would be simple and humanitarian. . . . It is unfortunate that he is not making policy instead of so fascinatingly describing its formation."—John R. Kramer, Executive Director, the National Council on Hunger and Malnutrition in the United States.

"The publication of Nick Kotz's book is a time for tears and outrage—tears for the suffering of the hungry millions whose helplessness he describes, outrage at the unbelievable fact that America still refuses to end their suffering. . . . But *Let Them Eat Promises* has a message of hope. . . . America must hear that message."—Charles Evers, Mayor of Fayette, Mississippi, and Civil Rights Leader.

"Nick Kotz has written an incisive and searing indictment of our number-one national disgrace—hunger. *Let Them Eat Promises* is by far and away the best treatment of this problem that I have seen."—U.S. Senator Walter F. Mondale, Member, Senate Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs.

"*Let Them Eat Promises* is a story that every student of government should read, because it shows how our national government really operates. Nick Kotz's vivid and authentically detailed story explains how the needs of starving Americans were swept under the rug by the provincial autocrats who run Congress, and their allies, the faceless bureaucrats of government agencies. This revealing exposé shows how personal enmities and political maneuvers, extending from the White House to the courthouse level, can combine to kill even the most urgently needed social legislation."—Congresswoman Shirley Chisholm, New York.

A BOOK FOR TODAY—ON THE PLIGHT OF THE HUNGRY

(By Judith Randal)

This book, which is published here as 2,500 people arrive to attend the White House Conference on Food Nutrition and Health, is not the first about hunger in America. But "*Let Them Eat Promises*" dif-

fers from the others because it exposes the myths and the political realities that stand in the way of change.

The story begins in 1967 when Democratic Senators Robert F. Kennedy of New York and Joseph Clark of Pennsylvania, shocked by what they had seen on a trip to the Mississippi Delta, returned to Washington to report to Congress and the nation. As it quickly became evident that Mississippi was only one of many pockets of hunger and malnutrition in an otherwise affluent America, it was widely assumed that public opinion force the government to act. Nick Kotz has marshalled the record to show why this confidence was misplaced.

Kotz, a Washington correspondent for the Des Moines Register and Tribune, is to be commended for an accurate and properly balanced account that is also extraordinarily moving. While it would have been easy merely to record the plight of the hungry, he has examined carefully and as dispassionately as possible the coalition of circumstances that have made a problem with as basically simple a solution so difficult to solve. And while he does not neglect statistics, he never forgets that what he is discussing is people.

Until the great depression, government did not concern itself with the welfare of either farmers or the poor. Then, as crop prices fell and one-third of the nation became destitute, Congress passed legislation which permitted the Department of Agriculture to pay farmers to reduce their productivity and to buy up the accrued surpluses for distribution to those in need.

The system made some sense in the 1930's. But a generation later it permits a large grower to collect vast sums in farm subsidy payments while thousands of his neighbors and millions across the nation go very nearly without. The surplus commodity program was never designed to provide a balanced diet and besides it requires each county to defray the administration costs, so that many have chosen not to participate.

The alternative—a food stamp program—at least has the virtue of giving people a choice at the grocery store. But the poorest of the poor cannot afford the stamps and the purchasing power they provide, by Agriculture's own admission, is inadequate. Thus, despite recent minor improvements here and there, both programs and the school lunch program, as well, work to the advantage of the farmer while perpetuating hunger and malnutrition at taxpayer expense.

When mechanisms as irrational as these take hold, an elaborate series of deceptions is needed to sustain them. Across these pages flash denials from local officials about the existence of hunger, charges of shiftlessness from conservative Senators and Congressmen—particularly from areas where there are feudal extremes of affluence and privation—and the conventional wisdom that ignorance, rather than poverty, is the villain in malnutrition.

"Hell, all people want is coke and potato chips," a food company official tells Kotz, trotting out the industry's traditional excuse for not enriching the products it offers the consumer. Citing government figures on who the hungry are and how they spend whatever food money they have, he shows conclusively how few of these allegations are true. "We are a nation of nutritional illiterates," Kotz quotes one professor as saying. "Yet we expect the poor to exercise some special discipline of nutrition knowledge that the rest of the country lacks."

One of the strengths of "*Let Them Eat Promises*" is that it places its heroes and villains in the context of their times, conceding the limitations imposed by people and events. Orville Freeman, secretary of Agriculture in the Johnson Administration, for example, bent over backwards to observe the fine print of the law, sometimes seeing

in it constraints that did not in fact exist. Certainly no one except perhaps Freeman himself would have accused him of being a crusader in the cause of food reform. Still, Freeman had to answer to Congressional agriculture committees that were and are opposed to more equitable treatment of the poor, and Kotz fairly points out that President Johnson never gave Freeman his support—or indeed made any public pronouncements about hunger at all.

What of the Nixon Administration? The author makes no claim to clairvoyance. But he cites a revealing passage in what he says are the official minutes of a cabinet meeting at the White House on March 17. Asked by the incumbent Agriculture Secretary Clifford B. Hardin how far he could go in speaking for the administration and its posture on hunger, Nixon is reported to have said:

"You can say that this administration will have the first far-reaching attack on the problem of hunger in history. Use all of the rhetoric, so long as it doesn't cost any money . . ."

If this book does nothing else, it gives the lie to the notion that, once given the facts about injustice, this country moves quickly towards reform."

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, Dec. 2, 1969]

LET THEM EAT PROMISES: THE POLITICS OF HUNGER IN AMERICA

(Reviewed by Leroy F. Aarons, a reporter on the national staff of the Washington Post)

Nick Kotz has written a passionate book about an American scandal, as important in its dissection of government's inertia and indifference as was Ralph Nader's exposure of the automobile industry in "Unsafe at Any Speed."

Kotz's thesis is that at least 15 million Americans continue to go hungry in the United States because it is profitable for agriculture interests. These interests have been protected by powerful congressmen who have succeeded in intimidating the Agriculture Department, which, in turn, has failed to press reluctant administrations to advocate needed reforms.

The reason hunger has been discovered and dignified as an issue, Kotz makes clear in this fascinating book, is that a small group of concerned congressmen and citizens used publicity, research and politics to force it into the open. Thus the book's subtitle, "The Politics of Hunger in America."

Published on the eve of the White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health, opening today, this volume, which will be circulated at the conference, should give the 3,000 delegates some disturbing things to ponder.

They will learn, for example:

That government food surplus programs in the South have been used to benefit farmers—by unloading surplus foodstock—rather than to help the poor.

That only one-sixth of the poor receive any government food benefits.

That the food stamp program forced a million poor out of the food program because, among other things, stamps were too expensive.

That the FBI was sent by the all-powerful House Appropriations Subcommittee on Agriculture to intimidate people giving evidence to hunger investigators.

That on at least 12 occasions Lyndon Johnson rebuffed efforts by his subordinates to push through a food reform package.

That as recently as last March Richard Nixon told his Secretary of Agriculture: "You can say that the administration will have the first far-reaching attack on hunger in history. Use all the rhetoric so long as it doesn't cost any money."

Some of these revelations emerged during the last three years as the hunger issue be-

gan to impose itself on a largely indifferent nation. Others, including many fascinating behind-the-scenes insights, were dug out by Kotz, who is Washington correspondent for the Des Moines Register.

Two chapters in particular deserve special mention. In one, Kotz, a Pulitzer Prize winner, traces the scandalous concentration of power in one man—Rep. Jamie Whitten, chairman of the agriculture appropriation subcommittee, whose very name causes brave men in the Agriculture Department (which administers food programs) to cringe.

The other chapter offers the best and most compassionate account I have read of the ill-fated 1968 Poor Peoples' Campaign, particularly the face-down scene between Ralph Abernathy, who knew the campaign had failed, and Agriculture Secretary Orville Freeman, who knew he was powerless to promise the kind of food aid being sought.

UNO—FREEDOM BID DENIED

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, December 1, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, several years ago, U.S. citizens demonstrating at the United Nations Organization in New York learned the hard way that the UNO does not respect the right of peaceful assembly or free speech. The demonstrators were summarily placed under arrest and ejected.

This year, the unelected functionaries of UNO again displayed their callous attitude and lack of restraint. A group of Russians smuggled a petition to the UNO charging the Soviet Government with "repression of basic civil rights."

The UNO reacted speedily and in typical fashion. A directive was issued forbidding any UNO information center the world over to accept petitions from any group or individuals.

The hapless Russian petitioners did not gain a hearing nor any relief on their complaints. They were promptly conveyed to jails and mental institutions in Soviet Russia.

Those misguided liberals and moderates who have faith in the UNO and who idealize international government should be disenchanted by this latest example of UNO hypocrisy. Every day the UNO exposes its indifference to human rights and such basic precepts of freedom as petition by aggrieved individuals and groups.

An editorial follows along with a letter and petition to the UNO from the Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Inc.:

[From the Manchester (N.H.) Union Leader, Nov. 27, 1969]

ANOTHER U.N. FARCE

Those unrealistic citizens who worship the United Nations should perhaps consider the latest example of the loss of its integrity. It was brought out in the open the other day by a Dutch delegate to the U.N., Leopold Quarles van Ufford.

The Dutch diplomat complained indignantly about the recent executive order that had gone out from the New York headquarters to the various U.N. Information Centers located around the globe.

This order now forbids the centers to accept petitions by groups or individuals, a

custom that had been rigorously followed for years.

The force behind this order, as could be expected, was the Communist delegates to the U.N. It seems that last June a group of 43 exceptionally brave Russians appeared at the U.N. Moscow office and asked that a petition charging the Soviet government with "repression of basic civil rights" be accepted for transmission to U.N. headquarters in New York.

The Russian in charge of the office kicked the delegation out—and later simply claimed that no approach had ever been made by anybody in the matter.

Later the Russian petitioners, unmindful of jails and mental asylums awaiting them, succeeded in smuggling out the complaint and having it duly transmitted to the U.N. in New York.

After the whole affair, Soviet Ambassador, Jacob Malik visited Secretary General Thant and put on the pressure.

So from now on the various U.N. offices around the world can no longer accept petitions by groups or individuals!

How any rational individual can have the least confidence in the U.N., which has not been able to keep peace in the world, and now will not even accept petitions by groups or from aggrieved individuals or groups, is hard to understand.

WOMEN'S ASSOCIATION FOR THE DEFENSE OF FOUR FREEDOMS FOR UKRAINE, INC.,

New York, N.Y., November 1, 1969.

Subject: Human Rights for the Ukraine.

Hon. CHARLES W. YOST,
U.S. Ambassador,
United Nations General Assembly,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: In keeping with the sentiments of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, the 20th anniversary of which we observed last year, and as we approach the year 1970, proclaimed by UNESCO as "Lenin Year" to commemorate the centenary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Ulanov Lenin, it is only fitting that certain historical facts be brought to the attention of the world body of the United Nations, in order to realistically evaluate what UNESCO calls "Lenin's humanistic ideas and activities on development and realization of economic, social and cultural rights."

The Universal Declaration of Human Rights, one of the great documents of our century, which declares the right of peoples and nations to self-determination, combating racial discrimination, social and economic injustice, national and cultural oppression, and the practice of genocide, was signed by the representatives of the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic on December 10, 1948, as an equal charter member of the United Nations Organization. However, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic is not, as many would like to have us think, a free and independent state of Ukrainian people.

After a short period of independence, Ukraine was invaded by Russian armed forces in 1919, under the leadership of dictator Lenin, and after three years of heavy fighting, was incorporated—by force—into the U.S.S.R. as "The Sovereign National Ukraine Republic". It is a captive nation, under the Russian imperial-colonial system!

Human rights are denied the Ukrainians by Kossygin-Brezhnev, just as they were by Lenin-Stalin-Khrushchev. Terror, arrests, deportations, forced atheism, police control of family and public life, are the order of the day.

About one-half million Ukrainian men, women, underage young people, and children, have been, and are being arrested (according to recent documents) and are being held in Lvov, Kiev, Odessa, Lutsk, Rovno, Ivano-Frankovsk, Zhytomyr, Ternopol, Kharkov prisons located in the Ukraine. There are also

nearly one million innocents in chain concentration camps and hard labor camps such as Potma (36 camps), Kingir-Karaganda (16 camps), Norilsk-Dudinka, Ulan-Bator, Pechora, Vorkuta, Kulyma and Vladimir.

Over two million Ukrainian young people, as well as skilled workers are being deported to the "Soviet Virgin Land"—the wasteland of Kazakhstan—for permanent living and work. Many are being deported to the State of Mordovia, to work on Russian atomic fields. Hundreds of thousands of these have died and are dying from lack of proper living conditions, food, medical care, and from the hard labor and the climatic conditions.

Among the multitude of Ukrainian prisoners there is a high percentage of women who are serving, what in the free world would be, unbelievably high sentences, up to 25 years. Their "crime" is that they want to be Ukrainians! They want to read, speak and write in their own Ukrainian language, to preserve and enrich their native culture. They want to be—and have the rights of—Ukrainian citizens. Their punishment is unjust, illegal, and inhuman.

We respectfully call your attention to the recent destruction of irreplaceable Ukrainian architectural monuments, historical documents of Ukrainian statehood, and ancient cultural artifacts, perpetrated by deliberate Russian arson, as well as the planned, forced program of total Russification of Ukrainian daily life. These acts, together with the already mentioned terror, arrests, deportations, etc., are crimes against humanity that cry out to heaven for retribution.

We Ukrainians, the first victims of Red Army aggression under Lenin's leadership, the first victims on whom Lenin demonstrated his "humanistic ideas" such as the "development and realization of a new state economy" (the Kolhkoz System under which millions of Ukrainians died from famine in 1923-24), and "social and cultural rights" (under the terror of the CHEKA and GPU secret police), along with his closing of churches and educational institutions; the arrests, secret killings, and deportations by hundreds of thousands—this is the Lenin Era that the Ukrainians know and will never forget.

It is fitting as we approach the centenary of Lenin's birth, to recall his statement made in 1918 regarding domestic policy, namely: "As long as we do not apply terror with execution on the spot, we shall get nowhere." This quotation speaks eloquently for itself, and for Lenin's "humanistic ideas"!

It is a historical fact that Vladimir Ulanov Lenin, together with Josef Djugashvili Stalin, were the architects of the Soviet Union, and the Communist Party. Without them there would be no Russian Colonial Empire, no U.S.S.R. and Communist Party, to operate as an international instigator of intrigue and conspiracy, troubling the United States' security and the peace of the whole world.

Echoing the sentiments of 1968's observance of the 20th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, and approaching the dubious occasion of the centennial commemoration of the birth of Vladimir Lenin—(the individual responsible for invading the Ukrainian State, forcing its incorporation into the U.S.S.R. and thereby enslaving the Ukrainian people)—We, the members of the Women's Association for the Defense of Four Freedoms for Ukraine, Incorporated, on behalf of the millions of voiceless women in the homeland of Ukraine, on behalf of the Ukrainian prisoners, and burned Ukrainian martyrs, appeal to you, Mr. Ambassador, to place on the Agenda of the United Nations General Assembly, the subject of the Russian invasion of the Ukrainian Nation, and the human rights of its people.

We suggest that a Special United Nations Committee be established for the following purpose:

1. To investigate the violation of the United Nations Charter and the Declaration of Human Rights as they pertain to Ukraine and the other Republics of the U.S.S.R.

2. To prevail upon the Soviet Government to ultimately release all political prisoners who are languishing for long years in Russian prisons and concentration camps without benefit of amnesty, and return them to their homes in the Ukraine with benefit of full citizenship.

3. To impose on the Russian Government the removal of armed and police forces from the Ukraine and the territories of other captive nations, so that truly free elections under the supervision of the United Nations can take place.

Only by establishing a sovereign Ukrainian State, free from Russian domination, can all Ukrainian citizens achieve freedom and be guaranteed their human rights. And only when all the Captive Nations succeed in achieving the restoration of their independence will Russian power diminish and the Communist threat to world peace and security be minimized.

We look forward to your kind consideration of the above matter.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. ULANA CELEWYCH,
Chairman.
Mrs. MARIA NESTERCHUK,
Secretary.

HOUSE PASSES BILLS TO AID POW FAMILIES

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker, I am most gratified that the House of Representatives has passed unanimously my two bills, H.R. 9485 and H.R. 9486, to aid the families of prisoners of war.

At the moment there are hundreds of known American prisoners of war in Southeast Asia and almost a thousand other Americans listed as missing in action. Although these figures seem small compared with the staggering casualties of the war, we must not overlook the hardships these Americans are forced to endure in Communist captivity. Also, we must not forget the mental anguish suffered by their wives and families as they anxiously await the safe return of loved ones.

Last year I had the opportunity to meet with a group of POW wives who reside in my district of San Diego, Calif. Although our Government is doing everything possible within the bounds of existing laws to assist these families, certain inadequacies in these laws do exist and should be corrected. The purpose of the two bills, H.R. 9485 and H.R. 9486, before us is to correct the inadequacies of these laws.

In 1967 Congress approved a measure allowing prisoners of war and servicemen in a missing status to participate in the uniformed services savings deposit program which provides 10 percent interest on savings up to \$10,000. What Congress failed to recognize, however, in approving this bill is that the American prisoner in Southeast Asia has no control whatsoever over his return from overseas. Thus, an American who is held

captive for several years would accumulate deposits considerably more than \$10,000—even after the necessary allotments for his dependents were deducted from his pay. H.R. 9485 would remove the \$10,000 limit on deposits for any member of the uniformed services who is a prisoner of war, missing in action or in a detained status during the Vietnam conflict.

With regard to H.R. 9486, this bill merely gives the \$30 family separation allowance to all prisoners of war with dependents. A good number of these men are enlisted servicemen with relatively low pay, and it is their dependents who suffer the most financially during their absence. Part of the economic hardship results from the fact that there is no man around the house to perform routine maintenance chores. The armed services have recognized this problem to some extent by providing a \$30-a-month family separation allowance to servicemen, E-4 and above, whenever the serviceman's duties require him to be away from the home for more than 30 days—provided that his family does not live in military housing.

Under this bill, all prisoners of war and servicemen in a missing status—regardless of whether their families live in military housing or whether they are E-4 or above—would be entitled to the family separation allowance.

Now that the House has passed these bills, I hope the Senate may consider them and approve them before the end of this session.

HOW THE PENTAGON JUGGLES PROCUREMENTS

HON. OTIS G. PIKE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. PIKE. Mr. Speaker, there is an article in the current edition of the Armed Forces Journal which should be must reading for anyone who does not quite understand the mechanics of how, despite the clearly expressed will of Congress and the clear language of specific laws, major procurements running into billions of dollars can be juggled around for political purposes or at least for reasons having nothing to do with national defense. The article points out the clear language of the law itself as to procurements and clearly points out precisely how the military violates it.

The well publicized cost overruns on the Cheyenne helicopter, the F-111 aircraft, and the C-5A may, or may not, be attributable to the procurement practices which were followed in awarding those contracts. It is clear, however, that in each of those cases the law was ignored. In at least two huge procurements now pending, the F-15 and the AMSA, both of them involving billions of dollars, the law is not being complied with. What the result will be only time will tell but if the past is truly prolog, what time will tell us will be very sad news indeed. The full text of the article follows:

SOURCE SELECTION: WHAT THE LAW REQUIRES

Section 2271, Act of 10 Aug. 1956 Title 10, Armed Forces Act.

Design competitions; Advertisement; Selection of Winner—

[a] . . . To encourage the development of aviation and to improve the efficiency of aeronautical war material for the Army, Navy, Air Force, and Marine Corps, the Secretary of each military department, before procuring new designs of aircraft, aircraft parts, or aeronautical accessories, shall invite the submission of new designs thereof in competition, as follows:

[c] . . . The department concerned shall furnish to each applicant identical detailed information as to the conditions of the competition and the features and characteristics to be developed in the design, listing specifically the measures of merit expressed in percentages, that are to be applied in determining the merits of the design. These measures of merit shall apply throughout the competition.

[d] . . . The announcement of the results of the competition shall state the percentages awarded to each feature or characteristic of each of the designs submitted and the price named for design and each feature thereof, if separable.

The law cited above is the most explicit and unambiguous of several on the books that express the will of Congress on ground rules under which aircraft design competitions will be held. But it isn't being followed.

Contractors, bidding on the Army's AAFSS, the TFX, and the C-5A, for instance, were not given the detailed criteria (weightings, or "measures of merit expressed in percentages") by which their proposals would be judged. Nor were the same weightings used throughout the source selection process on these programs.

And in each of these three programs, findings of the principal evaluation groups on the relative merits of various contractor proposals later were overturned. In the case of the C-5A, for example, a 23 September 1965 Air Force memorandum shows that an evaluation board headed by two Air Force major generals and two brigadier generals unanimously recommended that the Boeing entry be picked.

That recommendation was overturned by a three-fourths majority when the Air Force Chief of Staff, the Commander of AFSC, the Commander of Military Airlift Command, and the Air Council cast their votes.

Nor were the weightings spelled out above given to firms competing for the Navy's F-14 and S-3A. The three companies bidding for the F-15 don't have them. And they weren't provided with the recent AMSA (B-1) Request for Proposals.

As Senator John L. McClellan (D-Ark.) told us when The Journal discussed source selection procedures with him—he cited the law above during the TFX contract investigation—"So far as I know they haven't complied with the law. Apparently, it's just being ignored. I think the law should be applied."

In fairness to DoD and the Services, we have to point out that they aren't necessarily "ignoring" the law. The problem is that there are different laws on the books, and some are contradictory. In a sense, how DoD competes is a question of "dealer's choice."

DoD's General Counsel's office told us that the 1956 provision cited above is "permissive, not mandatory"—a stand we find somewhat difficult to understand given the repeated use of the word "shall." DoD points out that the 1956 law is simply a codification of earlier statutes, that the specific provisions we cite here were laid down as part of the Air Corps Act of 1926, and that "it hasn't been used since World War II." (We still haven't found out why Congress bothered in

1956 to "codify" the 1926 requirement if they didn't intend for the original law to be followed.)

DoD's top expert on procurement policy, John Malloy, told us he was not "personally familiar" with the 1956 provision, and had never heard it discussed as an issue.

The legal basis which DoD and the Services use *not* to give industry the specific weightings by which new aircraft designs will be judged rests in Section 2304(a) (11) of Chapter 137, Title 10, U.S. Code, laid down in 1947 as part of the Armed Services Procurement Act. This 1947 section spells out 17 exceptions—all quite broad and general, compared with the very specific language shown above—by which DoD need not formally advertise for bids (thereby circumventing or negating the rest of the language we've quoted from Section 2271, Chapter 135—the chapter's title: "Encouragement of Aviation"—of the U.S. Code).

There's a real question, however, of how applicable the exception which DoD cites is to design competitions like the F-14, the F-15, and S-3A—systems DoD clearly intended or intends to put into production. The exception (to the requirement for formally advertised bids) reads: "If the purchase or contract is for property or services that he [the head of a Military Department] determines to be for experimental, developmental, or research work, or for the making or furnishing of property for experimental, test, development, or research."

As one senior Air Force officer told us, giving prospective contractors the detailed weightings by which their designs would be evaluated would make it difficult later to apply any "corporate judgment" in picking the winning contractor. He has a good point. But following the 1956 law would give industry a better idea of what design attributes the Services really felt to be important, and more energy could be spent on those. More important, perhaps, the 1956 law would make it awfully hard to award contracts on other than straight merit—a goal well worth shooting for as the Pentagon and Congress try to restore public faith in the integrity of DoD's procurement process.

HAZARDS CAUSED BY BLOWING SAND

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, at a time when citizen participation in politics seems to range between the extremes of apathy and violent confrontation it is very gratifying to deal with people who are willing to work through legitimate channels to achieve their goals. Yet due to lack of action their patience is being strained. It is a pleasure for me to represent a group of individuals who share common problems and who are united by a desire to work together to find solutions to these problems. I am referring to the people of Coachella Valley, Calif. The problems of an area like the Coachella Valley are so complex and so numerous that they cannot be ignored. As an agricultural region, as a tourist center, as a growing metropolitan area, the Coachella Valley, like so many growing communities in California demands continued efforts to make it a better place for living, working and visiting.

I would like to address myself to one particular problem which I think indicates the type of concerted effort needed to improve conditions in this area. I am

referring to the attempts being made to alleviate the hazards caused by blowing sand.

The combination of high winds and loosely packed soils has presented a problem in this region for a long time. But a report prepared by the U.S. Soil Conservation Service in 1967 indicates that blowing sand has become increasingly serious in recent years. This has been due to new residential and highway developments in the area. The sand has become more loosely packed, the wind has continued to blow and more people are endangered by it. In 1963, committees from the California State Senate and State Assembly conducted public hearings on the problem in Palm Springs. The effect was to call public attention to the costs and hazards involved to transportation facilities and vehicles, but no positive action to alleviate the conditions has resulted. Thus a legitimate citizen concern—a deteriorating environment—is not being alleviated.

A number of local citizens have devoted much time and effort toward achieving a solution to the problem. I have closely followed the progress of these efforts for the past 3 years, providing whatever assistance I could. Today I would like to introduce legislation to increase Federal participation in the quest for a lasting solution to this problem and with problems of financing such a solution.

I have studied many Federal programs and have met with representatives of various agencies in order to discover some avenue of assistance open to the people of Coachella Valley and as a result to other communities faced with similar problems.

First of all, the Bureau of Public Roads and the State highway department are empowered to take measures to improve safety conditions along interstate highways. The possibility of undertaking such a project along Interstate 10 is now under consideration, and it is possible that windbreaks and other safety devices can be installed to provide some relief for vehicles moving along this important highway.

After talking with officials at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, it was suggested that there is a possibility of obtaining a grant for open-space acquisition and development. This grant could cover the acquisition and development of land for parks, recreation, or conservation. Representatives from the Soil Conservation Service have assured me that their continued technical cooperation will be available in planning stabilization programs.

It has, however, become apparent to me that there is no single Federal program designed to alleviate the type of wind-erosion problem faced by Coachella and perhaps other communities.

Therefore, I am introducing a bill to attempt to coordinate Federal action in this area. The legislation authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture—acting through the Soil Conservation Service—in cooperation with the Secretary of the Interior—acting through the Bureau of Reclamation—and the Secretary of the Army—acting through the Corps of En-

gineers—to make a full and complete investigation and study of the wind erosion problems of the Coachella Valley.

Not later than 6 months after the date of enactment the Secretary of Agriculture would be required to report the results of the study to Congress together with his recommendations for those specific Federal actions or contributions which he determines to be necessary to alleviate, abate, and control such wind erosion problems including any necessary legislative recommendations.

It is important to revitalize our rural areas in view of the fact that over 600,000 people per year are leaving for urban metropolitan areas. Much of this migration is caused by the deterioration of opportunities in rural America. There must be increased public and private investment. People must be given encouragement and incentive to remain in rural areas. Industry must be encouraged to locate in rural areas.

Environmental deterioration such as blowing sand must be alleviated and a coordinated program of Federal assistance is required to accomplish this goal.

THE REVOLUTION'S SOUTHERN- MOST BATTLEFIELDS

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, within the city limits of present day Jacksonville lies the site of the most southerly combat of the American Revolution, our War of Independence. And much of the terrain involved—forests, hammocks, swamps, marshes, creeks, and wildlife—is little different today from what it was on May 17, 1777, when the battle of Thomas Creek, the most southerly battle of the war, took place.

There should be created in these lands the Revolution's Southernmost Battlefields Park, not only for the unique historic aspects but also for wildlife preservation purposes and recreational values. The approaching 200th anniversary of our Nation makes it important that a project to accomplish this be launched promptly. The year 1976 will obviously be not only a time of maximum interest in our War of Independence but also an ideal time to have such a facility in the best condition possible for tourist enjoyment.

The 14th and 15th British Colonies in the Revolutionary War years were East Florida and West Florida. They were havens for Loyalists who fled from the other 13 Colonies. Some Florida inhabitants favored independence; but there were probably more Loyalists in Georgia than there were Florida inhabitants seeking independence from England. In any event, the three chief efforts to gain independence for Florida were launched from Georgia; and a major reason why they failed was that it was impossible to surprise the British troops in Florida because of information fed to the British by Loyalist sympathizers who lived in Georgia. Another major difficulty was that the Georgia Governors wrangled with their military leaders as to whether

the Governor or the military should take command of the troops. Moreover, the Georgians never arrived in Florida with sufficient numbers to assure victory.

In 1776 the British were for a time pushed back from the Georgia border as far south as the south bank of the St. Johns River. Gen. Augustine Prevost, in charge of the British troops at St. Augustine, reported on September 9, 1776, to his superior officers as follows:

The party which was on the St. Mary has been obliged by a strong one of the rebels to abandon that river and to retire on the south side of St. John's river. They took lately a sergeant and 5 men of the party reinforced to 100 men.

Gen. Charles Lee of the American troops in Georgia was never able to put into Florida the bulk of the forces he planned to use in an invasion that year. It remained for other leadership to make a better effort the next year.

In 1777 Georgia's President and Commander in Chief, Button Gwinnett, a signer of the Declaration of Independence, optimistically mounted a new campaign to capture St. Augustine and liberate East Florida: he decided to lead the forces himself, instead of allowing Gen. Lachlan McIntosh, the ranking military officer of the State to lead it. A dispute arose, partly based upon this affront to the latter, but more because of Gwinnett's accusations of disloyalty publicly made against the brother of the general. In any event, neither went to Florida in the expedition which was planned to rendezvous two separate elements at Sawpit Bluff, Fla., on May 13, 1777. This location is within the present city limits of Jacksonville and near the mouth of Nassau River.

Lt. Col. Samuel Elbert from Sunbury, Ga., embarked with one element, 400 Continental troops, to make the trip by water; and the other element of troops, 109 men of the Georgia militia led by Col. John Baker, marched overland to Sawpit Bluff. Despite combat with Indians who were loyal to the British and the difficult crossing of swollen streams, Baker reached Sawpit Bluff on the appointed day. He immediately sent out a reconnaissance troop, which discovered from an inhabitant that the British were well informed of the expedition and were preparing a strong resistance.

On May 17, having heard nothing from Elbert, Baker decided to place his own forces in a better spot for observation and possible retreat, knowing that a substantial British force was planned against him. While moving inland searching for easily fordable narrow headwaters of the creeks in the area, the Americans were surprised by Florida ranger, or scout, forces under Col. Daniel McGirth, these forces being inhabitants of Florida assisting the British regulars. A third element of the British forces was the Indian contingent. All three loyalist elements were present in the battle which took place near Thomas Creek, somewhat south of where it empties into Nassau River—on today's map this is west of and adjacent to Interstate Highway 95, where it crosses Nassau River. The main body of the enemy was led by Maj. Jean Marc Prevost—brother of the general—who formed his attack with three columns of 100 men each.

Surprised and greatly outnumbered by the British regulars and their allies, almost half of the men under Baker soon abandoned the fray. Subjected to heavy enemy fire, Colonel Baker was compelled to retreat with those who fought by his side. There were at the time of the disengagement only about 50 remaining with him. The Americans lost eight killed—including five massacred by the Indians immediately after their surrender—nine wounded, and 31 captured.

In the memoirs of Maj. Patrick Murray, who was present in this battle of Thomas Creek, we find the following comment:

In April or May Major Baker's Georgian Dragoons made an incursion into the Province, drove our Rangers and Indians as far as St. Johns River and had skirmish with the Black Creek Factor, in which 2 Indians were killed. Major Marc Prevost of the 2nd. Battalion, with Captain Graham of the 16th. Light Infantry, Captain Wulf of the Grenadiers 4th Battalion, and a detachment of the 2nd. and 3rd. Battalions—the whole did not exceed 100 men—crossed at the Cowford and advanced 11 miles to Rolfe's Saw-Mill, when in the night a Ranger brought the Major one of their horses' ears as a proof of where they were. At day-break they were found at Thomas's Swamp when the Indians began to skirmish with them as they were about to mount, and kept a bushy run of water between them, giving way until at Broadday the Major with his 3 Columns appeared advancing with fixed Bayonets, on which they fled to their horses and attempted to escape through a miry passage in the discharge of Thomas's Swamp but were fired upon by the Indians with Rifles, and attacked by the troops. About 30 of them escaped with Major Baker, about 40 with Captain Few surrendered; the remainder plunged into the Swamp leaving the Horses; and what became of them is not known. The prisoners were all put to death except 16, among whom was Captain Few, saved with difficulty by Major Prevost and the Troops from the fury of the Black Creek Factor.

Colonel Elbert did not arrive in Florida until May 19 and landed on the north end of Amelia Island on May 20. Elbert sent Captain More, Lt. Robert Ward and a detachment of Continentals to reconnoiter and secure the island by a march to its southern tip; but these Americans were driven back by a British detachment on the island; and Lieutenant Ward was slain in the encounter. Some of Baker's men who had escaped from the Thomas Creek battle joined Elbert, who decided that the force remaining under him was insufficient to subdue East Florida. So he retired to Georgia, as Baker had already done. Colonel Elbert's order book contains the following comments under date of May 25, 1777:

On the morning of the 19th we were joined by thirteen of Colo. Baker's then, soon after by two more, & two Days after by three others, who all agree in the account of that unfortunate Gentlemen being attacked on Saturday, the 17th, by a Superior Number of Regulars who were assisted by the Florida Scout and a Number of Indians.

Somehow the British at St. Augustine had been well informed of the size of each of the approaching elements; and precautions had been taken by the British in sending troops to Amelia Island and a detachment of artillery to defend the battery at St. Johns Bluff. Also an armed schooner and sloop had been sent to defend the inland passage between

Amelia Island and the mainland. Elbert concluded that, in view of the inability to preserve secrecy, any movement against Florida in the future should be more adequately manned. This is the thrust of what he wrote General McIntosh on May 26, 1777, in a letter which contained the following comments:

I am Just now favored by a Letter from Colo. Screven, wrote at your Desire: I lament the Behavior of Colonel Baker's Men, but it will always be the case where Subordination is wanting; this little Success will make the Enemy very Impudent, particularly the Indians; I think from every Information we can get that the Enemy are at present on their Guard, that little can be done, unless by a formidable Invasion, which I Judge to be rather too much for Georgia to undertake till her Forces are put on a more respectable footing, and therefore would recommend confining our Operations intirely to the defensive till a more favorable opportunity; we have too many Secret Enemies amongst us who Keep up a regular correspondence with our Florida Neighbors, and until they are put a Stop to it will be impossible for us to enter Florida without their having timely notice of our approach.

In a protesting letter written from Cumberland Island, Ga., on May 31, 1777, by Colonel Elbert to Major Prevost the following was said:

That Humanity with which you mention our people taken by you have been Treated, is what Americans can never depart from, but Sir, it hurts me, as I am sure it must you, to be informed that some of the unfortunate men of Colo. Baker's Detachment who fell in your hands, were cruelly Butchered by the Savages, in cool Blood, and in the presence of some of your people; if Savages can't be restrained, why are they Employed?

On May 16, 1777, the feud between Button Gwinnett and Gen. Lachlan McIntosh came to a tragic conclusion as the two men met in a duel at Savannah on that day. Gwinnett died on May 19 from the wound received in the duel, a duel precipitated by a challenge by Gwinnett when the general called him a scoundrel.

On July 14 General McIntosh summarized his feelings about the 1777 Florida expedition as follows in a letter to George Walton:

Our late Don quixot Expedition to Augustine proved abortive as I expected. Our late president & council conferred the command of it on Colonel Elberte which I allowed for peace sake. He went by water to St Marys with three galleys & about 400 men in Craft of various kinds and Baker with his Horse by land & returned again, without being able to affect any one thing after an amazing expence.

After being tried and acquitted on a murder charge for Gwinnett's death, General McIntosh, at the suggestion of friends, consented to leave Georgia for the time being and take command in the western districts of Pennsylvania and Virginia. It was almost 2 years later before he returned to Georgia with new military assignments in his native State of Georgia.

In the meantime in 1778 a new Georgia Governor, John Houston, and a new military commander, Gen. Robert Howe, heard rumors of an impending major expedition planned against Georgia from Florida. To them the time seemed ripe for a new patriot expedition against Florida, this time to be of sufficient size to achieve the conquest of East Florida.

The estimates of the number of patriot troops that could be placed in such an expedition against Florida were between 2,000 and 3,000. The estimate of the enemy's regulars in Florida was 760 with no firm estimate on the numbers available in the Rangers and Indian allies.

On June 22, 1778, Gen. William Moultrie advised General Howe that it had been learned that the enemy in the number of 1,200 had marched out of St. Augustine to oppose the advance of the Americans. The British troops moved under Gen. Augustine Prevost to headquarters at Cowford—in what is today central Jacksonville—utilizing chiefly the more defensible southern bank of the river, as the Spanish had done previously at their St. Nicholas southside location.

Maj. Patrick Murray recorded in his memoirs that at that time "Gen. Robert Howe with about 3,000 men, of whom 1,200 were high up on the St. Marys" were advancing. He recorded that Col. Thomas Brown of the Rangers pushed on to the St. Marys from the St. Johns "with the Indians and Rangers and took post at Captain Taylor's house where he was surrounded" by the Americans who were "high up on the St. Marys; but he contrived to escape southward into Cabbage Swamp." Murray then recorded that Major Prevost was sent northward from his brother's headquarters at Cowford "with the Grenadiers of the 2d Battalion, the Light Companies of the 16th and 4th Battalion, and the South Carolina Royalists" and constructed a crude fortification at Alligator Bridge where the St. Augustine and Cowford stretches of the King's Road to Savannah crossed the narrow portions of Alligator Creek. This is believed to be near the central portion of today's Callahan, Fla., and was only about 2 miles north and 10 miles west of where the 1777 battle of Thomas Creek occurred. This is the way in which Murray described what ensued:

He took post at Alligator bridge 22 miles from the Cowford with about 450 men. The enemy took a position at Niel Rain's 17 miles from Alligator Bridge.

Major Prevost sent forward Major Graham of the 16th with 200 men with some of McGirth's rangers towards the cabbage swamp to relieve Colonel Brown. The Rangers scouted to the right and fell in with a Column of the enemy who fired upon their advanced men and then changed the direction of their route.

Major Graham continued his march until joined by Colonel Brown, when the whole encamped. The morning after Major Graham's advance there came into Major Prevost an inhabitant who had escaped from Nassau Bluff 17 miles to our right, and fearing to cross Mill's Swamp in the night, he informed the Major that Colonel White was there with 90 of the 4th. Georgia, and Captain Nash with 14 Dragoons. Major Prevost dispatched Captain Murray with 20 of his company, 20 of the 16th. Light infantry, and Captain York of the South Carolina Dragoons. As soon as the detachment had got through Mills and Thomas's swamp, Captain Murray sent forward Captain York to occupy the 2 ends of a Pond which formed a half moon projecting outwards; the 2 Points closing in upon the Bluff; but Captain York thought it prudent to keep his men together and took post at the farther end, upon which Colonel White judged it full time for him to get over Nassau; and Captain Murray with the mounted men pursued, but the last boat load of his rear went down the stream leaving a doctor and his

2 daughters who had joined the enemy, but as the 2 families of Royalists who had been prisoners at the bluff declared Colonel White had used them well, Captain Murray suffered the doctor and his family to depart with their baggage, not thinking it right to allow them to remain in the province.

Captain Murray, Lieutenant Calderwood 16th., Campbell 4th. Battalion and Captain York, South Carolina Royalists, made a hearty dinner at the Bluff upon roast Beef and fine Biscuit. Colonel White, having provided an ample provision for his whole detachment, our men fared sumptuously and towards evening we fell back to a swamp 2 miles in our rear for the night (this was on the 28th. June 1778 the day of the Battle of Monmouth).

At day break a large decked boat full of men appeared under sail in the Nassau passage, and made a signal for the Bluff, which not being answered, she put about and hastened down the rivers with oars. Captain Murray had notice of this by one of the Loyalists whom he had left there as a decoy and joined Major Prevost at 10 o'clock. At about mid-day when the men from the detachment were cleaning their arms and others washing in the creek in front of the camp the Grenadiers constructing a breastwork. — Major Graham's detachment had joined on the evening before, — while Colonel Brown encamped at a swamp in front about 10 miles to collect his men.

At mid-day a mounted Sergeant came to Major Prevost's tent to announce the Colonel being at hand with his Corps. The Major, by the Sergeant, desired Colonel Brown to come to his tent; presently we heard Whiffled the Drummer beating the Grenadiers' March, and the rangers filing over a bridge where he had a sub-guard. Soon after entering when the Ranger drum beat to arms, and the Rangers many of whom had lost their arms in the cabbage swamp, were seen flying into that in front of our camp, Captain Muller of the Grenadiers and his men running to the Camp for their arms, musket balls whistling over our tents while the enemy with sabres and rifles were shouting, "down with the Tories." Captains Smith and Johnston with a few of their Rangers bravely defended the Alligator bridge, till the regulars having got under arms and relieved them.

According to Capt. Hugh McCall's "History of Georgia," which was written in 1784 and published in 1816—and republished in 1902 at Atlanta by A. B. Caldwell—Col. Elijah Clarke was sent forward with 300 of the Georgia militia to pursue the enemy to Alligator Creek; and—at page 359 of the 1902 edition—the events are recorded by McCall as follows concerning the battle of Alligator Bridge:

An entrenchment had been opened round the camp, fronted by logs and brush, as a substitute for abatis; at first view the camp was considered assailable, and a detachment of mounted militia, under the command of colonel Elijah Clarke, was ordered to penetrate the camp on the weakest flank, and if practicable to throw the enemy into confusion, of which the main body was to take advantage by advancing quickly on the front. Clarke's detachment acted with great spirit, but their utmost efforts to pass the works were vain and unsuccessful; the horses were entangled among the logs and brush, and with much difficulty got through: when they reached the ditch, it was found too wide to leap over. Here they were met by the fire and huzzas of the enemy, to which the horses had not been accustomed; and they could not be forced to meet it. Colonel Clarke was shot through the thigh, and with difficulty escaped falling into the hands of the enemy. A retreat was ordered, and the American loss was three killed and nine wounded. As the execution of this part of the plan of attack had failed, the main body did not attempt to

perform that part of the operations, which had been assigned to it. Finding that nothing could be achieved, and that re-inforcements to the enemy were at hand, the Americans retreated and re-joined the army.

Murray reported the loyalist losses in this June 30, 1778 battle as follows:

One man of the 2nd Battalion was killed and one of the 4th wounded; Captains Johnston and Smith with five of Brown's rangers wounded.

He also chronicled:

The horses being at pasture could not be collected during the short action, and Ensign Gigglighter of the South Carolina Royalists who wore yellow breeches were taken at the advanced guard and carried off. Mayor Prevost did not allow any pursuit.

Speaking of the patriot losses, he reported that two were left upon the field, neither named; but one was designated as an ensign and the other as "a black man."

The British retreated southward as Colonel Clarke and his troops rejoined the main forces of the Georgia militia.

As General Howe entered Florida his forces met with no resistance at the St. Marys River and at Fort Tonyn on the northern tip of Amelia Island; and from this island location he wrote to General Moultrie on July 5, telling of the difficulties he was having in assembling his troops and in the conflicts in authority being experienced, among which difficulties was one reminiscent of the 1777 expedition, the unwillingness of the new Governor of Georgia to relinquish authority over State troops to the military head of the expedition. The letter read as follows:

FORT TONYN.
5th July, 1778.

DEAR GENERAL.—I have been waiting for the galley first, and after her arrival, a tedious while for the Militia of this State and for the long expected coming of Col. Williamson and our country-men with him. In short, if I am ever again to depend upon operations I have no right to guide, and men I have no right to command, I shall deem it then as now I do, one of the most unfortunate accidents of my life. Had we been able to move on at once, and those I expected would have been foremost had only been as ready as we were, a blow might have been given our enemies which would have put it out of their power to have disturbed us, at least not hastily, and perhaps have been attended with consequences more important than the most sanguine could have expected. But delayed beyond all possible supposition, and embarrassed, disappointed, perplexed, and distressed beyond expression, the utmost we can now achieve will be but a poor compensation for the trouble and fatigue we have undergone, excepting we may be allowed to suppose (what I truly think has been effected) that the movements we have made have drove back the enemy and prevented an impending invasion of the state of Georgia which would otherwise inevitably have overwhelmed it, and also a dangerous defection of the people of both States. This good, I am persuaded, has resulted from it, and this is our consolation.

The enemy were 2 or 3 days since at Alligator Creek, about 14 miles from this place. Their forces, by all accounts, are at least equal either to the Governor's troops or mine, and we are on contrary sides of the river and not within 8 miles of each other. Ask me not how this happened, but rest assured that it has not been my fault. I believe, however, that the Governor will encamp near me tonight, and if the enemy are

still where they were, which I hope to know tonight or tomorrow morning, we shall probably beat up their quarters.

Col. Charles Cotesworth Pinckney, writing also from Fort Tonyn to General Moultrie, had this to say in his letter of July 10, 1778:

After we have waited so long for the junction of the Militia we now find that we are to have as many independent commanders as corps: Governor Houston declaring that he would not be commander; Col. Williamson hinting that his men would not be satisfied to be under Continental command or indeed any other command but his own; and Commodore Bowen insisting that in the naval department he is supreme; with this divided, this heterogeneous command, what can be done? Even if the season and every other military requisite was favorable (but that is far from being the case) the Continental troops have been so violently attacked by sickness, and the desolation made by it is so rapidly increasing, that if we do not retreat soon, we shall not be able to retreat at all, and may crown this expedition with another Saratoga affair in reverse. But the many reasons which ought to induce us to return I cannot now enumerate. Some of the principles I herewith enclose you. From thence you will learn that we have the strongest grounds to imagine that the enemy mean not to fight us seriously on this side of St. John's. Skirmish with us they may, perhaps hang upon our flanks, and harass our rear, and, if we would give them an opportunity, attempt to surprise us; but to fight on this side of St. John's would be the most imprudent thing they possibly could do, and all their movements show they have no such intention.

In 1778 it was almost impossible to see any way for there to be a patriot conquest of Florida. There was widespread and fatal illness among the troops. There was a lack of surprise in their operations against the enemy. Most important of all, there was a lack of unified patriot command. Governor Houston would not let his State militia be commanded by General Howe of the Continentals. Col. Andrew Williamson wished a separate command for his South Carolina volunteers. Commodore Oliver Bowen maintained that naval support, under his command, should not be subordinated to the army elements.

So on July 11, General Howe called a council of war at Fort Tonyn, on Amelia Island. Among the participants were Col. C. C. Pinckney, Col. Samuel Elbert, Col. John White, Lt. Col. John McIntosh, Maj. John Habersham, and so forth. General Howe put a series of questions to the council. One was "as driving the enemy out of Georgia, and demolishing Fort Tonyn, were the objects principally aimed at; have not these purposes been effected?" He received a unanimous affirmative reply.

Another question was: "Is the army in a situation to cross the St. Johns River, attack the enemy, and secure or retreat in case of accident, though they should be added by the militia men embodied under Governor Houston and Colonel Williamson?" This question was resolved unanimously in the negative; as were questions as to whether, since Governor Houston had denied General Howe the right to command the Georgia militia, and no junction had been achieved with the militia, it would be safe or beneficial

to the common cause to pursue the combat further in Florida.

Capt. Hugh McCall in his "History of Georgia" wrote concerning the conclusion of these 1778 efforts:

Thus ended General Howe's expedition, on the success of which the fate of Georgia was suspended. He ordered the sick and convalescents on board of the galleys and such other boats and vessels as could be procured, under the direction of Colonel C. C. Pinckney, to proceed by the inland passage to Sunbury, and with the remainder which had been reduced by disease and death, from eleven hundred to three hundred and fifty; he returned by land to Savannah. Governor Houston and Colonel Williamson proposed a plan of proceeding with the militia as far as St. John's river, but this arrangement was fortunately abandoned, and their commands returned to Georgia and dispersed.

The 1778 operations did at least discourage substantial loyalist attacks in Georgia in that year; but 1779 was another matter. On September 11, 1779, Savannah was taken by the British; and although major Revolutionary War combat was still to be experienced in Georgia, this was never again to be so in Florida. At the end of the war, England transferred East and West Florida to Spain, which took possession in 1784.

It seems proper now that we plan a park at the site of our most southerly battlefield of the Revolution. The Thomas Creek location seems the most appropriate. Although we know that combat took place still further south on the north bank of the St. Johns at Cowford, the substantial nature of that combat is not known and the land is preempted now by high-rise construction. All we know of the 1776 combat at Cowford is to be found in the following quotation from a January 27, 1777, letter from Governor Tonyn in which he said:

The Indians by themselves forced back the Rebels when they had advanced as far as the Cowford, and had they not discovered men dressed in red at their fires in the night time, they would have surprised them, these were those clothed in the Regimentals of the Soldiers taken at the Cowford, the Indians however pursued them until they passed St. Mary's River and I must acknowledge that they are very intelligent, and useful Spies in observing the movements of the Rebels.

Moreover, still further south, on August 30, 1778, a privateer committed depredations and carried off 30 Negroes from New Smyrna. But we are not advised of any armed resistance south of Thomas Creek and the best spot to commemorate this southernmost frontier of the Revolution is certainly the battlefield at Thomas Creek. I hope this commemoration can be done, and I have introduced H.R. 12424 to accomplish this by providing for a national park facility at the location.

TELL IT LIKE IT IS—ON BOTH SIDES

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, all Americans and decent citizens every-

where abhor the atrocity reported as allegedly committed at Pinkville by a few battle-weary soldiers in the Vietnam war last year. One of the sad and tragic facts of war is that people get killed—over 30,000 brave young Americans have died in a nasty, brutal war in Southeast Asia in an attempt to preserve freedom and halt the deathly spread of communism.

However, it is an affront to millions of honest, God-fearing, freedom-loving Americans for a sensation-seeking, so-called "news" service to portray the unselfish, dedicated American servicemen, in Vietnam and elsewhere, as inhumane, berserk murders because of an isolated incident that may have been committed by a handful of edgy, war-torn and battle-weary GI's.

My remarks are directed primarily at the Dispatch News Service, its two partners and a select few of the news media representatives who so eagerly paid out thousands of dollars for a sensational, off-color incident in an apparent sordid attempt to degrade and demoralize the U.S. Army specifically, and America generally. One of the warped-thinking "news" partners, David Obst, a 23-year-old school dropout, who departed the United States, "because I wasn't learning anything in school in this country," says he has been busy selling the story, telephoning newspaper offices in the press building—and tells that at one point he spent 18 consecutive hours on the telephone talking with editors. The youthful salesman boasts that Dispatch News Service has a left-of-center, anti-war tone.

The other member of this duo is Seymour M. Hersh, a 32-year-old Washington free-lance writer, who was brought up in Chicago's "front page" school of newspapering. Hersh, a fast-talking, fast-moving, job-to-job reporter—listed as a former campaign press secretary for Senator EUGENE MCCARTHY—is described by a London newspaper as a "left-wing nut."

Why have not these money-hungry, headline writing sensationalists written about the brutal Communist murder of thousands of innocent victims—men, women, children, and babies—in South Vietnam, in Hungary, in Czechoslovakia, and elsewhere around the globe?

Why have not they photographed and headlined the savage Communist deboweling and deboning and horrendous murder of thousands of screaming Vietnamese citizens?

Why have not these bleeding-heart pacifists written about the senseless slaughter of thousands of decent young American boys who have been ambushed, poisoned, gassed, bombed, burned and murdered by the godless Communists in Vietnam?

Could it be that they are more interested in condemning the Americans in the eyes of the world, than they are in telling the truth about the Communists? Could it be that they are more interested in "selling" and telling the story one way—rather than reporting it like it is, on both sides? Perhaps.

Mr. Speaker, a story in the December 5 issue of Time magazine, entitled, "On the Other Side: Terror as Policy," is a

sparsely publicized insight into the Communist terror policies that should be brought to world attention. I include the article as follows:

ON THE OTHER SIDE: TERROR AS POLICY

For shocked Americans, what happened at My Lai seems an awful aberration. For the Communists in Viet Nam, the murder of civilians is routine, purposeful policy. Terror is a part of the guerrillas' arsenal of intimidation, to be used whenever other methods of persuasion have failed to rally a village or province round the Viet Cong flag.

In a long war, no one knows just how many civilians have been attacked by the Communists. The U.S. has listed well over 100,000 separate incidents of terrorism against the South Vietnamese population since 1958. During the past eleven years, the Communists are known to have killed more than 26,000 South Vietnamese, injured hundreds of thousands, kidnaped at least 60,000 in their campaign of terror.

Many of the Communists' civilian victims died singly or in small groups, as the Viet Cong sought to exterminate effective local leaders loyal to the government in Saigon. In 1960, Father Hoang Ngoc Minh, a popular Kontum parish priest, was ambushed by Viet Cong who drove bamboo spears through his body, then machine-gunned him to death. In 1961, the Viet Cong shot and killed two Vietnamese National Assemblymen near Da Lat.

Many other South Vietnamese have been killed in the random violence designed to paralyze South Viet Nam and frighten its people into abandoning the government. Forty-three were killed and 80 injured, most of them civilians, when terrorists dynamited the My Canh floating restaurant in Saigon in 1965. Forty-eight farm laborers were killed and seven others injured when Viet Cong mines exploded under a bus and another vehicle on a road near Tuy Hoa in 1966.

Not all Communist terrorism is carried out at random. Thousands of Vietnamese have died in well-planned massacres. In 1967, Montagnard tribesmen, who had fled the Communists a year earlier, were set upon in their new home at Dak Son 75 miles northeast of Saigon. Six hundred Viet Cong, 60 of them armed with flamethrowers, invaded the village, setting fire to the huts and shooting the inhabitants as they fled their burning homes, then executing 60 survivors of the assault. Altogether, 252 unarmed Montagnards, nearly all of them women and children, were murdered, 100 kidnaped, 500 listed as missing.

The Communist slaughter of civilians was wholesale while the Communists held the old imperial capital of Hue during the 1968 Tet offensive. Working from house to house with specially prepared "blood lists," they rounded up all officials and people suspected of working with the U.S. and Saigon governments. Some were arrested, others shot on the spot. The magnitude of the massacre did not begin to become fully evident until after government troops had retaken the city and uncovered a mass grave with 150 bodies. Their find led to the discovery of more grisly caches: 19 mass graves in and around Hue have so far yielded more than 2,300 bodies, almost all of them civilians, many with their hands tied behind their backs. Most had been shot or bludgeoned to death; others had been buried alive.

OUR FOREIGN AID POLICY

HON. SHERMAN P. LLOYD

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, recent action by the House of Representatives in

passing the foreign aid bill was taken in the face of widespread grassroots opposition which sometime simplifies our foreign aid program as that "foreign giveaway program."

Believing as I do that greater understanding of the program is in the basic national interest, I think widespread dissemination of a column written by David Lawrence and published in the December 1 issue of the Washington Star would be useful. That column follows:

FOREIGN AID ESSENTIAL PART OF POLICY

(By David Lawrence)

"Foreign aid" has become an unpopular phrase in America largely because its critics have spread the wrong impression—that the program is bigger than it really is and that the United States could better use the money at home. But Secretary of State William Rogers points out that the program, in effect, pays for itself many times over.

The administration asked Congress for an appropriation of \$2.6 billion. The House cut it by \$466 million. The Senate is being asked to restore this sum to the measure. Actually, the amount requested for the entire "foreign aid" program is less than one-fourth of 1 percent of the gross national product of the United States at present. Secretary Rogers feels that such a percentage is only a small part of America's capacity to befriend two-thirds of the peoples of the world.

"Foreign aid" is justified by the secretary of state not only for "moral" and "humanitarian" reasons but because it is "a very important factor in our foreign policy."

He declares that the cut will be viewed abroad as a backward step by America and will lead to a belief that the United States is beginning to turn away from aid programs for the underdeveloped countries.

He says that the effects would be felt in the next few years and that the American aid could have a lot to do with whether "the peaceful revolution in economic and social development now taking place in most regions of the world maintains a satisfactory momentum or not."

It so happens, incidentally, that much of the "foreign aid" given by the United States consists of products or services that are purchased from American companies. The net result, however, is to stimulate ways of building stronger economic systems in each of the countries aided.

The United States is regarded everywhere as a rich country and one able to help the underprivileged. No step has ever been taken in international relations which has won more acclaim for the American people than the "foreign aid" projects. Under the Marshall Plan, which was developed during the Truman administration, the countries hurt in World War II were given a chance to rehabilitate themselves through the use of American funds.

The record of the United States in canceling most of the loans made to the allied powers after both wars and in coming to the rescue even of former enemy countries is unsurpassed in world history.

It is most unfortunate that the same policy was not followed immediately after World War I. Instead, the German people were neglected and they became the victims of Hitler's fascism—an ideology that took advantage of the frustration of the people.

Today the situation is in many respects more acute. The Soviet Union has quietly been using a "foreign aid" device of its own, with large sums spent for military equipment given to North Vietnam as well as the Arabs. There has been some penetration, too, in Africa.

Of course, the example of a Communist-dominated Cuba, with bases for missiles made available to the Soviets, is a not-to-be-forgotten illustration of what can be done

by our own potential enemies through the use of their kind of "foreign aid."

It's time the "foreign aid" rendered by the United States was explained fully so that American citizens will not be applauding those members of Congress who want to wreck it but will be warning them instead that the whole project is essential to the carrying out of a successful foreign policy.

The United States has a mission to perform in assisting the countries of Latin America, Africa and Asia to improve their economic facilities so as to be able to handle an ever-increasing population. America can certainly afford more than a quarter of 1 percent of the money taken in by all kinds of businesses and financial operations in what is known as "the gross national product."

Above all, "foreign aid" is a practical policy that could help to prevent another world war by aligning America with other nations everywhere which not only are free but may become strong enough to do their part in preserving world peace.

THE SAN FRANCISCO SUMMER HAPPENTHING

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the city of San Francisco was indeed fortunate this summer. We did not witness the outbreak of violence which has marked previous summers in many cities in our Nation. I am convinced one of the factors contributing to a more productive summer for the youth of our city was a volunteer program organized by a coalition of business and professional men, and union and community leaders.

Calling themselves the San Francisco Summer HappenThing, this group of citizens joined together in May in response to the recognition that previous summers lacked coordination of the youth programs and resources for such programs. The Summer HappenThing issued a prospectus and enlisted the assistance of brokerage houses throughout the city; "shares" were issued for the contributions received. This group of community-minded citizens was able to raise nearly \$100,000.

The activities of the Summer HappenThing were unusual in several ways. The organization avoided spending a substantial portion of its income on administration; no program was instituted by the organization, rather funds were contributed to existing organizations and groups with the young people themselves holding the majority position on the committee allocating funds to programs.

The public-spirited citizens behind the Summer HappenThing deserve congratulations. At a recent meeting of the board of directors, their chairman, Edward Scarff, president of Transamerica Corp., listed a number of accomplishments. I would like to cite some of these achievements with the hope that they will inspire other members of business and labor along with interested citizens to voluntarily organize to solve some of their communities' problems. Mr. Scarff reported that significant results included:

Transportation of over 15,000 young people from 94 organizations within the city and throughout the surrounding area.

Receiving of grants from \$300 to \$6,000 to support recreation and education among 35 different groups.

Distribution of funds by a program review committee, a majority of whose members were young people.

A comprehensive inventory of programs of youth-serving agencies was conducted which will aid in the creation and coordination of future youth programming in San Francisco.

Employment of 18 college students under the college work study program and participation by them in various aspects of the Summer HappenThing.

Providing of over 3,000 free tickets for circuses, plays, movies, and baseball games.

Spending of less than 8 percent of funds collected on administration.

The San Francisco media aided in making the community more aware of the need for summer youth programs and the way in which it might participate through numerous interviews, articles, and editorials.

I believe San Francisco's mayor, Joseph Alioto, accurately pinpointed the main reason behind the continued enthusiasm and interest generated by the HappenThing when he noted that "the most impressive 'success' of the Summer HappenThing was its willingness and readiness to involve youth in decision-making and to support programs designed and operated by young adults." We are all deeply appreciative of those who took leadership in this endeavor and who devoted their time, talents, and effort; San Francisco is certainly indebted to them.

KOREA VERSUS VIETNAM

HON. RICHARD BOLLING

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Speaker, the dreadful economic record, one that approaches negligence, being compiled under the duress of the Vietnam war, stands in stark contrast to the effective record compiled during the Korean war. This unenviable contrast has been forthrightly and clearly delineated by Dr. Alvin H. Hansen, formerly Littauer professor of political economy at Harvard University. At the same time Dr. Hansen quite properly points out that economic growth, including, of course, a low rate of unemployment is usually accompanied by a degree of inflation. I insert Dr. Hansen's article, published in the November 30, 1969, issue of the Washington Post, at this point in the RECORD:

INFLATION: KOREA VERSUS VIETNAM

(By Alvin H. Hansen)

Price stability and full employment are goals, which taken together, are not easily come by. Our record in the last decade is deplorable. For the seven-year period, 1958-64 inclusive, we did indeed earn a high mark for price stability, consumer prices having in-

creased on the average by only 1.5 percent per annum. But the unemployment rate averaged 5.8 per cent.

This seven-year period comprises three Eisenhower years and four Kennedy-Johnson years. Each averaged a 5.8 per cent unemployment rate. The Eisenhower inflation rate was 1.7 percent while the Kennedy-Johnson inflation rate was 1.3 per cent.

The Council of Economic Advisers in the Kennedy-Johnson administration announced as an intermediate goal an unemployment rate of 4 per cent. In view of the 1958-64 record of 5.8 per cent, the announced goal could perhaps be regarded as ambitious. At any rate it was not easily reached. Four years of the new administration passed by and unemployment still stood as high as 5.2 per cent in 1964. Indeed the 4 per cent rate was not reached until 1966, nearly two years after the beginning of heavy involvement in Vietnam. It required the 1964 tax cut plus the sharp escalation of the war in 1965 to bring the unemployment rate at long last down to the hoped-for 4 per cent goal. Once this was reached, the price level began to rise.

Have we not by now reached a stage at which it might be of some interest to compare our methods of attacking inflation during the Korean war with the policies of 1965-69?

In the Korean war we acted swiftly and vigorously, employing a whole battery of anti-inflation weapons. The contrast between our action then and the tardy, ineffective policies of the last four years can perhaps largely be explained by the fact that the Korean war broke like a thunderbolt upon an unsuspecting world, while Vietnam stealthily and almost unnoticed crept up on us. In the Korean case the shock of a sudden eruption of war caused at once an intense rush of buying both on the part of consumers and businessmen fearful of a recurrence of war-time scarcities. The ensuing rapid inventory buildup which spread throughout the free world caused within the brief period of six or seven months a sharp 15 percent rise in prices, in all major industrial countries.

Fear of inflation induced firm action. The U.S. Congress quickly passed three tax laws affecting both corporations and consumers, but especially corporations. Wage and price controls were again introduced together with control of consumer credit.

The effect was striking. Inflation was quickly brought under control, though this was in part a natural reaction from the excessive inventory buildup. Consumer prices rose by only 2 per cent from 1951 to 1952 and by less than 1 per cent from 1952 to 1953.

The war quickly reduced unemployment from 5.8 per cent in 1949 to 3.3 per cent in 1951 and to 2.9 per cent in 1953. At the same time stiff taxes and controls achieved price stability. Moreover the growth rate was 5.2 per cent per year in real terms and the stiff tax program helped to sustain a low 3 per cent interest rate.

Rigid price and wage controls appear no longer to be politically acceptable. But might not a less ambitious control policy, such as a compulsory cooling off period, be feasible? In the area of administered prices, corporations might be required to announce a proposed price increase six months in advance, together with a detailed cost-price analysis justifying the proposed increase. This would give the government time to publicize its own analysis of the relevant cost-price data. An informed public opinion could possibly exert sufficient pressure to moderate price increases.

A profound shift has similarly occurred with respect to wartime taxes. In the Korean war, corporate profits after taxes actually fell to \$20.8 billion in 1951-53 from \$21.7 billion in 1949-50. In contrast, in the Vietnam war, profits after taxes have sharply

increased from \$32.5 billion in the prewar years 1961-64 to \$51 billion in 1968. Indeed we have added fuel to an overheated economy by continuing the investment tax credit.

When corporate profits after taxes are abnormally high, judged from average past experience, labor unions can be expected to press hard for wage increases. Thus the wage-price spiral is started. Collective bargaining cannot be expected to stand firm against unjustifiable wage increases (i.e., wage increases in excess of productivity gains) if corporate coffers are packed full of abnormally high profits. During the Korean war the low level of profits after taxes brought substantial support to the government's efforts at wage price control.

If tough taxes (particularly on corporations) and control measures are unacceptable even in wartime, a compromise between consumer price stability and full employment becomes virtually unavoidable since there are powerful forces working against each goal. Our statistical knowledge of the relation between these two variables is far from being on solid ground. But such as it is, it seems to suggest that consumer price inflation of about 4.5 per cent per year is more or less consistent with a 3.5 per cent unemployment rate, while a 3.5 per cent inflation rate is roughly consistent with a 4.5 per cent unemployment rate.

A 4.5 per cent unemployment rate, while intolerable in terms of European standards, could possibly be regarded as acceptable in the United States if we sharply increased unemployment insurance benefits and broadened its coverage, while at the same time moving rapidly forward with a retraining and relocation program.

Would a 3.5 percent inflation rate be acceptable in the U.S.? In Western Europe the answer appears to be "yes." Western Europe has learned to live with what we appear to regard as unacceptable. In the 11-year period from 1957 to 1968 consumer price increases averaged 3.0 per cent per year in Western Europe (Germany, Italy, Holland and Britain). This experience appears to throw doubt on the popular view that moderate inflation inevitably accelerates into galloping inflation. The reasons in part appear to be that exceptional price increases lead to exceptionally strong government resistance of one sort or another, and so the tide is turned. Moreover, there are inherent in the cost-price system long lags that delay rapid escalation.

The period 1957-68 (and much the same record goes back to 1950) was one of unparalleled growth, prosperity and rising living standards in Western Europe. Indeed one may ask if such a degree of economic progress was ever achieved in any advanced country without a moderate inflation. When times are good there will necessarily be upward pressures on prices and wages.

In the U.S. we are perhaps a little too sensitive about moderate rates of inflation. History shows that we are not normally subject to inflation sprees. Highly important here is our demonstrated capacity to increase production sharply when put under pressure. One of the most prosperous periods in American history was that from 1897 to 1914. In this period of 17 years, prices rose by approximately the same percent as the recent average European rate.

PUBLIC OPINION POLLS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, in light of recent reports on the employment of

public opinion polls as campaign tools, some large margins of error are indicated. As an example, in Mayor Lindsay's victory by some 7 percent, one poll had indicated a victory of 14 percent, and another indicated a victory by 18 percent. Perhaps the public reaction outlined in the following article has already begun:

LIARS OF THE WORLD

I have a great friend who runs a market research organisation and he's going to hate me for this. But considerations of personal affection must give ground to the need I feel to issue a clarion call to the nation. It is this:

If you are ever asked questions by opinion polls, lie in your teeth.

If you're going to vote Labour insist that you're a Tory, and vice versa. If you like the new enzyme washing powders, declare your undying loyalty to the carbolic that mother used to use. I know the market researchers claim to have ways of checking our truthfulness but if enough of us tell lies we are bound to get them down. Our's is an essential and noble mission.

What have I got against opinion polls? Well, for a start, they're too often right, and this is deeply offensive to the integrity of the individual. Can you think of anything more insulting than the fact that by questioning just 2,000 people, a pollster can tell how thirty-five million of us are going to vote in next year's general election?

It indicates we are just a bunch of sheep, and the sooner we start actively disproving the fact the better.

It's one thing to be a sheep peacefully cropping the pasture and whisking off flies with your tail. It's quite another kettle of algae when people keep shouting in your ear all the time that you are a sheep and that this is the way you are going to behave.

I tell you, for us sheep there's a dog's life ahead. Did you know that there are now five major polling organisations which between today and polling day will be making the air hideous with yeses, noes and don't knows?

Gallup, of course, has been with us for many decades and when it was in the columns of the dear old *News Chronicle* it seemed to be a mild and gentle exercise in liberal sociology. Now it appears in the up-right and conservative pages of the *Daily Telegraph* and has taken on a much sterner mien.

In the early fifties the *Daily Mail* started its own survey called National Opinion Polls which soon managed to steal at least some of Gallup's thunder. It was NOP which predicted at breakfasttime that the Liberals would run off with the first prize in the Orpington by-election that self-same day. All this was in the innocent years of the 1950's. In those days two opinion polls were enough for any one nation.

But next came a breakaway group from NOP. They formed an organisation called Opinion Research Centre which now carries out polls for the *Sunday Times*, the *London Evening Standard*, and sundry regional newspapers. Not to be outdone by its Sunday sister, the *Times* newspaper recently began Marplan which is also an opinion poll, not something you cover the kitchen floor with. And then there were four.

The *Daily Express* used to have a poll of its own but nobody took it seriously, least of all the *Express*. It would publish predictions but admitted it was doing so merely "as a contribution to the gaiety of our readers." But now even the *Daily Express* has lost its sense of humour. At a cost of tens of thousands of pounds it has signed up the Lou Harris polling organisation of America and is now publishing its findings with a desperate sobriety.

So Britain goes into the 1970's—and the next general election—with five major opinion polls. To paraphrase James Thurber we

have opinion polls like other people have mice.

But, you may ask, what harm do they do apart from sapping our faith in our own individuality? The answer is that the technique of opinion polls can pasteurise the process of decision-making by our institutions as well as by individuals. A nightly check on a few hundred homes tells television chiefs what we are all watching on the box. But what if those chiefs could be brought to the point of not trusting "the ratings"? Then they would have to start using their own judgment, and I'm sure an improvement in programmes would result.

The political implications of the polling business are far worse. Both main parties use market research all the time and secretly, and what they do with the information they get is not exposed publicly. But we do know how far the use of polls in American politics has gone. When Robert Kennedy was campaign manager for his brother Jack he would send a market research team ahead of the whistle stops so that when the future President of the United States addressed a local audience he would tell them exactly what they wanted to hear. That was nearly ten years ago and today a Government policy can be pre-tested like an easy-to-spread margarine. The judgment of a statesman is replaced by the punch card and the computer.

The suggestion has been made that public opinion polls might be banned, or at least controlled. It is certainly difficult to discover what good they do, and it is possible that they are of direct harm to the democratic process. A survey published on the morning of polling day about what we're going to do when we get into the voting booth a couple of hours later is no value to man or beast, though, if we are sheep, it might persuade some of us to go along with the herd. In the recent West German elections the pollsters held off publishing their final surveys in case this "bandwagon" effect was created.

But the case is not proved, and, if we are fighting for the individual, we must defend the right of the individual statistician to do his little sums. But we have no obligation to help him.

In fact an encouraging trend is reported from America where, may they be forgiven, the whole polling business started. After the last Presidential election the pollsters went back to discover why their predictions had turned out to be a bit off. They found that one out of every ten of the people had voted for a different candidate from the one they had nominated in the pre-election survey. A very good start.

So now let us unfurl the banner of prevarication. Let untruth be our guide. If you're a Wilson man, plump for Heath. You may fancy Jeremy Thorpe but enter Enoch Powell in the space provided. I hereby name our movement Operation Spanner-in-the-works.

There will be those gentle ones among us who are reluctant to stray from the path of verity. When accosted by a part-time housewife earning a bit of money on the side and wanting to know which can of mush they feed their cats they will be tempted to answer truthfully. This admirable tendency must be resisted. For, after all, you will be lying in a good cause and, though I speak with no authority, I am confident that the Lord Above would, in this instance, forgive.

FORT DIX STOCKADE

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I desire to bring to the attention of this

body a newspaper account of comments attributed to a colleague, MARIO BIAGGI, after he toured the stockade at Fort Dix, N.J., on October 24, 1969. A news conference was held afterward outside the post.

As a member of the Special Subcommittee To Probe Disturbances on Military Bases, I made an official visit, accompanied by Congressman JOHN HUNT and Counsel Bill Cook, to this particular stockade on November 1. While there, our group interrogated administrative personnel and several prisoners under oath. We also inspected the physical plant. As a result of our interviews and investigation, we found much of the press information attributed to Mr. BIAGGI to be in error.

Therefore, I take this opportunity to set the record straight.

In the October 25, 1969, edition of the Philadelphia Enquirer, Congressman BIAGGI is quoted as having said:

There are about 300 attempted suicides at the post, in and out of the stockade, each month.

Sworn testimony before our subcommittee indicates approximately 300 suicide gestures at Fort Dix per year, not per month. The men who attempt suicide are examined immediately at the emergency room by both a physician and a psychiatrist. A most significant fact is that there has not been one successful suicide within the past year in the stockade.

The record reveals that there is a turnover of about 75,000 people every 3 months at Fort Dix. Thus, this post has an annual population of about 300,000 people. This figure includes all soldiers, permanent cadres, and civilians.

The newspaper article noted that the Congressman saw a "prisoner suffering from withdrawal from heroin use" and, also, that heroin was "readily available at Fort Dix." Our information suggests that "narcotics on Fort Dix is no more of a problem than it is anywhere else." Also, the prisoner who was allegedly suffering from heroin withdrawal was, in actuality, recovering. This soldier obtained his first heroin from nearby Wrightstown. Some, he admitted, was available from soldiers on base. However, it is available at a price that servicemen can rarely afford. Thus, some who are "hooked" go a.w.o.l. in order to supply their requirements. After going absent without leave to discuss the problem with his family, this particular soldier returned voluntarily to the Army to seek medical assistance. The patient was given a shot of methedone, examined by hospital physicians, and checked each succeeding morning during recovery. According to the soldier, the Congressman who had visited in October had not questioned him about the availability of heroin on the base nor about his treatment. He was only asked how much of the drug he was using.

The newspaper article revealed our colleague's distress over the "disciplinary chow." First of all, it should be noted that this diet is prescribed only for prisoners (who are) unresponsive to discipline in the stockade. No one is put on this diet if he has a psychological prob-

lem. Likewise, this restrictive diet would not be given to any prisoner with a serious illness or any similar medical history. The following regulations safeguard the health of men on this diet:

First. The diet contains a minimum of 2,100 calories a day.

Second. A balanced portion of the food is served, but without meat, dairy products, or dessert.

Third. The diet is chosen from the regular menu.

Fourth. No man is kept on this diet longer than 14 days at a time.

Fifth. A physical examination of each man is conducted before placing him on the diet.

Sixth. The medical officer examines these men daily.

Seventh. A man exhibiting good behavior may receive regular diet before the 14-day period is completed.

The newspaper quotes our colleague as having stated that he observed prisoners who had lost "40 pounds during their period of incarceration." The record shows that the prisoner who claimed this 40 pound weight loss had been on the restricted diet for only 48 hours. When the man was asked why he told the Congressman that he had lost 40 pounds, he replied, "I was only kidding."

Our subcommittee was curious about the "so-called political prisoners" mentioned by the press. After an investigation, I can only assume that the term referred to the defectors returning from foreign countries and assigned to Fort Dix. Some of these were involved in a major disturbance at the post on June 5, 1969, and some are awaiting trial on these charges.

Conditions at Fort Dix are not perfect by any stretch of the imagination. However, they are not such as to justify a blanket indictment as suggested in the Associated Press article of October 25. Under very trying circumstances and with limited personnel and inadequate facilities, the administration is, in my judgment, doing a responsible job.

A 13-YEAR-OLD VIEWS SEX EDUCATION

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS
OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, the teaching of sex education in the schools has become a subject of intense debate in many communities throughout the country. At this time, I would like to place in the Record a letter I received from a 13-year-old girl in my district. I feel it is a thoughtful letter on this issue, expressing concern with many of the problems facing youngsters today. The letter follows:

HON. MARTHA GRIFFITHS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR Mrs. GRIFFITHS: This is my first time writing to a Congressman, and I'm not to sure on going about it. I was told by my Civics teacher to first state the problem on

which I was speaking about. So I think it's best that I do.

There are so many problems in our nation, sex education is just one of them. After reading that last sentence I bet you thought it was a deep subject for a kid to be talking about. Well, I think it's time a "kid" said something about his own education materials. I've heard and read controversy about sex education from teachers, parents, churches, doctors, and psychiatrists, but never "a" kid. By the way I'm for sex education.

The real problem with sex education is trying to convince organizations, such as the John Birch Society, that sex education is anything but harmful. If it does anything, sex education should help.

In convincing opposed organizations we could bug them to death to at least to try different methods in teaching sex education and see what happens. If they pointed to Anaheim, California we could tell them that it was only one method.

There would have to be many debates and conferences, with many more facts brought up. Schools would have to try and find different methods. Anything that could help would have to be done.

It is very hard for a thirteen year old to come up with the right solution, but all I know is that something must be done. Just look at the statistics:

At least one teenage girl in every six, it is estimated, today becomes pregnant out of wedlock.

Illegitimate children are swelling the welfare rolls all across the nation, and in dozens of American cities, special schools, tutoring or night classes have been established for unwed mothers to-be.

There's been a startling rise in teenage V.D.—an estimated 200,000 to 300,000 infections yearly.

A recent public school health education study of some 18,000 children in 38 states: it revealed an appalling ignorance.

It seems ignorance is the major cause of these increasing rates. However, other reasons such as wanting someone of her own are in many cases of the illegitimacies.

These reasons are a "must" for sex education in schools. It is the obligation of the parents to teach sex to their children, but many are embarrassed or may not know all of the facts themselves. So they turn to the school or church for help, but a lot of people do not attend church.

Even if sex education is not the answer I still think it should be taught. We are the highest of being and reproduction is a life process. I've been taught how to eat, talk, read, write, and go to the toilet, but never have I been taught about sex.

Thank you for reading one of the many letters that you receive. It sure would be nice if sex education was introduced as a bill and I'm sure after reading this letter from a thirteen year old girl who has never had any sex education and is in need of it. That you would probably approve the bill, if introduced.

Sincerely,

VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM S. MAILLIARD

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. MAILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues know, I have stated my support of the President and his efforts to deal with the complex and difficult situation in Vietnam. I do not, however,

feel we should close our eyes and minds to new ideas. It is for this reason that I am inserting the following open letter from Dr. George Lerski, professor of government at the University of San Francisco, which appeared in the university newspaper, the San Francisco Foghorn:

Dr. Michael Lehmann deserves the gratitude of the Faculty's silent majority for his bold warning that the increased "political activism on campus will destroy the scholarly work." For identical reasons I feel compelled to voice my serious dissent with the amazing appeal of the thirty-two Faculty dissenters, although I sincerely respect most of the signers as charming colleagues and fine scholars.

One can well understand the moral indignation with the tragic and unnecessary war in the far away tropical jungle of an artificially divided Southeast Asia country, but I deeply deplore the emotional urging "all students in the University to join . . . to demonstrate in whatever way we can our outrage . . ." For instance, are you all ready to "resort to violent confrontation" or to use "sticks and stones" as recommended on our campus by Dr. Carlton Goodlet, the hero of the "Bloody Days Ahead" editorial in the last issue of the *San Francisco Foghorn*?

It is indeed high time to stop the nonsensical half-hearted war for the Seventeenth Parallel in Vietnam, but not through strikes and further radical agitation on American campuses which may lead to a complete standstill of academic life, as happened in Japan.

As for stopping the Vietnam war, this writer would like to submit a "Wilsonian" peace formula to be simultaneously proposed through all available channels for consideration of the U.S. government.

The origins of the so-called containment policy can be traced back to the fatal decisions of the Teheran, Yalta, Potsdam and Geneva Conferences with their disregard for the natural rights of smaller states for territorial unity and national self-determination. The inhuman divisions of those unwilling countries along the Iron or Bamboo Curtains, Curzon Lines, Thirty-eighth or Seventeenth Parallels were bound to perpetuate misery, tensions, and "limited" wars in defense of those artificial borders. Before those conflicts escalate into a major world confrontation, it might not be too late to try to solve the Vietnam calamity by constructive implementation of the following seven steps:

- (1) Complete withdrawal of all foreign troops and of foreign military or police advisors from the entire region of the former French colonies in Indochina, including Cambodia, Laos and both Vietnams.
- (2) Total demilitarization and neutralization of both Vietnams, similar to the 1955 detente in Austria.
- (3) Abolition of the Seventeenth Parallel border drawn across the living body of the Vietnam nation.
- (4) Free the unfettered secret elections in reunited Vietnam under the impartial control of the United Nations.
- (5) American recognition of the outcome of such elections regardless of their political result.
- (6) International guarantees of the borders and independence of a united but disarmed and neutralized Vietnam by the major powers, including Mainland China.
- (7) Our economic assistance to the war-torn population of united Vietnam and readiness to give political asylum to the rejected leaders of any of the belligerent parties.

I have reason to believe that any such disengagement formula for peace without surrender if implemented by our government may gain the support of world opinion. Perhaps it is still not too late to convince the

irresponsible hardliners both in Hanoi and in Saigon that it is better to negotiate for real peace than to face the tragic alternative of nuclear smashing of the cities and ports of their country. Increasingly advocated by equally irresponsible American hawks on one side and radical hotheads such as Eldridge Cleaver on the other.

It is exactly that explosive polarization of American society—and of its academic microcosm—our own university community—which may bring about the catastrophe.

A FOURTH-CLASS ANSWER TO A FIRST-CLASS MESS

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, approximately 1 month ago, on November 3, I told our colleagues about one of my recent personal experiences with our inept mail service. It involved a special delivery, airmail letter which was delivered to my office in the Cannon Building 4 months after it was dispatched in San Bernardino, Calif.

Well, the Post Office Department, having been apprised of my remarks, elicited a certain amount of concern over the matter and undertook what appeared to be a painstaking investigation of the incident. Here I was all prepared to commend the officials involved when lo and behold comes an official explanation from the Postmaster General's congressional liaison officer which is utterly extraordinary.

Let me quote a couple of pertinent paragraphs from the letter and then add some additional comment:

Our request of the Washington, D.C. Postmaster produces information that the Special Delivery Messenger assigned to that particular delivery trip on July 10, has since retired from the Postal Service and cannot be asked for specific details of his performance . . . However, Special Delivery Messengers working from the Main D.C. Post Office are not expected to have the information needed to deliver accurately mail that is incorrectly addressed.

If, in this case, the messenger arrived at 1517 Longworth Building at some hour after most offices had closed and found the door locked with nobody in the corridor with whom to consult, he would have delivered the letter in the mail slot adjacent to the door.

Of course, the supposition is totally unrealistic and unsupportable. If the postal investigators had checked carefully, they would have found out that the mail slot at the former office was, and has been since I vacated the office last March, sealed closed with cardboard and tape. The premises are currently shared by two colleagues who use the room for utility purposes. But there have been cases when mail addressed to me was slipped under the door and in every instance it has been promptly forwarded to my present quarters.

So here we have the great monolithic Post Office Department letting some anonymous retired postal worker take the blame for the whole deplorable episode.

Clearly, the Post Office Department is assuming a fourth-class attitude in a first-class mess.

TIME WILL PASS ON FOR HIPPIES AS IT HAS PASSED ON FOR US

HON. E. Y. BERRY

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. BERRY. Mr. Speaker, the Daily Market RECO carried a cute article by Elmer Roessner which should be made available to the Members by insertion in the RECORD:

(By Elmer Roessner)

NEW YORK.—A pair of hippies, the girl carrying a baby, shuffled through the rain along a park. "Isn't that terrible?" I asked my companion. "Look at that couple, wasting their lives away, hungry and clad in rags, fighting some vague establishment. And look at that poor baby, likely to catch its death of cold in this weather. Isn't that a tragic, criminal sight?"

"Not at all!" said my companion, who builds houses and small apartment buildings. "It's a wonderful picture. You may see it as the end of a miserable life. I see it as the beginning of a new life, with satisfactions for that bearded hippie, pleasure for that bedraggled, slack-hair wench and food and fun for that little kid."

"Are you dreaming?" I asked.

NO PLACE TO GO

"No. I'm not dreaming. I'm simply seeing again what I have seen dozens of times before. You are seeing a beautiful picture but you don't recognize it. That tattered family there is the future of America."

"The hippies are going to take over?" I asked.

"Nonsense," my friend replied. "Those people are simply at the end of the trail. There is no place to go but up."

"If the wind turns a little colder, they are within an hour of abandoning their life of protest. They will be forced to realize that there is no revolution tonight. It will hurt them to the marrow of their bones, but they will realize that one phase of their lives is over."

"Tomorrow, even tonight, that fellow is going to start looking for a job, not a job of washing dishes but a job that will take his family in out of the cold. He'll even shave that funny growth off his face if necessary to hold down the job and get along with the establishment."

HOOKED FOREVER

"The girl will primp up a bit and as soon as they can afford it, she'll get some new clothes and, if she can find a baby sitter, start looking for a job."

"From time to time the couple will mutter about how they are trapped by the establishment, but they'll never try to get out. And as they make a little money, they'll start thinking about a house in the suburbs, where the growing child can get some fresh air and try to catch frogs."

"Eventually, the girl will join a P-TA and the young fellow—well, he won't join the Republican party but he'll vote for the men he thinks will keep unshaven bums out of his corner of Suburbia."

"You build houses," I said. "Why don't you be the first one to give them a builder's card?"

"That might spoil it," he replied. "I'll let God and the weather work on them for a little while."

"How do you know all this?" I asked.

"When I was a teen, I was a member of the Young Anarchists Society. We met in a cellar and talked about blowing up Union Depot and the Court House.

"But we never had any matches and we became interested in jobs, and grabbing off a girl for keeps, and buying or renting a house somewhere and, before we knew it, we were grown up and making money and calling for outlawing of young anarchists' leagues and demanding that the government finance new businesses for young people and shooting off firecrackers on the Fourth of July."

Anyhow, I stopped feeling sorry for the hippie, his girl and their baby alongside the park.

**CONGRESSMAN BRAD MORSE
URGES ADOPTION OF A COHERENT URBAN POLICY**

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the House Republican task force on urban affairs, I wish to call the attention of my colleagues to the thoughtful and perceptive statement concerning Federal urban policy made by the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MORSE) to the New England Merchants National Bank 11th annual New England municipal conference in Boston on November 17, 1969.

In his statement, Mr. MORSE demonstrates an acute awareness of the underlying social, economic, and political forces that have shaped urban life and are today causing rapid and deep-seated changes. As a former mayor of a large city, I am particularly impressed with the gentleman from Massachusetts' analyses of the problems which result from the failure to provide municipal governments the authority and fiscal resources commensurate with their responsibilities.

As he so ably points out, the proliferation of Federal programs, particularly between 1960 and 1969—the number of Federal programs rose from 45 to 435—an increase of almost 400 percent in this period—have certainly not met the problem. There is, indeed, a gap between the number of categorical aid programs issuing forth from Washington on the one hand and the degree of social satisfaction that has ensued on the other.

As Mr. MORSE and Daniel Patrick Moynihan, the President's adviser on urban affairs, point out, a spate of "programs do not a policy make." We lack any coherent and unified urban policy. To quote my colleague from Massachusetts:

What is necessary is a national urban policy which establishes goals and which can then form a framework within which to formulate programs for the accomplishment of those goals.

In his statement to the New England Merchants National Bank municipal conference, BRAD MORSE has provided us with not only a thoughtful perspective on current urban problems but with suggestions concerning what our urban policy goals should be. We desperately need a coherent urban policy. I therefore commend

his statement to my colleagues and insert it in the RECORD following my remarks:

ADDRESS BY F. BRADFORD MORSE

Christopher Morley once wrote: "All cities are mad but the madness is gallant. All cities are beautiful but the beauty is grim."

In 1965, Watts burst into flame and burned for three days. In the ensuing years, countless numbers of cities across the country experienced similar violence and destruction—Chicago, Miami, Detroit, Nashville, Buffalo, Rochester, Washington, D.C.—the list goes on.

There was nothing very gallant nor very beautiful about those events. Certainly there was much that was grim.

But while much was destroyed in the process of these violent upheavals, something else was created—a new concern and a new awareness. Watts, and the subsequent rioting and violent destruction that engulfed so many cities, riveted the nation's collective attention on problems it had too long neglected—and the so-called "crisis of the cities" became a national crisis.

The problems themselves, of course, have been with us for a long time. Indeed, the problems of our nation are the problems of the city: transportation, housing, airports, schools, employment, sewage disposal, water and air pollution, recreational facilities and conservation, to name a few.

These already severe physical problems have been compounded by social problems—millions of people—black people, poor people, young, old, unemployed—feel oppressed, alienated and left out of the system.

As the same time, our present social and political environment exacerbates our difficulties further. We live in a time of profound revolution—and I choose that word with care—and we do not fully understand what new pressures are being generated. We are worried and we are even frightened by the rapid and deep-seated changes that are taking place around us.

Our society has been undergoing a steady polarization—hawk against dove, young against old, black against white—that is increasingly isolating citizens from each other. Where we seek community we find fragmentation. Where we seek order, we find chaos.

And now, when it is most crucial for the city to respond effectively to the increasing demands being made upon it, the city itself, the community itself, is virtually immobilized.

What has happened?

How did we come to the present impasse and where might we—must we—go from here?

We are a nation of cities in spite of ourselves.

The American tradition has been built upon the values of the rural, agrarian life—Independence, self-sufficiency, hard work—and democracy itself, so the theory goes, flourishes best in an agrarian setting. Our Constitution and our political institutions reflect the essentially rural character of an earlier day.

But cities are the natural outgrowth of a growing country and an increasingly industrialized economy and so they sprang up, early in our history, and they have been growing ever since, until today the vast majority of Americans live in cities.

That is not to say that most Americans live in big cities—they do not. Too often we tend to think only of such places as New York, Chicago, Detroit or Los Angeles when we hear about the "urban crisis." As a matter of fact, in 1960, only 9.8 percent of our people lived in cities of 1 million or more. On the other hand, 98 percent of the units of local government have fewer than 50,000 persons.

But this fact does not mean they are the less urban. More important, they represent conditions of living and problems of

government profoundly different from those of our agrarian, rural, small town past.

It is a simple enough matter to relate the basic facts underlying today's urban crisis.

In the early period of our history, the growth of the city was primarily a predictable economic development. Cities sprang up in response to two factors: first the economic interest, and second, the need on the part of people for a feeling of community.

The political jurisdiction of the city more or less covered the areas of intense economic development, that in turn more or less defined the area of most dense settlement. Under such circumstances municipal government could—and largely did, deal with the process of governing. Though in some cases people might quarrel with the methods used—for example by the political bosses of the old city machine—nevertheless, they got the job done and they governed.

In the last thirty years, however, economic incentives and social desires have combined to produce a fractionating process that has made it ever more difficult to collect sufficient power in one place to provide the rudiments of effective government.

Part of this fractionating process is inherent in the structure of municipal government itself and should not be underestimated as a cause of today's crisis in the cities. Much of this crisis is in fact a crisis in governing—an inability to perform the most essential functions of government because of a lack either of authority or resources or both. We must add to this, however, another consideration—that much of the crisis is also due to the increasing isolation of large segments of the population.

We have lost two things—we have lost the viability of our municipal structures and we have lost our sense of community.

As a result of these forces, and as a part of the process of fractionation, the central area of the cities ceased to grow and began to decline. The core began to rot.

Additional special circumstances compounded this problem. First, the extraordinary migration of rural people, mostly southern blacks to the northern city brought vast numbers of largely unskilled and often unemployable people into the central city. Second, a postwar population explosion—90 million babies were born between 1946 and 1968—combined with the influx of other citizens to place immense pressures on all municipal services.

Understandably, the municipal services have not been up to the challenge and many middle class whites have moved to the suburbs, seeking escape from the rapidly changing, rapidly declining, central city.

Third, both resulting from and contributing to this process, more and more industries have moved from the cities to areas where taxes are lower and the environment more favorable.

As a result of all these factors, the economic stagnation of the inner city became desperately exacerbated by the problem of racial tensions. In the course of the 1960's, tension turned into open and violent racial strife.

The present immobilization of city governments in the face of these demands and tensions is not the result of lack of effort. On the contrary, city governments began to respond to what the President's Advisor on Urban Affairs, Pat Moynihan, has called "the onset of economic obsolescence and social rigidity," a generation ago. But, they found their fiscal resources strained beyond capacity in no time at all.

As all of you know too well, the cities are severely limited in their sources of revenue. As countless municipal officials have pointed out, many cities are strapped by the limitations imposed on their corporate charters by the state legislatures. In many cases they do not have the right to levy any except limited forms of taxes, mainly sales and

property taxes which hit hardest on those least able to pay.

Today, with the new demands and intensified requirements for services for additional people, the cities are confronted with financial problems that they simply do not have the capability to solve.

Let me pause here to mention a subject which I know is of great interest to you—the provision in the House-passed tax reform bill which would levy a tax on interest earned from municipal bonds. As you know, this is a subject of considerable controversy and the House action itself, while it was not yet a law, was enough to cause a significant drop in the sales of municipal bonds.

As you may know, the Senate Finance Committee announced last month that the bill it will report to the Senate will not subject State and municipal bond interest to Federal income tax.

Beginning in the postwar period the states, to a limited degree, and the Federal government on an escalating scale, have become involved in urban programs. In this decade especially, considerable resources have been channeled from Washington to the cities and this trend will doubtless continue and probably increase.

But is this enough? Does the solution of our "urban problem" really lie in spending more and more money, almost purely for the sake of spending it? That is what many—and I must include state and municipal officials in this group—would have us believe. Certainly it is the assumption behind most of our federal grant-in-aid programs to the states and cities.

But has our success been such that we can confidently say that a continuation of these policies will eventually bring a satisfactory solution?

I do not think so. This assumption, and our whole approach to the so-called "urban problem" bears careful and critical scrutiny.

The cities are in the grip of a cruel paradox. Where people are is where their needs must be met. Most Americans live in cities. And so the responsibility for meeting our society's cast needs in the areas of social services, jobs, welfare, housing, transportation, and the quality of life—this responsibility has fallen on our cities. But the fact is that of all the units of government in this country, the city is the *least* equipped and the most poorly structured to deal with these problems.

This is a fact at least as fundamental as the social and physical problems of the cities themselves. Until it is solved, all the resources we may pour into the cities will not bring the results we seek.

The impasse in municipal government today I believe results from a combination of these social and physical factors. First, as Moynihan suggests, "the sense of general community is eroding, and with it the authority of existing relationships." Second, and at the same time, there is a "powerful quest for specific community emerging in the form of ever more intensive assertions of racial and ethnic identities." Third, the authority system within the city is so divided, so fragmented, that effective action is virtually impossible. The city lacks authority commensurate with its responsibility for governing.

Much of the crisis of the cities arises from the interaction of these new demands on the one hand, and the relative inability of the urban social and political system to respond to them on the other.

We cannot be sanguine about the future. We can foresee a time when, if trends continue as they are now, most industry and other income-producing activity will have moved out of the city, taking with them their employment and their wealth. Their place will be taken in the inner city by the poor, black and white. The outer ring of

suburbia, largely white and middle class, will become ever more protective and defensive. The inner city itself will become more riddled with difficulties and the potential for conflict and violence will be immeasurably increased.

How do we meet this problem?

I am convinced that the very future of our democratic system lies in the balance. The upheavals and the polarization that are paralyzing our society are a direct challenge to its viability. We have been nurtured on a consensual system of authority—and the people will continue to consent to that authority only so long as it continues to meet their legitimate needs.

What, then, are we to do to prevent the apocalypse which so many fear is imminent?

First, I believe we must take steps to make our cities governable, pure and simple. We must devise systems of municipal government where the *authority* to do is commensurate with the *responsibility* to do. We must overcome the fragmentation that immobilizes local governments and reconstitute them in a more naturally organic way.

The metropolitan area of Minneapolis, for example, comprises some 1.8 million people—certainly not one of the giant cities when compared to New York, Chicago, or Los Angeles. But within that metropolitan area there are over 400 different units of government operating—from police departments, to school districts, to the office of the Mayor. It is a wonder that any cooperation or coordination is accomplished in such a situation.

That circumstance is duplicated, perhaps not to the same degree, in every municipal government in the country. We must begin to give serious consideration to the possibility of totally reconstituting local governments along area or regional lines—perhaps metropolitan government is the answer—where a regional government has jurisdiction over the entire area which encompasses its problems.

The problem of water pollution is a current and very illustrative example. If a city—let us say my home city, Lowell—wants to do something about the pollution in the Merrimack River (which is severe as I am sure you all know), it can spend millions of dollars to build treatment plants and sewage disposal facilities and be the model of action in the fight against pollution. But unless the other cities along the same river do the same thing, then the City of Lowell may as well have dumped its money into the river, along with its sewage. It is in the nature of the pollution problem that it *cannot* be successfully attacked piecemeal.

For years I have been urging, on both the Federal government and local governments, the application of systems management techniques to the problem of pollution control on the Merrimack River as well as to other non-defense public problems. In order to meet that problem it will take the concerted, cooperative efforts of all the towns on the river—and that means in New Hampshire as well as in Massachusetts. That is a fairly simple proposition. But years and years have gone by with little or no action. And the reason is also fairly simple. There is no one unit of government with the authority to demand and enforce compliance with pollution control for the entire Merrimack River Basin.

I do not mean to suggest that this is all the fault of our presently constituted system of municipal government. Certainly I do not mean to suggest that metropolitan government alone would solve this problem because clearly it would not.

I do suggest, however, that this situation points out an important factor in the future effectiveness or ineffectiveness of local governments.

Clearly, if a Basin wide authority for the

Merrimack Valley were to be established, each of the municipalities along the river would have to relinquish some of its sovereignty to that central authority. That is the basis of our federal system. Each of the states gives up something in sovereign authority in the expectation that the rewards of union will be greater for all than the sacrifice each makes. The same is true in this instance. Each of the municipalities along the river will have to relinquish some of its sovereignty if all of them together are to benefit from a clean Merrimack river. As yet there is not the political will to take that step.

Unless we overcome the parochialism which characterizes municipal governments across the country, we will not begin to solve our problems. Parochialism is not only a problem between governments—it plagues the city with hundreds of different units of government—remember Minneapolis—with specific authority over limited areas of concern. Cooperation is minimal. The result is chaos in local government and I do not think we can tolerate its effects for very much longer before the entire system is irretrievably damaged.

While the problem of structure is not nearly as exciting nor as publicly interesting as poverty or hunger or pollution, I suggest to you that its solution must accompany the others.

Of course structure is not enough. You must have programs to move through the structure—programs which speak meaningfully to the unique needs of a polarized mass society in the 1970's that is seeking, more than anything else, a sense of itself.

We have had a proliferation of federal programs in recent years, however, and they have not met with much success. In the period between 1960 and 1969, the number of domestic programs of the Federal government rose from 45 to 435—an increase of almost 400%. But it is clear to even the casual observer that there is a gap between the number of categorical aid programs issuing forth from Washington on the one hand, and the degree of social satisfaction that has ensued on the other.

Clearly there is a need for something more—perhaps I should say something different. That something different has been suggested by Pat Moynihan.

Moynihan suggests, and I agree with him, that "programs do not a policy make." What is lacking is any coherent and unified logic behind those programs—what is necessary is a national urban policy which establishes goals and which can then form a framework within which to formulate programs for the accomplishment of those goals.

Much that takes place in municipal government comes as a result of policies established by the Federal government. Municipal governments often adopt policies and plans in such a way as to qualify for available Federal money. In effect this is an incentive system, much like that of profit in private enterprise. But as yet, the Federal government has not found an effective incentive system to shape the forces at work in urban areas in such a way that urban goals are in fact attained.

Too often, municipal officials adopt policies only in response to initiatives from Washington. They have, to far too large a degree, abdicated their leadership role to the Federal government. City priorities are being established by the Federal government.

I think that the President's proposal for sharing revenue with the states and cities, modest though it is in the beginning, is an important way to bring much needed revenue into the hands of state and local governments for use in meeting their own priority needs.

What should be the objectives of a national urban policy?

There are several goals which I suggest are matters of urgency and importance and

which must be dealt with. First, and most important, we must attack the social isolation of the several groups in our central cities. Until we do we will not be able to eliminate the source of violence and disruption in our urban life. This is not to say that we must destroy the sense of specific community among members of racial and ethnic groups of which I spoke earlier. It does mean that we must establish channels of communication and cooperation which will in turn generate a restoration of that general community which we are so sorely lacking today.

Second, federal programs which affect urban areas, and there are few which do not, must take account of the balance which does not, but should exist between economic and social forces in urban areas. Imbalances in industry, transportation, housing, social services, and other elements or urban life, have become more rather than less pronounced in recent years. We must take account of this balance and structure programs in such a way as to create and maintain an equilibrium among these forces.

Third, and this goes back to my major point regarding structure, Federal programs should be structured in such a way as to stimulate the reorganization of local government in response to the reality of metropolitan conditions.

Fourth, a primary object of a federal urban policy should be to restore the fiscal vitality of urban government and to assure that local government have sufficient revenue sources to meet their own problems on their own initiative.

Federal urban policy should seek to equalize the provision of public services among different jurisdictions in metropolitan area. The residents in the inner city should receive, dollar-for-dollar, the equivalent of those in more prosperous and more prospering areas, insofar as that is possible. While we may not be able to guarantee equality of achievement, we must at least guarantee the equality of opportunity for which we have traditionally stood.

These are only some of the ingredients of a national urban policy. Perhaps equally as important as its content, however, is the realization by all of us of the necessity of thinking about our approach to this crisis. We need to ask ourselves the most basic questions. Perhaps the city as we have come to know it is no longer a viable institution for living, working and governing in the 1970's. Perhaps we will have to devise totally new systems of grouping people to meet the evolving nature of a future America. Whatever the answer may be, we shall not find it until we begin to ask these questions.

For until we establish a national commitment, every bit as deep as that to our own security, to a basic set of goals for urban America, and then take the proper steps to implement those goals at all levels of government, the "crisis of the cities" will intensify.

And if the cities die, America will die with them.

LOS ANGELES MUSIC AND ART SCHOOL

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call to the attention of my colleagues an organization in my congressional district which has joined in the efforts to combat juvenile delin-

quency and the school dropout problem in a rather unique way.

The Los Angeles Music and Art School, which I visited recently, is a nonprofit organization located in the heart of East Los Angeles—an area in which a large amount of poverty exists among the residents, who are overwhelmingly composed of Americans of Mexican descent.

In 1944 the school was founded by Pearle Irene Odell, has now reached an annual enrollment of 700 pupils, and has recently moved into a new \$350,000 home which has facilities for 3,000 pupils.

Some pupils pay no tuition whatsoever, and the school is run on an entirely nonprofit basis. A staff of 40 of the finest and most dedicated professional teachers comprise the school staff.

The purpose of the program is not to develop professional musicians or artists, however, but to give the student a sense of achievement which encourages him, through proficiency in some facet of the arts, to complete his formal education and to become a taxpayer instead of a recipient of relief funds. Many former pupils have won scholarships to universities and have used music as an avocation.

According to school records, no pupil from this school has ever become a juvenile delinquent.

The Los Angeles Music and Art School receives no government assistance of any kind. The \$100,000 annual budget of the school necessitates private fundraising efforts. The list of trustees, sponsors, and other officers of the school boasts a number of well-known responsible and concerned citizens from throughout the Los Angeles area.

TOP JOB FOR THE U.N.: THE LANGUAGE OF PEACE

HON. JAMES J. DELANEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, as most are aware, there are a great many obstacles which must be overcome before we can expect to have lasting universal peace among nations. According to a number of experts on international affairs, one of the major barriers to a peaceful world is a lack of understanding among peoples of the various countries.

In this regard, I would like to call my colleagues' attention to an editorial in a recent issue of Columbia magazine which urges that member countries of the United Nations take action to adopt, in addition to their native tongue, a world language, such as Esperanto, for use as a medium of international communication.

Those who analyze the U.N., estimate that at least 10 percent of its budget is spent on translation and interpretation. It is anticipated that adoption of a universally acceptable second language would result in significant savings in this budget item, and at the same time greatly improve understanding among nations.

Under leave to extend my remarks, the article is inserted at this point in the RECORD:

TOP JOB FOR THE U.N.: THE LANGUAGE OF PEACE

World attention again is focused on the United Nations General Assembly as that international body of diplomats tries to cope with the many thorny problems that lie astride the path to universal peace.

The multitude of frictions between nations will be reflected in the speeches and deliberations: the Arab-Israeli conflict, the Vietnam war, the border tensions between the Soviet Union and Red China.

The General Assembly in its three-month session each year cannot solve all these complicated issues. At best it only can hope to "cool" them and keep them under control.

The fact is that most of these difficult problems cannot be resolved by any surface decision of the General Assembly because they are too deep-rooted and often imbedded in the outlook and state of mind of the peoples and nations involved. For instance the dispute between Israel and the Arab countries goes far beyond the question of territory and frontier demarcation. Basic to the issue is a deep-rooted attitude of intolerance and unacceptance.

The purpose of the United Nations, according to its charter, is to maintain international peace and security and cooperate in establishing political, economic and social conditions under which this task can be achieved. Its efforts so far have been devoted largely to snuffing out or at least controlling the smoldering fires of war. Under the preoccupation of constant threats to peace the international body has not been able to concentrate on promoting the political, economic and social conditions which foster and protect peace.

But it must be realized that genuine peace, at least among the democratic countries, is more a people-to-people than a nation-to-nation issue. This means that unless some understanding, sympathy and empathy exists between the peoples of different countries it is difficult and sometimes impossible for the politicians to steer a course which always veers to the side of peace. National sentiments often have more impact on a country's policy than the cool-headed assessments of its leaders.

Consequently one issue to which the United Nations should give serious attention is the matter of creating climates of understanding among the peoples of the world.

But before the world's peoples can understand and trust each other they must be able to communicate with each other. Significantly technological advance enables easy world-wide communication through the printed word, radio, telephone, motion pictures and even by live television. But the sad after effects of the tower of Babel still lock out people from each other. There are hundreds of languages spoken throughout the world. But very few people are gifted with enough tongues to speak to all others.

Here is an area in which the United Nations could use its prestige and influence to assure that at least the generations of the future could understand each other and thus greatly facilitate mutual trust and cooperation.

The United Nations has five official languages: Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish—all widely spoken. On the working level it has gotten down to three languages: English, French and Spanish.

For obvious political reasons none of these can be chosen as a United Nations or world language. Consequently an effort should be made under U.N. auspices to prepare an artificial language or decide on an existing one which would be acceptable to the peoples of the world as a second tongue, could be taught

in schools and eventually would become a world-wide medium of communication.

A number of artificial languages have been elaborated by linguists with a view to simplicity and easy acceptance by the world's major language groups. Among these are Esperanto, Interlingua and Volapuk.

The last named was established by Johann Martin Schleyer, a priest of Konstanz, Baden, Germany, around 1880. Esperanto is the creation of Lazarus Ludwig Zamenhof, Russian oculist and philologist who died in 1917. It is a simplified, regular language. Supporters have held international congresses and gained recognition in some countries. In the early 1960s an estimated 8 million people could speak and use the language. Interlingua is the creation of the International Auxiliary Language Association and has been used at international medical and scientific meetings.

The important issue is not which language is chosen but that a language be chosen and promoted as a world tongue. The selection or creation of such a language by the international body and its promotion as a world-wide medium of communication well might prove the greatest single contribution that the U.N. can make to world peace.

To a large extent an atmosphere for war evolves because peoples are sealed off from each other and develop concepts of history and of events which are completely contradictory. Most frequently the block to outside ideas and information results from an unfortunate failure by people to understand any language but their own.

Both by correspondence and direct conversation COLUMBIA has been in touch with U Thant, secretary general of the United Nations, urging him to establish an international commission to study this question and have it prepare recommendations to be submitted to the U.N. General Assembly for united action.

Thant has expressed agreement with the idea but insists that the question of a universal language is such a highly emotional issue that it would be difficult for the office of the U.N. secretariat to introduce it. Thant's hope is that member nations can propose the idea for discussion.

However difficult the problem may be it seems obvious that someone, possibly in concert with other interested parties, should start the ball rolling. It is an effort that will not pay off for at least two generations—which means 40 to 50 years hence—but it is an initiative which is owed to the future of mankind.

Every person genuinely committed to peace should contact his top government officials and his nation's representative at the U.N. to encourage such a move. The latter can be contacted easily by writing to the country's mission at the United Nations Building, New York City, U.S.A.

Here is where you can lay a stone for the temple of peace for which future generations truly will bless you.

ELMER VON FELDT.

WORK-STUDY PLAN CUTS DROPOUT RATE

HON. F. BRADFORD MORSE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Speaker, a unique program that was adopted by the Lowell High School in Lowell, Mass., in 1965, is meeting with considerable success 4 years later. The creation of Lowell High School's placement director, Christo-

pher Mitchell, the work experience program matches students to work situations which fall within their related fields of study and interest. The program has twin aims: First, it is designed to help provide financial assistance to students. But, equally important—and this is where the program differs from most so-called work-study programs—this work experience program augments the student's studies in his selected area of interest. Thus the student is learning both from study and from direct experience about what most probably will later become his career.

As far as I know, this is the only program of its type. Most work-study programs merely provide the student with financial assistance, putting him to work at whatever kind of job the school can find for him to do. This work experience program makes sure that the student spends his working time at a job which will contribute to his learning and which will form the basis for future employment.

A recent article in the Lowell Sun explains the program in more detail and I commend it to my colleagues attention. So that Members of Congress may read about this important new departure, I insert the Lowell Sun article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Lowell (Mass.) Sun, Nov. 23, 1969]

UNIQUE PLAN CUTS DROPOUT RATE

LOWELL.—An outstanding and unique "Work Experience Program" originated at Lowell High School in 1965 currently is meeting with sufficient success to draw the attention of the Mass. State Board of Education and that of school boards and administrators throughout the state.

In contrast to the Work-Study plans which now are and have been in vogue throughout New England high schools for a number of years, the brainchild of Lowell High's Placement Director Christopher Mitchell assumes that participating students are matched to work situations which fall within their related fields of study and interest. In the Work-Study program, pupils simply work at anything the school can find for them to do whether the work be relevant to their studies or totally unrelated. The Work-Study plan in most instances exists purely to allow financially-distressed pupils to obtain extra funds . . . period.

Mr. Mitchell's Lowell High Work Experience Program on the other hand is aimed not only at financial assistance for participating pupils but also toward augmenting studies in their selected fields of interest . . . fields in which they may and in most cases will seek employment upon graduation. Regarding graduation; the Miller plan has become an insurance against a student's giving up the educational battle and joining the ranks of luckless dropouts. This year alone, the Work Experience Program has succeeded in enticing 17 potential dropouts into finishing school . . . full four years of high school while at the same time, being gainfully employed two to six hours a day in fields analogous to their studies and future careers.

As far as is known, no other such program hinges upon a student's being required to accept employment in and to do preparatory study in some area related to his part-time employment. One of the most valuable assets accruing to a student participating in the program is the fact that he, upon graduation, can apply for employment in a specific field and not only have his high school diploma as a credential, but added weight of proving he has had at least a year's experience . . . and

successful experience working in that specific field. Potential employers seldom hand such an applicant a "don't call me, I'll call you" brush-off.

The entire Work Experience Program is geared to the so-called "gray area" high school pupil. He or she is the one who is headed for his diploma (barring becoming a dropout) so generally educated he isn't truly equipped for any speciality in the economic world which is increasingly dominated by highly specialized industrial complexes.

One of the strengths of Work Experience Program lies in its recognition that, to succeed, the program must enlist the co-operation of industry in on-the-job training. Industry with alacrity. It has become just what the program prospectus stated industry must: The laboratory for training and experience for participating students.

Not only has the State Board of Education approved of and lauded the program, industries which thus far have lent their support are equally enthusiastic. The young people who are accepted into the program, and who are trained on the job by these industries are considered by their employers as well worth their earnings, which are the minimum going salary for the particular industrial task being trained for.

EPISCOPAL DIOCESE OF CALIFORNIA SUPPORTS TITLE II REPEAL

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, it is heartening to know that freedom-loving and justice-seeking concerned citizens throughout our country are joining in growing numbers in the effort to repeal title II of the Internal Security Act of 1950—the infamous Emergency Detention Act.

As an indication of this growing concern, I am pleased to report that on October 21, 1969, leaders of the Episcopal diocese of California adopted overwhelmingly a resolution calling for the repeal of the Emergency Detention Act.

This concentration camp authorization law, passed over President Truman's veto in 1950, provides that upon the President's declaration that a state of "internal security emergency" exists in this country, the U.S. Attorney General may apprehend and detain any person as to whom "there is a reasonable ground to believe that such person probably will engage in, or probably conspire with others to engage in, acts of espionage and sabotage."

In supporting repeal of title II, the delegates at the 120th convention of the Episcopal diocese of California expressed the view that the type of detention authorized in the act as contrary to the legal principles of constitutional government.

In order that my colleagues may read the resolution in its entirety, I am privileged to submit it for inclusion in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point:

RESOLUTION SUPPORTING REPEAL OF TITLE II, 1950 INTERNAL SECURITY ACT—EMERGENCY DETENTION ACT OF 1950

Whereas the Internal Security Act of 1950 provides, in Title II, for the Emergency Detention, under circumstances declared by

the President to be an "Internal Security Emergency", of persons believed likely to engage in or to conspire with others to engage in acts of treason or of espionage, and

Whereas this type of detention without a hearing is contrary to the legal principles of constitutional government, and

Whereas the experience of this country with such a measure in the internment of Japanese-Americans in World War II produced results that were less than desirable, and

Whereas at the present time Senate and House bills supporting the Repeal of Title II (Emergency Detention Act of 1950) are pending in Congress, namely S. 1872 and H.R. 11825, now, therefore,

Be it resolved that the 120th Convention of the Episcopal Diocese of California support the Repeal of Title II (Emergency Detention Act of 1950), of the Internal Security Act of 1950, and

Be it further resolved that this Convention urge the people of the Diocese to write their legislators in support of the House and Senate bills (S. 1872 and H.R. 11825) to repeal the Emergency Detention Act of 1950.

Note: This resolution was passed by the Department of Social Relations on September 9, 1969 and by Diocesan Council on October 21, 1969.

TWO MARYLANDERS KILLED IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, WO John H. Whittington and Sp5c. Mark F. Tearl, two fine young men from Maryland, were killed recently in Vietnam. I wish to honor their memories by including the following article in the RECORD:

TWO MARYLANDERS, WHITTINGTON, TEARL, KILLED IN VIET ACTION

The Department of Defense yesterday announced that two Maryland Army men, one of them from Baltimore, were killed in "non-hostile" action in Vietnam.

The two men were:

WO 1 John H. Whittington, 21, 3044 Arunah avenue, in Baltimore.

Army Spec. 5 Mark F. Tearl, 22, 309 Oak street, in Edgewood, Maryland.

Mr. Whittington died Monday in an Army hospital in Yokohama, Japan. He was injured October 28 when the helicopter he was piloting crashed.

He had been in Vietnam six months, according to his mother, Mrs. John H. Whittington, of Baltimore.

CITY COLLEGE GRADUATE

He was a graduate of City College in 1966 and attended Morgan State College for a year before enlisting in the Army. While in high school, Mr. Whittington was on the wrestling and cross-country teams and played trumpet in the school band. He also was a member of Kappa Alpha Tau fraternity.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete at this time.

Mr. Whittington is survived by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. John H. Whittington, of Baltimore; his paternal grandmother, Mrs. Clara Whittington, of Baltimore; his maternal grandparents, Mr. and Mrs. Norman Spriggs, of Baltimore; and three brothers, Norman, Aaron and Alan Whittington, all living at home.

SECOND VIETNAM TOUR

Specialist Tearl died November 17 in Vietnam when the plane in which he was flying crashed.

He was finishing his second tour of duty in Vietnam and was scheduled to return to Edgewood next January 29.

Specialist Tearl was born in Wilmington, and moved with his family to Edgewood, Md., when he was a boy. He attended high school there and was active in football and baseball.

He also attended Harford Junior College briefly before enlisting in the Army.

Funeral arrangements are incomplete at this time.

Survivors include his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Stephen J. Tearl, Sr., of Edgewood; a brother, Lawrence Tearl, who lives at home; and three step-brothers, Stephen J. Tearl, Jr., of Edgewood, Arthur Tearl, and James Tearl, of Wilmington.

SPEECH ON PATRIOTISM

Hon. PETER H. B. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, recently the history classes of the Washington Township School in my congressional district sponsored a school assembly program in observance of Veterans Day.

One of the student speakers during the program, Doris Schumacher, delivered a speech on patriotism and what it means to be an American.

I feel that Miss Schumacher's comments deserve the attention of my colleagues in the House and would like to include her comments in the RECORD at this time:

SPEECH ON PATRIOTISM

(By Doris Schumacher)

Many of us who have lived in a free America for a long period of time do not know what real patriotism is. Here is one story about a man who came from Europe. He had been persecuted in his own country during the war because of his race. After the war, he had been pushed about from one place to another. He had no home and no country, but he had a dream—somehow to reach America, the land of liberty. His son in America had finally located him and arranged for him to come to this country.

When the old man arrived, he was full of fear. He especially feared policemen because their uniforms resembled the soldiers who had ordered him about. At first he was afraid to talk freely, even to his own son! When he finally realized that he was not being spied upon, he whispered over and over again, "I want to be an American citizen". The man gradually lost his fear and gained the citizenship that he had once dreamed of.

Americans who have always lived in freedom sometimes take their precious liberty for granted. Stories like this one make you realize what a wonderful thing it is to be able to live our lives without fear, to speak freely, to take part in our government, to look in any man's eye as an equal, and just to be an American. You know that there are many people in the world today who do not have the liberties we have and who live more like slaves than like free men.

America was founded on the idea that human beings are entitled to live in freedom. We believe that our Democratic government and our way of life mean more liberty and happiness to more people than any system of government. You should be proud and thankful to be Americans.

Patriotism means unselfish service. Every American worthy of the name loves his coun-

try and respects the flag. But, Patriotism is more than a feeling. It is willingness to serve America, to put the Nation's welfare above our own. Our history is filled with stories of American Patriots who devoted their lives to their country.

Everyone knows such loyal patriots as George Washington, Ben Franklin, and Abe Lincoln. But there are many other patriots who have not gained such world recognition as Horace Mann, who believed citizens should pay taxes in order to support public schools. This was a very unpopular view in his time. But his campaign proved successful and new and improved schools sprang up all over the country.

Today, many public schools have pictures of Horace Mann to honor him because he worked hard to give every American child a chance to get an education.

A more recent patriot is Martin Luther King, Jr. He led a new kind of struggle for American Negroes civil rights. He was a trained minister so he was an inspiring speaker and showed Negroes how to protest actively, but peacefully. He believed that American Negroes had just as many rights as white people and set out to prove his point. In 1964 Martin Luther King won world recognition for his leadership of American Negroes and was awarded the Nobel Peace Prize and as most of you know he was assassinated in April of 1968.

An even more recent patriot is Private First Class John Lindaberry of Middle Valley who graduated from this school system not too many years ago. He fought for his country to restore peace and freedom in Viet Nam. He also gave his life so that the land he loved would remain free.

As I have given this speech many of you may have wondered, "What can I do in order to be a Patriot in my country?"

There are many things you can do, for example, you can display your flag on National holidays, be proud that you are an American, take part in Civic holidays, or just serve America by being good citizens day by day. And as you grow older you will have many more duties as a citizen like voting for the candidate of your choice, and as citizens of this great Democracy, you owe America your wholehearted loyalty and service!

A MINISTER SPEAKS FOR THE MAJORITY ON PROTEST

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in a time when more and more members of the clergy address themselves to secular issues, often with compassionate rather than practical orientation, it is interesting to read a sermon cast in the latter context. Such a sermon was delivered on November 17, 1969, by Dr. Raymond J. Bean of the First Baptist Church in Manchester, N.H.

I commend Dr. Bean's sermon to the thoughtful consideration of all readers of the RECORD:

THE SILENT MAJORITY

(Sermon by Dr. Raymond J. Bean)

"I tell you, if these were silent, the very stones would cry out." These words from Jesus are usually a part of the Scripture lesson read on Palm Sunday but I think they are most applicable to our day. It is obvious, of course, that stones don't cry out literally. Like the expression concerning the trees clapping their hands, or the stars sing-

ing for joy, I interpret this passage in a poetic sense. When the Pharisees, the religious leaders of the day, urged Jesus to make His disciples remain silent instead of acclaiming Him as the Messiah, He refused and uttered those words concerning the stones crying out if they were silent.

It is dangerous to assume that there are always real parallels between our day and any that has preceded us and perhaps even more so to talk about our generation in terms of our Lord's disciples. But while I recognize the differences, that is exactly what I want to do this morning. I want to talk about the silent majority, to use a phrase employed recently by President Nixon and often quoted in the days since his speech.

I realize that there is no unanimous agreement as to just how our generation should be likened to the disciples of our Lord. Are His present-day followers to be found among the minority who are so much in the headlines by their protests? Or are they in the silent majority? Or, perhaps, in both?

It is a fact that a good many clergymen have been making the headlines by their protests. Sometimes these have taken form of a sermon or a written article, sometimes it has been by an act to illustrate how they feel. They have indicated, for example, that they are opposed to the American participation in the War in Vietnam. There is a sizeable organization that has been going for some years which seeks to enroll ministers and get them to speak out against our involvement there. They seem to be in general agreement that we made a mistake getting into Vietnam and it is better late than never to think about getting out. They seem certain that if we make some meaningful gesture toward peace, it is bound to be followed by a similar one from the other side. Some of these clergymen were among the leaders who wanted us to stop the bombing, arrange cease-fires and now insist that we ought to withdraw even though no concession is made by the enemy.

A few of these men have carried their protest beyond the pulpit and the printed page. They have been arrested for involvement in such things as obstructing the orderly process of the Selective Service system and even for attempting to destroy the records of those who are enrolled. One also hears of them, from time to time, as being among the people who oppose R.O.T.C. on our campuses and object to the military research being carried on in our universities.

It is quite hopeless for the average person to attempt to reach or reason with such individuals. They seem sure that their actions are motivated by the same purity that caused Jesus to drive the money changers out of the temple. They protest our involvement in a society that is all too ready to make war not peace and to hate rather than to love.

This is an area where I have not been silent and if you have, I sincerely hope you will be silent no longer. While I am willing to believe that such ministers and priests are sincere in what they believe, I cannot but feel they are terribly wrong and are being used by others. Of course we would expect a minister to be opposed to war, against the slaughter of women and children. But I think we have a right to expect that spiritual leaders have a realistic approach to the age in which we live.

It is all too obvious that bombing pauses and cease-fires have been a terrible mistake. When a minister, or someone else, points out that we have had over 40,000 killed in Vietnam already, I remind him that such a total would not exist if we had pursued the war differently, if we hadn't assumed that the other side would play according to our rules. Big-hearted America kept trying for peace

and in the process enabled the enemy to increase his military potential at a terrible cost in American lives as well as South and North Vietnamese ones. How can we put any faith in the suggestion that we pull out of that unhappy land even if we have to do it alone? Does any serious student of world affairs honestly believe that would bring about peace? It would only result in a complete Communist takeover of South Vietnam with the execution or mutilation of the leadership of its villages and cities. This has taken place over and over again already—is there the slightest reason to think it would not take place again—especially when there was no chance of punishment for the murderers.

As I think of the situation in Vietnam, I am reminded of the parable of the Good Samaritan. There are those who would have us be like the priest and the Levite and turn away from a nation that is wounded and fighting for its life. No amount of oratory from the anti-war crowd will ever convince me that we do not have a duty as Christians, as Americans, to help preserve freedom in that part of the world. In so doing, we should realize, too, we may be making a great contribution toward its continuance everywhere. I have sometimes added this thought to the parable of the Good Samaritan: I think Jesus would have said that if the man who helped him had come along at the time the robbers were beating him, he ought to have done what he could to help him beat off the robbers—not merely wait to bind up his wounds later.

On the issue of Vietnam and the war, we have been silent too long. Those who have made the most noise are not in the majority. Let's stand up and be counted. Before we leave the subject of Vietnam let's remember that every demonstration in favor of abandoning the South Vietnamese, every speech in that direction by an American Senator makes the enemy feel a bit more confident that we will one day accept his terms for surrender and withdrawal. This has been made abundantly clear over and over again by the words which have come from Hanoi and its delegation at the so-called talks in Paris. It would be wrong to say that all those people who oppose President Nixon's policy are Communists or fellow-travellers but it is true to say that they are giving aid and comfort to the enemy.

Another area in which the silent majority are concerned is that of our colleges and universities. If education was once classified as the 3 R's it is now nearer the 3 D's—Disruption, Disobedience, and Demonstration. In a day when it is being urged that academic barriers should be lowered, to permit more of minority groups who cannot meet rigid standards for admission to be permitted to enter our institutions of higher learning, some of us would prefer to begin with an emphasis on harder standards for those who are already there—harder in terms of things academic and also in matters of discipline. Those students who do not measure up to the requirements in terms of grades or conduct should be dismissed without any hesitation.

It goes without saying that I belong to the old school of thought. It is my conviction that the faculty should decide what is going to be taught and the trustees should administer the program of the institution. If the students don't like it they can go somewhere else or go to work. This is not to say that they shouldn't have a voice through a student senate or some similar organization: it is to insist that they should not have the veto power or make the rules on faculty appointments or course requirements.

Apparently students find it quite easy today to drop their books at any time and take part in any kind of demonstration in

any part of the country. A moratorium march, or a demonstration is sufficient reason to forget classes and take part in doing one's thing. If those of use over 30, that segment of the population that the youngsters can't trust, don't quite understand the reason that prompts such action, it may be that we don't understand the vocabulary of the day. It is quite apparent that some words must have taken on completely opposite meanings to those they knew in our day as students. Take two examples that are common today:

The first of these is the expression "non-violent". This term was common to Mahatma Gandhi and to Martin Luther King. For both of these men it meant just what it seems to suggest. As a result of Dr. King's work, there was organized the Student Nonviolent Coordinating Committee. Any similarity between the original and the modern meaning of the title would be impossible to discover. Students involved in this organization have had no hesitation about resorting to violence against anything and anyone who did not see things their way.

The second organization is the so-called Students for a Democratic Society. It's a lovely title but it certainly doesn't mean what it suggests. Undoubtedly many have been taken in by the assumption that this is a body that seeks to build a society in which the will of the majority will prevail but that rights of the minority will be respected. The Students for a Democratic Society seem only interested in trying to have their point of view prevail—no matter what has to be done to insure that end. What they want is just the opposite of a democratic society. The will of the minority—themselves—is the only one that matters to them. They have made this abundantly plain by their demonstrations and their refusal to permit any other point of view when it could be avoided.

Our universities are supposed to be the ground in which liberal spirits can grow but when a little group of students is able to prevent a distinguished lecturer from speaking, as occurred recently at Dartmouth, one has to wonder what has happened to the idea of "liberal" which really means "free".

What arrogance it is for college students to assume that they are the authority for what courses should be taught, what political decisions should be made by the government, what contracts should be undertaken by the great industrial concerns of the nation and so on and so on.

I have minister friends who defend these young men and women who do such things. They see them as the finest generation of young people, filled with a genuine concern for the good of the land. I see them as spoiled sons and daughters of a permissive generation which has gratified every whim and has too often given them everything except a sense of purpose and a willingness to do their part in improving society. They condemn the establishment that their parents have provided but they offer no constructive suggestions for making it better.

A third area in which the silent majority is concerned is that of law and order. Last Thursday night Vice President Spiro Agnew pointed out that the American public can be given a false impression of what is happening because we are so dependent on television and that industry is controlled by only a few individuals. A handful or two of men determine what will be seen and heard and thus present the news from their point of view. It may even be said that they make the news since many people will have only the impressions they received from the lighted box. This, he illustrated by reference to the Democratic National Convention in Chicago. The television cameras were focused

on the police and their seemingly harsh treatment of young college-age youth who wanted to protest. Viewers saw clubs being swung and youths being herded off in arrests but the cameras never did record the provocations that brought on the police response. It was easy for some to assert that it was police brutality but the provocations have seldom if ever been equaled in American history.

But that incident was only one in a long series of attacks on law and order. We have seen the attitudes expressed as college students sought to take over the buildings on their campuses to try to enforce their opinion; in the sought-for confrontations with the police so the law enforcement officers would be charged with brutality. It is a simple sequence which is followed. People refuse to obey the officers and make it as difficult as possible for the men in blue to remove them. If they are required to use force or to drag them, they are accused of being brutal.

No more cheap and vicious attack on law and order has been witnessed than that which took place recently in a Chicago courtroom. Outside a crowd battled the police and inside the defendants sought to ridicule the American system of justice. Bobby Seale, 33, leader of the Black Panthers continued to refer to Judge Hoffman as a fascist and a pig. Some of the language he used was so bad the papers wouldn't print it. In spite of continued warnings from the judge, he kept on until he was bound and gagged. What a commentary on America, that a defendant has to be gagged to maintain sufficient quiet in the courtroom to enable the trial to take place! Seale was one of eight being tried for their part in inciting the riot in Chicago. Most Americans will not feel that Seale's sentence of 4 years is too heavy.

These are some of the areas in which the silent majority are vitally concerned. Others can be added but they are closely related to one or more of these. Gradually the silent majority is beginning to speak and to make its point of view felt. Why should it sit idly by and see its campuses destroyed by those who are less interested in learning than destroying?

Less concerned with the search for truth than in presenting their own juvenile viewpoint? Why should the American public continue to give vast sums to higher education if radical groups are permitted to disrupt the classes and take over the buildings? Why shouldn't we urge our judicial system from top to bottom to consider the rights of the majority as well as those few who want to destroy our way of life?

Who would you say are the Americans who most merit your respect this morning? Perhaps you would reply the astronauts on their moon journey. I appreciate their work and pray for their success. But my choice this morning would be two individuals: one an educator and the other a politician. Neither is the best known man in his field but, for me, at least, they speak the message that Americans need to hear and obey. The first is Dr. Hayakawa, the little Japanese American on the West Coast. He is a renowned authority in the field of literature and by accident he came to be the acting president of an institution where the radicals threatened its very existence. He brought to his task a courage and a common sense that the administrators of all our schools might well copy. The other man is vice-president Agnew. Vice-presidents traditionally live in the shadow of the president and this is to be expected. But Spiro Agnew is covered by a clear light rather than shadow as he speaks his mind on such acts as moratoriums and law and order. He is speaking for me and, I believe, for the great majority of Americans.

Yes, we have been silent too long. Let's have the courage to speak out on behalf of what we believe is right, the right way of life for Americans and for followers of our Lord. Jesus said "if these were silent, the very stones would cry out." I ask . . . if we are silent who else is going to cry out?"

INFORMING THE PUBLIC: TWO CASES IN POINT

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the recent anti-Vietnam war demonstrations in Washington illustrated the urgent necessity of alerting the public concerning radical and subversive involvement in causes and programs aimed at garnering large-scale public support. When the New Mobilization Committee To End the War in Vietnam was identified as having Trotskyites and Communists of various types in its leadership, a number of supporters had the good sense to disassociate themselves from the effort.

Fortunately, progress is being made in providing authoritative information for use by the public in this area. The much-maligned Subversive Activities Control Board has received from the Justice Department during this administration a total of 15 cases of individuals who have been identified as members of the national or local committees of the Communist Party, U.S.A. The Board, a quasi-judicial Federal agency, will hold public hearings in which these individuals have the right to cross-examine Government witnesses and to dispute the evidence presented. If the Board so judges, the individuals will be declared members of the CPUSA, and the public record will be available for the information of the public. Granted, 15 cases is but a modest beginning, but it is hoped that this listing will include organizations in the near future.

In all fairness it must be stressed that the SACB is not a self-starter agency, but is wholly dependent on the Justice Department for the cases which it receives. In the past unjustified criticism has been leveled at the Board for inaction when the Justice Department should have been the target of the protests. While the 15 cases cited above leave much to be desired, the determination to use the Board in the capacity for which it was created is heartening.

Earlier this year added publicity accompanied the Board's activities when Otto F. Otepka, the former security officer at the State Department, was appointed as one of its Commissioners. It will be remembered that his monumental fight with State extended over a 5-year period in which bureaucratic skullduggery and chicanery reached an all-time low. Fortunately for the record, the scheming, malicious efforts on one powerful Federal department to break a

solitary Government official is spelled out in "The Ordeal of Otto Otepka" by William J. Gill, former UPI correspondent and coauthor of "Suite 3505: The Story of the Draft Goldwater Movement."

Like the press coverage given the Otto Otepka case itself by some segments of the communications media, the publication of this important account has been a well-kept secret—the book reviewers have not exactly rushed to appraise its contents for the public.

The publication, "Best Sellers," a semimonthly review of current books, carried an objective appraisal of the Gill book in its November 15 issue. Published by the University of Scranton at Scranton, Pa., "Best Sellers" first opened shop in 1941. The review of the Otepka case by Robert B. Nordberg, professor of education at Marquette University is far from being totally favorable but does not prevent the reviewer from making this significant comment:

Yet, the book leaves one sorely troubled. It is an important document, deserving the attention of every American citizen. No library should be without it. (I have not said that often.)

At this point in the RECORD I include the Nordberg review of "The Ordeal of Otto Otepka," followed by an item of the Baltimore Sun of November 21 reporting on the latest cases forwarded to the Subversive Activities Control Board by the Justice Department:

THE ORDEAL OF OTTO OTEPKA

(Gill, William, J. Arlington House, Oct. 18, 1969, 505 p. \$8.00 (1))

Walt W. Rostow was said by President Johnson to have the most important job in the White House next to the President's. Yet, he had thrice been denied security clearance because of a long history of close association with Soviet espionage agents, a negative CIA evaluation of him, and a judgment by Air Force Intelligence that he was a security risk. So we read in this book by a free-lance writer, formerly a correspondent for UPI and a contributor to many well known publications, Mr. Gill is co-author of "Suite 3505: The Story of the Draft Goldwater Movement."

The book is about Otto Otepka, former Deputy Director of the State Department's Office of Security, who was subjected to an almost incredible campaign of frame-up, lies, and cover-ups. Why? Because he tried to enforce the laws and regulations on security that he was paid to enforce. Mr. Gill's purpose, obviously, is to acquaint the public with this incredible series of events. He documents a 1960 meeting of Dean Rusk, Robert Kennedy, and Otepka, at which Otepka was (in effect) asked to clear the thrice-rejected Rostow and declined to do so, or at least insisted on an adequate review. Henceforth, it seems, the New Frontier was out to get Otepka, although it took them years to do so. President Nixon appointed Otepka to the Subversive Activities Control Board, a vindication but not of the sort he had been led to expect.

What is William Gill saying? That Otepka was harassed and persecuted shamefully? He makes a convincing case for that. That Dean Rusk was an active if invisible participant in what was done? He makes a case for that, too. That the security system all but crumbled under Kennedy and Johnson, with very

serious results for the national interest? He also makes that case. But, he hints at more. Is he also saying that Dean Rusk and Walt Rostow were conscious agents of the Communist conspiracy? He is much closer to affirming it than to denying it. He even seems to suggest that John F. Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson while basically loyal to the United States, operated under the delusion that the Soviet and Chinese leaders were moderate, rational creatures, and thus did incalculable harm to freedom throughout the world.

At times, Mr. Gill is quite convincing. Unfortunately, his work is marred by two serious flaws. First, he often uses prejudicial language, in exactly the same way that infuriates him when his adversaries do it. Second, he seems unable to be objective, at least on this subject. With very few exceptions, his Washington is divided into saints (Otepka and his supporters) and devils. He is quick to impute the darkest motivation to those who were in any way against Otepka. If one of them did not see military service, for example, it could only be because he "ducked out" of it. There is a one-sidedness to the book. One feels that he cannot possibly know the truth until somebody has presented another side of the story. This is a polemic, not a history. Otepka probably recognizes that since he is presented as a moderate, cautious man. His one fault, Gill complains, is a stubborn refusal to call a spade a spade. Perhaps it is more nearly the case that Mr. Gill is inclined to call it a steam-shovel.

Yet, the book leaves one sorely troubled. It is an important document deserving the attention of every American citizen. No library should be without it. (I have not said that often.) The shameless cynicism of Joseph McCarthy in exploiting the Communist issue seems to have had the ironic result of making many people in very high places falsely conclude that the issue is something of a joke, despite Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Kim Philby, etc. It is too bad that Mr. Gill leans to over-statement and one-sidedness, because that weakens his presentation of what is undoubtedly one of the major developments of the 1960's. The enormity of what happened helps one to excuse him for going overboard here and there. Read it, by all means! (69-16946)

ROBERT B. NORDBERG, Ed.D.,
Professor of Education,
Marquette University.

MITCHELL LABELS 10 PERSONS REDS—ASKS SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD RULING

WASHINGTON, November 20.—John N. Mitchell, the Attorney General, asked the Subversive Activities Control Board today to declare 10 persons from 4 states members of the Communist party.

Such a finding by the board carries no penalty, however, and may be appealed to the courts.

Mr. Mitchell identified all the individuals as members of national or local committees of the Communist party.

They included: A. George Dawson, of Los Angeles, a national committee member; Leo Baefsky, of Monterey Park, Calif., a southern California district committee member; Shirley Kessler, of Monterey Park, of the same unit; Hans Richard Leuchtag and his wife, Alice, Indianapolis, of the Indiana Communist party; Ira Cohen, Gary, Indiana Communist party; James Rufus Fisher, of Wilkinson, Pa., Western Pennsylvania Communist party; Joseph Carl Fabrizio, Jr., Freedom, Pa., Western Pennsylvania unit; Jo Anne Elaine Gerber, Pittsburgh, 1968 educational director of the Western Pennsylvania Youth Club, and Frank I. Kinces, Philadelphia, Eastern Pennsylvania Communists party.

The board now must hold public hearings, after which an order could be issued declaring persons to be party members.

OUTSTANDING SCOUT GETS GOD AND COUNTRY AWARD

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Richard E. Snyder, a fine young man from Maryland, was recently awarded the God and Country Award. I wish to honor his achievement by including the following article in the RECORD:

OUTSTANDING SCOUT GETS GOD AND COUNTRY AWARD

Sunday, November 23, meant further achievement for Richard E. Snyder Jr., when presented his God and Country Award during church service by Rev. Julian A. Tavenner at the Havre de Grace United Methodist Church.

Scouts and Leaders from Boy Scout Troop No. 967 of the Havre de Grace United Methodist Church turned out in uniform to honor and witness his receiving the award.

One of the 12 Scout Law states "A Scout Is Reverent." All Scouts show this by being faithful in their religious duties, but some go further and give special service to their Church or Synagogue. This may qualify them for a Religious award. Such an award is not a Scouting award. It is conferred on the Scout by his Religious Leader. Working toward this goal for the past year and 10 months with Rev. Tavenner, Richard Jr. adds this achievement to his Scouting career. He is 16 years old, a Junior in high school taking data processing along with the academic course in preparation for college. He likes dramatics as well as all Scouting activities.

Having reached Eagle over a year ago, he didn't stop earning rank as he went on to earn the Bronze Palm, Gold Palm, and presently has earned Silver over Bronze Palm with earning 41 Merit Badges (almost twice needed for Eagle). Having held an officer's position in almost every phase over the past 5½ years as a Boy Scout (Asst. Patrol Leader, Patrol Leader, Troop Scribe, Troop Quartermaster, Troop Librarian, Asst. Senior Patrol Leader, Instructor), he is currently serving as Jr. Asst. Scoutmaster. He served as Den Chief with Cubs for a year, and has served in numerous community activities. He served as staff discussion leader in the fall a year ago, and this fall as leader of the Staff Scouts for Junior Leader Training for Harford District. He is an active Brotherhood member of the "Order of the Arrow." He was one of the three delegates and discussion leader for the National Order of the Arrow conference at Indiana University, Bloomington, Ind., during Aug. 1969 among 4,500 Arrow-members from all over the U.S.A. that meet every other year. He has earned, in addition to all Rank awards in Scouting, the 50-miler award, Historic Trails award, Scout Lifeguard, 2-mile Swim, Interpreter's (Spanish, which he is taking 3rd year of in school) stripe. He has been nominated as a candidate for "Report to the Nation" during February, 1970.

He has been a member of the Havre de Grace United Methodist Church for several years, and is a youth representative member of the Church board. He served as President of the United Methodist Youth fellowship (with over 60 members) during 1968-

69 year, and is presently serving as Chairman of Worship.

THE VIETCONG IS LOSING ITS GRIP

HON. CHARLES E. CHAMBERLAIN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. Speaker, as we consider today House Resolution 613, affirming the support of the House of Representatives for the President in his efforts to negotiate a just peace in Vietnam, I call the attention of my colleagues to two very timely and related articles appearing in the December 1969 issue of the Reader's Digest.

The first is a fresh assessment of the position of the Vietcong by the well-known columnist, Joseph Alsop, who recently completed his 18th journey through Vietnam since 1953. His report, which contains much encouraging news, concludes as follows:

The real key to the problem . . . is nothing more or less than the degree of resolution that will be shown by the President and the people who chose him as their leader. For the first time, it can be said with some assurance that if we want an honorable peace, we can get it by being resolute, and without over-long delays. But shall we? Who can tell?

At this point I include Mr. Alsop's article, "The Vietcong is Losing Its Grip", together with a succinct and reflective Reader's Digest editorial entitled, "Patience!"

THE VIETCONG IS LOSING ITS GRIP

(By Joseph Alsop)

(NOTE.—Since World War II, when he served under Gen. Claire Chennault in the 14th Air Force in China, Joseph Alsop has covered every war of serious interest to the United States and its allies, ranging from Korea and Malaya to the Middle East. He has visited Vietnam, always for extended periods, no fewer than 18 times, so that he knows the provinces and the people, both Americans and South Vietnamese, with real intimacy. Very few reporters have the background to make the kind of before-and-after comparison that Alsop has equipped himself to make.)

Before many months pass, there should be mighty few communist guerrillas, as well as mighty few people under Vietcong control, in the war against the VC in South Vietnam. The unreported process that is producing this dramatic and unforeseen result is the chief discovery that I made in Vietnam this September. It is an important discovery. For the progressive erosion of the whole Vietcong structure in South Vietnam—which is really what is happening—is bound to aid President Nixon greatly in his patient quest for an honorable peace.

It is simplest to begin with the way I made this discovery, vastly to my own surprise. This was my 18th visit to Vietnam since 1953. I spent most of my long trip going from district to district, quite literally from the DMZ to the Point of Ca Mau, always trying to find out what was happening in the crucial rice-roots war.

I specify the rice-roots war because two quite different, though related, wars are in fact being fought simultaneously in South Vietnam.

There is the big-unit war, in which the ARVN (South Vietnamese) and American and other allied troops fight mostly against North Vietnamese (NVA) battalions and regiments. And there is the rice-roots war, in which the true VC—the native communist South Vietnamese who serve as hamlet or village guerrillas, or as soldiers in the local-force companies—are the enemy. In this war the main burden is carried by the South Vietnamese “territorial” forces: the little Regional Force companies and Popular Force platoons, and the thousands upon thousands of villagers who have now joined the People's Self Defense Force.

Populated districts, rather than remote and empty base areas, are the scene of the rice-roots war, and district chiefs are in effect the frontline commanders. Since they are fighting the VC around the clock (and hardest of all, at night), the district chiefs and their American advisers know their enemy rather intimately.

THE RICE-ROOTS WAR

To start getting a feel of the countryside I first visited Cu Chi district, in Hau Nghia province. For many years Cu Chi had been celebrated as a VC mini-fortress. The able and courageous South Vietnamese district chief, Maj. Nguyen Xuan Sanh, had administered this little patch of rural Vietnam, with its tens of thousands of hardworking people, for more than a year and a half. I asked him for a before-and-after comparison.

“When I came here,” Major Sanh answered, “it was very different.” In this one district, the VC had at its command the Cu Chi local-force battalion, plus four local-force companies, plus over-strength guerrilla platoons in every village, plus guerrilla squads in almost every hamlet—well above 800 fighting men, altogether. They fought hard, too. And although officially it was *my* district the VC party secretary for the district controlled most of Cu Chi.

And now? The answer was eye-opening. First, Major Sanh ticked off the units he no longer had to fight, beginning with the Cu Chi battalion. Since 1963 this had been a famously tough VC outfit, but in only seven weeks of 1968, it had lost four successive battalion commanders! The same hard fighting had also transformed the battalion's basic character; for there were no more recruits from the district to fill the terrible gaps in the ranks, and North Vietnamese infiltrators had to be used as replacements. Meanwhile, the North Vietnamese big units in the province were in just as much trouble. In the end, this battered VC battalion, so long deep-rooted in the soil of Cu Chi, was called out of the district to strengthen the 268th NVA Regiment.

For the same harsh reasons—heavy losses and near-zero recruitment—Cu Chi's four local-force companies had also dwindled, until only two were left. “And those two companies, with a combined strength of about 40 men, are more like platoons,” said Major Sanh's American adviser, with marked satisfaction. Next, to my astonishment, the major and his adviser all but began counting the remaining VC in Cu Chi on their fingers. After knowingly reviewing the different situations in their villages and hamlets, they put the number of surviving guerrillas at about two dozen. In sum, this district—where only 18 months earlier the VC had some 800 fighting men—no longer contained more than a hunted remnant of around 60 armed VC. Most important of all, and in consequence, effective control of Cu Chi had naturally passed from the VC party secretary to Major Sanh.

The lesson I learned in Cu Chi suggested that the whole VC structure in Vietnam must be in deep trouble. This is a complex structure, exactly comparable to a clandestine government, with all the usual departments that any government must have. Yet its real strength in any district or province

can always be measured with considerable accuracy by the numbers of armed VC. A VC village chief in refuge in deep jungle cannot function if he has no guerrillas to enforce his orders in his former village; and a province secretary hiding in the mountains, if he has no armed men to impose his will in the province's populated areas, is finished. All over South Vietnam, therefore, I asked the people in the districts, “How many armed VC do you still have to fight?” And what I learned in this manner is bad news for Hanoi—good news for our side.

NEW-FOUND PEACE

Our side should know, for example, that there are now whole districts, even whole provinces, where the VC structure has been entirely uprooted. These are still exceptional, but they are profoundly exciting. For in huge areas of this beautiful country, the industrious, long-enduring people are enjoying real peace for the first time in many years. The fertile coastal strip, which supports the entire population of Thua Thien and Quang Tri provinces, is a good example.

Except in two fringe districts still directly threatened by North Vietnamese troops, there are virtually no ARVN or U.S. forces in the long, rich strip. The regular troops are not there any longer because there is no enemy there any longer. The “territorial” self-defense troops stand guard, of course, against any attempted reinfiltration by the few hundred surviving VC, who have taken refuge in the mountains over toward the Laotian border.

Three of the less exposed districts of Thua Thien province are even being given a civilian administration—another first in Vietnam since the war started! And everywhere along the coastal strip, the people are tilling fields long fallow, heaping up new dikes to keep the salty sea tides from the land, rebuilding schoolhouses and roads and markets, and generally resuming the busy, cheerful, normal life of rural Vietnam in peacetime.

For the present, to be sure, this wonderful, new-found peace of the million people in this area squarely depends on the continuing presence of U.S. and ARVN troops, to the west and north. From base areas in Laos, and from above the DMZ, no fewer than ten North Vietnamese regiments keep trying to press into the two provinces. If they ever manage to break through the protective screen of U.S. and ARVN troops, these Northern regiments will carry fire and sword all up and down the coastal strip. This is therefore something that President Nixon has to think about, when he ponders thinning the protective screen by further U.S. troops withdrawals. But what Hanoi has to think about is the effective elimination of just about the whole VC structure in Thua Thien and Quang Tri.

Hanoi has other unpleasant things to think about. Take Hau Nghia province, where my district-hopping began. In 1965, this was the province with the largest number of armed VC in the whole of Vietnam—more than 10,000 of them. But in the last year and a half, the same things that happened in Cu Chi have also happened in the other districts of Hau Nghia, so the total of armed VC in the whole province has dropped to no more than 400. You cannot say that the VC structure has been absolutely uprooted: this wretched, always dwindling remnant still hangs on precariously in the province's populated areas. There is no peace in Hau Nghia, either, because North Vietnamese big units, like the 268th Regiment, are also hanging on precariously. But, as their captured documents tell us, the condition of the VC structure in Hau Nghia is now dreadful to contemplate. And there are a good many other provinces, such as Binh Duong, also in III Corps, or Go Cong, in the Delta, where the VC structure is in the same grave plight.

THE DAYS ARE NUMBERED

Finally, there is a third kind of situation, which I found in the provinces of lower I Corps, in big Binh Dinh province in II Corps, and in the VC's stronghold provinces in the Delta. In these places the VC's rice-roots strength, though still considerable, is visibly and rather rapidly declining. Everywhere the VC guerrillas and local-force soldiers are being killed or captured, most often by the government's territorial forces. In increasing numbers they are also defecting to the government, or fading into the landscape. And, everywhere, the VC recruiters are getting at best only one replacement—most often a woman or a little boy—for every three guerrillas they lose. Any structure suffering heavy and continuous losses, and unable to replace more than one loss in three, is obviously in trouble.

When I got back to Saigon from a trip to lower I Corps, I also got a crude numerical measurement of the erosion of the VC in the areas where they are strongest. Lower I Corps is one of these areas. The numbers of armed VC are still formidable but dropping conspicuously. I told what I had found to one of the most intelligent—and pessimistic—Americans in Vietnam.

“I've looked into all the facts,” said my friend, glumly. (And no one had a better opportunity to know the rice-roots facts!) “You have to be careful not to exaggerate. After all, the VC in those provinces have lost only 14 percent of their strength since the end of May, although I admit that this rate of loss is likely to continue, and may even rise.”

I answered, reasonably I think, that if I had lost 14 percent of all my worldly goods in three months, and were told I would go on losing indefinitely at the same rate, I should have to prepare for near bankruptcy before very long. That, so far as I can see, is what now lies ahead for the VC structure throughout South Vietnam. Even in those provinces where the VC as yet retain real strength, their days are numbered, unless President Nixon is finally driven to throw in the sponge.

In the big-unit war, one must always bear in mind, Hanoi has long been using North Vietnamese rather than VC as cannon fodder. Yet the new erosion of the VC structure, with its far-reaching and inevitable effects on the rice-roots war, has enormous significance; and it is important to know how it began to happen, and why.

The real turning point was the Tet offensive of 1968. Shockingly misreported in this country, Tet was in fact a disaster for Hanoi and a double disaster for the VC. The ablest Southern leaders of the VC, and the most seasoned of their soldiers, fell in vast numbers. And the ruthless brutality of the Tet attacks caused the fence-sitting masses in the cities and the countryside to turn bitterly against the VC.

After Tet, new, much more effective methods of government control of the countryside were adopted—which deserve a whole separate report. This control has now been enormously extended, and is still extending. It is crowding the VC out of more and more hamlets and villages, radically reducing the old VC recruiting base, and each month causing thousands of the more faint-hearted VC to go over the hill as defectors.

THE BIG-UNIT WAR

If the tide is turning in the rice-roots war, what of the big-unit war—the war fought with North Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam?

First, let's take a look at the massive numbers of troops that Hanoi has in fact sent to South Vietnam. This movement has not been infiltration so much as continuous invasion—and on a scale that most people will find hard to credit.

Imagine the United States sending off to a foreign war, in a single year and with little hope of return, all the able-bodied young Americans who reached draft age in 1965, 1966 and 1967. It is not easy to imagine, thank God, because we have never done anything like that. Yet that is closely comparable to what Hanoi did in 1968. To provide manpower for the Tet offensive and its two sequels, Hanoi in truth sent southward in that one year just under 350,000 men—despite the fact that in North Vietnam only about 125,000 able-bodied youths annually reach military age.

And this was merely the climax of a long process. At least 400,000 had already been sent off to the war in the South before the year of Tet began. Hence, when the Hanoi war planners studied their balance sheets after the dire failure of the third of the 1968 "victory" offensives, the first item on the debit side was the sacrifice of six entire "year classes" of North Vietnamese young men!

Any government not completely irrational would be inclined to stop, look and listen, after throwing so many of its young men down the drain to no good military purpose. And this is just what Hanoi did. The numbers being sent off to the South were sharply cut back, from an average of 29,000 a month in 1968, to 10,000 a month in the first six months of 1969, and to only about 3500 a month since July. The cutback was not a "signal" but a practical response to the cruel pressure of hard facts; and one may be sure that the cutback was a belated victory for those in the Hanoi Politbureau who have always advocated "protracted war," against the advocates of the much more costly "big-unit" war.

THE STRATEGY PARALLEL

Protracted war is the Hanoi theorists' phrase for classical guerrilla war, fought with small units and with minimal losses. After Hanoi's frightful and fruitless manpower losses in the 1968 offensives, it was only natural for its advocates to get their innings at last. No doubt they were aided, too, by the argument that American public opinion would not stand for a war indefinitely protracted. And their new policy could perhaps work, if the people President Nixon calls the "bug-outs" finally prevail in this country.

But if the President means what he has rather grimly said, about refusing to become "the first President of the United States to lose a war," he can take comfort from the fact that reversion to protracted war, which might have worked well in 1965, is working horribly badly in 1969. Four years ago, the Saigon government and army had had no time to recover from the near-total disintegration of the whole political-administrative apparatus that followed the death of President Ngo Dinh Diem. Meanwhile, the VC firmly controlled vast areas of the countryside; they had large reserves of manpower, and everywhere possessed the high morale that the South Vietnamese army then lacked.

By the beginning of this year, in contrast, the Saigon government and army had been strengthened in many ways; the huge fence-sitting element of the masses had been decisively turned against the VC; the VC structure and manpower reserves had also been severely strained. Furthermore, the whole VC structure had come to depend heavily on big-unit support. From 1966 onward, in fact, there was a kind of rough division of responsibilities: while the VC structure controlled as much of the countryside as possible, the North Vietnamese in the big units bore the main brunt of the fighting. In these greatly changed circumstances, Hanoi then began to starve the big units of replacements. The support for the VC structure was therefore drastically weakened; and the erosion of that structure thereupon became serious.

This is terribly bad news for Hanoi, because the protracted war that Hanoi is now trying to fight is, basically, guerrilla war; and you cannot indefinitely protract a guerrilla war if the number of guerrillas is continuously shrinking at a heavy rate. The rate of loss is such that, unless premature American troop withdrawals change the whole picture, the VC structure can be in ruins in most of South Vietnam by next spring. This constitutes a time problem for Hanoi, every bit as grave as the time problem President Nixon confronts because of American impatience to get the war over with.

Indeed, if you think about it, Hanoi's way of dealing with the war in South Vietnam has always oddly paralleled Washington's way of dealing with it. Both governments began in a small way, Hanoi aiding the VC, Washington aiding Saigon. Before U.S. intervention, Hanoi had in fact sent only two North Vietnamese divisions to the South, and the Hanoi Politbureau—which also controls the VC, of course—was counting on winning all of South Vietnam for this small investment of Northern manpower. Both governments then put in more and more troops, although, proportionately, the American effort was trifling.

For remember that the North Vietnamese sent off to the war in the South numbered close to 750,000 men by the end of 1968. Proportionately, because Vietnam is a small country, this figure is actually equivalent to about ten million Americans! Yet few of these poor North Vietnamese conscripts will ever come home again; and none at all have been sent home as yet, except for tragic thousands of hopeless cripples.

Both governments also responded in parallel to the bloody climax of the year of Tet. President Nixon's graduated withdrawal program is comparable to the Hanoi Politbureau's somewhat earlier decision to reduce greatly the flow of North Vietnamese troops to the South, and thus to transfer much more of the burden to the VC. To complete the parallel, picture what would have happened to the American effort in Vietnam if the Saigon government and army had fulfilled Hanoi's best hopes by collapsing under the impact of the 1968 offensives. You then get a rough idea of how unmanageable Hanoi's problems will be, if the erosion of the VC structure continues to the point of final breakdown all over South Vietnam.

IN SEARCH OF AN END

So we come back to the question: What can Hanoi do about it? I believe (or perhaps I should say, I hope with good reason) that we can rule out any prolonged return to the former dreadful level of expenditure of North Vietnamese manpower. If Ho Chi Minh were still alive, this would be less easy to rule out. But a viciously divided Politbureau, including at least four rivals for supreme power, and without the final arbiter of all decisions, is surely unlikely to be able to agree on resuming the appalling yearly sacrifice of three whole year classes of men of fighting age.

For the same reasons, however, it seems almost equally unlikely that this divided Politbureau will be able to agree on open admission of defeat. Seriously negotiating in Paris, on the basis of President Nixon's minimum condition of self-determination for the South Vietnamese, would really amount to that kind of open admission.

All the same, one must be careful to remember the difference between the two kinds of war, the Vietcong rice-roots war and the North Vietnamese big-unit war, that are now going on in Vietnam.

Unless—and it is an important unless—President Nixon withdraws too many U.S. troops too soon, it is hard to see anything Hanoi can do to avoid effective defeat for the Vietcong in the rice-roots war in the next six to ten months. What is happening at the

rice-roots cannot even be much slowed down, in fact, except by the kind of North Vietnamese big-unit effort that would require Hanoi to invest manpower as ruthlessly as in 1968.

On the other hand, the Hanoi leaders are remarkably wily, obstinate and resilient. They can still use all sorts of tactics of delay to keep the big-unit war going at a low level, in order to wear out American patience. They can also assault American public opinion politically, by proposing the kind of fake cease fire that would permit massive North Vietnamese re-invasion of the South after American withdrawal. Or they can assault our public opinion even more directly, by mounting one or more spasm offensives—relatively low in cost, not really aimed to achieve solid military results, but sure, nonetheless, to increase casualty rates.

In sum, victory in the rice-roots war against the VC, which can now be hoped for, should in the end (but only in the end) be decisive, because, in the long run, it will create unmanageable problems for Hanoi. Yet most of the real fighting in Vietnam, above the rice-roots level, has long been done by Hanoi's North Vietnamese troops; and Hanoi still has various ways to drag out this other war, or even to change its character. At the moment, for instance, two of the North Vietnamese divisions that formerly threatened III Corps from Cambodian bases are apparently moving into the Delta, where there are no longer any U.S. troops.

Gen. Creighton W. Abrams, the brilliant U.S. commander in Vietnam, is reportedly confident that the resulting test between South Vietnamese and North Vietnamese big units will turn out very well indeed. Pray God he is as correct this time as he has been in the past; but the fortunes of war are never exactly predictable.

In any case, however, the real key to the problem in Hanoi is nothing more nor less than the degree of resolution that will be shown by the President and the people who chose him as their leader. For the first time, it can be said with some assurance that if we want an honorable peace, we can get it by being resolute, and without over-long delays. But shall we? Who can tell?

PATIENCE!

For nearly five long years our nation has been immersed in a bloody, baffling and undeclared war 12,000 miles from our shores. The immediate aim of the United States in this effort is to prevent the enforced communist domination of a people who ask only to be allowed to live in freedom. Seldom if ever in our history have we endured a more frustrating and traumatic experience.

Into the deltas and jungles of South Vietnam we have poured some 95 billions of dollars of our treasure. We have seen nearly 40,000 of our young men go to their graves. The American objective in this war has been clear and carefully limited. We seek no territory. We seek only to give the people of South Vietnam an opportunity to determine their own destiny. Our immutable bedrock position is that the communist enslavement of the nations of Southeast Asia must stop at the 17th parallel.

Four American Presidents have committed our nation to this position—in the belief that the defense of South Vietnam is a defense not only of one country but of all of Asia.

Despite the dimensions of the threat, the United States has conducted the most restrained war that any nation has ever fought. Now, at last, we begin to see the successful end to our efforts. The American and South Vietnamese troops, as well as the troops of other nations who have fought, bled and died in this cause, have brought the war to a point where it is impossible for the enemy to win it by force of arms.

As the following article by Joseph Alsop points out, the enemy is in serious trouble.

The Vietcong guerrillas control less and less of the countryside, and the North Vietnamese armies are feeling the heavy drain on their manpower. That the United States is able to order the withdrawal of 60,000 troops from Vietnam—with more to come—shows that our position is increasingly strong. The leaders of the communist world know that time is no longer on their side.

Why, then, do they continue to hold out? Where do they look for hope of victory? As they survey the scene of battle, the North Vietnamese leaders and their Soviet and Chinese allies do not yet despair, for they know there still remains one resource that can tip the scale in their favor.

The enemy's greatest hopes lie in the division that he has created in public opinion in the United States. This is why the enemy fights on. This is why the Soviet Union has continued to support him in Vietnam. This is why Hanoi holds out in Paris. This is why the enemy refuses concession after concession offered him at the conference table. He clings to the belief that the American patience will run out, that sooner or later the American people will persuade their President to run up the white flag of ignominious surrender.

This is the hope that keeps the enemy going. Were it not for this, the war would have ended before this. No one will ever know how many American boys have gone to their death because the enemy holds on, watching for signs that American resolve is weakening.

To the enemy the constant outcries in the United States must sound like so many bombs being dropped against our troops in South Vietnam. The anti-war speeches in Congress, the campus protests from students and faculty, the barrage of defeatist editorials in some of the most powerful newspapers, these are worth regiments and whole divisions to the enemy. He reads his newspaper, hears the broadcasts, rubs his hands and once more refuses to talk in Paris, refuses to call his invaders back from South Vietnam.

Where it not for his belief that the American patience will crack, the enemy would lose his reason to keep on fighting. It is a monstrous irony that the louder the protest is raised against the war, the longer the war will continue.

Most of those who oppose the war sincerely believe that they are somehow helping to save the United States from error. But against that minority belief must be weighed the cost to the nation. For these are the voices that are listened to in Hanoi—and these are the voices that prolong the months of battle. In the interests of peace, they should now be lowered.

The President of the United States has said that he will not be shaken from his resolve to honor our nation's commitment—and our dead—in Vietnam. In this resolve, he is neither blind nor willful. No matter how loud the clamor from critics in Congress becomes, he will hold his course. He knows the nature of the enemy, the nature of the enemy's designs in Asia and the world. Most of all, he knows the consequences of a craven act of surrender on our part in South Vietnam. The results would haunt us for years to come.

The first consequence would be a blood bath for our friends—the certain slaughter of tens of thousands of South Vietnamese whose only mistake was to have trusted the word and will of the United States. The communists would deal swiftly and unmercifully with these as they butchered their way to power. Lest there be any doubt about this, we have only to look at what happened in Hue, where several thousand South Vietnamese were shot or buried alive during the brief communist occupation of the city during the 1968 Tet offensive.

The next to suffer from our betrayal would be the nearby countries of Cambodia, Laos, Thailand and Malaysia. They could not hope

to remain free once the South Vietnamese roadblock to communism had been removed. The communist domination of Southeast Asia would shake countries even farther away—such as Indonesia, India, Japan.

Vietnam has come to be a crisis point. If America and its allies in South Vietnam were to fail, the cause of freedom would fall and the area of freedom would be diminished. The lesson would be clear for all to read. *Defeat lies in store for those who put their trust in the United States. Freedom is a dead dream; the future belongs to the enslaver.*

If the world were to witness such a defeat, the United States, leader of the free world, overnight would lose the respect of the world and would lose its self-respect. In a test of will, the United States would have been found wanting. In a test of conscience, the United States would have been found to have no conscience. In a test of strength, the United States would have been found to have no strength enough.

Did 39,000 American boys die for this? Has America forgotten the stuff it is made of, its purpose in the world?

If one listened only to the cries of those who urge peace at any price, one would have cause to question as Hanoi must question—the essential fiber of this nation. But the cries for a dishonorable end to the war do not reflect the will of anything like the majority of the American people. Nor do many of those who urge withdrawal really mean that they would accept peace on the enemy's terms. They simply want—as who does not?—an end to the war.

It is easy for the enemy to underestimate this country. In waiting for us to surrender, he hears the shrill protests and misses the true, patient heartbeat of America. This country has never lost a war; it has never surrendered to an enemy. And it is not about to do so now.

The need today, when an honorable end to the war is within sight, is for courage and patience, in the best American tradition. When their country is in trouble the American people close ranks and stand together. Together, we have brought our country through many storms.

We are now in the midst of a storm, and we will see it through. If the enemy is counting on this nation to falter, he is wrong. The heart of America is as strong as ever, and its patience will endure. Our enemy need not question it. Our allies need not doubt it. Our President need not wonder.

THE ROLE OF THE NEWS MEDIA

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, the role of the media both in reporting and as an active agent in the happenings of our times is beginning to receive some serious consideration.

There are those who assert that we now have a form of censorship in the media in the sense that what is reported, how widely it is reported, the prominence given the story, and the time at which it appears are all determined by individuals over whom the public exercises no appreciable control. Individuals as diverse as Robert Kennedy and Spiro Agnew, Lyndon Johnson, and Richard Nixon have been critical of the informational resources given our Nation. If the premise is accepted that a form of news control now exists—reportedly major

news magazines such as Time, Newsweek, and Life first declined to purchase and run the Song My story—then the question becomes whether the censorship we have should be operated privately or publicly; whether the power to control news flow, content, and coloration should depend on financial strength and inclination, or whether it should be handled by public elected or appointed individuals subject to removal through the exercise of the public will.

Accordingly the article "Press Coverage of Civil Disorders" appearing in the Public Opinion Quarterly, fall 1969 issue, is of considerable interest in reflecting the degree of responsibility exercised, and sometimes not exercised, in the media.

An excerpt follows:

EXCERPT FROM "PRESS COVERAGE OF CIVIL DISORDERS"

A CASE STUDY OF WINSTON-SALEM, 1967

"A variety of voluntary codes and guidelines—some devised by the police, some by city administrations, most by the media themselves—now govern the reporting of riots in many American cities. Designed to curb flamboyant or sensational accounts that might exacerbate racial tensions, these guidelines may also have unanticipated and less desirable consequences. The following case study analyzes the implications of one newspaper's coverage of one such disorder.

"David L. Paletz is Assistant Professor of Political Science at Duke University and Robert Dunn is a student there.

"Racially larded civil disorders have occurred throughout American history. Until the advent of television, the press provided the basic source of information on these minacious disturbances. Yet, surprisingly, there are few attempts to evaluate, analyze, or even describe the way the press covered such events. Academies have been notably derelict. This essay is one small attempt to rectify the scholarly omission. We briefly canvass the nature of newspaper coverage of riots during the period 1919-1943. Then we peruse the ways recent racial disturbances have been treated in the press. In the body of the paper, to examine a newspaper in action, we report on the results of a case study we conducted of the treatment by the Winston-Salem Journal of that city's November 1967 riot. This leads to certain uneasy reflections on the present nature and future direction of riot coverage in the press.

PRESS COVERAGE OF RACIAL DISTURBANCES

"According to the limited research actually conducted, prior to the 1960's racial disturbances extensive enough to be considered riots consisted primarily of violent clashes between whites and Negroes. In most instances black people were the victims of white aggression. Many attacks were stimulated by the local press. The classic example is the Washington, D.C. fray of mid-July 1919 when the Washington Post, with its vastly exaggerated tales of Negro rapists, played a major role in provoking the disturbance. The press of East St. Louis is supposed to have played a similar role in provoking the riots that occurred in that city in the same month. In Chicago, which also experienced major racial conflict in July 1919, the press gave Negroes scarcely better shrift. As the Chicago Commission on Race Relations pointed out:

"Negroes in Chicago almost without exception point to the Chicago press as the responsible agent for many of their present difficulties. Throughout the country it is pointed out by both whites and Negroes that the policies of newspapers on racial matters have made relations more difficult, at times fostering new antagonism and enmities and

even precipitating riots by inflaming the public against Negroes.

"When the riots occurred it appears the press tended to misreport events to the detriment of Negroes. And when trials followed riot, much of the press viewed Negro defendants as guilty and presented their cases less than fairly. Not all the press was culpable, but much of it deserved Seligmann's indictment:

"It will be the work of years to undo the poisonous and anti-social accomplishments of such organs as The Omaha Bee, The Washington Post and The Times, The Chicago Evening Post, The New York Times, in fact of the majority of American newspapers.

"The next major outbreaks of racial conflict occurred in Detroit, Harlem, and Los Angeles in 1943. The dearth of research here is even greater than we encountered in summarizing the 1919 disturbances. In general the press appears to have been less virulent and more constructive, but an accurate assessment would require the kinds of studies apparently not yet conducted."

I recommend the entire article for further study.

PEOPLE POWER—IN THE DEFENSE OF CHRISTMAS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, through the length and breadth of our land we are witnessing something new and encouraging. The American people have had enough—and they are saying so.

For long years the Hitler technique of the big lie has been applied in America. The closely controlled news media have drummed the never-changing theme of socialism, collectivism, and internationalism into the minds of the people.

Crime, ignorance, failure, laziness—these are never the fault of the criminal, the ignorant, the failure or the lazy, but of "society" in some strange manner. If a test consistently proves that there are differences in people, then the test must be wrong. If children are incapable of learning English, then they must be taught Swahili. If the lowest segment of our society has no concept of family responsibility, then the family must be destroyed.

And, above all, the people know nothing. The bureaucratic autocrats are the only ones who are able to think for the people, to plan their lives, to educate their children.

But the people are now being heard. They are not alone. They are the majority, and all around the country, they are letting this be known.

I include a typical newsclipping of the restoration of Christmas in Massachusetts by irate parents, who just refused to believe that Christmas is un-American:

[From the Washington Post, Dec. 2, 1969]

SCHOOL BAN ON YULE RITES IS RESCINDED

MARBLEHEAD, MASS.—A ban on all religious reference to Christmas in Marblehead public schools has been rescinded after parents and children picketed the home of the school committee chairman and left an inflatable Santa Claus on his lawn.

"The program of observing religious holidays in the Marblehead public school system will continue as it has in the past," the school committee said in a statement Sunday.

The school department had issued a statement earlier saying: "All reference to the word Christmas will be eliminated in group activities planned in all Marblehead schools."

School Superintendent Aura W. Coleman said the ban had been adopted after a conference with clergymen of all faiths. In its new statement, the committee said it would not prohibit specific classroom activities, but would rely on the "sensitivity" of teachers in attempting to eliminate complaints of religious bias.

Coleman said that during the Christmas season last year he received "numerous complaints" from Jewish parents about their children's participation in school holiday activities.

In a 1963 ruling, former Attorney General Edward W. Brooke, now the state's junior U.S. senator, said observances were permissible as long as they were part of the educational process and had no specific religious connotation.

STANTON ON AGNEW

HON. LIONEL VAN DEERLIN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. VAN DEERLIN. Mr. Speaker, last week, in a speech to the International Radio and Television Society, Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, sharply rebuked the Vice President for the way in which Mr. AGNEW had criticized the news media. Dr. Stanton's greatest concern was over Mr. AGNEW's reference to television's being "sanctioned and licensed by Government," and to Mr. AGNEW's suggestion that "it is time that the networks were made more responsive to the views of the Nation."

Could this choice of words, employed by the second highest official in the administration, have been purely accidental? asked Dr. Stanton.

Mr. AGNEW insists they were. But to Dr. Stanton, and myself, these phrases have a distinctly ominous ring. Who, for instance, would the Vice President charge with the responsibility of "making" the networks more responsible to national views? The Vice President did not say, but the implication—the implied threat—seems rather obvious, to me at least.

Under unanimous consent, I include Dr. Stanton's speech of November 25 at this point in my remarks:

INTERNATIONAL RADIO AND TELEVISION SOCIETY, INC.

(Address by Frank Stanton, President Columbia Broadcasting System, Inc., New York, November 25, 1969)

I am not here to defend broadcast journalism as being beyond all criticism. No one could have worked as long as I have in radio and television without realizing that we are far from perfect in carrying out our enormous responsibilities in broadcast journalism. We have never been satisfied with the job we are doing. We are not satisfied now.

It is our continuing hope and our continuing effort to do better. We are concerned with what the press says of us. We are concerned with what our audiences write us. We are concerned with what our affiliates tell us. We do strive for objectivity, although it is not always easy to achieve. While freedom of the press is meaningless without the freedom to be wrong, we do try to be right. And I think that in the vast majority of cases we have succeeded.

Let me turn now to the events of the past few weeks that have commanded the attention of many of us. On November 3, the President of the United States delivered a much-publicized and eagerly-awaited speech presenting the Administration's position and plans on the war in Vietnam. That war has been the subject of one of the longest and most fervent public debates in all American history. Good, conscionable and dedicated men and women, from all sections of our society, have earnest and deeply-felt differences as to its meaning, its conduct and its prospects. Fundamental questions of rightness and wrongness have disturbed our people as no other issue in this century.

The President spoke for 32 minutes on all four nationwide television networks, four nationwide radio networks and scores of independent stations. Some 88 million people heard his words as they were conveyed, uninterrupted and in a place and under conditions of his own choosing. Following the President's address, each of the television networks provided comments by professionals analyzing the content of the speech. Participating were experienced newsmen, most of whom have performed similar functions for many years following the live broadcast of special events of outstanding significance. Since the participants were different on the four television networks, the comments of none of them were heard by the same huge audience that heard the President. One of the networks added to the expertise by presenting the views of a distinguished diplomat and public servant, who had held high posts in nine Presidential terms, of both parties, prior to the present Administration. Another presented the comments of two United States senators, who took divergent views of the policy advocated in the speech.

In all this, nothing unprecedented had happened. Such comments have customarily been offered after most significant Presidential appearances—State of the Union, Inaugurals, United Nations addresses, press conferences, for example. And they usually have been more than mere bland recapitulations, which would serve little purpose, and have frequently called attention to emphases, omissions, unexpected matters of substance, long anticipated attitudes, changes of views, methods of advocacy or any other aspect of the speech. Such comments have been offered by enterprising news organizations since the dawn of the modern press and continued into the era of radio and television.

Following the President's speech and following the relatively brief comments made directly after it, the White House was deluged with telegrams and letters approving the President's speech, the White House reported, by an overwhelming margin. Two days later, the Gallup Survey reported that nearly 4 out of every 5 of those who heard it, approved the President's speech and the course that it advocated with regard to Vietnam.

Ten days after the President's speech, the second highest official in the Administration launched an attack on the television networks on the grounds that critical comments on government policy as enunciated in a Presidential address might unduly influence the American people—even though, following such comments, the President received a 77 percent vote of confidence from those who heard him on the issue discussed.

The Vice President also censured television network news for covering events and personalities that are jolting to many of us but that nevertheless documented the kind of polarized society—not just here but throughout the world, whether or not there is television and whether it is controlled or free—in which, for better or worse, we are living. It is not a consensus society. It is a questioning, searching society—unsure, groping, running to extremes, abrasive, often violent even in its reactions to the violence of others. Students and faculties are challenging time-honored traditions in the universities. Young clergy are challenging ancient practices and even dogma of the churches. Labor union members are challenging their leaderships. Scientists, artists, businessmen, politicians—all are drawn into the fray. Frequently, because everyone is clamoring for attention, views are set forth in extreme terms.

As we do not propose to leave unreported the voice of the Vice President, we cannot in good conscience leave unreported any other significant voice or happening—whether or not it supports government policy, whether or not it conforms with our own views, whether or not it disturbs the persuasions of any political party or bloc. But no healthy society and no governing authorities worth their salt have to fear the reporting of dissenting or even of hostile voices. What a healthy society and a self-respecting government do have to fear—at the price of their vitality if not of their life—is the suppression of such reporting.

To strengthen the delusion that, as a news medium, television is plunging the nation into collapse and can be deterred only by suppressing criticisms and by either withholding bad news or contriving a formula to balance it with good news, the Vice President's speech was replete with misinformation, inaccuracies and contradictions. To deal adequately with all of these on this occasion would take us through the afternoon, but let me note some of them by way of example, then move on to consider with you the context of the Vice President's speech so far as the actions and statements of other Administration officials are concerned and, finally, make some observations on the significance of this unhappy affair.

The Vice President began his indictment of November 13 with a monstrous contradiction. He asserted flatly that "no medium has a more profound influence over public opinion" than television. And yet he also claimed that the views of America have been very little affected by this "profound influence," when he said, "The views of the majority of this fraternity [i.e., television network news executives and editors] do not—and I repeat, not—represent the views of America." The Vice President can't have it both ways. If the views of the American people show "a great gulf" between how a speech is received by them and how it is treated in a broadcast, obviously the treatment of it has no material effect upon their opinion. Even the premise of the Vice President's claim is proved wrong by the Gallup findings already mentioned.

The Vice President objected to the subjection of the words and policies of the President to "instant analysis and querulous criticism." The analysis, whatever its merits or failings, was hardly instant. Highly-informed speculation about the content of the speech had gone on for days and even weeks. Copies were made available at least two hours in advance of the analysis, allowing at least as much time as most morning newspapers had before press time. If a professional reporter could not arrive at some meaningful observations under those circumstances, we would question his competence.

The Vice President took care—and the point should not be lost on us—to remind us that television is "enjoying a monopoly sanc-

tioned and licensed by government." A monopoly, by any definition I know, is the exclusive control of a product or a service by a single entity. Television news is broadcast in this country by four networks, all with different and fiercely competitive management, producers, editors and reporters, involving hundreds of strongly individualistic people; by a dozen station groups, initiating and producing their own news broadcasts, and by hundreds of stations, producing their own news broadcasts wholly independent and distinct from those of any network they may otherwise be associated with. Moreover, it is estimated that, on the average day, 65 percent more hours of viewing are devoted to station-originated news broadcasts than to network news broadcasts. In addition, there are 6,717 radio stations in this country—the overwhelming majority without network affiliations.

All this hardly represents monopolistic control.

The Vice President seems to maintain that the First Amendment applies differently to NBC from what it does to *The New York Times*, because NBC's audience is bigger and because television has more impact. That the First Amendment is quantitative in its applicability is a chilling innovation from a responsible officer of the government. By this standard, the *Times* is less entitled to the protection of the Bill of Rights than the *Des Moines Register*, with a third of its circulation, and twice as entitled to it as the *New York Daily News*, which has double the *Times'* circulation. As for the impact of the television medium, it may be true that combined picture and voice give television a special force. On the other hand, print can be reread, it can be lingered over, it can be spread around, it can be consulted over and over again. Should, on the grounds of these advantages over television, the print media have less freedom?

The Vice President asked how many "marches and demonstrations" there would be if there were no television cameras. An elementary textbook in American history might prove instructive. There was no television to record the demonstrations against slavery; demonstrations against the Mexican War; demonstrations against the Civil War draft; demonstrations for women suffrage; demonstrations for Prohibition; demonstrations for the League of Nations; demonstrations against child labor; demonstrations for economic justice. That there would be no disturbing news except for television is a canard as dangerous as it is egregious.

Now let us turn to the crucial issue raised by the Vice President.

Despite his complaints about and what we report, the Vice President protested that he was not advocating censorship. He found it necessary, a week later, to repeat his protest three times in one paragraph. It is far more shocking to me that the utterances of the second-ranking official of the United States government require such repeated assurances that he had in mind no violation of the Constitution that it is comforting to have them at all. Of course, neither he nor any of his associates are advocating censorship—which would never survive judicial scrutiny. But it does not take overt censorship to cripple the free flow of ideas. Was the Vice President's reference to television's being "sanctioned and licensed by government" accidental and devoid of any point or meaning? Was his suggestion that "it is time that the networks were made [emphasis added] more responsive to the views of the nation" merely sloppy semantics and devoid of any notion of coercion?

Perhaps the Vice President, in his November 20 follow-up speech, was not referring to government action, but only to a dialogue among citizens when he said, "When they [network commentators and some gentlemen of *The New York Times*] go beyond fair

comment and criticism they will be called upon to defend their statements and their positions just as we must defend ours. And when their criticism becomes excessive or unjust, we shall invite them down from their ivory towers to enjoy the rough and tumble of public debate." Who, in those sentences, will do the calling of these men to defend themselves, and before whom? Who is the "we" who shall do the inviting? And by whose standards will the limits of "fair comment" and "just criticism" be judged and who shall be the judges?

The ominous character of the Vice President's attack derives directly from the fact that it is made upon the journalism of a medium licensed by the government of which he is a high ranking officer. This is a new relationship in government-press relations. From George Washington on, every Administration has had disputes with the press, but the First Amendment assured the press that such disputes were between equals, with the press beyond the reach of the government. This all-important fact of the licensing power of life and death over the broadcast press brings an implicit threat to a government official's attacks on it, whether or not that is the intention and whether or not the official says he is speaking only as an individual.

But the Vice President does not seem to have been walking a lonely path in the direction of suppression and harassment:

Herbert G. Klein, the Administration's Director of Communications, revealed that, on November 4, the day after the President's speech, calls from White House offices went out to broadcast stations asking whether editorials were planned and, in Mr. Klein's words, "to ask them what they would say in their editorial comment."

In Washington, D.C., television stations were called by a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, Paul O'Neil, requesting logs of news coverage devoted to support of and in opposition to the Administration's Vietnam policy. His wife, a Dade County official of the Republican Party, who specified her husband's official position, made the same request of Miami, Florida stations.

On November 4, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, in unprecedented calls to the presidents of the three broadcasting companies with national television networks, demanded transcripts of the remarks of their reporters and others who had commented on the speech, saying there had been complaints, the source of which he failed to specify—although, two weeks later on sober second thought, he seemed to reverse himself when he signed a letter adopted by the full Commission finding that the comments made on the networks after the speech in no way violated its doctrine of fairness.

A special counsel to the President, Clark R. Mollenhoff, said that the speech "was developed by various White House aides," adding "if you are asking me, 'does it reflect the Administration's views,' the evidence is abundant that it does." The President's press secretary, Ronald Ziegler, agreed that a White House special assistant, Patrick J. Buchanan, "very well could have contributed some thoughts to the speech."

Mr. Klein, on November 16, said, "I think that any time any industry—and I include newspapers very thoroughly in this, as well as the networks—if you look at the problems you have today and you fail to continue to examine them, you do invite the government to come in."

In my judgment, the whole tone, the whole content and the whole pattern of this government intrusion into the substance and methods of the broadcast press, and indeed of all journalism, have the gravest implications. Because a Federally-licensed medium is involved, no more serious episode has occurred in government-press relationships

since the dark days in the fumbling infancy of this republic when the ill-fated Alien and Sedition Acts forbade criticism of the government and its policies on pain of exile or imprisonment.

In the context of this intimidation, the self-serving disavowal interpolations of no censorship, no matter how often repeated, are meaningless. Reprisals no less damaging to the media and no less dangerous to our fundamental freedoms than censorship are readily available to the government—economic, legal and psychological. Nor is their actual employment necessary to achieve their ends; to have them dangling like swords over the media can do harm even more irreparable than overt action. If these threats implicit in the developments of the past week are not openly recognized, unequivocally denounced and firmly resisted, freedom of communications in this country will suffer a setback that will not be limited to checking the freedom of television or to barring critical comment on government policy. It will precipitate an erosion that will inevitably destroy the most powerful safeguard of a free society—free, unhampered and unharassed news media.

This does not have to be the resolute intention of any person or group, any party or government. We can wander unintentionally—all of us—into a lethal trap if we let our dissatisfaction with the handling of specific issues, which are variable, and of events, which are transitory, compromise our adherence to basic principles, which are constant. No permanent freedom was ever wisely exchanged for temporary popularity, for the popularity can be gone with changing political or social cycles and the freedom can be regained, if ever, only at fearful cost. And this is a truth that should be remembered by those who demand that our freedoms be preserved only when they agree with us, but who have been eager to restrict them whenever they disagree with us. You cannot side with restrictions or with bullying or with recriminations when they support your views and then oppose them when they differ, for they will rise up and haunt you long after your cause is lost or won.

The issue here is simple. Dwight D. Eisenhower said, "I believe the United States is strong enough to expose to the world its differing viewpoints. . . ." His successor, John F. Kennedy, said, "The men who create power make an indispensable contribution to the nation's greatness, but the men who question power make a contribution just as indispensable."

Criticism is an essential ingredient in that mix. It is central, not tangential, to a free society. It is always a free society's strength and often its salvation. Television itself is not and should not be immune to such criticism. As a matter of fact, it is the most criticized medium in the history of communications. Newspapers, magazines, academic groups, learned societies—who wouldn't dream of criticizing each other—criticize us every single day. Everyone has free access to what we do, and everyone sees us do it. We are *not* unaccountable. We are *not* clandestine. We have *no* end product that is not seen and judged by everyone. But such open criticism is a far cry from sharp reminders from high official quarters that we are licensed or that if we don't examine ourselves, we in common with other media "invite" the government to move in.

The troubled pages of this century's history are writ dark with the death of liberty in those nations where the first fatal symptom of political decay was an effort to control the news media. Seldom has it been called censorship. Seldom is the word used except in denials. Always it has been "guidelines" in the name of national unity. And we might well ponder the fate of the un-

happy role of nations that had no regard for their freedoms or took them for granted or held them lightly.

As we meet here, 39 nations in the world have a controlled press or a press that wavers uncertainly between control and freedom. These melancholy statistics might well be borne in mind by those of our own countrymen who, as the Vice President descends upon one part of the country to attack the journalists of another part, are moved by their temporary irritations to applaud their own ensnarement. In his speech of November 13, the Vice President turned to Learned Hand to support a proposition that would have been total anathema to the great judge. Let me, in conclusion, invoke Hand in more revealing words:

"Our democracy rests upon the assumption that, set free, the common man can manage his own fate; that errors will cancel each other by open discussion; that the interests of each when unguided from above, will not diverge too radically from the interests of all. . . ."

I appreciate having had this opportunity to speak to you today in what all thoughtful people must regard as a critical period in the life of a free society and of the free communications without which it cannot exist.

EXPORT CONTROL ACT

HON. GARRY BROWN

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, it is expected that the House of Representatives will take up and consider yet this week the conference report on H.R. 4293, the 1969 amendments to the Export Control Act as newly titled "The Export Administration Act of 1969."

My fellow conferees, Mr. WIDNALL and Mr. MIZE, and I refused to sign the conference report because we disagreed with the determination of the other conferees to accept the Senate version of section 4(b), the "Authority" section of the bill. The three of us have heretofore circulated to all Members of the House an expression and explanation of our views in opposition to adoption of the conference report. We will actively oppose the adoption of the conference report until and unless the House version of section 4(b) is incorporated in the legislation in lieu of the Senate version of such section. Since the time the conference was completed on H.R. 4293, I have received several letters from exporters and others urging adoption by the House of Representatives of the conference report. In each of such letters, the writer has indicated his lack of support for the policy which would be established by adoption of the Senate version of section 4(b) regarding trade in strategic goods with Russia and other Communist bloc nations.

Inasmuch as many of my colleagues in the House may be receiving similar letters from exporters, I have decided it might be desirable or helpful to share with them my typical response to such letters as well as the content of the letter which was earlier circulated by Mr. WIDNALL, Mr. MIZE, and myself among our colleagues. The letters follow:

NOVEMBER 18, 1969.

Re conference report on H.R. 4293, Export Control Act.

DEAR COLLEAGUE: The Conference Report on the Export Control Act, having been approved by the Senate, will be before the House of Representatives this week, probably on Wednesday.

We are urging you to oppose the adoption of the Conference Report.

As Conferees on the part of the House, we did not sign the Report and hope it will not receive your support because the all-important Section 4, the "Authority" section, of the Report is almost verbatim the Senate language to which we strenuously object for the following reasons:

(1) It will be impossible to canvass the government defense laboratories and private defense contractors throughout the United States to ascertain which of the many thousands of commodities, technologies and information affected by the bill would, or would not, make a significant contribution to the military potential of Communist Countries within the six month period to which such review is limited by Section 4(a).

(2) Section 4(b) provides that if strategic products, technology or information are available from any other source including Russia and other Communist countries or friendly nations not allied with the United States, such items cannot be subject to export control unless the President makes a specific determination that this is necessary in the interest of national security. Even if the President makes such a determination, the President then must report in detail to the Congress, his reasons for same. This reporting mandate will require detailed public disclosure which could, and no doubt would, be detrimental to our national security, our foreign relations and would damage U.S. firms in regard to matters of trade confidentiality.

(3) No provision is made for the maintenance of controls over "basket categories"—groupings of many similar products in general categories without individual identification. Use of basket categories is essential to control of the exportation of new products or technology having strategic potential but for which a separate classification does not exist because such new product or technology has never been previously identified. The Senate language in the Report requires individual identification of all products subject to control and therefore inability to identify many new products and technologies would authorize their uncontrolled export even to the detriment of our national security.

In summary, we concur with many in the Congress who believe the Export Control Act needs up-dating. We agree that some of its provisions have been unnecessarily restrictive but we reject the radical changes proposed by the Senate and incorporated in the Conference Report.

We think it extremely unwise and not in this nation's interest to shift the burden of proof to the President in total disregard of the fact that justification of his actions may entail the divulging of information which would be contrary to the national security interests of this country. When we, in the House, adopted an amendment to the Export Control Act making "availability" elsewhere of the proposed export a matter to be considered by the President in exercising his control authority, we restricted the application of such availability test to those nations with which we have defense treaty commitments—in other words, we can have an impact upon trade policy and shipment of goods from other free world nations but we have no similar power or control with respect to the shipment of goods

among and within the nations of the Communist Bloc.

Defeat of the Conference Report will permit an opportunity to re-examine the questions and issues we have raised herein and hopefully the adoption of the House "Authority" section.

Sincerely,

WILLIAM B. WIDNALL,
CHESTER L. MIZE,
GARRY BROWN.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D.C., December 1, 1969.

DEAR —: Thank you for contacting me urging my support of the Conference Report on H.R. 4293, legislation amending the Export Control Act of 1949 and entitled "The Export Administration Act of 1969."

Frankly, I am somewhat at a loss to reconcile your support of the Report and some of the statements in your communication in view of the Senate version of the "Authority" section of the bill as included in the Conference Report. These statements lead me to believe that you have not carefully read the Conference Report or preferred to ignore some of its language.

Needless to say, I am actively opposed to the Conference Report in its present form, although I was a prime mover for modification of the Export Control Act when the bill to renew the Act was originally before the House of Representatives. In fact, I was successful in amending the Act even with respect to the "Authority" section.

Your communication expressly states that you are opposed to trade in strategic goods by exporters of this nation with nations of the Communist bloc, including Russia; yet, the language of the "Authority" section of the Conference Report, which was the Senate language, denies to the President the right to restrict or control such trade unless he satisfies the two-factor test of Section 4(b) or makes an absolute determination that such trade would be detrimental to the national security of the United States and explains his reasons for such determination in a "full and detailed statement" in the next quarterly report to the Congress.

The strategic importance of most exports which may have military significance detrimental to the national security of the United States must necessarily be established from intelligence reports. Disclosure of the substance of these reports to the general public, through a detailed quarterly report to the Congress, would not be in this nation's interest in the view of this writer. It, therefore, would be almost essential for the President to attempt to satisfy the two-factor test of the "Authority" section for the control of exports which does not necessitate the filing of such a report.

It is this two-factor test within the "Authority" section that causes me the greatest concern. If you have read the language of the Report, you will know that it denies to the President the right to control exports either through the establishment of restricted trade lists or by denial of export licenses, unless the President satisfies both requirements of such section. This test provides that with respect to any export control action, the President must determine: (1) that the item to be restricted or denied a license "would make a significant contribution to the military potential of such nation or nations which would prove detrimental to the national security of the United States"; and, (2) such item or items "sought to be exported are not readily available to such nation or nations from other sources" (emphasis added). Since this is a two-fold test, satisfaction of only one of the requirements is not sufficient to justify controls.

The impact of this two-fold test is to deny

to the President the right to control the export of items to any nation even though such item or items may have substantial military significance detrimental to the United States, if such item or items are readily available to such nation or nations from any other source, including a source within the Communist bloc of nations, even Russia, since the term "other sources" has in no way been limited by the Conference Report.

The questioning of Senator Mondale regarding his interpretation of this language of the Conference Report (see *Congressional Record* for November 14, 1969, pages 34290-34293) clearly establishes that either Senator Mondale and his colleagues in the Senate did not mean that which they had written in their Senate language or did not say what they meant. Nevertheless, the language is not patently ambiguous and, therefore, is not subject to interpretation regardless of the amount of legislative history which the Senate colloquy established in the pages of the *Congressional Record* to which I have referred.

Again, it is impossible for me to reconcile your rejection of trade in strategic goods with Communist nations with the analysis I have above set forth. We both support modification of the Export Control Act substantially along the lines of the Conference Report, and it appears to me you should be supporting my opposition to adoption of the Conference Report until the "Authority" section has been corrected to reflect that which apparently even the Senate intended.

My purpose in opposing the adoption of the Conference Report is to permit an opportunity for the Congress to adopt the House version of the "Authority" section and for no other reason. This action would be consistent with what the Senate apparently intended and would accommodate a reconciliation of what appear to be the conflicting recommendations of your letter. Even more importantly, such action would effect a realistic modernization of the Export Control Act without jeopardizing the effectuating of proper export control policy.

With best regards.

Sincerely,

GARRY BROWN.

ADDRESS OF DR. FRANK STANTON,
PRESIDENT OF COLUMBIA BROADCASTING CO., BEFORE THE INTERNATIONAL RADIO AND TELEVISION SOCIETY, NEW YORK CITY, NOVEMBER 25, 1960

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, on November 13 the Vice President of the United States spoke in Des Moines, Iowa, focusing his remarks on the television industry in this country. One week later on November 20, in Mobile, Ala., Vice President AGNEW spoke again concerning the Nation's media, this time concentrating his comments on newspapers.

Mr. Speaker, at this point, I would like to insert in the RECORD a thoughtful and significant response to the Vice President's criticism, an address by Dr. Frank Stanton, president of the Columbia Broadcasting System, before a meeting of the International Radio & Television Society held in New York City on November 25.

Dr. Stanton's address follows:

ADDRESS BY DR. FRANK STANTON

I am not here to defend broadcast journalism as being beyond all criticism. No one could have worked as long as I have in radio and television without realizing that we are far from perfect in carrying out our enormous responsibilities in broadcast journalism. We have never been satisfied with the job we are doing. We are not satisfied now. It is our continuing hope and our continuing effort to do better. We are concerned with what the press says of us. We are concerned with what our audiences write us. We are concerned with what our affiliates tell us. We do strive for objectivity, although it is not always easy to achieve. While freedom of the press is meaningless without the freedom to be wrong, we do try to be right. And I think that in the vast majority of cases we have succeeded.

NIXON OUTLINES VIETNAM PEACE PLAN

Let me turn now to the events of the past few weeks that have commanded the attention of many of us. On November 3, the President of the United States delivered a much-publicized and eagerly-awaited speech presenting the Administration's position and plans on the war in Vietnam. That war has been the subject of one of the longest and most fervent public debates in all American history. Good, conscientious and dedicated men and women, from all sections of our society, have earnest and deeply-felt differences as to its meaning, its conduct and its prospects. Fundamental questions of rightness and wrongness have disturbed our people as no other issue has in this century.

The President spoke for 32 minutes on all four nationwide television networks, four nationwide radio networks and scores of independent stations. Some 88 million people heard his words as they were conveyed, uninterrupted and in a place and under conditions of his own choosing. Following the President's address, each of the television networks provided comments by professionals analyzing the content of the speech. Participating were experienced newsmen, most of whom have performed similar functions for many years following the live broadcast of special events of outstanding significance. Since the participants were different on the four television networks, the comments of none of them were heard by the same huge audience that heard the President. One of the networks added to the expertise by presenting the views of a distinguished diplomat and public servant, who had held high posts in nine Presidential terms, of both parties, prior to the present Administration. Another presented the comments of two United States senators, who took divergent views of the policy advocated in the speech.

In all this, nothing unprecedented had happened. Such comments have customarily been offered after most significant Presidential appearances—State of the Union, Inaugurals, United Nations addresses, press conferences, for example. And they usually have been more than mere bland recapitulations, which would serve little purpose, and have frequently called attention to emphases, omissions, unexpected matters of substance, long anticipated attitudes, changes of views, methods of advocacy or any other aspect of the speech. Such comments have been offered by enterprising news organizations since the dawn of the modern press and continued into the era of radio and television.

Following the President's speech and following the relatively brief comments made directly after it, the White House was deluged with telegrams and letters approving the President's speech, the White House reported, by an overwhelming margin. Two days later, the Gallup Survey reported that nearly 4 out of every 5 of those who heard it, approved the President's speech and the course that it advocated with regard to Vietnam.

AGNEW CRITICISM OF TELEVISION NETWORK NEWS

Ten days after the President's speech, the second highest official in the Administration launched an attack on the television networks on the grounds that critical comments on government policy as enunciated in a Presidential address might unduly influence the American people—even though, following such comments, the President received a 77 percent vote of confidence from those who heard him on the issue discussed.

The Vice President also censured television network news for covering events and personalities that are jolting to many of us but that nevertheless document the kind of polarized society—not just here but throughout the world, whether or not there is television and whether it is controlled or free—in which, for better or worse, we are living. It is not a consensus society. It is a questioning, searching society—unsure, groping, running to extremes, abrasive, often violent even in its reactions to the violence of others. Students and faculties are challenging time-honored traditions in the universities. Young clergy are challenging ancient practices and even dogma of the churches. Labor union members are challenging their leaderships. Scientists, artists, businessmen, politicians—all are drawn into the fray. Frequently, because everyone is clamoring for attention, views are set forth in extreme terms.

As we do not propose to leave unreported the voice of the Vice President, we cannot in good conscience leave unreported any other significant voice or happening—whether or not it supports government policy, whether or not it conforms with our own views, whether or not it disturbs the persuasions of any political party or bloc. But no healthy society and no governing authorities worth their salt have to fear the reporting of dissenting or even of hostile voices. What a healthy society and a self-respecting government do have to fear—at the price of their vitality if not of their life—is the suppression of such reporting.

To strengthen the delusion that, as a news medium, television is plunging the nation into collapse and can be deterred only by suppressing criticisms and by either withholding bad news or contriving a formula to balance it with good news, the Vice President's speech was replete with misinformation, inaccuracies and contradictions. To deal adequately with all of these on this occasion would take us through the afternoon, but let me note some of them by way of example, then move on to consider with you the context of the Vice President's speech so far as the actions and statements of other Administration officials are concerned and, finally, make some observations on the significance of this unhappy affair.

MISINFORMATION, INACCURACIES, AND CONTRADICTIONS

The Vice President began his indictment of November 13 with a monstrous contradiction. He asserted flatly that "no medium has a more profound influence over public opinion" than television. And yet he also claimed that the views of America have been very little affected by this "profound influence," when he said, "The views of the majority of this fraternity [i.e., television network news executives and editors] do not—and I repeat, not—represent the views of America." The Vice President can't have it both ways. If the views of the American people show "a great gulf" between how a speech is received by them and how it is treated in a broadcast, obviously the treatment of it has no material effect upon their opinion. Even the premise of the Vice President's claim is proved wrong by the Gallup findings already mentioned.

The Vice President objected to the subsection of the words and policies of the President to "instant analysis and querulous

criticism." The analysis, whatever its merits or failings, was hardly instant. Highly-informed speculation about the content of the speech had gone on for days and even weeks. Copies were made available at least two hours in advance of the analysis, allowing at least as much time as most morning newspapers had before press time. If a professional reporter could not arrive at some meaningful observations under those circumstances, we would question his competence.

The Vice President took care—and the point should not be lost on us—to remind us that television is "enjoying a monopoly sanctioned and licensed by government." A monopoly, by any definition I know, is the exclusive control of a product or a service by a single entity. Television news is broadcast in this country by four networks, all with different and fiercely competitive management, producers, editors and reporters, involving hundreds of strongly individualistic people; by a dozen station groups, initiating and producing their own news broadcasts, and by hundreds of stations, producing their own news broadcasts wholly independent and distinct from those of any network they may otherwise be associated with. Moreover, it is estimated that, on the average day, 65 percent more hours of viewing are devoted to station-originated news broadcasts than to network news broadcasts. In addition, there are 6,717 radio stations in this country—the overwhelming majority without network affiliations.

All this hardly represents monopolistic control.

The Vice President seems to maintain that the First Amendment applies differently to NBC from what it does to *The New York Times*, because NBC's audience is bigger and because television has more impact. That the First Amendment is quantitative in its applicability is a chilling innovation from a responsible officer of the government. By this standard, the *Times* is less entitled to the protection of the Bill of Rights than the *Des Moines Register*, with a third of its circulation, and twice as entitled to it as the *New York Daily News*, which has double the *Times'* circulation. As for the impact of the television medium, it may be true that combined picture and voice give television a special force. On the other hand, print can be reread, it can be lingered over, it can be spread around, it can be consulted over and over again. Should, on the grounds of these advantages over television, the print media have less freedom?

The Vice President asked how many "marches and demonstrations" there would be if there were no television cameras. An elementary textbook in American history might prove instructive. There was no television to record the demonstrations against slavery; demonstrations against the Mexican War; demonstrations against the Civil War draft; demonstration for women suffrage; demonstrations for Prohibition; demonstrations for the League of Nations; demonstrations against child labor; demonstrations for economic justice. That there would be no disturbing news except for television is a canard as dangerous as it is egregious.

CENSORSHIP IS THE CRUCIAL ISSUE

Now let us turn to the crucial issue raised by the Vice President.

Despite his complaints about how and what we report, the Vice President protested that he was not advocating censorship. He found it necessary, a week later, to repeat his protest three times in one paragraph. It is far more shocking to me that the utterances of the second-ranking official of the United States government require such repeated assurances that he had in mind no violation of the Constitution that it is comforting to have them at all. Of course, neither he nor any of his associates are advocating censorship—which would never survive judicial

scrutiny. But it does not take overt censorship to cripple the free flow of ideas. Was the Vice President's reference to television's being "sanctioned and licensed by government" accidental and devoid of any point or meaning? Was his suggestion that "it is time that the networks were made [emphasis added] more responsive to the views of the nation" merely sloppy semantics and devoid of any notion of coercion?

Perhaps the Vice President, in his November 20 follow-up speech, was not referring to government action, but only to a dialogue among citizens when he said, "When they [network commentators and some gentlemen of *The New York Times*] go beyond fair comment and criticism they will be called upon to defend their statements and their positions just as we must defend ours. And when their criticism becomes excessive or unjust, we shall invite them down from their ivory towers to enjoy the rough and tumble of public debate." Who, in those sentences, will do the calling of these men to defend themselves, and before whom? Who is the "we" who shall do the inviting? And by whose standards will the limits of "fair comment" and "just criticism" be judged and who shall be the judges?

The ominous character of the Vice President's attack derives directly from the fact that it is made upon the journalism of a medium licensed by the government of which he is a high ranking officer. This is a new relationship in government-press relations. From George Washington on, every Administration has had disputes with the press, but the First Amendment assured the press that such disputes were between equals, with the press beyond the reach of the government. This all-important fact of the licensing power of life and death over the broadcast press brings an implicit threat to a government official's attacks on it, whether or not that is the intention and whether or not the official says he is speaking only as an individual.

AGNEW SPEECH HAS ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT

But the Vice President does not seem to have been walking a lonely path in the direction of suppression and harassment:

Herbert G. Klein, the Administration's Director of Communications, revealed that, on November 4, the day after the President's speech, calls from White House offices went out to broadcast stations asking whether editorials were planned and, in Mr. Klein's words, "to ask them what they would say in their editorial comment."

In Washington, D.C., television stations were called by a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board, Paul O'Neill, requesting logs of news coverage devoted to support of and in opposition to the Administration's Vietnam policy. His wife, a Dade County official of the Republican Party, who specified her husband's official position, made the same request of Miami, Florida stations.

On November 4, the Chairman of the Federal Communications Commission, in unprecedented calls to the presidents of the three broadcasting companies with national television networks, demanded transcripts of the remarks of their reporters and others who had commented on the speech, saying there had been complaints, the source of which he failed to specify—although, two weeks later on sober second thought, he seemed to reverse himself when he signed a letter adopted by the full Commission finding that the comments made on the networks after the speech in no way violated its doctrine of fairness.

A special counsel to the President, Clark R. Mollenhoff, said that the speech "was developed by various White House aides," adding "If you are asking me, 'does it reflect the Administration's views,' the evidence is abundant that it does." The President's press secretary, Ronald Ziegler, agreed that a White House special assistant, Patrick J.

Buchanan, "very well could have contributed some thoughts to the speech."

Mr. Klein, on November 16, said, "I think that any time any industry—and I include newspapers very thoroughly in this, as well as the networks—if you look at the problems you have today and you fail to continue to examine them, you do invite the government to come in."

In my judgment, the whole tone, the whole content and the whole pattern of this government intrusion into the substance and methods of the broadcast press, and indeed of all journalism, have the gravest implications. Because a Federally-licensed medium is involved, no more serious episode has occurred in government-press relationships since the dark days in the fumbling infancy of this republic when the ill-fated Allen and Sedition Acts forbade criticism of the government and its policies on pain of exile or imprisonment.

In the context of this intimidation, the self-serving disavowal interpolations of no censorship, no matter how often repeated, are meaningless. Reprisals no less damaging to the media and no less dangerous to our fundamental freedoms than censorship are readily available to the government—economic, legal and psychological. Nor is their actual employment necessary to achieve their ends; to have them dangling like swords over the media can do harm even more irreparable than overt action. If these threats implicit in the developments of the past week are not openly recognized, unequivocally denounced and firmly resisted, freedom of communications in this country will suffer a setback that will not be limited to checking the freedom of television or to barring critical comment on government policy. It will precipitate an erosion that will inevitably destroy the most powerful safeguard of a free society—free, unhampered and unharassed news media.

This does not have to be the resolute intention of any person or group, any party or government. We can wander unintentionally—all of us—into a lethal trap if we let our dissatisfaction with the handling of specific issues, which are variable, and of events, which are transitory, compromise our adherence to basic principles, which are constant. No permanent freedom was ever wisely exchanged for temporary popularity, for the popularity can be gone with changing political or social cycles and the freedom can be regained, if ever, only at fearful cost. And this is a truth that should be remembered by those who demand that our freedoms be preserved only when they agree with us, but who have been eager to restrict them whenever they disagree with us. You cannot side with restrictions or with bullying or with recriminations when they support your views and then oppose them when they differ, for they will rise up and haunt you long after your cause is lost or won.

CRITICISM IS VITAL TO A FREE SOCIETY

The issue here is simple. Dwight D. Eisenhower said, "I believe the United States is strong enough to expose to the world its differing viewpoints. . . ." His successor, John F. Kennedy, said, "The men who create power make an indispensable contribution to the nation's greatness, but the men who question power make a contribution just as indispensable."

Criticism is an essential ingredient in that mix. It is central, not tangential, to a free society. It is always a free society's strength and often its salvation. Television itself is not and should not be immune to such criticism. As a matter of fact, it is the most criticized medium in the history of communications. Newspapers, magazines, academic groups, learned societies—who wouldn't dream of criticizing each other—criticize us every single day. Everyone has free access to what we do, and everyone sees us do it. We

are not unaccountable. We are not clandestine. We have no end product that is not seen and judged by everyone. But such open criticism is a far cry from sharp reminders from high official quarters that we are licensed or that if we don't examine ourselves, we in common with other media "invite" the government to move in.

The troubled pages of this century's history are writ dark with the death of liberty in those nations where the first fatal symptoms of political decay was an effort to control the news media. Seldom has it been called censorship. Seldom is the word used except in denials. Always it has been "guidelines" in the name of national duty. And we might well ponder the fate of the unhappy role of nations that had no regard for their freedoms or took them for granted or held them lightly.

As we meet here, 39 nations in the world have a controlled press or a press that wavers uncertainly between control and freedom. These melancholy statistics might well be borne in mind by those of our own countrymen who, as the Vice President descends upon one part of the country to attack the journalists of another part, are moved by their temporary irritations to applaud their own enslavement. In his speech of November 13, the Vice President turned to Learned Hand to support a proposition that would have been total anathema to the great judge. Let me, in conclusion, invoke Hand in more revealing words:

"Our democracy rests upon the assumption that, set free, the common man can manage his own fate; that errors will cancel each other by open discussions; that the interests of each when unguided from above, will not diverge too radically from the interests of all. . . ."

I appreciate having had this opportunity to speak to you today in what all thoughtful people must regard as a critical period in the life of a free society and of the free communications without which it cannot exist.

AID FERTILIZER POLICIES QUESTIONED

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, recently I have had cause to question a proposed policy change at AID which involved what I considered to be a circumvention of the "buy American" principle of our foreign assistance program. Accordingly, I wrote the following letter to Administrator Hannah:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., September 11, 1969.

Dr. JOHN A. HANNAH,

Administrator, Agency for International Development, Department of State, Washington, D.C.

DEAR DR. HANNAH: The enclosed letter and material have been received from a man in whom I have the greatest amount of respect, and whose knowledge in the area of the U.S. bag industry is well recognized.

On a previous occasion he supplied valuable information regarding bag specifications, which resulted in large savings to the AID foreign assistance program and to the American taxpayer.

What appears to be the major problem here is not a single company's ability through an AID exemption to buy bags overseas, but the implication of the ruling as it affects the entire U.S. bag industry and all those who handle bagged shipments.

The Buy American principle, which has been a keystone of our foreign aid program is in jeopardy of being completely cut off for an important segment of U.S. business. I find it hard to believe that AID's recent ruling is not in direct opposition to the intent of Congress as expressed in foreign aid legislation.

Specifically, I understand that an AID legal officer, Mr. Kenneth Fries, sent out an official letter stating that bags were not included "as components of non U.S. origin for purposes of AID componentry limitations." This appears to mean that suppliers will be entirely free to bag supplies anywhere abroad, thereby by-passing an entire American industry that has always been in the past an integral part of our foreign assistance program.

I would appreciate your close attention to this matter, and determination regarding the status of the U.S. bag industry.

Kind regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

PETER W. RODINO, JR.

SEPTEMBER 11, 1969.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PETER: I should like to bring to your attention a serious problem that will lead to unemployment of thousands of people—a problem caused by a ruling of the legal department of A.I.D. going in the opposite direction of the intent of Congress in the assistance to less fortunate nations.

As you know, through the Agency of International Development, our fellow citizens have given material costing billions of dollars to the have-not nations. For bookkeeping purposes, formal contracts have been drawn up similar to commercial transactions. And it is a matter of record these nations have not paid the interest on the so-called loans and it is ridiculous for anyone to believe the money for the assistance given through the generosity of the American people will ever be paid.

That is our foreign assistance policy and today I am not going to debate the flaws in it. But I do take issue when we help these countries at the expense of American management and labor.

We ship millions of tons of fertilizer under this program to such nations as India, Pakistan, Vietnam and Indonesia.

In my judgement that is good and that is the intent of Congress in carrying out the wishes of the American people for we all want to help individual farmers in those countries to plant and harvest rice for subsistence.

But it is an indisputable fact that when we ship fertilizer in bulk seven percent of the shipment disappears between the time it leaves the fertilizer plant and is loaded on a ship in one of our ports. Further, it is an indisputable fact that at least a third of the bulk shipments disappear into the black market at the recipient port and in Vietnam, quite possibly, is detoured into the hands of the enemy. It is also an indisputable fact that fertilizer shipped in bulk losses its potency in transit because it is hygroscopic and absorbs moisture as a blotter would absorb water.

Bagging of the material in a U.S. port is, of course, the most efficient, effective method because the weight is exact, the material is protected against moisture and each bag is printed with the A.I.D. emblem and the printing shows the material comes from America.

When material is shipped in bulk, it is shoveled into unprinted bags by underpaid labor in the recipient port. The bags are manufactured overseas, so America loses. Not only does this increase unemployment in bag plants, but stevedores are also unemployed.

Now, the legal department of A.I.D. has ruled that all shipments of fertilizer can be

shipped in bulk and the bags can be purchased in Asia for packing the material in Singapore. In view of the loss of material and the adverse effect to both management and labor by this new policy, I believe this must be corrected immediately.

This policy is not only unrealistic, it is a flagrant example of bureaucrats abusing their responsibility and daring Congress to take issue on the matter. This must be stopped. We can no longer sit by and allow this agency to increase unemployment in this country.

Giving this material to needy nations is in keeping with the generosity of the American people. But when this leads to enrichment of black marketers in Asia and unemployment at home, then it is time that we step in and say in terms that need no clarification that this "public be damned" policy of A.I.D. bureaucrats be stopped immediately.

WERTHAN BAG CORP.,
JOHN WALLACE.

In response, Dr. Hannah replied as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE, AGENCY FOR
INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT,
Washington, D.C., November 12, 1969.

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN RODINO: Thank you for your letter of September 11, 1969, and the enclosures, particularly a letter to you from Mr. John Wallace dated September 11. This correspondence deals with the question of bagging fertilizer financed by A.I.D. for export to such countries as India, Pakistan and Indonesia. I have not replied earlier pending outcome of discussions held between your staff and your constituent. However, our staffs have agreed that we should now respond to your letter.

For several years, A.I.D. has financed certain types of fertilizer (such as ammonium sulfate and diammonium phosphate) for shipment from U.S. ports in bulk. Such fertilizer was bagged in the receiving country at its own expense. This method of shipment has made it possible for A.I.D. to supply considerably larger quantities of fertilizer for the same amount of money. Not only did the receiving countries pay for the bagging, but savings were also realized on ocean freight. We believe that these efforts to reduce the cost of aid to the U.S. Government, and to have the aid-receiving countries bear a portion of that cost, are consistent with the intentions of Congress.

In the recent past, an American company has brought into production a urea plant in Alaska owned jointly with Japanese interests. It inquired of A.I.D. whether, under our regulations, A.I.D. could finance urea produced in Alaska, including the cost of bagging, if the urea was shipped in bulk from Alaska and bagged in Japan for shipment to the recipient country. The company raised this question in the context of an interpretation of A.I.D. Regulation 1 which governs most of the Agency's commodity import programs.

The General Counsel's office of A.I.D. informed the company that under A.I.D.'s basic procurement regulations neither bagging material nor the cost of bagging are regarded as "components" within the meaning of the regulations dealing with componentry limitation, which restricts the inclusion of physical components within a product to 10% of the cost of the product financed by A.I.D. Accordingly, the fertilizer which the company proposed to bag in Japan would not be rendered ineligible for A.I.D. financing by virtue of A.I.D.'s componentry limitation.

Regulation 1 applies to all commodities financed by A.I.D., and is, as a legal matter, interpreted uniformly for all commodities. The legal ruling would, of course, apply to any manufacturer or exporter of fertilizer. It is, as a legal matter, consistent with the

Agency's long-standing practice to permit the use of free-ports or bonded warehouses for packaging and distribution where American manufacturers and exporters find that distribution from such points outside the United States and outside the customs territory of third countries reduces the cost of a product to their customers and thus favors their competitive position in the world market. We, therefore, believe that A.I.D.'s existing rules and the interpretation given them are in the interest of the American export trade.

While there are thus no legal obstacles to deliveries of commodities of U.S. source from free ports and similar installations, specific arrangements between A.I.D. and importing countries frequently preclude such transactions. In the case of fertilizer, most countries, including the largest importers of A.I.D.-financed fertilizers (India, Pakistan, and Indonesia) purchase bagged fertilizer only on the basis of delivery "FOB US Port". Under procedures for fertilizer purchases with those countries, which must be approved by A.I.D., they could not, and do not purchase fertilizer bagged in a third country. We have no present intention to change this policy, although, of course, if a process should be developed by which we could save substantial funds we would want to weigh the facts against the policy you and we share as a general rule, i.e. that U.S. funds should be spent for U.S. procurement.

In his letter to you, Mr. Wallace makes several points with which I am unable to agree, and I would like to comment briefly on each of these.

Mr. Wallace states, first of all, that "it is a matter of record these nations ['the have-not nations'] have not paid the interest on so-called loans." It is a matter of record that almost all countries with which A.I.D. and its predecessor organizations have entered into loan agreements have paid interest on the loans when due and are paying the installments on principal as they mature. If you desire, we would be glad to provide information on the relatively few loans which are delinquent.

Mr. Wallace further asserts that "when we ship fertilizer in bulk seven percent of the shipment disappears between the time it leaves the fertilizer plant and is loaded on ship in one of our ports." I have no information on such losses, but assuming the accuracy of Mr. Wallace's figure, you should know that purchases financed by A.I.D. are made on the basis of delivery "FOB vessel." Therefore, only the fertilizer actually tallied at the port and loaded on board is paid for from A.I.D. loans, and any losses occurring prior to loading on board a ship are to the account of the manufacturer or his agents.

Mr. Wallace goes on to assert that "at least one-third of the bulk shipments disappear into the black market at the recipient port." Since, in the last few years, fertilizer has come into more abundant supply in the principal importing countries, such as India and Pakistan, so-called "black market" sales have become increasingly rare.

Mr. Wallace further asserts that "fertilizer shipped in bulk loses its potency in transit because it is hygroscopic and absorbs moisture." As mentioned earlier, some types of fertilizers, such as ammonium sulfate and diammonium phosphate, absorb moisture only to a negligible extent and buyers and sellers of those types of fertilizers have found shipment in bulk suitable, whether A.I.D. is involved in the financing or not. Thus A.I.D.'s practice is consistent with that of the trade generally.

We have not yet found a method suitable for bulk shipments of urea and have not financed such shipments. Whether shipment in specially designed vessels or any other special method of shipping urea in bulk over long distances is economically feasible has not yet been demonstrated.

Mr. Wallace states that local bagging overseas involved "unprinted bags". A.I.D. regulations do not require that the bags so used bear A.I.D. markings, although there are markings.

To sum up, A.I.D. has permitted bulk shipments of certain types of fertilizer for some time under arrangements from which both the A.I.D. recipients and the U.S. Government gain. A.I.D. has not amended its rules either recently or as a concession to one manufacturer; A.I.D. has furnished a legal interpretation of its regulations, which would be applicable to all manufacturers, but that legal interpretation does not, in and of itself, permit a fertilizer manufacturer to ship from a U.S. port in bulk when the specifications call for fertilizer in bags "FOB U.S. Port". Under current purchasing practices this is the normal specification.

I hope the foregoing comments will clarify the issues and A.I.D.'s current policies. Since Chairman Morgan of the House Foreign Affairs Committee has also expressed an interest in this matter, I am sending him a copy of this letter.

Sincerely yours,

JOHN A. HANNAH.

Since Mr. Wallace, who works on a day-to-day basis with the problems of supplying jute bags for overseas fertilizer shipments, disagrees so fundamentally with AID, I asked him to respond to Dr. Hannah's letter. He complied as follows:

WERTHAN BAG CORP.,
Nashville, Tenn., November 21, 1969.
Congressman PETER W. RODINO, JR.,
Rayburn Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR PETE: As I noted on Tuesday the letter from A. I. D. is certainly unsatisfactory, now I shall respond for your files and also for Chairman Morgan's file.

In reply to their statement, second paragraph, page three, it is true that most of "the have-not nations" have made some interest payments; I think they should forward the record of India and Pakistan during the past decade.

Regarding the next paragraph: If this statement is of no interest to A. I. D., then they wasted an afternoon of industry representatives complaining about this loss and seeking a solution. That meeting was in June 1968, at the Greenbrier Hotel, White Sulphur Springs. The meeting was called by Mr. John Osgathorpe, at the request of the Indian delegation. The proceedings were taped.

Concerning the next paragraph, my figure of loss of product in the recipient nation was on the low side. At least there is an admission that black market operations have existed, a fact they always denied.

I can assure you that while the supply of fertilizer has increased they will not have enough material to meet their needs during the lifetime of a baby born today.

I never suggested or implied the ammonium sulphate be shipped in bags. It is the testimony of A. I. D. officials a couple of years ago who fought you tooth and nail when they insisted that unless a multiwall bag insert with a moisture barrier was used as opposed to a cheaper polyethylene liner that the material would lose much of its potency.

Now they are shipping this material in bulk and bagging it overseas in unprinted bags. Until now they denied that such bags were unprinted. This is a loose policy, bags are half to two-thirds filled and it is up to A. I. D. to explain where the remainder of the cargo disappears.

It is my contention that the purchasing of bags overseas increases unemployment in bag plants, and also the stevedores.

The textile industry is the sickest major industry in the country.

If this policy is correct then why does not

the Defense Department purchase all of its requirements for sheets, uniforms, blankets and tents in Hong Kong?

Warmest regards.

Sincerely,

JOHN WALLACE.

Mr. Speaker, obviously we have a situation here where there is rather substantial disagreement over what should be matters of ascertainable fact. A number of questions are certainly in order.

First of all I can personally testify to the fact that over 2 years ago Mr. Wallace brought to me evidence that AID was requiring expensive overpackaging of diammonium phosphate by calling for a burlap bag with a five-layer multiwall paper insert. This very expensive combination of bag and insert was specified for the principal reason of keeping out moisture, which if allowed to penetrate the fertilizer would sap it of its strength and cake it into a solid piece almost as strong as concrete.

Mr. Wallace proposed the substitution of a polyethylene liner, much cheaper and fully adequate as a moisture protector for the highly hygroscopic diammonium phosphate. After the intervention of the then Inspector General for Foreign Assistance, and the Administrator for Southeast Asia AID in fact changed their specifications and subsequently have been saving American taxpayers many thousands of dollars yearly.

The point, however, is that AID firmly believed diammonium phosphate required heavy bagging care and attention to preserve it from moisture penetration.

The following year at a meeting of the National Plant Food Institute in White Sulphur Springs, the Indian delegation announced that this particular material, diammonium phosphate, would soon be shipped in bulk instead of bags. This led to a heated exchange between bag representatives and the Indians, but now, true to their threat, a situation exists in which AID has changed the specifications of diammonium phosphate to bulk shipment. They no longer talk about protecting the product from the elements.

Since the nature of this fertilizer has not changed, one can only wonder how AID managed to completely reverse itself, for in Administrator Hannah's reply to my earlier inquiry, he stated:

Some types of fertilizer, such as . . . diammonium phosphate, absorb moisture only to a negligible extent and buyers and sellers . . . have found shipment in bulk suitable . . . Thus AID's practice is consistent with that of the trade generally.

In addition to the above, the "bag versus bulk" controversy has never been satisfactorily researched and competently answered.

Mr. Wallace contends that for efficient handling, product protection, correct cargo identification, proper weights, and domestic employment the best course to follow in order to cut waste and aid domestic employment is to bag all hygroscopic fertilizer in the United States. He contends that the combined added expenses of bulk shipments due to additional port costs and black market opera-

tions brings the total price up to the level of bagging the material in the United States. And, aside from the economics, he feels that only through U.S. bagging can the proper U.S. origin identification be maintained.

I believe, also, that one would find the American public supporting the policy of marking every bag of fertilizer, or any other material shipped under the AID program, with a clear indication of U.S. origin. Administrator Hannah's admission that AID regulations do not require material bagged overseas to bear AID markings is a policy in need of immediate administrative correction.

I understand that the Indian stevedores who handle U.S.-origin bagged fertilizer use steel hooks to unload the material. This practice, of course, tears up many bags with a resultant loss of valuable fertilizer. The Indian farmer then receives a badly damaged bag of U.S. fertilizer. Iron Curtain countries, however, seem to fare much better, and there is at least a suspicion that the political coloration of the Indian stevedore unions has a great deal to do with the situation.

There are other questions, of course, that need clear and decisive policy determinations. U.S. bag and fertilizer industries, for example, are justifiably disturbed over the so-called Indian fishing expeditions. This costly practice occurs when the Indian Government offers tenders for thousands of tons of U.S. fertilizer, only to subsequently cancel before the award date because they believe they can get the material cheaper in some other country.

In the meantime, U.S. fertilizer manufacturers, their agents and bag manufacturers have wasted valuable time and money. There is no question of lack of competition in the United States, only a question of playing the international market at the expense of U.S. suppliers. Once a tender is offered the lowest bidder should receive the award. AID, after the difficulties it has encountered from a skeptical Congress, should be interested in gaining public support. And a good place to begin is with U.S. business interests that have participated in AID-financed programs.

CITY LIVING CIRCA 1985?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is incomprehensible to me that those who live in urban areas with the direction of those whom they have chosen to lead them for the moment, cannot create attractive, enlightened, dynamic, and progressive urban environments in even the most blighted neighborhoods. Massive—although admittedly inadequate—Federal funding is standing by to assist. Local funding alternatives also exist.

Each national administration in recent years has had its urban crash programs from model cities to housing.

Yet somehow, somewhere, the individual verve on the part of urban inhabitants seem to be lacking. Can it be that the senses of those who live along city canyons have become dulled to the point of apathy? Does the discouraging example of disinterested neighbors appear insurmountable?

To get the job done in metropolitan areas there are certain fundamental ingredients for success. These are:

First. An intelligent, workable, plan with an identifiable attractive objective.

Second. Interest and support from affected residents and businesses.

Third. Time limitations sufficiently realistic to require expedition and give monthly proof of specific accomplishment.

Fourth. Legislative authorization to representative local groups to impose meaningful sanctions and to use powers of eminent domain.

Fifth. Satisfactory temporary housing for those affected with options to return as desired.

Sixth. Specific and substantial penalties upon individuals and corporations who willfully noncomply with the community effort.

Seventh. Federal matching assistance fundwise but without sole Federal funding, with appropriate standards providing ample local options for variances.

Eighth. Awareness that solutions as well as plans must of necessity vary substantially from city to city.

Falling specific and positive direction and development of some such permanent solution to continuing urban crises, David Broder's column in today's Washington Post suggests the appalling possibilities of tomorrow's urban fortress Americana. As Mr. Broder points out, tax relief would indeed be a dubious bargain if these conditions are to be a long-range consequence.

The column follows:

TAX RELIEF A DUBIOUS BARGAIN IF CITIES DIE IN WAVE OF CRIME

(By David S. Broder)

Last week's report from the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence makes a point that is terribly pertinent to the current Senate debate on the tax bill—a point that has been largely overlooked.

The commission headed by Dr. Milton Eisenhower, in its study of "crime in the streets," the epidemic of violence that afflicts the major cities and fosters the politics of fear, said there are only two ways of dealing with the problem.

Either society and government will make the expenditure of public funds needed to combat crime and to eliminate its causes or individual families will buy as much protection for themselves as they can afford.

The consequences of the choice are enormous—and the tax bill is an important part of the choice, because it represents the biggest decision on national priorities Congress will make this year.

In its present form (even without the additional tax-reduction amendments Sen. Albert Gore is sponsoring) it embodies a

political compromise, to procure a limited amount of tax reform at a substantial cost in federal revenues.

The reforms—many of them worthwhile in themselves—would bring the government something over \$6 billion a year of extra revenue, when fully implemented. To close these loopholes, it is proposed that more than \$9 billion a year of tax cuts be granted. About \$625 million of the cuts would go to the poor families, who would be relieved of their income tax obligations by the bill. But the vast bulk of the tax relief would go into the pockets of the middle- and upper-income families as a subsidy to further private consumption.

It is this decision to give private spending priority over public investment that has largely escaped challenge in congressional debate. Belatedly, the administration and some members of the Joint Economic Committee have questioned the inflationary aspects of the scheduled tax cuts. But few voices have been heard from either party challenging the basic assumption that private spending has priority over public.

Yet that question must be raised when one considers the Eisenhower Commission's description of what the "private spending" solution to the crime problem means to the future of our country.

If individuals are left to cope with the problem of providing safety for themselves, the commission says, central business districts will be inhabited only during daytime "and will be largely deserted except for police patrols during nighttime hours."

"High-rise apartment buildings and residential compounds, protected by private guards and security devices, will be fortified cells for upper-middle and high-income populations living at prime locations in the cities . . ."

In the suburbs, the commission says, "ownership of guns will be almost universal; homes will be fortified by an array of devices from window grills to electronic surveillance equipment; armed citizen volunteers in cars will supplement inadequate police patrols in neighborhoods closer to the central city, and extreme left-wing and right-wing groups will have tremendous armories of weapons which could be brought into play, with or without any provocation."

"High-speed, patrolled expressways will be sanitized corridors connecting safe areas, and private automobiles . . . will be routinely equipped with unbreakable glass, light armor and other security features. Inside garages or valet parking will be available at safe buildings in or near the central city. Armed guards will ride shotgun on all forms of public transportation."

Meanwhile, the report says, "the ghetto slum neighborhoods will be places of terror, with widespread crime, perhaps completely out of police control during nighttime hours . . . Between the unsafe, deteriorating central city . . . and the network of safe prosperous areas and sanitized corridors, there will be not unnaturally, intensifying hatred and deepening division."

That is a description of a hellish America, a society living in constant fear, a society that could not possibly sustain for long the habits and institutions of freedom and self-government. But it is not so different from the cities of today that anyone can believe it is exaggerated.

What is the alternative? The Eisenhower Commission, like every other body that has looked at the problem, says there simply must be a massive commitment of resources—doubling the amount we spend on the criminal justice system and making billions of dollars available to improve housing, education and job opportunities in the slums that produce most of our urban crime.

Those billions, of course, are the slums Congress is preparing to return to the taxpayers—as an inducement to accept some small steps toward equity in the tax system. It is a dubious bargain.

OEO LEGAL SERVICES PROGRAM IN JEOPARDY

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, there has been a great deal of discussion in recent weeks concerning the controversial Murphy amendment which was added at the last minute to the Senate-passed OEO authorization bill. The leading newspaper in my district, the Ogden Standard-Examiner, commented on the issues involved in this dispute in its lead editorial of Wednesday evening, November 19, 1969. I am pleased to call this editorial to the attention of my colleagues in the Congress:

LEGAL SERVICES FOR POOR THREATENED

One of the most successful programs of the Office of Economic Opportunity—its legal services branch—is threatened with virtual extinction unless the U.S. House of Representatives rallies to the side of the nation's poor.

The Senate has already approved an OEO appropriation containing a last-minute amendment by Sen. George Murphy, R-Calif., that would jeopardize the ability of attorneys to ignore political implications when serving the impoverished.

Sen. Murphy admitted during debate on the measure that "in the speed of writing the amendment, I have not had a chance to even read the language which the staff has included." However, he stuck by the change—acting at the request of his former entertainment colleague, Gov. Ronald Reagan of California.

As passed by the Senate, the Murphy amendment would give each governor the power to veto—in whole or in part—any OEO legal services program in his state, even a pending law suit, without giving a formal reason.

This gubernatorial veto power has been attacked by a number of legal organizations, including the American Bar Association and the National Legal Aid and Defenders Association.

The Bar Association resolution noted that the ABA "supports and continues to encourage every lawyer in the exercise of his professional responsibility to represent any client or group of clients in regards to any cause, no matter how unpopular."

"The American Bar Association deplors any action or statement by any government official who attempts to discourage or interfere with the operation or activities of any properly constituted organization which provides legal services to the community . . .," the resolution stated.

The threat to the OEO agency has possible repercussions in our part of Utah.

The Legal Services office in Ogden has four attorneys and six other staff members, aided by volunteers from among our community's legal profession, who so far this year have considered 1,450 applications for aid. Many of the requests seek help on housing problems. The office played a leading role in

changing methods for selection of juries in Weber County to assure equal representation for all taxpayers.

We concur with The Washington Post and the New York Times that, as the Post put it, "a governor should not be given power to veto or to intimidate through a threat of a future veto any project that is designed to bring equal rights to all Americans."

ERNEST GRUENING'S PLAN TO END THE WAR IN VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, since the beginning of the conflict in Vietnam, Ernest Gruening, former Senator from Alaska, has been a strong and active voice against American involvement in Vietnam.

Senator Gruening courageously opposed the escalation of the war by the Johnson administration. He realized, even then, that U.S. participation in the war would only bring tragedy to Vietnam as well as to this Nation.

Unfortunately, Senator Gruening no longer serves in the U.S. Senate. He has not, however, silenced his opposition to the continued presence of American fighting men in Vietnam.

In the November 27 issue of the New York Times, a letter to the editor from Senator Gruening appeared in support of immediate withdrawal of U.S. troops from Vietnam.

I am inserting this letter in the RECORD. I urge all my colleagues to give careful consideration to what Senator Gruening suggests in his letter:

WASHINGTON, D.C.,
November 24, 1969.

FOR WITHDRAWAL NOW

TO THE EDITOR: Dean Acheson, in your Nov. 24 issue supporting President Nixon's Vietnam policy, concludes by saying:

"If there is a better plan than the President's, let's hear it."

There is a much better plan. It is to accept Senator George Aikens proposal made months ago for the United States to declare we have won the war; then we should pull out just as rapidly as we can. Senator Charles Goodell's bill to end the U.S. military presence by Dec. 1, 1970 would carry out that purpose. I know all of the arguments against a unilateral withdrawal, but the fact is that President Nixon's Nov. 3 plan will not only not end the war but will prolong it.

Our boys will continue to die in vain and the costly drain on our resources to the exclusion of most of our vital domestic programs will continue. There will be no peace by negotiation because our adversaries feel quite understandably that there is nothing to negotiate.

Sooner or later withdrawal without further ado will become inevitable. Why not now before we sacrifice needlessly more American lives, kill more South and North Vietnamese, destroy more of the land we are allegedly "saving," and foster ever deepening dissent at home?

ERNEST GRUENING,
Former U.S. Senator from Alaska.

URGES DEFEAT OF "MURPHY AMENDMENT"

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago I spoke out against the so-called "Murphy amendment" to Senate bill S. 3016. At that time I brought to the attention of the House Members a resolution adopted by the Los Angeles County Bar Association Board of Trustees strongly opposing the Senate action in including this amendment in its bill to provide for the continuation of economic opportunity programs.

Recently, nine law school deans from the State of California issued a statement urging defeat of the "Murphy amendment" from the Senate bill. These gentlemen believe the amendment is inconsistent with the canons of professional ethics and professional responsibility which are essential to the proper functioning of our traditional system of justice. It should also be noted that these gentlemen oppose any limitation on the legal services program. I fully agree with the statements made by these nine law school deans from my own State.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 12321, to authorize continued programs under the Economic Opportunity Act, comes to the floor for consideration this week. The committee very wisely did not include any version of the "Murphy amendment" in its bill. However, it is expected that an attempt will be made to offer such an amendment to the House bill during floor debate.

As we begin consideration of this legislation, I wish to add the voices of these nine law school deans to the growing opposition to the "Murphy amendment," and urge the attention of my colleagues to their statement:

STATEMENT OF CALIFORNIA LAW SCHOOL DEANS

We strongly urge the defeat of the amendment to S. 3016 which grants State Governors an absolute veto over Legal Services Programs. The amendment is intended to allow Governors to bar particular types of legal actions.

As Deans of the law schools educating most of California's future lawyers, we are deeply concerned about the impact of this amendment upon the ideals and practice of law in this State and the Nation. It is inconsistent with the Canons of Professional Ethics which we endeavor to instill in our students. It constitutes a direct infringement upon the independence and professional responsibility which are essential to the proper functioning of our traditional system of justice.

This amendment has been opposed by most representatives of the legal community, including the unanimous action of the American Bar Association's Board of Governors. It is also opposed by the Judicial Conference of the United States under Chief Justice Warren Burger, by the National Legal Aid and Defender Association delegates and board, by the American Bar Association's Section on Individual Rights and Responsibilities, and by the President of the Association of American Law Schools. We join in opposing the amendment for these further reasons:

(1) Any limitation on the Legal Services Program threatens law and order by closing

a peaceful channel for the redress of the grievances of the poor.

(2) Preventing poor people from maintaining legal action against their government undermines the American system of a government of law in which no official is beyond legal review.

(3) Granting State Governors an absolute veto over Legal Services Programs almost assuredly will result in a substantial, or indeed total, denial of legal assistance to the disadvantaged in a number of states.

Dated: November 1969.

Dean Dorothy Nelson, University of Southern California Law Center; Dean Murray Schwartz, University of California, Los Angeles, School of Law; Dean Edward C. Halbach, Jr., University of California, Boalt Hall, Berkeley; Dean Leo O'Brien, Loyola University School of Law; Dean B. A. Manning, Stanford University Law School; Acting Dean William Riegger, University of San Francisco Law School; Dean L. A. Huard, University of Santa Clara School of Law; Dean A. M. Sammis, Hastings College of Law, University of California; Dean Edward Barrett, University of California at Davis Law School.

INDIANS DENIED DAY IN COURT; A TRAVESTY OF JUSTICE

HON. JERRY L. PETTIS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. PETTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a matter which both perplexes and angers me. Why is it that a proud and mighty U.S. Government insists continuously on trampling on the rights of the American Indian? How can it be, I wonder, that such a compassionate and affluent Nation will annually pour out billions of dollars' worth of aid to a motley variety of countries and then turn around and treat the Indians—the earliest natives of these United States—with such brutal disregard?

To the shame of America, there are already too many such instances on file and now I find myself having to add still another citation to this inglorious record. I refer specifically to the attempted grant by the Bureau of Land Management of the Department of the Interior to the State of California of 1,500 acres of highly valuable land occupied by the Fort Mojave Indian Tribe since time immemorial and to which they claim title. This attempted "give-away" of the Mojave lands, instituted 10 years ago, is a bleak and sordid story of an entrenched bureaucracy seeking to sustain an unconscionable series of bumbling acts which can best be described as amoral.

The Fort Mojaves have attempted several times, unsuccessfully, to use their proper legal rights to protest this acquisition. Their efforts have been aborted by a series of delays, postponements and indecision. Never have they had their day in court. Then, in October, a hearing on the Indians' case was scheduled for November 18. Now allow me to quote from an October 14 opinion from Mitchell Mellich, the Solicitor of the Department of the Interior:

The Director of the Bureau of Land Management is instructed to schedule a hearing on November 18, 1969; he is to appoint the hearings examiner who, in turn, will inform the parties as to the time and place of the hearing. No postponement or continuance will be granted.

Yet the Solicitor's office shortly proceeded in typical callous fashion to abrogate its own dictum by allowing the Attorney General of California to have another continuance, until December 15. That cynical decision was then followed by the ultimate in deception and discrimination. At the pretrial hearing called by the hearing examiner, the Mojaves were told that the proceeding was not a hearing de novo; moreover, the Mojaves were told that the record of the proceedings from which arose the "giveaway" decision, would remain a part of the reconvened proceedings, although the Mojaves could cross-examine the witnesses who had testified at the "giveaway" proceedings.

That is an outright contradiction of a promise made at a meeting on March 21 of this year in the Office of the Secretary of the Interior, with Senator Alan Cranston of California and members of his staff; Mr. Raymond Simpson, counsel for the Mojaves; four members of the Mojave tribe, and myself. But though the Secretary arranged for the meeting, he disdained joining the gathering himself and designated some lackey to represent him. This individual stated very plainly that he had the authority to speak for the Secretary and he proceeded to inform us that a hearing de novo would be granted the Mojaves.

Under that assumption, the following telegram was dispatched to Secretary Hickel confirming the understanding:

MARCH 21, 1969.

HON. WALTER HICKEL,
Secretary of the Interior, Department of the Interior, Washington, D.C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: On behalf of the Fort Mojave Indians, their counsel, Raymond Simpson and myself, I wish to express deep appreciation for the meeting you arranged today on our behalf. We are particularly grateful that, after a wait of two years, you have promised a decision by April fifteenth on this critical matter of the swampland application. We are aware of the tremendous responsibilities that any Secretary bears when first assuming office. Therefore, we are doubly grateful for this prompt promise of action. Best personal regards.

JERRY L. PETTIS,
Member of Congress.

Now that promise has been broken again. The Indians still have not had their day in court and I call now on the Secretary for an explanation of this contemptible conduct. What has happened, I wonder, to the man who used to visualize himself as the champion of the Indians and Eskimos when he was the Governor of Alaska? Has Potomac fever so dimmed his perspective?

Simply stated the Mojaves are being denied the due process of law; they are not getting their long-awaited and justifiable day in court. The ground rules for the proposed hearing are so restrictive that it is virtually a kangaroo court. And what it amounts to is a shoddy attempt by the present incumbents in the Department of the Interior to legalize a bad

and unjust decision made long ago by some incompetent bureaucrat.

Can we wonder then why the Indian has come to consider his white brother as fork tongued? Considering everything, I think it is a charitable description.

It is my intention to secure a just solution of this matter and perhaps in so doing focus some badly needed attention, by the Congress and the public, on those appointive officials who feel so free to disregard and abuse the rights of our Indians.

What follows is a precise and comprehensive document of the sad history of this case and, Mr. Speaker, I would invite our colleagues to give it their careful attention:

From the standpoint of the Mojaves the calculated seizure of their lands commenced, unbeknownst to them, 10 years ago. By a letter dated April 24, 1959, California filed its application to have the lands which the Mojaves claim as part of their ancient homeland, declared subject to the so-called Swamp and Overflow Act of 1850, which would recognize title in California. Notice of California's 1959 application was neither given to the Mojaves nor to the Bureau of Indian Affairs. Some 5 years later the Bureau of Land Management on September 30, 1964, rejected California's April 1959 application for the lands. Notice of this action was not given to either the Mojaves or to the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

By its 1963 opinion the Supreme Court in the case of Arizona against California, refused to rule upon the disputed boundary of the Fort Mojave Indian Reservation which directly involved the lands to which the Mojaves at all times have laid claim. To have the disputed boundary resolved—evidencing the title of the Mojaves to the lands in question—the Bureau of Indian Affairs by a memorandum dated December 7, 1964, requested the appropriate officials of the Department of the Interior to undertake a resurvey of it. This latter date becomes increasingly important as the sequence of events will reveal.

Although the request for a resurvey of the lands in question was pending before the Department of the Interior, the following events and actions transpired:

On December 13, 1965—a full year after the request to resolve the boundary dispute—California renewed its application for the lands and requested a hearing provided for in the Swamp and Overflow Act; no notice of this application was given to either the Mojaves or the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

January 24, 1966, is the date that the Department of the Interior granted California's application to be heard in regard to its claim that the lands in question were subject to the Swamp and Overflow Act. No notice was given to the Indians or the Bureau of Indian Affairs of that Department order.

April 25, 1966—a notice of hearing was given to all interested parties—with the exception of the Indians and the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

September 19, 1966, is the date of the actual hearing in Sacramento, California. The Mojave Indians and the Bureau of Indian Affairs were denied notice of

the hearing and denied an opportunity to be heard at it.

February 10, 1967, is the date of an opinion rendered by the Solicitor's Office responding to the December 7, 1964, request for a survey of the lands in question, in which it was declared: "In my opinion, there is no legal justification for a resurvey of the 1928 western boundary."

March 15, 1967—shortly after the Solicitor's opinion of February 10, 1967, denying the request for a resurvey of the lands involved—is the date when the hearing examiner for the Bureau of Land Management declared in effect that title to the 1,500 acres claimed by the Mojaves, resided in the State of California. No notice of this decision of March 15, 1967, was given either to the Mojaves or the Bureau of Indian Affairs.

Early in July of 1967—quite by accident—the Bureau of Indian Affairs learned of the "giveaway" of the 1,500 acres of land to California.

July 11, 1967—the Bureau of Indian Affairs filed a motion to intervene in the proceedings which resulted in giving California the 1,500 acres, the matter then being on appeal by the Bureau of Land Management.

August 9, 1967, the Mojaves, through their attorney, likewise petitioned to intervene in the proceedings.

There ensued a year-long struggle by the Mojaves and the Bureau of Indian Affairs to have their day in court—a trial de novo.

August 14, 1968, the Solicitor in an order (a) denied the Bureau of Indian Affairs' petition to intervene—alleging it had been represented at the hearing by the Solicitor's Office; (b) gravely restricting the Mojaves their demanded right to a day in court, the Solicitor required that there first be considered and determined by the Secretary of the Interior a most complex question of law, namely: If the Mojaves held aboriginal title in 1850 to the 1,500 acres of land, would the Swamp and Overflow Act have application to the land, as claimed by California? (c) only after the Secretary of the Interior had determined that complex legal question would the Secretary decide whether the Mojaves would be heard relative to the Swamp and Overflow question and then, in effect, only if it was decided that the boundary dispute alluded to above was resolved in the Mojaves favor, which, as stated, had already been resolved against them by the Solicitor's opinion of February 10, 1967.

Of great importance in regard to the Solicitor's decision of August 14, 1968, is the fact that the decision purported to establish the Secretary of Interior as a court of law to determine the far-reaching "threshold" question.

Another year of struggle was consumed by the Mojaves now fighting alone because the Bureau of Indian Affairs was not permitted to intervene.

Denial by the Solicitor in the August 14, 1968, decision of the right of the Bureau of Indian Affairs to intervene in the proceedings in question, in addition to grievously injuring the Mojaves, was this shocking result:

It constituted action by the Solicitor's office which defeated the will of Congress

by precluding the Bureau created by the Congress to assist the Indians in the performance of its function as declared by the Congress.

As the Solicitor's tactics against the Mojaves unfolded, this incredible fact came to light: The member of the Solicitor's staff whose opinion of February 10, 1967—immediately antecedent to the giveaway opinion of March 15, 1967—was writing opinions antagonistic to the Mojaves and otherwise participating in the matter. When this grave conflict came to light, the attorney for the Mojaves immediately filed a motion to have that member of the Solicitor's office disqualified by reason of his earlier opinion to antipodal to the Mojaves interest. January 23, 1969, is the date when the motion of the Mojaves to disqualify was denied by the Solicitor.

To fall into the procedural pit created by the Solicitor would have been fatal to the Mojaves. As a consequence they renewed their petition for a trial de novo denying that the Secretary had the power to render a legal decision regarding the threshold question and at all costs to avoid being caught by the cat-and-mouse tactics being used by the Solicitor against the Mojaves.

Noting the shameful practices indulged in against the Mojaves, I interposed objections to the Solicitor and demanded the Mojaves have their day in court—a trial de novo and I was promised a trial de novo by the Solicitor's office.

October 14, 1969—the Solicitor's office reversed itself—declaring that the August 14 decision, purporting to constitute the Secretary of the Interior a court of law with power to render a legal opinion respecting the "threshold" question, was in error. In that opinion, reversing the August 14 opinion, the Solicitor's office declared:

(a) The "giveaway" decision of March 15, 1967, declaring title to the Mojave lands to be in California, was vacated. (b) It also stated, in effect: The Mojaves have petitioned for a trial de novo and a new proceeding would be held commencing November 18, 1969 affording to the Mojaves an opportunity to be heard, specifically ruling that: "When the hearing is reconvened, the Tribe (Mojave) and the Bureau (of Land Management) each will be afforded the opportunity to present such evidence as may now be available to them as to the right of the state to the subject lands under the Swamp Land Act, and it is so ordered." (By an opinion dated October 27, 1969, the hearing date on California's request was changed to December 15, 1969.)

Believing justice would be accorded to them under the October 14, 1969, Solicitor's opinion, the Mojaves were joyful at their "victory." However, their joy was short lived. At a pretrial hearing called by the hearing examiner, the Mojaves were told that the proceeding was not a trial de novo; moreover, the Mojaves were told the record of the proceedings, from which arose the "giveaway" decision, would remain a part of the reconvened proceedings, although the Mojaves could cross-examine the witnesses who had previously testified at the "giveaway" proceedings.

In addition, the hearing commissioner likewise sought to secure agreement from the Mojaves, without success, that the now truncated proceedings over which he

would preside constitute "due process" of the law, thus curing the denial of the Mojaves of their right to notice of the "giveaway" proceedings and also curing the defect arising from the failure of the Mojaves to be represented at the hearing from which emanated the "giveaway" of Mojave lands.

Further, the hearing examiner denied that the Bureau of Indian Affairs could participate in the now most restrictive proceedings, thus continuing to frustrate the will of Congress which had created the Bureau of Indian Affairs to protect the Indian interests.

November 14, 1969—a final blow to the Mojaves in their struggle to recover their lands was delivered by the Solicitor's office. Responding to the Bureau of Indian Affairs' memorandum seeking to have the boundary dispute referred above resolved in the hearing now set for December 15, 1969, the Solicitor's office wrote the following cryptic memorandum:

Your memorandum of October 24 concerning the above mentioned subject stated on October 14, we ordered a hearing de novo in regard to the application for patent under the Swamp Land Act of 1850, 43 U.S.C. Sec. 982-984 (1964) by the State of California for certain lands in the state.

As a matter of fact a hearing de novo was not ordered in this case. The case has been reopened for the purpose of permitting the introduction of additional evidence. The evidence which has already been introduced is a part of the record. Admission of new evidence will, of course, be determined by the Hearing Examiner.

VINCENT P. MANCUSO HONORED

HON. MICHAEL A. FEIGHAN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. FEIGHAN. Mr. Speaker, the International Association of Lions Clubs endeavors, through exchanges of ideas and services, to foster and maintain peaceful international relationships. In the United States, Lions Clubs are constantly seeking to improve the condition and welfare of all citizens. It seeks expression, in its humane endeavors, to advance the well-being of indigent blind and visually handicapped. In the Greater Cleveland area, various significant services are rendered, and progressive, community achievers who wear the Lions pin of humane recognition, provide meaningful services wherever and whenever possible.

These important services extend to recognitions of nonaffiliated citizens whose efforts are multiplied in effect, through the examples they provide for others.

On Saturday, November 29, 1969, the Heights Lions Club, Inc., presented to an individual its annual Book and Scroll award, conferring title, "Exemplary Citizen, 1969." The award is made to one who provides "extraordinary and varied services—in that such services have inspired emulation, confidence in our

American life, and faith in the concept of universal brotherhood."

Recipient of the 1969 award was Vincent P. Mancuso of South Euclid, Ohio. Mr. Mancuso's outstanding record of service covers many years, and has been often lauded for their humanitarian and selfless motivation and tireless dedication. Among recognitions previously received are:

Sir Noble, Order of Alhambra; Sir Knight, Moses Cleaveland General Assembly; Grand Knight, Our Lady of Lourdes Shrine; Knight of the Year, 1967, Gilmour Council 310, Knights of Columbus; Outstanding Man of the Year, 1960, Italian Sons and Daughters of America.

Further, Mr. Mancuso has recently served, for the fifth year, as general chairman of the annual Columbus Day Parade and Banquet in downtown Cleveland. In addition, earlier this month he served as general chairman of the annual benefit banquet-ball for mentally retarded children, an event sponsored each year by the Carmona Caravan of the Order of Alhambra. This wonderful effort resulted in gifts to this fund of \$15,000 this year. He has been most aptly described by the chairman of the Heights Lions Club award presentation, Daniel L. Mausser, as, "the irrepressible general chairman of practically everything."

VIETNAM CRISIS

HON. W. R. HULL, JR.

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, the American people, speaking through yesterday's historic vote in the House of Representatives endorsing the President's peace efforts, have told the world, including the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, they repudiate proposals for a precipitous pullout from South Vietnam.

The overwhelmingly favorable vote in support of House Resolution 613 directed toward the goal of achieving peace with justice in Vietnam, a resolution which I was proud to cosponsor, demonstrates that the now-fabled silent majority in this country has a voice too. And this voice will not be shouted by the participants in street demonstrations, who demand that we abjectly capitulate to the Communists by abandoning South Vietnam.

Communist leaders have declared time and time again that they do not expect to take over South Vietnam by force of arms. They do not really believe they can defeat us militarily. Their principal hope, and they admit it, is for a political victory when the American people, weary of its defense of freedom, withdraws its support to the Government.

Recognizing this fact, President Nixon accurately noted in his speech to the American people on November 3:

North Vietnam cannot defeat or humiliate the United States. Only Americans can do that.

Notwithstanding the traitors who parade in the streets waving the flags of the enemy which has killed thousands of young Americans, most Americans will tolerate neither the defeat nor the humiliation of the United States in Vietnam. It is enough that we tolerate the apologists for the Communists.

We intend to achieve peace with justice, and the Congress has signified the American people will not be satisfied with less.

CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, this is another in a series of statements dealing with crime in the District of Columbia.

Chief of Police Wilson of the District of Columbia recently released the crime index for October 1969.

In July 1969 the Metropolitan Police Department developed a crime trend prediction based on total crime index offenses for 1966, 1967, and 1968. At that time it predicted a crime index rate for fiscal year 1970 of 62,000 crimes. It seems obvious from the October report that that figure will be substantially exceeded this year.

Chief Wilson in discussing the crime index with a group of lawyers in October was predicting a rate of crime of 80,000 by fiscal year 1972. However, the crime rate for October 1969 is 6,063, thus reflecting an annual rate of 72,756, as against an annual rate in October 1968 of 53,724. This is an approximate annual rate of increase in crime in the District of Columbia of 36 percent, an astonishing statistic by any yardstick. If this trend or rate of increase continues, Chief Wilson's figure of 80,000 may be achieved or exceeded next year.

These are grim statistics which I set forth below for the information and enlightenment of all Members of Congress. Of special interest to Members of Congress should be the information that the fifth precinct, in which the Capitol and the House and Senate Office Buildings are located, had the greatest increase in crime than any other precinct in the city, during October.

The crime index follows:

CRIME INDEX FOR OCTOBER 1969

On November 26, 1969, the Office of the Chief of Police released the reported Crime Index Statistics for the month of October 1969. The October statistics show an increase of 3.6% over September 1969. These same figures compared with October 1968 show a 35.4% increase.

Larceny and Auto Theft with 1101 and 1030 offenses reported in October, decreased by 0.8% and 7.5%, respectively, over September 1969. Auto Theft also decreased by 12.6% over July and by 10.4% over August 1969. The continuing decrease in Auto Theft for three consecutive months is significant and may mark the beginning of a downward trend. However, Larceny, with 1085 in July and 1196 in August 1969 does not reflect the

same downward trend. The major contributors to the Larceny rate are Larceny from Auto and Larceny from Office buildings.

There was an increase of 192 burglaries or 9.6% over September 1969. The Burglary Prevention Program, instituted in the middle of October, is now in full swing. This program is an effort to encourage the citizens to assist The Police in preventing Burglary and other crimes. Police Department Officials hope that with citizen cooperation, improvements can be expected in future months.

Robbery has continued to increase. In October 1969, 1348 robberies were reported. According to the Robbery Squad, 749 of these or 55.5% were armed robberies. September had 821 armed robberies, thus remaining the

high month in this category for 1969 with October ranking second.

In July 1969 the department developed a crime trend prediction based on total Crime Index Offenses for 1966, 1967 and 1968. This prediction indicated a Crime Index Rate of about 62,000 Crime Index Offenses in Fiscal Year 1970. The 12-month total offenses ending with October 1969 was 60,248 which indicates Crime Index Offenses for Fiscal Year 1970 may exceed the initial prediction.

Crime index offenses as related to percentages of total, October 1969

	Number	Percent
Homicide	29	0.48
Rape	35	0.58
Robbery	1,348	22.23

Crime index offenses as related to percentages of total, October 1969—Continued

	Number	Percent
Aggravated assault	338	5.57
Total crimes against persons	1,750	28.86
Burglary	2,182	35.99
Larceny \$50/Over	1,101	18.16
Motor vehicle theft	1,030	16.99
Total, property crimes	4,313	71.14
Total, reported crimes	6,063	100.00

CRIME INDEX OFFENSES, OCTOBER 1969

Classification	October		Change		Cumulative through October 1969		Percent Change	12 months end October 1968	12 months end October 1968	Percent Change
	1968	1969	Amount	Percent	Fiscal year 1969	Fiscal year 1970				
Criminal homicide	22	29	+7	(1)	62	105	(1)	178	276	+55.06
Rape	30	35	+5	(1)	113	144	+27.43	241	341	+41.49
Robbery	839	1,348	+509	+60.66	2,981	4,908	+64.64	7,627	12,154	+59.35
Aggravated assault	256	338	+82	+32.03	1,082	1,300	+20.15	3,057	3,556	+16.32
Burglary	1,569	2,182	+613	+39.06	6,090	8,442	+38.62	17,639	21,581	+22.35
Larceny (\$50 and over)	760	1,101	+341	+44.86	3,125	4,492	+43.74	7,808	11,059	+41.64
Auto theft	1,001	1,030	+29	+2.89	4,342	4,472	+3.00	10,946	11,281	+3.06
Total	4,477	6,063	+1,586	+35.42	17,795	23,863	+34.10	47,496	60,248	+26.85

CRIME INDEX OFFENSES REPORTED

Precinct	October		Change	
	1968	1969	Amount	Percent
1	466	649	+183	+39.27
2	417	526	+109	+26.13
3	391	463	+72	+18.41
5	269	450	+181	+67.28
6	178	305	+127	+71.34
7	123	163	+40	+32.52
8	115	130	+15	+13.04
9	480	575	+95	+19.79
10	424	603	+179	+42.21
11	473	732	+259	+54.75
12	289	331	+42	+14.53
13	505	591	+86	+17.02
14	347	543	+196	+56.48
Harbor	0	2	(1)	(1)
Total	4,477	6,063	+1,586	+35.42

CRIME INDEX OFFENSES REPORTED OCTOBER 1969

Precinct	Total	Homicide	Rape	Robbery	Aggravated Assault	Burglary	Larceny \$50 and over	Auto theft
1-D	649	0	2	108	25	130	253	131
2	526	5	1	153	50	165	93	59
3	463	0	2	74	14	160	165	48
5	450	4	2	124	18	140	78	84
6	305	3	3	82	11	124	44	38
7	163	0	2	17	2	83	42	17
8	130	0	3	29	1	48	40	9
9	575	2	1	154	49	197	54	118
10	603	5	6	127	40	272	83	70
11	732	3	6	139	42	298	50	194
12	331	0	0	88	19	123	46	55
13	591	1	4	166	39	189	123	69
14	543	6	3	87	28	252	29	138
Harbor	2					1	1	
Total	6,063	29	35	1,348	338	2,182	1,101	1,030

¹ Base too small to compute percent change.

CRIME INDEX OFFENSES RELATED TO POPULATION, OCTOBER 1969

Precinct	Crime against persons	Crime against property	Total	Property, percent of total	Crimes against persons per 1,000 population	Crimes against property per 1,000 population	Total crime per 1,000 population
1-D	135	514	649	79.20	¹ 22,900	5.90	28.34
2	209	317	526	60.27	² 52,000	4.02	10.17
3	90	373	463	80.56	29,500	3.05	15.69
5	148	302	450	67.11	¹ 43,100	3.43	10.44
6	99	206	305	67.54	¹ 67,700	1.46	4.50
7	21	142	163	87.12	¹ 31,900	.66	5.11
8	33	97	130	74.62	¹ 68,000	.48	1.91
9	206	369	575	64.17	² 89,200	2.31	6.45
10	178	425	603	70.48	² 92,500	1.92	4.59
11	190	542	732	74.04	² 118,800	1.60	6.16
12	107	224	331	67.67	¹ 65,500	1.63	3.42
13	210	381	591	64.47	² 63,100	3.33	9.37
14	124	419	543	77.16	² 91,700	1.35	5.92
Harbor		2	2	100.00			
Total	1,750	4,313	6,063	71.14	836,000	2.09	7.25

¹ 1966 figures unrevised based on 798,000 total population.

² Most recent population estimates; 1966 based on 853,700 population total.

HAPPY BIRTHDAY MIKE KIRWAN

SPEECH OF

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, December 2, 1969

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, permit me to join others in paying a

warm tribute to our beloved colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KIRWAN) on the occasion of his 83d birthday.

Certainly we all wish this grand gentleman and dedicated public servant a happy birthday—he deserves the best.

MIKE KIRWAN can reflect on his long career of public service with justifiable pride—as Mr. Public Works of America and as chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Works Appropriations, MIKE KIR-

WAN has helped to build the muscle and sinews of the Nation's water transportation system. He is a leader in the development of our vast system of flood control projects, in power production, in conservation, and in other areas of resource development in the public interest.

As MIKE KIRWAN observes his birthday, it is fitting and appropriate for us to honor him for his great achievements

and accomplishments—and we wish him the best of good luck and good health.

**CONGRESSMAN FRANK HORTON
PRAISES DR. MARK ELLINGSON'S
YEARS AS EDUCATOR AND PRESIDENT
OF ROCHESTER INSTITUTE
OF TECHNOLOGY**

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, educator, president, and community servant—Dr. Mark Ellingson, former president of Rochester Institute of Technology is all these things.

After 33 years, Dr. Ellingson has retired as president of RIT. During this time, the enrollment has grown from 550 full-time students to more than 4,100. He has been the guiding spirit behind the expansion of RIT which has resulted in a beautiful 1,300-acre campus south of Rochester in Henrietta, N.Y.

I am proud to have Dr. Ellingson as a friend. His modesty and the quality of his concern and dedication are exemplary. He has always strived for excellence in student relations and in education, and he has achieved these goals admirably.

Dr. Ellingson came to RIT in 1926. He became economics professor, wrestling coach, and head of the photography department. Ten years later, in 1936, he became president of RIT. Since that time, the school has gained worldwide reputation for its excellence.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday night next week I hope to take part in a special community salute to Mark Ellingson by the leaders of the business, education, government, and industrial community in the Greater Rochester area.

It will be my privilege to give recognition to this distinguished educator and community leader as the representative of those in local, State, and National government. I am sure, that all of my colleagues here join with me in extending to Dr. Ellingson a sincere thank you for a job well done and best wishes for the coming years.

The citizens of the Greater Rochester area and the entire education field owe a great deal to Mark Ellingson. Mr. Speaker, in order for the Members to know just a little of Mr. Ellingson's accomplishment, I would like to share with them a two-part series by Beatrice Collins which appeared in the Brighton-Pittsford, N.Y., Post:

**CREATED MODERN RIT: A MODEST LEADER
CLOSES HIS DESK
(By Beatrice Collins)**

Dr. Mark Ellingson closes his office door next Wednesday retiring after 33 years as president of Rochester Institute of Technology.

Dr. Ellingson of 3940 East Ave., Pittsford, retires with a dream come true—the handsome, new 1,300-acre campus off Jefferson Road, dedicated a year ago.

But the enthusiastic educator, under whose leadership RIT's enrollment has grown from 550 fulltime students to more than 4,100 declines to accept much credit for the steady growth of the school.

The Institute grew out of the needs of the community. It has grown naturally in a

very favorable environment," Dr. Ellingson said. And it prospered because the industry of Rochester has always had great confidence in it."

Then he added, "I was coincidental with the development of the Institute."

The purpose of RIT, the educator explained in an interview this week, has been to "help young people become competent in a series of occupation fields."

And helping the school in its goal has been a long list of community leaders—in business, industry and civic affairs.

"I hate to start naming names," Dr. Ellingson said, "because there are so darned many of those guys and everyone of them was interested in this community."

However, it is impossible to discuss the progress of RIT without mentioning such community-minded citizens as Frank W. Lovejoy, James Gleason, Thomas Hargrave, and Frank E. Gannett.

"These men were deeply devoted to their community and perfectly willing to utilize part of their profits to better it."

He cited the quality of men like William S. Vaughn, chairman of the Board of Eastman Kodak Co., Kodak president Louis K. Eilers, Joseph C. Wilson of Xerox Corp. and F. Ritter Shumway, a grandson of the founder of Mechanics Institute, forerunner of RIT.

The development of Midtown Plaza by Gilbert McCurdy and Maurice Forman is given by Dr. Ellingson as another achievement by area business leaders.

"This was before urban renewal," he pointed out. "Why do people do this? Well, I'm sure the profit motive is not wholly absent but there's more to it than that."

"People of the community have had their eye on what is good for the community," he said.

These men have maintained the tradition of concern which began with the early Rochester leaders who passed on their concern to the generations coming up, the retiring RIT president said.

"I doubt if this institution could have thrived or prospered in any other community."

Dr. Ellingson added, "I think the soil in this community has been well-cultivated by leadership in business and industry. The Rochester area is different from other areas because of the quality of the men and women who live here!"

He named the Industrial Management Council as one of the significant forces here. This association, made up of most of the businesses and manufacturers in the city, works closely with industry, is something which makes this community unique, he said.

Dr. Ellingson explained that RIT has been guided by a board of trustees, composed mostly of persons from business and industry.

"We have discussed what the community's needs are. Then, working with IMC, we have set up these programs."

In recalling those who have been instrumental in the institution's growth, Mr. Ellingson pointed out that from the beginning, "everyone had one foot in his industry and the other foot out in the middle of the community saying 'What can I do?'"

And they have maintained their interest. The late James Gleason was on RIT's board for 65 years and was 95 when the school made its move for a new campus.

He told us to get 500 acres, not 50 or 60, Dr. Ellingson recalled. "When we told him that we had 1,300 acres, he said, 'That's more like it.'"

"Those guys had characteristic greatness," declared the man who had guided RIT from 1936 until this week.

**END OF AN ERA—ELLINGSON REALM AT RIT:
"CHANGE—CHANGE—CHANGE"**

(By Beatrice Collins)

Dr. Mark Ellingson of Pittsford, newly retired president of Rochester Institute of

Technology, offered an explanation for the apparent minimum discontent on that campus.

"This is a professional school," he said.

When one finds students who have decided how they are going to make their career, they are less concerned with revolt and turmoil than those who don't yet know what they want to do.

Dr. Ellingson, sitting behind the massive desk in the contemporary office which he was about to vacate, discussed RIT and its students in an interview a week before his retirement yesterday.

The imposing but genial president, who characterized RIT as "not a traditional school," declared, "I have great faith in the American student—he is better educated and more sophisticated than before."

The key to the comparative calm on the RIT campus may lie in the fact that Dr. Ellingson and the administration have anticipated some of the demands being made by college students today.

On the RIT campus, students sit in on policy-making committees and they also handle 90 per cent of the discipline problems, Dr. Ellingson said. "It is easy to turn over a great many problems to our students."

He added that RIT's students are not passive, "they are very active and they do participate." He said he talked often with the president of student government whom he described as "a very able person."

The graying director of the Institute, which has attained world recognition in many fields, explained that most of the problems on campuses have arisen in the liberal arts colleges, particularly among the history and sociology majors "who don't know where they are going to fit in."

General studies were not ignored, but RIT has capitalized on work experience and was the second institution in this country to have a cooperative work program.

"We've been innovative and a pioneer in this field," Dr. Ellingson said.

He spoke proudly of RIT's School for American Craftsmen. "Few colleges have anything like it."

The visitor waiting to see RIT's president cannot help but be impressed by an unusual tapestry which covers a large wall area in the reception room. The work was designed and woven by Sheila Hicks, a graduate of the school for craftsmen.

Before 1950, RIT did not grant degrees. It was not until the state changed its rules in the system of granting degrees that the local professional school adopted the system.

It was not necessary for the Institute to change materially, said its president, because "there is now a lot of latitude in degree-granting in the state."

RIT has a different attitude from the traditional institutions of higher learning. "We do not admit students unless they are admitted to a specific department," Dr. Ellingson said.

"We take the attitude that it is better for a student to make up his mind and change it later than not to make it up at all," said the man who for many years also coached RIT's wrestling team.

Dr. Ellingson came to Rochester in 1924 to study voice at the Eastman School of Music. Twenty years old then, it took just one year to convince him that "this was a mistake."

He went back to study economics and was offered a job at RIT by a member of the faculty whom he had known in Idaho.

The year was 1926. Ten years later, Mark Ellingson, economics professor, wrestling coach and head of the photography department, was president of RIT.

Much of the emphasis at RIT has been on the position that no citizen can be a first-rate citizen unless he is a productive citizen, Dr. Ellingson pointed out.

"There is no moral equivalent for work—there is a sobering, steady, maturing influence in work," he said.

He spoke of the continuing education program at RIT. Almost all local industries have encouraged employees to continue their education along with their employment, he pointed out. About 2,700 to 2,800 students are working on bachelor's degrees in continuing education alone.

"Education is the key to man's advancement," Dr. Ellingson said firmly, "Education is not like vaccine—one shot doesn't vaccinate you against ignorance."

Of the school's role in today's education, Dr. Ellingson said, "I think the things we are doing are relevant to how our students will live their lives."

"We've changed—changed—changed. This is one thing which has been most characteristic in the years I've been here. We've searched for new and different ways."

It's not difficult to understand why modest Mark Ellingson has been such a successful educator. At RIT he has been accessible to the students, both in the sports program and as president, and he obviously likes them.

"We have high quality students and they know what they want to do. I am filled with admiration and respect for the young people of today."

WHOSE CRIME IS PINKVILLE?

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, the facts about the alleged Pinkville massacre are still fragmented and incomplete. Moreover, in fairness to the accused, we cannot condemn in advance men who have yet to be tried.

Nevertheless, the apparent efforts of some military officers and Government officials also prompts one to be uneasy about waiting for the results of a trial. At the least, the specter of possible Pinkville should make all Americans of good conscience ponder the implications of our involvement in Vietnam.

Mike Royko recently raised in his column, "Whose Crime is Pinkville?" Mr. Royko's column makes you laugh—but painfully—with tears in your eyes. The column poignantly points up the immorality of a policy that frequently seems to be telling the South Vietnamese that we will save them even if this means destroying them in the process.

The column, which appeared in the Chicago Daily News on November 26, 1969, follows:

WHOSE CRIME IS PINKVILLE?

(By Mike Royko)

Americans should try to avoid getting a guilt complex about the Pinkville incident.

In the difficult process of spreading lasting freedom and peace to other countries, there are bound to be mishaps.

Because Americans are soft-hearted and sentimental, the thing that upsets them most is that a few babies, as well as many women and older children, were among those shot.

Naturally, it is always regrettable when babies are shot. I think most Americans agree that we did not go to Vietnam to shoot babies. That has never been our goal.

But if the majority of babies in Vietnam are to grow up free and in peace, some babies will have to make the supreme sacrifice. It cannot be avoided.

Even if we constantly cautioned our men not to shoot babies, or even adolescents and

women (except when fired upon, of course), some babies would be killed.

That's because we must drop bombs and use cannon and rockets and other such weapons. And as precisely as we may aim them, it is very hard to avoid having them land on babies and women now and then.

We can take comfort, though, in knowing that most of the time our men are spared the discomfort of seeing it happen up close. That is one of the blessings of modern aerial warfare.

Something else Americans should keep in mind are the circumstances leading to the shooting of the Pinkville civilians.

It wasn't a case of our men simply walking into a day nursery and opening fire. That would have been intolerable, even if it had been a Viet Cong day nursery.

The Pinkville area is in a notoriously pro-Communist part of South Vietnam, which means those children might very well have grown up to be Communists, if they weren't already.

And surely some of the women and older children in Pinkville were part of the Global Communist Conspiracy to bury us, or at least were fellow travelers. What were they doing in Pinkville anyway?

Some people seem to forget that Marx, Lenin, Stalin, Mao, Ho and Claude Lightfoot were once babies, too. Would any true anti-Communist say he would regret it if Stalin had been a baby in Pinkville?

Another reason Americans became agitated by the Pinkville incident is that most of us have never witnessed the shooting of a child or even a grown woman.

It has been our good fortune and national destiny to have wars for peace and freedom in other countries, such as Vietnam, instead of here in our own land.

But people in many other countries that have had wars aren't nearly as surprised that babies and other such noncombatants die. The Vietnamese are probably less surprised at the Pinkville incident than we are, since such things have been happening to them ever since the battle for their peace and freedom began.

For this reason, Americans should try not to let the Pinkville affair upset them, especially before a holiday. Many babies and their mothers have been killed in Vietnam, and many more will be, before there is a just and an honorable peace.

The news media should try to show restraint. It would be a good idea if they didn't carry such stories at all. They only stir up dissent and make the job of our leaders more difficult.

But if the commentators must talk about the killing of children, the least they can do is be impartial. I have already seen one commentator shake his head and look glum while describing the shooting of those people.

Commentators should avoid looking glum, or raising their eyebrows or trying to sway opinion for or against the killing of babies. The people can decide for themselves if they want babies killed.

And the commentators should be fair and mention that the Communists also have killed a lot of women, children and babies in Vietnam, too.

And they weren't even doing it for peace.

PREVENTING CRIMINAL RECIDIVISM

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, perhaps the most important single question for

society in relation to the continuing crime problem, is what to do with the convicted criminal in order that he—or she—may return to society as a useful citizen? Simple incarceration is not an answer. Neither is long-term confinement with its inevitable exposure to hardened, hopeless criminals.

Commission of crime should never be considered as an open ticket to free psychiatric care, or a prolonged tax-subsidized stay at Mother Uncle's rest home. At the same time there are many who commit crimes who have done so for reasons indicative of a justification in terms of understanding if not in law. When these cases require prosecution and result in conviction there ought to be a way to make it reasonably unattractive to prospective violators yet also reasonably certain that those who can be restored to society will at the very least have exposure to constructive character building during confinement.

In this connection the lead editorial in today's Wall Street Journal emphasizes society's continuing dilemma in an era of rapidly rising crime. I support constructive, broad-based legislation, encouraging and assisting increased Federal-State cooperation in meeting this challenge.

The editorial referred to follows:

UNGLAMOROUS BUT CRUCIAL

We're more than happy to see examples of increasing attention to prison reform. So unglamorous an issue seldom attracts lasting attention and support, but we are convinced it is one of the first prerequisites to any serious efforts toward reducing the problem of crime.

Within the past few weeks, President Nixon has directed the Attorney General to start a study intended to result in a total overhaul of the Federal prison system. The Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training has recommended a considerable expansion of funding for the correctional process. Just as necessary as more money, though, is the kind of public thought and discussion that can clarify the nation's thinking on what prisons and corrections are all about.

Even within the legal process, there is no agreement on what real purpose is served by sending a man to prison. Is it punishment? Is it supposed to rehabilitate him? Is it merely a matter of protecting society by separating dangerous individuals? The metaphysical arguments on these questions can and do go on forever, and it's past time they yielded to cold pragmatism.

The overpowering pragmatic consideration is that a large share of all crime, probably most of it, is committed by repeaters. President Nixon says 40% of all convicts are returned to prison for a second offense. Lowering this repeat rate looms as one of the major keys—perhaps matched only by a more orderly approach to narcotics addiction—to reducing the crime rate. It stands to reason that reducing recidivism ought to be the cardinal objective of the correctional process.

Beyond that obvious line of reasoning, we sense that the futility of corrections is poisoning the rest of the law enforcement process. The experience of apprehending and convicting criminals and repeatedly finding them back at the same crime certainly must erode the morale of police officers and judges; it's a wonder they are not even more cynical and pessimistic than they tend to be. We also suspect that the ease with which defense attorneys have recently gained rules making convictions more difficult is somehow related

to the futility of gaining convictions in the first place.

The conventional wisdom seems to be that cutting the repeat rate is an impossible task. Most of those who assert as much add that the way to deal with crime is to solve all our social problems, as if that were a more feasible alternative. In fact, many other nations do much better in rehabilitating criminals than the United States does, and at least a few experiments in this country also offer some encouragement.

The United States has never, or at least very seldom, actually tried to reduce recidivism. At present a judge sentencing a criminal is typically faced with two alternatives. He can sentence a convict to prison, which scarcely seems the way to help him get along with normal society in a law-abiding way. Or he can grant probation or parole; with the casework loads of probation workers what they are, this usually means releasing the criminal with no effective supervision whatever.

Successful experience with rehabilitation points in quite an opposite direction—having the offenders operate in normal society but under the tightest supervision. The approach is to concentrate on juvenile offenders, get casework levels down to far lower figures, and establish far more programs where offenders are released for work or school during the day, but spend nights in correctional facilities.

These are rather new directions of the American criminal process. They will not arise spontaneously from a divided sentiment, where half of the public blames society for forcing the poor criminal to break the law, and the other half thinks "getting tough" with criminals will solve everything. As the Nixon Administration studies reforming prisons, it ought also to give some thought to crystallizing public attitudes around rehabilitation as an entirely hardheaded and pragmatic response to the crime problem.

New facilities, more manpower and more funds will be needed, both at Federal and state levels. But they are not likely to come until there is a more cogent public sentiment, until there is a broader understanding that the weak link in law enforcement today is not catching the criminal or trying him, but doing something sensible after he is convicted.

U.S. ARMY DESERTERS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is an alarming state of affairs when more than 56,000 are listed as deserters from the U.S. Army. In my opinion, these deserters are a disgrace to the uniform and to our Nation. They must be apprehended and punished severely for their crime.

Discipline must be maintained if our Nation expects our Armed Forces to be a potent force for the protection of our country. In my view, most of these desertions border on mutiny. These men are deliberately avoiding hazardous duty while more than 479,000 are serving our country in Vietnam with selfless devotion. When a member of the Armed Forces is absent more than 30 days, it should be prima facie evidence of an intent to remain away. He must be tried for desertion, for the punishment to be commensurate with the abhorrent of-

fense. The penalty for servicemen's defiance of allegiance to our country must be sufficient to deter others.

Mr. President, those who have sought sanctuary in foreign countries rather than serve their country should get the message loud and clear that they face charges of desertion with maximum penalties. Every effort should be made to negotiate with these countries for the return of military deserters so that these criminals can be tried by courts-martial for desertion.

An editorial published in the November 24 issue of the State newspaper in Columbia, S.C., presents an excellent analysis of this national problem. I quote a key point in this fine editorial:

The best prevention is the sure knowledge that fast, firm and fair punishment awaits at the end of a trip over the hill.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial be printed in the *Extensions of Remarks*.

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

PATH OVER THE HILL MORE POPULAR THAN EVER

Pamper rhymes with scamper and, as far as the U.S. Army is concerned, the relationship seems to go much deeper than that.

One only has to drive out to Fort Jackson and note the attractive brick barracks and other facilities for housing, caring for and training recruits to realize that GI Joe never had it so good. Over and beyond the improved physical facilities the recruits get better pay, shorter hours, more passes or time off, less physical or verbal abuse and other blessings that were not available to his counterpart of a few years ago.

But, unfortunately no one has figured out how to modernize a foxhole or stiffen a spine or make the thought of combat pleasant. The prospect of going to war is apparently the No. 1 reason that the Army's absence-without-leave and desertion rates are the highest since George Washington's "summer soldiers" disappeared at the fall of the first leaf or the sound of the first musket.

When *The Wall Street Journal* checked into this AWOL derby recently, there were 23,000 men listed as deserters (missing 30 days or more). This is equivalent to a combat division with some support units thrown in.

The *Journal* cited other uninspiring figures: last year 56,600 soldiers deserted and more than 150,000 were AWOL at one time or the other during the period. This cost the Army 10,000 man-years, hurt morale and forced larger draft calls.

About a tenth of those who went over the hill last year disappeared between the time they finished recruit training and the time they were scheduled to leave for Vietnam. Of course, many leave for all the old familiar reasons—homesickness, dislike of regimentation, marital or financial troubles, etc.

But why is the desertion-AWOL rate twice as high now as it was during the Korean Conflict, another nasty, unpopular Asian war?

Most authorities point to the light punishments being meted out these days. Others put part of the blame on a society that sees nothing particularly wrong with Johnny going over the hill; he might even be a hero to the anti-war set. We might also suggest that these youngsters' parents, by failing to teach discipline and respect in the home, made their contribution.

It is quite possible that the absentee rate will do an about face when the new draft

reform law is implemented, which it will soon. A draft lottery, concentrating on the 19-year-olds instead of the older draft eligibles, is fairer and should produce fewer malcontents. As a whole this age group is not beset with as many problems and commitments as the older guys. The late teen years are generally the most convenient for satisfying the military obligation.

But other than that, it's up to the army commanders to tackle this costly and debilitating service sickness. Improved prevention and counseling programs may help. But the best prevention is the sure knowledge that fast, firm and fair punishment awaits at the end of a trip over the hill.

WHAT IS YOUR CIVIC IQ?

HON. BILL NICHOLS

OF ALABAMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, I recently had the honor of presenting to Dr. Houston Cole, president of Jacksonville State University, the distinguished George Washington Honor Medal, awarded by the Freedoms Foundation. Dr. Cole was presented this outstanding award for a patriotic speech he delivered last May to the Alabama Federation of Women's Clubs. I would like to share this fine speech entitled "What Is Your Civic IQ?" with my colleagues by having it printed in the *RECORD* at this point:

WHAT IS YOUR CIVIC IQ?

(By Dr. Houston Cole)

No greater compliment can be paid an individual than to say that he is a good citizen. The term "good citizen" embodies about all of the finer qualities of human nature. It involves gratitude to those in the past who sacrificed "life, fortune, and sacred honor" to provide us the freedom to live, move, worship, and to make our livelihood. It involves a willingness to contribute time, effort, and material substance for the good of all, and it signifies the moral qualities that are basic to civilization.

These are times that demand high-level citizenship. Daily our country faces problems at home and abroad that are complex and baffling. Locally, we must deal with taxation, education, highways, welfare, and many other issues that bear down with increasing intensity.

At the foreign level, the forces of danger constitute a constant threat to our safety and security. It would be unwise indeed for us to be lulled into complacency by the present easing of world tensions. We still face in Communism a determined and vigorous foe, fanatical in its belief in itself, and having world domination only as its religion, that is challenging us to a duel for the future. And there is no prospect in the foreseeable future for the danger to go away.

CIVIC INDIFFERENCE

In this modern world of higher mathematics, complicated technology, and mysterious economics, we cannot afford indifference to and ignorance of the issues that involve the destiny of the nation. Unfortunately, public opinion polls and casual observation would indicate that our civic IQ is not as high as circumstances would demand.

Surveys reveal that only about 10 percent of the American people exhibit any noticeable degree of political activity; about 20 percent can be described as taking some part

in political and civic life, while the remaining 70 percent are characterized as dormant.

In one poll, 70 percent of those contacted did not know the length of the term of a U.S. senator, and 56 percent could not name the two senators from their home state. Six months prior to the death of President Kennedy, 45 percent of those polled by a radio station in the west could not identify Lyndon B. Johnson. It is a statistical fact that one-third of our voters do not go to the polls in a presidential election, and only about 50 percent participate in a congressional election.

Good citizenship starts at the community level. If a person demonstrates good qualities of civic responsibility in his own locality, it is a good bet that he will be a good citizen at the state and national levels.

It is not difficult to find examples of civic indifference. As you drive along the highways, take note of the empty beer cans, bottles, papers cups, scraps of paper, and other litter that have been thrown from passing cars. Our public buildings and parks are oftentimes the objects of vandalism, and in many communities there is a widespread reluctance on the part of many to participate in drives and other activities involving community betterment.

A conspicuous example of civic indifference can be found in the reluctance of the average citizen to assist in the enforcement of law. With our crime rate increasing four times that of the population, it would appear that a wide gap exists between the citizen and the police. Our law enforcement officers are handicapped in the performance of their duties because they do not receive the necessary aid and assistance from the public. Spectators will leave the scene of an accident to avoid being summoned into court as witnesses, and many people refuse to report speedsters, bootleggers, vandals and other law violators. It appears at times that our sympathies are more with the offenders than with the offended, more with the lawless than with the law. We might well re-examine our civic morality to determine which side of the law we are taking.

The home, the basic unit of our society, is making too little contribution to our civic welfare. A poll of young mothers with two or more children revealed that 87 percent admitted that they were actually encouraging poor citizenship, economic illiteracy, and a false sense of values on the part of their youngsters. A home in which adults have a healthy and outspoken respect for the law is rarely a home in which juvenile offenders live.

This is no time for the American people to substitute sawdust values for those fundamentals that gave birth, prosperity, freedom, and happiness to the nation. The present calls for a little more emotional attachment and a little less cynicism toward the principles that made this country great.

OTHER ASPECTS OF CITIZENSHIP

Competent citizenship involves more than voting, abiding by the law, and expressed concern for the public good. A person can do all of this and still be an incompetent citizen. Other considerations are involved.

Education is prerequisite to good citizenship. Not all educated people are good citizens, but today a person can hardly perform his civic duties effectively without education. The growing complexity of the problems with which government has to deal demands a high degree of enlightenment. If our is a government of the people, by the people, and for the people, it logically follows that the level of governmental action will not rise above the intellectual and moral level of the people.

Another aspect of civic competence involves the habit of thrift. A good citizen is

self-supporting. He does not look to relatives, local charity, or government for means on which to exist. This simply means that a person should spend less than he makes during his productive years. Mr. McCawber's theory of economics is still valid: "If a man had twenty pounds a year and spent nineteen pounds, nineteen shillings, and sixpence, he would be happy, but if he spent twenty pounds sixpence, he would be miserable." It has been aptly said:

If you want your father to take care of you, that's Paternalism.

If you want your mother to take care of you, that's Maternalism.

If you want Uncle Sam to take care of you, that's Socialism.

If you want your comrades to take care of you, that's Communism.

If you want to take care of yourself, that's Americanism.

It is a poor citizen who takes the attitude that one can have something for nothing, that success is assured, and that rights exceed responsibilities.

REKINDLE SPIRIT OF PATRIOTISM

There is a prevailing tendency in this country to regard demonstrations of patriotism as "old hat" or obsolete. Promoters of patriotic rallies are oftentimes looked upon as oddballs or seekers of the limelight. Flag waving is in bad taste and those who extol the original and basic principles of America become the butts of laughter or ridicule.

It is fashionable in some "intellectual circles" to debunk the founding fathers and subsequent leaders of the nation. A college professor went to great pains to eliminate the effectiveness of "Washington Crossing the Delaware," a picture that has hung in the classrooms of our nation for many decades. He told a high-school assembly that "it just wasn't so"—any man who stood up in the boat as Washington was portrayed was sure to have rocks in his head. Another teacher dispelled the aura of the Gettysburg Address by stating Lincoln spent months in preparation rather than using the time that elapsed on the train ride from Washington to Gettysburg.

Is there no place in history for symbols? The play, "Mr. President," a highly patriotic performance, was presented on Broadway a few years ago. It didn't last long because the critics called it "corny."

Some argue that you cannot teach devotion to country. What about Russia? Communism has spread and attained strength because of the deep devotion of its adherents. The people of the Soviet Union have been brought to the point where they willingly forego creature comforts and work longer, harder, and extra hours when the nation calls.

We experience little difficulty in arousing youngsters to a high pitch over an athletic contest. Can we not use the same basic potential to develop in them an enthusiasm for their country so great that they would willingly sacrifice their personal comfort for it?

SUMMARY

Responsible citizenship involves, among other things, gratitude to those who established our freedom and to those who fought to preserve it, intelligent voting, respect for law, high moral values, educational competence, and economic independence.

This is the price the good citizen willingly pays for the freedom to work, to move, to grow, and to increase his status in life. A college student well defined Americanism as that which gives the individual the opportunity to rise as high in life as his ability and willingness to work will permit. In this country, anybody who has what it takes and is willing to give what it takes can rise from the bottom to the top.

SONGMY HORRIFIES THE WHOLE NATION

HON. HASTINGS KEITH

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. KEITH. Mr. Speaker, the Nation's newspapers have recently been filled with stories about the events in the Vietnamese village of Songmy, where hundreds of civilians were allegedly killed by American troops.

These events, if they are true, raise serious questions that must be answered. The American conscience has been aroused as never before, and the American people will not allow this atrocity to be swept under the rug.

Typical of the press reaction to this unprecedented massacre are two editorials recently run by the Cape Cod and New Bedford Standard-Times. They raise the questions that are gnawing at the mind of America in the aftermath of this event. I hope that my colleagues will read them—and more importantly, I hope that those in positions of responsibility in the military and in the administration will read them—and answer them.

The editorials follow:

SONGMY HORRIFIES THE WHOLE NATION

The massacre at Songmy has sickened and horrified the people.

From President Nixon to the man on the street, comments indicate shock, dismay and a wondering how could it happen.

While the picture is still confused, and the question of who is to blame still unresolved, there seems no doubt that something appalling did take place at Songmy.

Too many servicemen have come forward telling of their own part in the killing for anyone to dismiss the reports as just another war story without basis or substance. The nation has seen ex-serviceman Paul Meadlo on national television saying that he witnessed the death of about 370 villagers and that he himself had killed 10 to 15 men, women and children in the first round of shooting but lost track afterward.

The Army has charged some with murder in the killing and may charge more. And it has now ordered those involved with the courts-martial to refrain from commenting on the incident.

Millions of innocent civilians have been killed in the wars that have raged around the world just in this century. But somehow, America has generally been immune to the brutalization of men who face to face indiscriminately kill anyone on the scene regardless of their status as combatant or non-combatant, or whether they are men, women or children.

White House spokesman have said that President Nixon has taken steps to see that Song My could not be repeated. But some hard questions remain.

It must first of all be established who was responsible for Song My? And if this was a deliberate and isolated incident or something that has happened before?

And why has it taken so long—some 18 months—for this to come to light? Was there a deliberate cover up by higher officers? If so, who were they, and what is going to be done about it?

But more important are the questions this is bound to raise about our policy of free fire zones in Vietnam. If an area of village is determined to be under the control of the

enemy, does this give us the right to kill every living thing in it and destroy it utterly?

If a pilot can bomb a village in the free fire zone and kill men, women and children with immunity from a court-martial, can an infantryman do the same? If an artilleryman can shell a village in a free fire zone and kill men, women and children with immunity from a court martial, can an infantryman do the same? Is there any difference when the end result is the same?

If an officer orders his men to kill men, women and children in a free fire zone, can they refuse the order with immunity from a court-martial?

Millions of Americans, particularly the young who are called upon to do the fighting and dying, regard the Vietnam war as immoral, unjust, and without sense or purpose to American interests. In the rage and frustration many soldiers feel at the conflict of interest, it is no wonder that a Song My could happen. The only wonder is that it had not happened before.

GOOD WAR VERSUS BAD WAR

Much of the world has expressed shock at the possibility that some South Vietnamese civilians were deliberately massacred by American troops.

If there was, in fact, a massacre, it is shocking and deplorable.

Evidence thus far available is incomplete and contradictory, but it appears unquestionable that something appalling did take place.

If there was violation of the international rules of war, whether willful murder or something less, the guilty should be punished.

But there is much more to be said than just this. Millions of war veterans, as well as civilian residents of London, Berlin and Hiroshima, may be moved to wonder at what shocks the world and what does not.

Not that a Vietnam village massacre is less, but that what has not shocked the world is more.

The painful, halting revelations of these soldiers returned from Vietnam, detailing the slaughter of helpless women holding little children and pleading, "No! No!", offends all that is civilized within us. One understands the soldiers when they say they cannot rid themselves of these memories, that they cannot sleep because of them.

Yet the world might ask itself whether, except for an altitude of 20,000 feet, which serves as a psychological guilt shock-absorber for the trigger-puller, there is serious difference between bombing helpless women and children to their death in Western Europe and shooting them to death at 20 feet in Vietnam.

Moreover, in World War II, most civilians killed more properly could have been designated non-combatants since there was no guerrilla warfare. Thus, it might be argued, their deaths were even more inexcusable than in Vietnam where any man, woman or child may shoot an unsuspecting soldier or place a mine under his jeep.

Those who have been to war know that when you tell a man to forget everything his parents and teachers have told him, when you tell him he is under obligation to kill from one date until some other date, he is changed, at least temporarily, by the knowledge that life, including his own, is expendable by military order.

That is also shocking, whether it occurs in Vietnam, North Africa or Belleau Wood.

This editorial is not concerned with whether wars have been necessary, inevitable or desirable, or whether war ought to be abolished—which, of course, it should be. Nor is it an attempt to make barbaric deeds seem less barbaric, or more excusable because of a particular set of circumstances.

But it is an effort to point out what ought to be more obvious than it apparently is to many: There are no good wars or bad ones; they are all bloody and awful. There are no

nice ways of killing people, and killing people is what wars are about.

Hollywood and television to the contrary, man in war is not magnificent; on the contrary, he is more likely to be frightened, confused, depressed, shocked, angry with an imperfect world that periodically reverts to such barbarism and is principally determined to survive, if possible, no matter what that requires. If there has been massacre in Vietnam, the world ought to be shocked. But let us put the matter in perspective and be shocked at all war and what it does to man and, for the immediate course, let us speed the withdrawal of Americans from Vietnam.

After that, if the shock has not run its course once the headlines are forgotten, let us support the strategic arms limitation talks in Helsinki, which are one immediate step toward avoiding more international massacres.

CORRECTING INEQUITIES IN THE FITZGERALD CASE

HON. RICHARD L. OTTINGER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. OTTINGER. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today, in behalf of myself and 24 colleagues, a sense of Congress resolution calling upon the President to correct the gross inequities in the case of A. Ernest Fitzgerald, who was fired by the Air Force because he responded fully and fairly to a congressional inquiry about cost overruns on the C-5A transport. The text of the resolution is as follows:

To express the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take prompt and effective action to correct all inequities in the case of A. E. Fitzgerald, and for other purposes.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That (a) it is the sense of the Congress that the President of the United States should take prompt and effective action to correct all inequities in the case of A. E. Fitzgerald, former employee under the Department of the Air Force.

(b) It is further the sense of the Congress that the correction of these inequities best can be achieved by the following actions and procedures:

(1) The abolished position formerly held by A. E. Fitzgerald—Deputy for Management Systems, Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (Financial Management)—should be reestablished.

(2) A. E. Fitzgerald should be reappointed to that position, without loss of or reduction in pay and other employment rights, entitlements, and benefits.

(3) The reestablished position should be classified at GS-17 of the General Schedule of section 5332(a) of title 5, United States Code, and A. E. Fitzgerald should be paid at the rate of basic pay for step 5 of GS-17.

(4) The President should transmit a letter of commendation to A. E. Fitzgerald in appreciation of his past services to the United States.

As everyone now knows, Mr. Speaker, A. Ernest Fitzgerald was fired because his report to the Joint Economic Committee was an embarrassment to the Air Force. Although Air Force Secretary Seaman insisted that Fitzgerald had not been fired—that his job was abolished as part of an economy drive—it is appar-

ent that Fitzgerald was indeed fired, and this was confirmed by the Secretary of Defense this week.

But the firing of Fitzgerald was far more than a reprisal aimed at one individual. It was a loud and clear message to all those involved in defense procurement: "This is a closed corporation. Don't rock the boat. Keep quiet at any cost."

This would be deplorable under any circumstances, but it is even more unconscionable at a time when Congress has just learned of fantastic cost overruns—in excess of \$20 billion—in some 35 major weapons systems.

If the Air Force intends to use the Fitzgerald case as a warning, then it is up to us in Congress to use it as a warning, too. A warning that we insist on efficiency and economy in the use of public funds; that the military will not be permitted to erect a wall of silence around its programs and policies to shut them off from public and congressional scrutiny; that those who demonstrate initiative and courage in the conduct of the Nation's business will be rewarded, not punished.

I am pleased that four distinguished members of the Committee on Armed Services have joined me in sponsoring this resolution. The full list of cosponsors comprises the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHLEY); the gentleman from California (Mr. BURTON); the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY); the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS); the gentleman from California (Mr. EDWARDS); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COUGHLIN); the gentleman from New York (Mr. FARBERSTEIN); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GAYDOS); the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILBERT); the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. HARRINGTON); the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HICKS); the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. JACOBS); the gentleman from California (Mr. LEGGETT); the gentleman from New York (Mr. LOWENSTEIN); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MOORHEAD); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. NIX); the gentleman from New York (Mr. PRIKE); the gentleman from California (Mr. REES); the gentleman from New York (Mr. SCHEUER); the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. STOKES); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. THOMPSON); the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. TIERNAN); the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. VIGORITO); and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. WHALEN).

We welcome additional cosponsors and urge speedy and favorable action on the resolution.

IS THE STATE FOULING ITS OWN SPRING?

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, the importance of giving necessary consideration

to the environmental aspects of all public works projects is nowhere more apparent than the \$3 billion-plus California water project.

This massive project proposes the transfer of tremendous amounts of water from the northern part of the State to the water deficient, but heavily populated, southern area.

While it is true that there may be surplus waters running from the northern rivers to the Pacific Ocean, principally through the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta and the San Francisco Bay Estuary, a full and complete study to determine the environmental and ecological aspects of this diversion has not yet been undertaken.

Despite this glaring and incredible lack of research, State and Federal officials are pledging to go ahead with this project so that commitments entered into some years ago, when knowledge was insufficient and concern absent, will be met—no matter the consequences.

I have opposed the continuation of this project without the necessary studies, Mr. Speaker, and I am highly gratified by the great numbers of concerned Californians who have joined in opposition.

Among these citizens is the great nature writer, Harold Gilliam, whose books, essays, and articles on environmental matters and the threats to nature posed by man have focused the attention of the Nation on the plight of the bay and delta area.

In the November 23 edition of the Sunday San Francisco Examiner-Chronicle, Mr. Gilliam wrote an excellent review of the California water project and the threats it poses to the bay and delta.

The article, "Is the State Fouling Its Own Spring?" follows:

IS THE STATE FOULING ITS OWN SPRING?

(By Harold Gilliam)

California's man-made water system may well be the climax of all of man's amazing efforts to reengineer the face of the earth for his own convenience.

To convey water from the wet northern end of the State to the dry south and make the deserts blossom, Californians and the Federal Government have built some of the biggest dams on earth, have constructed canals longer than Suez or Panama, have altered the drainage systems of mountain ranges, have transplanted rivers over distances of hundreds of miles.

Surely this achievement is a triumph of energy, skill and technological power at least as significant as man's venture into space. Yet the system is in deep trouble and may never be completed as planned. Its difficulties stem in part from man's increasing understanding of the world in which he lives.

CONQUEST OF NATURE

This series of colossal engineering projects was conceived and begun in an era when Americans universally assumed that man's primary mission on earth was the conquest of nature. It is still under way and reaching a climactic stage in an era when men are beginning to understand that their proper relation to nature is not conquest but co-operation.

It is conceivable that completion of the State Water Project as planned would be a monstrous, irreversible error.

The basic elements of the plan are simple:

The focus of the system is the Delta, beginning 50 miles northeast of San Francisco, where the waters of the Sacramento river from the north and the San Joaquin from the south, plus all their tributaries and several non-tributary streams, combine in a 1100-square-mile region of braided channels before gradually joining the salt waters of San Francisco bay.

SINGLE SYSTEM

The peat islands of the Delta, once impenetrable marshes, have been reclaimed and contain some of the most productive agricultural land on earth.

The Delta and the bay together constitute a single ecological system. The transition from the fresh waters of the rivers to the salt waters of the bay has produced one of the continent's richest estuarine environments.

Salmon, striped bass and steelhead by the thousands swim up from the ocean and bay into the Delta and its tributaries. Migratory birds and hundreds of forms of marine and estuarine life swarm in the tidal marshes, where each species finds the precisely proper proportions of fresh and salt water.

Thousands of yachtsmen, fishermen, duck hunters, swimmers, water skiers and bird watchers engage in recreational activities in the Bay-Delta system.

RIVER DIVERSIONS

In recent years, however, increasing diversions of Sacramento and San Joaquin river water by irrigation districts and cities upstream have greatly diminished the inflow of fresh water and on occasion have allowed salt water to penetrate the lower Delta, threatening the island farmlands and the region's ecosystem. Shasta dam and other dams of the Federal Government's Central Valley Project have alleviated the situation, controlling winter floods and storing water for release in the dry summer and fall months.

But the CVP also sends large quantities of water out of the Delta south to the dry San Joaquin valley. In addition, California voters in 1960 approved a \$1.75 billion bond issue for the State Water Project, designed to send additional millions of acre feet of water south to the San Joaquin and to Southern California.

An original Delta fresh water flow of 30 million acre feet per year has been reduced to about 18 million acre feet. When (and if) the State Water Project is completed, the flow will drop to 7 million acre feet, with a possible dry-year low of 2.5 million.

FRESH WATER DIMINISHED

Thus the flow of fresh waters through the Delta and bay continually diminishes as further units of the Federal and State water systems are completed. At the same time urban sewage and pesticide-loaded agriculture waste waters have increasingly poured into the Delta and bay, threatening to turn both into a dead sink. Dozens of large-scale fish kills have occurred; tens of thousands of ducks have been eliminated; swimmers in the Bay-Delta waters risk typhoid; and salt water threatens to ruin Delta farmlands.

In effect the State has been fouling its own spring. Water pumped out of the Delta near Tracy for export south has been of deteriorating quality.

The water engineers in Sacramento have proposed a "solution": a Peripheral Canal would divert fresh water from the Sacramento above the Delta and transport it directly to the pumping plants without mixing it with the polluted Delta water.

SUFFICIENT WATER?

To avoid turning off the Bay-Delta's freshwater spigot entirely, the engineers promised that sufficient water to preserve the ecosystem and farmlands would be released down the Sacramento and at certain intervals along the Peripheral Canal.

Delta users, particularly in Contra Costa county, were skeptical about what the engineers meant by "sufficient water." It turned out that they meant about 1500 to 1800 cubic feet per second (cfs)—a mere dribble from the standpoint of worried Contra Costa officials.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Administration was also dubious and has not given approval.

The Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Program (a special State agency set up to examine the problem) last March released a report by Kaiser Engineers also questioning that amount and recommending a flow of 3000 to 5000 cfs.

But the Delta people were still not happy. Marine Biologist Joel Hedgepeth deplored the canal's potential biological impact. Regardless of the amount released, the Delta salmon runs, for example, would probably be wiped out.

CANAL'S "MENACE"

"The menace of the Peripheral Canal," said Contra Costa Congressman Jerome R. Waldie, "lies with the fact that it gives virtual control of the entire Sacramento river and Delta to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the State Department of Water Resources . . . We fear that almost the entire flow of the Sacramento river will be diverted southward . . . with tragic consequences to the Bay-Delta area."

ANOTHER SUBSIDY

The Kaiser report did not deal with the basic issue in the controversy—whether vast amounts of water should be exported southward from the Delta.

About half of the water planned for delivery by the State Water Project is scheduled to go to agricultural users in the San Joaquin valley, much of it to large corporations growing subsidized cotton on tens of thousands of acres each. The water itself would be a further subsidy, averaging, says U.C. Economist Paul S. Taylor, an incredible \$1000 per acre. (Taylor proposes strict enforcement of the 160-acre limitation on the delivery of subsidized water).

The other half of the water would go through the Tehachapi range to the Metropolitan Water District of Southern California.

But why does that region need more water? Present supplies will amply provide for the present population; the additional water is for the projected doubled population of the future. There can be little doubt that the residents of Los Angeles, given a choice, would overwhelmingly reject the idea of doubled population.

THE GROWTH MYTH

It would be simple enough to deny extension of water mains to new areas.

Why should the Bay-Delta area be sacrificed to accommodate a doubled Southern California population desired by nobody but real estate promoters?

The answer, of course is in the obsolete myth that the goal of every community must be galloping growth. To grow, we must continue to "conquer" nature, which means filling the bays, leveling the hills, paving the deserts.

Fortunately, this pernicious assumption is beginning to be questioned by Californians bedeviled by smog, noise, pollution congestion and urban chaos.

The basic propositions of ecology are becoming public knowledge: Every species must live in balance with its natural environment.

A finite space cannot accommodate infinite growth.

Limited resources cannot support unlimited expansion.

There is a point at which the conquest of nature becomes overkill. At that point man jeopardizes his own life-support system.

It is time to find out whether we have reached that point. The State Water Project is a good place to begin.

SCHOOL BUS AIRLINES OF
AMERICA, INC.

HON. CLARENCE J. BROWN

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, America is well into the space age, and air travel and commerce have become as essential to society today as ships of the ancient traders, or the prairie schooners of the pioneers who pushed the Nation's borders westward during the 19th century.

It is important that America's youngsters learn about the Nation's tremendous air industry, which has such a vital impact on our daily lives, if they are to grasp its real significance.

The first project in the Nation to give schoolchildren this knowledge has been undertaken in Lucas County, Ohio, where fifth graders at Sylvania's Sylvan School made the first flights 3 weeks ago aboard School Bus Airlines of America, Inc., of Dayton, Ohio.

In addition to giving many youngsters their first experience of flying in an airplane, the project also gives children a much wider view of the world in which they live—another essential if they are to fully comprehend the size and complexity of our vast society. I hope programs of this nature can be expanded throughout the Nation in the future so other youngsters may share in this unique experience.

In order that my colleagues may learn more about the Lucas County project, I include the following article from the November 15, Toledo Blade in the RECORD:

FIFTH GRADERS TRY HIGHER EDUCATION: 90 CHILDREN GET NEW VIEW OF AREA FROM PLANE WINDOWS

It was up, up, and away for fifth graders of Sylvania's Sylvan School as School Bus Airlines of Lucas County started educational flights for area pupils this week.

Ninety were taken aloft in a DC-3 equipped with earphones at each seat for briefing the youngsters.

Similar flights also started for 1,000 county preschool children in the Head Start program.

The Federal Government will pick up the bill for the latter. For the school program, each child pays \$3. Flights are made by classrooms, and efforts are made to raise funds for children unable to pay.

FIRST IN NATION

Sylvan School's four flights from Toledo Express Airport made Lucas County first in the nation to start a School Bus Lines of America program of air education.

The Dayton-based national company plans to offer airplane field trips to millions of schoolchildren. It provides the two-engine propeller plane, its crew, preflight classroom lessons, insurance, and planned field trips.

Kits provided each teacher cover such areas as air occupations, weather, area geography and history, and energy forces and motions in aviation.

Thomas Myers and David Zak hold the franchise for the Lucas County educational air excursions. They are considering purchase of the franchise for Wood County, which is discussing reopening the old Toledo Municipal Airport. Franchises for other area counties also may be acquired later.

About half of the Sylvania children who made the flights had never before been in an airplane. One little girl claimed to be a veteran, but said she didn't remember much about her first flight, when she was only six months old.

VIEWS OF AREA

One boy in the group became ill, but he had expected it since it happened on a previous flight. Stewardess Jeanne Bailey came to his aid.

The children had birds-eye views of downtown Toledo, ships in port, the Maumee River, Fort Meigs, Toledo Zoo, and even Sylvan School.

The 25-passenger plane may be a retired airlines veteran, but the young passengers thought it was wonderful.

One boy was delighted because he had "a perfect view of the engine."

Most termed the trip "real cool."

"We'll see you again next year," Benjamin Stearns, of Dayton, founder and president of the national undertaking, told the children at flight's end.

"We have many schools to visit and hope to fly a million schoolchildren in 1969-70. We are trying to introduce students to the aerospace world through participation education."

ERNIE PYLE COMMEMORATIVE
STAMP

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, one of the most memorable personalities of World War II was the great war correspondent, Ernie Pyle, whose death in the Pacific theater on April 18, 1945, was like a personal loss to the millions who read his column and was, indeed, a personal loss to the thousands of GI's he befriended, helped, and wrote about.

Nunzio R. Calvo of Cleveland, Commissioner of Soldiers Relief for Cuyahoga County and president-elect of the Greater Cleveland Veterans Council, is working hard for an Ernie Pyle commemorative postage stamp, as the following articles evidence. Mr. Calvo is distinguished by his energy and patriotism and is winning wide support for the commemorative stamp. I understand that the idea now is on the agenda for consideration by the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee of the Post Office Department. If it is approved, Nunzio Calvo's efforts will have played an important role.

The articles follow:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, Nov. 1, 1969]

COMMEMORATIVE STAMP

On April 18, 1970, it will be 25 years since one of America's greatest and most beloved personalities was lost. Ernie Pyle has not only won a permanent place in the hearts of Americans as evidenced by the thousands who visit his grave in Honolulu, but he has won for our war correspondents the trust and respect of the American people and their fighting men. The memory of Ernie Pyle will continue to inspire today's war correspondents who are again bravely accompanying our fighting men into the swamps and jungles of Vietnam.

Ernie Pyle was responsible in World War II for combat infantrymen and medics re-

ceiving an extra \$10 a month in pay—he was responsible for the wearing of overseas bars on the left sleeve of uniforms. He was beloved by the men in combat, as well as the people back home.

The late General Eisenhower said of Ernie Pyle, "we have lost one of our best and most understanding friends," and in the words of President Truman, "no man . . . has so well told the story of the American fighting man as American fighting men want it told. He deserves the gratitude of all his countrymen." These remarks are a lasting tribute for a great person.

Ernie Pyle still has our gratitude, and next April will be the month to remember him. What better way could this be done than to have a commemorative stamp issued to honor this outstanding individual? Next year will be the 25th anniversary of his death. This would be the ideal time to pay homage to him. All former GIs who knew him and served with him, as well as those back home to whom he reported, should entreat the Post Office Department and the Citizens Stamp Advisory Committee in Washington now to authorize the issuance of a commemorative stamp for Ernie Pyle.

[From Ohio VFW News, Oct. 1969]

ERNIE PYLE STAMP CONSIDERED

Veterans organizations are being asked to support a proposal which has lead to bills being introduced in Congress to provide for the issuance of a commemorative stamp honoring World War II correspondent Ernie Pyle.

Having been referred to the committee on Post Office and Civil Services, one of the bills calls for date of issuance on April 18, 1970, the 25th anniversary of the death of Ernie Pyle.

Pyle has not only won a permanent place in the hearts of Americans, as evidenced by the thousands who visit his grave in Honolulu, but he has won for our war correspondents the trust and respect of the American people and their fighting men. The memory of Pyle will continue to inspire today's war correspondents who are again bravely accompanying our fighting men into the swamps and jungles of Vietnam.

Pyle was responsible in World War II for combat infantrymen and medics receiving an extra \$10 a month in pay and he was responsible for the wearing of overseas bars on the left sleeve of uniforms.

The late General Eisenhower said of Pyle, "We have lost one of our best and most understanding friends," and in the words of President Truman, "No man . . . has so well told the story of the American fighting man as American fighting men want it told. He deserves the gratitude of all his countrymen."

The original proposal for the stamp was the idea of N. R. Calvo of Cleveland—a veteran of World War II. He has contacted members of the House and Senate in Washington, and received written approval from several Postmaster Gen. Winton M. Blount also has been contacted. The proposal has been placed on the agenda for consideration by the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee.

Calvo is urging veterans organizations and all former GIs who knew Pyle and served with him, as well as "those back home" to whom he reported, to contact the Post Office Department and the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee in Washington to authorize the issuance of the commemorative stamp.

Calvo is a life member of VFW Post 5799 of Cleveland, and serves as commissioner of Soldiers Relief for Cuyahoga County in that city. He is active in veterans affairs and a member of other veterans organizations.

ERNIE PYLE COMMEMORATIVE STAMP BOOSTED
BY NUNZIO CALVO

CLEVELAND, OHIO.—An all-out effort is underway for the issuance of a commemora-

tive stamp for Ernie Pyle. The project is spearheaded by Nunzio Calvo of Cleveland, Ohio, a member of Avanti Amerita Lodge No. 133.

Bills have been introduced in Congress to provide for the issuance of the stamp to honor the World War II correspondent. Having been referred to the committee on Post Office and Civil Service, one of the bills calls for date of issuance on April 18, 1970, the 25th anniversary of the death of Ernie Pyle. On that date, it will be twenty-five years that one of America's greatest and most beloved personalities was lost. Ernie Pyle has not only won a permanent place in the hearts of Americans as evidenced by the thousands who visit his grave in Honolulu, but he has won for our war correspondents the trust and respect of the American people and their fighting men. The memory of Ernie Pyle will continue to inspire today's war correspondents who are again bravely accompanying our fighting men into the swamps and the jungles of Vietnam.

Ernie Pyle was responsible in World War II for combat infantrymen and medics receiving an extra \$10 a month in pay—he was responsible for the wearing of overseas bars on the left sleeve of uniforms. He was beloved by the men in combat, as well as the people back home.

The late General Eisenhower said of Ernie Pyle, "We have lost one of our best and most understanding friends," and in the words of President Truman, "no man . . . has so well told the story of the American fighting man as American fighting men want it told. He deserves the gratitude of all his countrymen." These remarks are a lasting tribute to a great person.

Ernie Pyle still has our gratitude, and next April will be the month to remember him. What better way could this be done than to have a commemorative stamp issued to honor this outstanding individual? Next year will be the 25th anniversary of his death. This would be the ideal time to pay homage to him.

The original proposal for the stamp was the idea of Nunzio Calvo of Cleveland, he himself a veteran of World War II. He has contacted members of the House and Senate in Washington, and received written approval of the idea from several, two of which introduced the legislation. He has received some national publicity on the project and received enthusiastic replies from individuals throughout the country. Postmaster General Winton W. Blount has also been contacted. The proposal has been placed on the agenda for consideration by the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee.

Calvo is urging all former GIs who knew Ernie Pyle and served with him, as well as "those back home" to whom he reported, to contact the Post Office Department and the Citizens' Stamp Advisory Committee in Washington by letter now to authorize the issuance of a commemorative stamp for Ernie Pyle.

Nunzio Calvo serves as commissioner of Soldiers Relief for Cuyahoga County in Cleveland, Ohio, where he is active in veteran affairs and a member of veteran organizations.

marks made in the House of Representatives by Davy Crockett during his term of office as a Congressman from Tennessee in the 23d Congress. Colonel Crockett's remarks carry a timely message for those of us who are charged with expenditures of public funds. They follow:

NOT YOURS TO GIVE

(From "The Life of Colonel David Crockett," compiled by Edward S. Ellis)

One day in the House of Representatives, a bill was taken up appropriating money for the benefit of a widow of a distinguished naval officer. Several beautiful speeches had been made in its support. The Speaker was just about to put the question when Crockett arose:

"Mr. Speaker—I have as much respect for the memory of the deceased, and as much sympathy for the suffering of the living, if suffering there be, as any man in this House, but we must not permit our respect for the dead or our sympathy for a part of the living to lead us into an act of injustice to the balance of the living. I will not go into an argument to prove that Congress has no power to appropriate this money as an act of charity. Every member upon this floor knows it. We have the right as individuals, to give away as much of our own money as we please in charity; but as members of Congress we have no right so to appropriate a dollar of the public money. Some eloquent appeals have been made to us upon the ground that it is a debt due the deceased. Mr. Speaker, the deceased lived long after the close of the war; he was in office to the day of his death, and I have never heard that the government was in arrears to him.

Every man in this House knows it is not a debt. We cannot, without the grossest corruption, appropriate this money as the payment of a debt. We have not the semblance of authority to appropriate it as a charity. Mr. Speaker, I have said we have the right to give as much money of our own as we please. I am the poorest man on this floor. I cannot vote for this bill, but I will give one week's pay to the object, and if every member of Congress will do the same, it will amount to more than the bill asks."

He took his seat. Nobody replied. The bill was put upon its passage, and, instead of passing unanimously, as was generally supposed, and as, no doubt, it would, but for that speech, it received but few votes, and, of course, was lost.

Later, when asked by a friend why he had opposed the appropriation, Crockett gave this explanation:

"Several years ago I was one evening standing on the steps of the Capitol with some other members of Congress, when our attention was attracted by a great light over in Georgetown. It was evidently a large fire. We jumped into a hack and drove over as fast as we could. In spite of all that could be done, many houses were burned and many families made houseless, and, besides, some of them had lost all but the clothes they had on. The weather was very cold, and when I saw so many women and children suffering, I felt that something ought to be done for them. The next morning a bill was introduced appropriating \$20,000 for their relief. We put aside all other business and rushed it through as soon as it could be done.

"The next summer, when it began to be time to think about the election, I concluded I would take a scout around among the boys of my district. I had no opposition there, but, as the election was some time off, I did not know what might turn up. When riding one day in a part of my district in which I was more of a stranger than any other, I saw a man in a field plowing and coming toward the road. I gauged my gait so that we should meet as he came to the fence. As he came up, I spoke to the man. He replied politely, but, as I thought, rather coldly.

"I began: 'Well, friend, I am one of those unfortunate beings called candidates, and—'

"'Yes, I know you; you are Colonel Crockett. I have seen you once before, and voted for you the last time you were elected. I suppose you are out electioneering now, but you had better not waste your time or mine. I shall not vote for you again.'

"This was a sockdolager . . . I begged him to tell me what was the matter.

"'Well, Colonel, it is hardly worth-while to waste time or words upon it. I do not see how it can be mended, but you gave a vote last winter which shows that either you have not capacity to understand the Constitution, or that you are wanting in the honesty and firmness to be guided by it. In either case you are not the man to represent me. But I beg your pardon for expressing it in that way. I did not intend to avail myself of the privilege of the constituent to speak plainly to a candidate for the purpose of insulting or wounding you. I intend by it only to say that your understanding of the Constitution is very different from mine; and I will say to you what, but for my rudeness, I should not have said, that I believe you to be honest. . . . But an understanding of the Constitution different from mine I cannot overlook, because the Constitution, to be worth anything, must be held sacred, and rigidly observed in all its provisions. The man who wields power and misinterprets it is the more dangerous the more honest he is.'

"I admit the truth of all you say, but there must be some mistake about it, for I do not remember that I gave any vote last winter upon any constitutional question."

"'No, Colonel, there's no mistake. Though I live here in the backwoods and seldom go from home, I take the papers from Washington and read very carefully all the proceedings of Congress. My papers say that last winter you voted for a bill to appropriate \$20,000 to some sufferers by a fire in Georgetown. Is that true?

"'Well, my friend; I may as well own up. You have got me there. But certainly nobody will complain that a great and rich country like ours should give the insignificant sum of \$20,000 to relieve its suffering women and children, particularly with a full and overflowing Treasury, and I am sure, if you had been there, you would have done just as I did.'

"It is not the amount, Colonel, that I complain of; it is the principle. In the first place, the government ought to have in the Treasury no more than enough for its legitimate purposes. But that has nothing to do with the question. The power of collecting and disbursing money at pleasure is the most dangerous power that can be intrusted to man, particularly under our system of collecting revenue by a tariff, which reaches every man in the country, no matter how poor he may be, and the poorer he is the more he pays in proportion to his means. What is worse, it presses upon him without his knowledge where the weight centers, for there is not a man in the United States who can ever guess how much he pays to the government. So you see, that while you are contributing to relieve one, you are drawing it from thousands who are even worse off than he. If you had the right to give anything, the amount was simply a matter of discretion with you, and you had as much right to give \$20,000,000 to \$20,000. If you have the right to give to one, you have the right to give to all; and, as the Constitution neither defines charity nor stipulates the amount, you are at liberty to give to any and everything which you may believe, or profess to believe, is a charity, and to any amount you may think proper. You will very easily perceive what a wide door this would open for fraud and corruption and favoritism, on the one hand, and for robbing the people on the other. No, Colonel, Congress has no right to give charity. Individual members may give as much of their own money as they please,

NOT YOURS TO GIVE

HON. WILLIAM E. MINSHALL
OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. MINSHALL. Mr. Speaker, a thoughtful and concerned constituent, Mr. Bernard C. Sauer, Jr., of Rocky River, Ohio, has sent to me a copy of re-

but they have no right to touch a dollar of the public money for that purpose. If twice as many houses had been burned in this county as in Georgetown, neither you nor any other member of Congress would have thought of appropriating a dollar for our relief. There are about two hundred and forty members of Congress. If they had shown their sympathy for the sufferers by contributing each one week's pay, it would have made over \$13,000. There are plenty of wealthy men in and around Washington who could have given \$20,000 without depriving themselves of even a luxury of life. The congressmen chose to keep their own money, which, if reports be true, some of them spend not very creditably; and the people about Washington, no doubt, applauded you for relieving them from the necessity of giving by giving what was not yours to give. The people have delegated to Congress, by the Constitution, the power to do certain things. To do these, it is authorized to collect and pay moneys, and for nothing else. Everything beyond this is usurpation, and a violation of the Constitution.

"So you see, Colonel, you have violated the Constitution in what I consider a vital point. It is a precedent fraught with danger to the country, for when Congress once begins to stretch its power beyond the limits of the Constitution, there is no limit to it, and no security for the people. I have no doubt you acted honestly, but that does not make it any better, except as far as you are personally concerned, and you see that I cannot vote for you."

"I tell you I felt streaked, I saw if I should have opposition, and this man should go to talking, he would set others to talking, and in that district I was a gone fawn-skin. I could not answer him, and the fact is, I was so fully convinced that he was right, I did not want to. But I must satisfy him, and I said to him:

"Well, my friend, you hit the nail upon the head when you said I had not sense enough to understand the Constitution. I intended to be guided by it, and thought I had studied it fully. I have heard many speeches in Congress about the powers of Congress, but what you have said here at your plow has got more hard, sound sense in it than all the fine speeches I ever heard. If I had ever taken the view of it that you have, I would have put my head into the fire before I would have given that vote; and if you will forgive me and vote for me again, if I ever vote for another unconstitutional law I wish I may be shot."

"He laughingly replied: 'Yes, Colonel, you have sworn to that once before, but I will trust you again upon one condition. You say that you are convinced that your vote was wrong. Your acknowledgment of it will do more good than beating you for it. If, as you go around the district, you will tell people about this vote, and that you are satisfied it was wrong, I will not only vote for you, but will do what I can to keep down opposition, and, perhaps, I may exert some little influence in that way.'

"If I don't," said I, "I wish I may be shot; and to convince you that I am in earnest in what I say I will come back this way in a week or ten days, and if you will get up a gathering of the people, I will make a speech to them. Get up a barbecue, and I will pay for it."

"No, Colonel, we are not rich people in this section, but we have plenty of provisions to contribute for a barbecue, and some to spare for those who have none. The push of crops will be over in a few days, and we can then afford a day for a barbecue. This is Thursday; I will see to getting it up on Saturday week. Come to my house on Friday, and we will go together, and I promise you a very respectable crowd to see and hear you."

"Well, I will be here. But one thing more before I say good-by, I must know your name."

"My name is Bunce."

"Not Horatio Bunce?"

"Yes."

"Well, Mr. Bunce, I never saw you before, though you say you have seen me, but I know you very well. I am glad I have met you, and very proud that I may hope to have you for my friend."

"It was one of the luckiest hits of my life that I met him. He mingled but little with the public, but was widely known for his remarkable intelligence and incorruptible integrity, and for a heart brimful and running over with kindness and benevolence, which showed themselves not only in words but in acts. He was the oracle of the whole country around him, and his fame had extended far beyond the circle of his immediate acquaintance. Though I had never met him before, I had heard much of him, and but for this meeting it is very likely I should have had opposition, and had been beaten. One thing is very certain, no man could now stand up in that district under such a vote."

"At the appointed time I was at his house, having told our conversation to every crowd I had met, and to every man I stayed all night with, and I found that it gave the people an interest and a confidence in me stronger than I had ever seen manifested before."

"Though I was considerably fatigued when I reached his house, and, under ordinary circumstances, should have gone early to bed, I kept him up until midnight, talking about the principles and affairs of government, and got more real, true knowledge of them than I had got all my life before."

"I have known and seen much of him since, for I respect him—no, that is not the word—I reverence and love him more than any living man, and I go to see him two or three times every year; and I will tell you, sir, if every one who professes to be a Christian lived and acted and enjoyed it as he does, the religion of Christ would take the world by storm."

"But to return to my story. The next morning we went to the barbecue, and, to my surprise, found about a thousand men there. I met a good many whom I had not known before, and they and my friend introduced me around until I had got pretty well acquainted—at least, they all knew me."

"In due time notice was given that I would speak to them. They gathered up around a stand that had been erected. I opened my speech by saying:

"Fellow-citizens—I present myself before you today feeling like a new man. My eyes have lately been opened to truths which ignorance or prejudice, or both, had heretofore hidden from my view. I feel that I can today offer you the ability to render you more valuable service than I have ever been able to render before. I am here today more for the purpose of acknowledging my error than to seek your votes. That I should make this acknowledgement is due to myself as well as to you. Whether you will vote for me is a matter for your consideration only."

"I went on to tell them about the fire and my vote for the appropriation and then told them why I was satisfied it was wrong. I closed by saying:

"And now, fellow-citizens, it remains only for me to tell you that the most of the speech you have listened to with so much interest was simply a repetition of the arguments by which your neighbor, Mr. Bunce, convinced me of my error."

"It is the best speech I ever made in my life, but he is entitled to the credit for it. And now I hope he is satisfied with his convert and that he will get up here and tell you so."

"He came upon the stand and said:

"Fellow-citizens—It affords me great pleasure to comply with the request of Colonel Crockett. I have always considered him a thoroughly honest man, and I am satisfied that he will faithfully perform all that he has promised you today."

"He went down, and there went up from that crowd such a shout for Davy Crockett as his name never called forth before."

"I am not much given to tears, but I was taken with a choking then and felt some big drops rolling down my cheeks. And I tell you now that the remembrance of those few words spoken by such a man, and the honest, hearty shout they produced, is worth more to me than all the honors I have received and all the reputation I have ever made, or ever shall make, as a member of Congress."

"Now, sir," concluded Crockett, "you know why I made that speech yesterday."

"There is one thing now to which I will call your attention. You remember that I proposed to give a week's pay. There are in that House many very wealthy men—men who think nothing of spending a week's pay, or a dozen of them, for a dinner or a wine party when they have something to accomplish by it. Some of those same men made beautiful speeches upon the great debt of gratitude which the country owed the deceased—a debt which could not be paid by money—and the insignificance and worthlessness of money, particularly so insignificant a sum as \$10,000, when weighed against the honor of the nation. Yet not one of them responded to my proposition. Money with them is nothing but trash when it is to come out of the people. But it is the one great thing for which most of them are striving, and many of them sacrifice honor, integrity, and justice to obtain it."

LETTER FROM CONSTITUENT

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert a letter from a constituent of mine concerning certain proposed amendments to the Economic Opportunity Act:

The OEO extension and authorization bill will soon be coming to a vote, and I write you with grave concern over the "Murphy Amendment" that will be proposed in some form. This amendment, drafted by Senator Murphy the day before the bill reached the Senate floor, gives state governors the power to veto Legal Services programs in whole or in part at the time they are refunded. It removes the existing power of the OEO Director to override such a veto. Though more subtle, this amendment is equally damaging to the Legal Services programs as the unsuccessful attempt two years ago by Senator Murphy to prohibit antipoverty lawyers from filing suits against government agencies.

The imminence of political interference with a Legal Services program for bringing an unpopular suit or opposing governmental action creates a conflict between the interests of the attorney over the future of his job and program and the interest of his client in the unrestrained assertion of his rights. Without the threat of being overruled by the OEO Director, governors will have a free hand in curtailing legal services activities. Full and vigorous legal representation of the poor will surely continue to alienate many state officials. Yet, surely it strikes at the heart of an advocacy system of justice to give the head of these state officials the power to

cripple the opposing representatives who may challenge state actions hindering the poor.

The threat to Legal Services pregnant in the Murphy Amendment will cause a severe morale crisis among legal services attorneys, destroying their confidence and job security necessary for unwavering legal representation of all their clients. This detrimentally weakens vigorous legal services programs and guarantees that the less effective programs will forever remain so. It will cause a rush of resignations of the best talent in the Legal Services programs who no longer feel they can adequately represent their clients or do anything to help improve the social order. Presently, the most talented of the law school graduates are competing to obtain jobs with Legal Services programs. The Murphy Amendment surely will end this.

More important than the loss of security by the lawyers, will be the loss of faith by the poor resulting from the Murphy Amendment. These we encourage to channel their grievances, frustrations, and discontents into the courts of law and administrative hearings instead of street and sidewalk confrontations. A right without the capacity to effectuate a legal remedy is no right at all. Orderly institutional change in the framework of the continuity of the law is made impossible if access to the full use of the institutions is restrained. The OEO has made great strides in bringing about the American promise of Equal Justice Under Law. Intimidation and restraint of the lawyers for the poor, making them second-class citizens in legal bargaining and litigation, will destroy many of the gains already made.

OEO Director Donald Rumsfeld, Legal Services Director Terry Lenzner, The American Bar Association, the National Legal Aid and Defender Association as well as many other legal and non-legal organizations have expressed their strong opposition to the Murphy Amendment for the threat it imposes to competent legal representation of the poor. I join these groups in opposing the amendment, and I ask you to give this amendment the serious consideration it deserves.

THE U.N. AND THE ENVIRONMENT: HOPE FOR THE FUTURE

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Star, in a recent editorial, says this country should begin now to prepare carefully for the United Nations Conference on Problems of the Human Environment, set for 1972 in either Geneva or Stockholm.

The story points out, quite correctly, that "we need the knowledge that the conference will generate" and that "we need the pledge of all nations to work together to solve the monumental problems we have created."

Through international cooperation at the 1972 conference, we should make the most of this chance "to rescue our polluted planet."

The text of the editorial follows:

A CHANCE TO RESCUE OUR POLLUTED PLANET

When all the world was young and truth in every ruler's tongue, many of us confidently watched the founding of the United Nations at San Francisco in the expectation

that the world had entered a new age. Permanent peace, and therefore permanent plenty, were at hand, to be established and maintained by the new organization, where the nations could sit down together and resolve their differences across the table rather than on the battlefield.

A sad thing happened on the way to the millennium. China got taken over by people who were not invited to the christening of the new world and they turned into wicked fairies. The Russians have successively invaded most of the East European nations, sometimes, as in Czechoslovakia, as a firm but unbloody army of occupation, sometimes, as in Hungary, with fire and death in hand. The United States has fought long wars in Korea and in Vietnam. India and Pakistan have indulged in mutual slaughter and threaten to again. The Turks and Greeks from time to time resume their ancient feud. Even defeat cannot keep the Arabs from trying to wipe out Israel. In Central America tiny and fragile republics have at it and at each other when the mood strikes them. There is no peace. War and rumors of war have set the pace for the age of the United Nations as they did for the age of the League of Nations.

But if the new peace-keeping organization has not kept the peace, it has accomplished a number of other things, desirable goals originally undertaken merely as auxiliary to the central task. Through various agencies it has furthered scientific knowledge, elementary education, preventive health measures, artistic appreciation and improved agriculture, to name a few.

It may well be that the U.N. will be one of those historical phenomena that earn human gratitude for their side-effects, like the Counter-Reformation, which did nothing at all about restoring religious unity to Europe but which created, as a by-product of the effort, one of the most exhilarating and engrossing styles of architecture in the world. It may even be that if the nations pursue these U.N. side-effects with enough determination and cooperation, they will, all unknowing, take some giant steps toward the central goal, peace.

The possibility is particularly pertinent right now because the Secretary General has issued a report and a call for a United Nations Conference on Problems of the Human Environment. The conference will take place in 1972 at either Geneva or Stockholm and, it is hoped, will be attended by representatives of all member-states, a large number of specialists in the various fields of knowledge concerned, and representatives of appropriate agencies both public and private. The report makes it amply clear why such a conference is desperately needed, how it will be organized and what we may hope for from it.

The need should be evident to anyone who pauses on the banks of the Potomac on a summer day and looks at the water. It is not very attractive. The recreational use being made of it is minimal and just about restricted to boating, although there is still some fishing. But to enjoy the pleasantest thing you can do with water, total immersion, Washington area people have to resort to pools or to travel considerable distances to lakes or the ocean.

The Potomac, like most rivers, has long been unsafe for drinking and a little less long for swimming. Unless some action is taken soon, the still surviving fish can't last much longer. Boating is still O.K. as long as you don't fall overboard, the main peril of which is not drowning but gulping in the rich content of decay and disease with which the river is loaded.

Also like most rivers, the Potomac is not the concern of one single jurisdiction. It flows through or borders three states and

the District of Columbia and past or through innumerable cities, towns, villages and counties, all of which contribute to its pollution and all of which suffer from its condition.

Other rivers are international in their length or borders, such as the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes system, the Rio Grande and the poor, poisoned Rhine. All of the seas and oceans are of international concern. The air moves freely over frontiers, as we learned early in the nuclear age. Radioactive clouds are not the only man-made pollutants falling as the gentle rain on those beneath, irrespective of pollutant authorship. Detroit sends its poisons into lungs in Ontario, and Belgium suffers from Dusseldorf. Then there are the more exotic and possibly more deadly effects of the way we live now, most of them thoroughly international. The report notes that "the reliance of modern technology upon the combustion of fossil fuels has brought a 10 percent increase in atmospheric carbon dioxide over the past century" which "could rise to 25 percent by the year 200. The consequence of such an increase upon world weather and climate . . . could eventually be catastrophic."

The report accurately labels industrialization, urbanization and exploding population as the main causes of the evils increasingly infesting our environment. It notes that many of the individual problems are susceptible to technical control or solution but that such control or solution usually lags far beyond the creation of the problem for obvious economic reasons.

The report further notes that some individual, isolated efforts at control have been successful, but that the whole body of knowledge in the field has neither been brought together for the benefit of all who need it nor given the kind of quantum jump that physics and engineering have received from modern weapons development and that is undoubtedly needed to cope with our self-created problems of environment.

The report analyzes the present situation into "human settlements problems," which may be left to individual nations, "territorial problems," which call for regional, international solutions, and "global problems," which will require world-wide agreements and actions in concert for the common good.

The conference, essentially, will present to the delegates the conclusions to be reached by two sets of four commissions. The substantive bodies will consider human settlements and industrial development; rational use and development of natural resources; environmental pollution; and the maintenance of values of the human environment. The "strategic" commissions will devise the legal, economic, social and diplomatic arrangements by which the recommendations or the substantive commissions can best be put into effect.

The subject is made for the machinery, the methods and the best hopes of the United Nations. It is true that none of the nations has yet paid anywhere near enough attention to the environmental problems on its own doorstep, but that is a reason for, not against, convening the United Nations Conference. We need the knowledge that the conference will generate. We need the pledge of all nations to work together to solve the monumental problems we have created.

Here in the United States, we have the special advantage that, since the year of the conference, 1972, is also a presidential election year, reflections from Geneva or Stockholm may well turn up in public discussions and debates in Boston and Los Angeles and, after November of that year and January of the next, here in Washington.

This country should back the conference as fully as possible and begin now to prepare carefully so that contributions in skills and knowledge will be equal to our needs and obligations.

REMARKS BY VICE PRESIDENT
AGNEW BEFORE THE GOVERNORS
CONFERENCE

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, Vice President AGNEW addressed the Governors Conference called by President Nixon today and once again his comments on this question of a so-called "generation gap" contain a message for all of us to heed and I include a copy of his remarks in the RECORD at this point:

REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT TO GOVERNORS
AND THEIR FAMILIES, WASHINGTON,
D.C., DECEMBER 3, 1969

It has frequently been stated that the strength of a nation depends upon the strength of its people. But people are not born strong. A young person draws his strength from the teaching and example of those closest to him. In most cases, this means the family. So it would not be inaccurate to say that the strength of a nation depends upon the strength of its families.

The President of the United States is a family man. Because he is, and because he believes you are family-oriented, we are here today—as the French say, "*en famille*."

Since so many of you have brought your youngsters with you, today I would like to talk about young people, about the silent majority and the vocal minority of youth. I would like to discuss shallow demonstrations and profound demonstrations, and a way for men and women of good will, and of all ages, to begin to bridge the generation gap.

For some time now, I have been speaking out against the cause that some people have been demonstrating about. As a result, I have been charged with being "against the right to demonstrate."

For some time now, I have been reminding parents and young people alike that self-respect begins with mutual respect, and that order in society begins with discipline and authority in the home. As a result, I have been charged with being "against young people."

(I've also made a couple of speeches about the media, but nobody paid any attention to those.)

Now, anybody who knows me, or has taken the trouble to read what I have to say, knows that I respect the right of dissent in America, and knows that I admire and respect the great majority of young people in America today.

But the fact of the charges illustrates a phenomenon of our times. Too many of us are unwilling to argue a point but are too willing to point at an arguer. Too many of us stand ready to evade a debate by challenging the motives of the debater. Why bother to come to grips with a real issue, they ask, when a strawman of your own offers such an inviting target?

That kind of evasion results in "ricochet rhetoric"—when people do not respond to what is said, but to what other people say you meant. There is nothing wrong with joining an issue, but there is something very definitely wrong in two sides deliberately missing each other's point.

That is why there is so little real communication between those who demonstrate and those who are the targets of demonstration. That is why what should be a "meaningful dialogue" has become all too often a cacophony of meaningless monologues. That refusal to approach an issue with an open mind, that refusal to entertain a spirit of compromise—that is what is building barriers between the young and the not-so-

young, between an outspoken minority and a soft-spoken majority. That is the barrier we must begin to dismantle—from both sides.

Freedom of speech is useless without freedom of thought. And I fear that the politics of protest is shutting out the process of thought, so necessary to rational discussion. We are faced with the Ten Commandments of Protest:

Thou Shalt Not Allow Thy Opponent to Speak.

Thou Shalt Not Set Forth a Program of Thine Own.

Thou Shalt Not Trust Anybody Over Thirty.

Thou Shalt Not Honor Thy Father or Thy Mother.

Thou Shalt Not Heed the Lessons of History.

Thou Shalt Not Write Anything Longer than a Slogan.

Thou Shalt Not Present a Negotiable Demand.

Thou Shalt Not Accept Any Establishment Idea.

Thou Shalt Not Revere Any but Totalitarian Heroes.

Thou Shalt Not Ask Forgiveness for Thy Transgressions.

Rather Thou Shalt Demand Amnesty for Them.

In the face of these Commandments of Protest, how do we establish communication? How do we reach out without caving in? How do we talk to each other instead of just at each other?

Fortunately, the true believers in these Commandments are relatively few. And fortunately, we have an Administration in this country, ready to listen to the legitimate needs of the young, and even more important, ready and able to respond to those needs in significant ways.

You have already seen this morning how we are tackling the problem of dangerous drugs, which are more of a threat to our young people than any other segment of the population. And right across town this week, a White House Conference on Food, Nutrition and Health is taking place; this Administration has thereby provided a forum and a focal point for constructive controversy on a subject of deep concern to millions of our committed young people.

To a young person's question, "What have you done for us lately?" the obvious answer is "reform the draft." Certainly this long-overdue reform ends the terrible uncertainty that hung over millions of young lives. By and large, most young people of draft age can now make plans for their lives with a big question mark removed. And now that the President has demonstrated his credibility in this area, I think most young people believe he means what he says about an all-volunteer army in the future, and an end to the draft.

But let us look beyond the issues of immediate concern to young people, and look into the events of the past month that may affect their lives for years to come.

We have signed a treaty that limits the spread of nuclear weapons, and reduces to some degree the threat of holocaust to future generations. The diplomatic negotiations that led to this signing are for historians of the future to detail, but there was far more to the signing of the Non-Proliferation Treaty than the stroke of a pen.

We have announced our intention to return Okinawa to Japan, in a generous rather than a grudging spirit, thereby laying the basis for a harmonious long-term relationship with the third most important industrial nation in the world, and increasing the chances for stability in the Far East in the generations to come.

We have unilaterally renounced the use of germ warfare, and by setting this example to the world, we have added to the environment

of peaceful negotiation as we lessen the terror of war to future generations.

We have begun Strategic Arms Limitation Talks with the Soviet Union, and the depth and extent of our preparation for these talks cannot help but impress the other side of the table with our seriousness of purpose. And on the outcome of these negotiations hang so many of the hopes of tomorrow's generation of Americans.

Consider for a moment what those four acts last month mean to young people in America: The NPT, the return of Okinawa, the renunciation of germ warfare, the opening of the SALT talks.

I believe that when future historians look at the month of November, 1969, they will not consider it to be the month of the March or the month of the Moratorium. I believe they will consider November, 1969, to be a turning point in the history of the 20th Century—a month in which President Nixon led the way toward world peace.

Since I mentioned the demonstration of last month, let me address myself to the focal point of the protest of so many of our young people: Why are we Vietnamizing the war in an orderly way—why don't we just pull out right now?

Here is the straight answer: We are being steadfast in Vietnam because we do not want the next generation of Americans to have to fight another war. If America were to cut and run, we would be cutting the chances for peace in the Seventies, and running out on the children in school today who would have to fight a war tomorrow.

This generation is charged with the responsibility of dealing with the real world, with life as it is. The power and pressure and suspicion of the real world cannot be dispelled by wishful thinking, or by turning inward, or by doubting our ideals, or by blaming ourselves for all the ills of mankind.

By following the path of appeasement, this generation could accomplish "peace in our time." But we say to the next generation—"We are just as much concerned with peace in *your* time." We refuse to accept a solution that says "Peace Now—Pay Later." Because it is our children—the younger generation—who would have to pay later the price of surrender now.

More than anything else, the desire to transmit a better and a safer world to the next generation motivates the men at the center of decision today.

Why are we overhauling our welfare system—if not to build a better life for children who would otherwise be doomed to lives of poverty?

Why are we taxing ourselves at the highest rate in America's history—if not to avoid the deficits that would bankrupt the next generation?

Why are we turning the flow of power away from Washington and back toward the States—if not to enable the adults of tomorrow to have a greater say in managing their own destinies?

This is our way of "demonstrating." This is our demonstration of good faith toward the young Americans who are far more the objects of our hopes than our fears.

In this demonstration, the only signs we carry are the signs of the times—the hard evidence of action, the deeds you can see and the reform you can feel.

And the march we are most interested in is the march of progress—the progress that comes from respect for each other, respect for our free institutions, respect for new ideas.

I believe that we will see young people tomorrow dedicating themselves more profoundly than by the simple drama of demonstration. I believe we will see them involving themselves in community action against pollution—organizing clean-up brigades, but-tonholing civic and political leaders, pressing their cause with cogent argument, and mobilizing support by the power of their ex-

ample. By working within the system, they can change the system.

Why do I believe this? Because sooner or later, you face the choice in life between getting something off your chest and getting something done. That's the choice that determines maturity.

I think the vast majority of the young activists in America are mature enough to want to get something done. In that cause—as in every positive cause—they will find an Administration, and an older generation, with them all the way.

HUDSON LEADS WAY TO POLLUTION CONTROL

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, the continued and growing problem of water pollution in these United States rightly concerns us all. As a matter of fact, it has become a national disgrace in many areas.

Unless this Nation reverses this trend, future generations will suffer irreparable damage from the uncontrolled pollution of business and government.

While we are quick to point out the problems, we seldom take the time to pay tribute to those who are doing something about this menace.

It is for this reason that I take this opportunity to pay tribute to the Hudson Pulp and Paper Corp., of Palatka, Fla., on its plan for a waste-water treatment plant.

This is the second phase of the company's water improvement program at this huge facility. Cost of the entire Hudson project is \$3,200,000.

The new treatment plant will bring Hudson into compliance with the January 1969 Florida environmental protection laws by late 1971—well in advance of the January 1973 requirement.

It was a red letter day for industry when Hudson vice president, John H. Trescot, Jr., made formal announcement of the project at a meeting of State and county civic and governmental leaders.

In 1961, the company installed its primary waste treatment clarifier. The new treatment facility will return oxygen to the mill effluent prior to its introduction into Rice Creek with 900 acres of oxidation ponds required along with the auxiliary piping and pumping equipment.

The company has noted that the waste water will flow through the ponds where natural aeration will reduce the odor and replenish the waste with oxygen.

Construction is scheduled to begin in September of next year with an expenditure of approximately \$1 million. It is scheduled to be completed in late 1971, after an expenditure of an additional \$2,200,000.

I might add that Hudson's interest in pollution control dates back many years. In 1950, the company cooperated with the State board of health in one of the first comprehensive stream quality surveys in the State.

The primary clarifier which removes the solid material from the mill wastes was placed in operation in 1961 and contributed greatly to the improvement of water quality in Rice Creek.

Here is a corporation that is doing something—and they deserve commendation from everyone for their public-spirited attitude.

I believe they are pointing the way for other industries to control pollution. It can be done, and it must be done.

Congress has passed legislation which will allow the States to establish water quality standards and I am proud of Florida for having taken the lead in this endeavor.

I am doubly proud that Hudson, whose plant is located in our district, has taken the lead among industry.

The management and all of the fine people who have made this corporation great have justifiable reason to be proud.

Further, I know that the citizens of Palatka and Putnam County take justifiable pride in this announcement by a corporation which is vital to their economy—and has proven once again that it is a partner and friend in the development of this area.

ALLEGED MASSACRE AT MYLAI

HON. ALBERT W. WATSON

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. WATSON. Mr. Speaker, no sooner had the Green Beret case been put to rest by the Department of the Army and all at once we have got the so-called "massacre" at Mylai. Like the Green Beret situation, the alleged killing of civilians at Mylai is surrounded by contradictions and inconsistencies. Quite frankly, the Army has done precious little to clear up either matter, and the American people are naturally confused. I know I am.

Mr. Speaker, it would be presumptuous of me to give an opinion of just who and who is not guilty of the Mylai tragedy. The facts thus far have not been established. All we know is what we have read—a young Army lieutenant stands accused of ordering his men to kill Vietnamese civilians in the little village of Mylai in South Vietnam about 20 months ago. There will be a trial, and under our judicial system, a man is considered to be innocent until proven guilty by a court of law.

It is this basic constitutional principle which causes me concern. Despite the fact that Lieutenant Calley's trial has not even started, for the most part the national news media in this country have already condemned him, and not only him but President Nixon, the American fighting men in Vietnam, and the entire Vietnam war itself.

Already the Senator from South Dakota, and other antiwar critics are using Mylai as an excuse to renew all-out attacks on this country's involvement in Vietnam. To them, Mylai is a symbol of the frustration of the Vietnam

war, and in my judgment, they will squeeze this terrible tragedy for everything it is worth in order to downgrade the President and our fighting men. Backed by Time magazine, Newsweek, the Washington Post, newspaper, national television correspondents and the like, the Senator from South Dakota and others like him have already found Lieutenant Calley and the men guilty, guilty by innuendo and insinuation. How can this young soldier possibly receive a fair trial because of such adverse publicity? It is obvious to me that, for the liberals, he is going to become the symbolic scapegoat for all the horrors of the Vietnam war.

Mr. Speaker, it seems very strange that after 20 months, the alleged massacre is just coming to light. Why are we learning about it at a time when the great majority of the American people are showing their support for the President's policy in Vietnam? There is no doubt that something terrible happened at Mylai, but it would be even more tragic for the cause of world peace and freedom in Southeast Asia if the events in that village caused this Nation to abandon its commitment in South Vietnam, and desecrate the memory of American soldiers who have paid the supreme sacrifice there.

No one abhors the idea of war more than I. The taking of a human life under any circumstances is hard to justify. In this Nation alone, the American people have killed and have been killed to prevent evil forces from destroying freedom. War is not a pleasant thing. Like so many of my colleagues, I discovered that in World War II. Yet, when we are called upon to protect freedom, American fighting men will have to engage in the tragic business of death.

I do not defend Lieutenant Calley nor do I condemn him. If he is guilty, he should be punished. But we must put this whole episode in its proper perspective. Some accounts say that the people of Mylai were responsible for killing American soldiers in Lieutenant Calley's command. Others say that not as many villagers were killed as news reports indicated. Hopefully, many of these points will be clarified at the trial. But even if this soldier is guilty, how can anyone who believes in justice and fair play condemn all American fighting men and the American people in general for this one event? It is reported that about 100 villagers were killed. Let us not forget that 40,000 young Americans have died defending villages and their inhabitants throughout South Vietnam.

Two wrongs do not make a right. But, before any apologist for America starts getting involved in a guilt complex, think for a moment how many Vietnamese civilians have been killed by the

Vietcong and the North Vietnamese regulars. No one knows for sure, but 100,000 is a conservative estimate. Long before we sent fighting units into South Vietnam, I recall an American military adviser telling me how sick he became after visiting a little village that the Vietcong had just departed. The villagers failed to cooperate with the Vietcong. They paid dearly. Every little child in

the village, from 1 week to 14 years, 150 in all, were decapitated and laid in a neat row for the parents to see.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time to cast aspersions on our fighting men, the President and ourselves for that matter, as some members of the national news media and a few demagogues are doing because of My Lai. It is time for us to renew our efforts to help assure South Vietnam that its future will be secure from further atrocities, regardless of who may commit them.

FOR BLACK INITIATIVE IN CRIME CONTROL

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, a frequently exploited misconception is that crime is a racial problem. But crime is not a white problem. Neither is it a black problem. It is a human problem. As such, it deserves and demands the concerted attention of all men of good will.

It behooves us to hear and to heed all thoughtful proposals for crime control. One such set of recommendations was outlined in a speech by our colleague, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

His trenchant and cogent proposals require little by way of introduction. I insert at this point in the RECORD the text of the address, delivered at a meeting of the National Council of Negro Women at St. Louis, November 24, 1969. The address follows:

FOR BLACK INITIATIVE IN CRIME CONTROL—IF LEFT TO WHITES, IT WILL BE AN INSTRUMENT OF REPRESSION

(By Representative WILLIAM L. CLAY)

Far too many politicians use crime as a political issue. They talk in generalities about a "return to law and order," to domestic tranquility—about the threat of this permissive society. And though it is never spelled out, it is made quite clear that social reform has no place in the kind of social order they seek.

When claims are made about their ability to "control crime," it usually means they will maintain the status quo—economically, socially, and politically. Too often, what is meant is that they will stifle dissent and rid this land of the notions of justice for all. Implied in these demands for law and order is police repression of attempts by blacks and other minorities to effectuate social change.

Black people have no quarrel with the need for protecting the population from criminals. It is the black population which suffers most from street crimes. We are the ones who are victimized. Our brothers and sisters and children are the ones being shot down on the streets—our homes are being burglarized—our wives and sisters raped—our businesses robbed and bombed.

Black people must find a way to show our concern for crime, our own fear of criminals, but in a way that is not interpreted as a step toward condoning a police state.

At the root of crime are the desperate conditions of the ghetto; the inadequate, over-

crowded, ill-equipped schools; the unbearable, dilapidated overcrowded housing; the unemployment; the broken families—all the vicious forces that push the poor urban black outside of society.

But there are glaring misconceptions about crime in black communities. Too many believe that drug addiction and poverty are the causes of most of the crime. Drug addicts usually commit passive crimes such as shoplifting and prostitution. The poor who are desperately trying to make ends meet commit very few crimes. But the crimes against persons—muggings, robberies, bombings are usually committed by hardened criminals who should be dealt with as such. They have created a reign of terror and a climate of fear which has changed our lives.

We no longer take strolls at night, shop at night, and we are afraid to use the city parks. We are victims of fear, we are victims of crime. And, by and large we have not been the ones to raise our voices in protest. The people screaming law and order are the suburbanites detached from the realities of the crime problem by superhighways. I am amazed by the notions held by many white people that the ghettos are safe if your skin is black.

The choice for black leaders seems clear. We must speak out to change the system so that the law respects and protects us as it is meant. When our elected officials, our police commissioners, our circuit attorneys, our judges and our juries treat crime by black people against black people as seriously as they treat crime which affects the white middle-income communities then we will be on the road to a solution.

In my view, the following recommendations must be made a part of any reasonable and comprehensive solution to crime:

First, and of prime importance, the conditions of the inner city, the slums which breed crime, must be eliminated. Until this nation gives priority to these tragic domestic ills, the probability for curbing the wave of crime will be remote.

Second, the law must be applied equally—across the board—to black and white. Equal rights and equal protection under the law must be assured and crime, wherever it occurs and whomever it strikes, must be considered a matter for law enforcement and prosecution.

Third, the quality of law enforcement agencies and personnel must be uplifted. The attitudes of law enforcement personnel must be free of prejudice. Citizens must play an important role in crime detection, but will do so only if they have no reason to mistrust the motives of the police.

Fourth, the total thrust of penal institutions must be revised. The job is to rehabilitate—not isolate—criminals. The quality of prison personnel, the conditions of prisons and the methods of prisons must be drastically improved.

Fifth, our court system must be expanded, and a more equitable system for the appointment of judges must be established.

Finally, crime, its prevention and control, is a community problem. All forces and resources of individual communities must be brought to bear on crime. Community efforts must be aimed at community institutions so they can be made responsive to community problems. Poverty and deprivation must be driven out with the realization that the conditions for breeding crimes are being eradicated.

For too long, we have allowed those political opportunists in all parties to obscure this issue with hysteria and prejudice. Make no mistake, if we fail to advance concrete actions on this matter, we shall continue to see the issue dishonestly exploited by every backward element on the political scene.

"CHICANO" VOTING POWER.

HON. JOHN V. TUNNEY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. TUNNEY. Mr. Speaker, we must not slacken speed in the task of securing equal opportunities for all Americans. The Civil Rights Acts of 1964 and 1968, and the Voting Rights Act of 1965 provide a strong basis for action, but constant work is required to make existing legislation effective and to broaden available protection.

Something like 800,000 Negroes have registered to vote in the States of Alabama, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, and South Carolina since the Voting Rights Act of 1965 eliminated literacy tests in those States as a condition for registration. Fairminded people rejoice that black Americans can make their presence felt increasingly in politics on the local, State, and Federal levels.

But the Voting Rights Act overlooks another minority group—Mexican Americans—great numbers of whom are disenfranchised by literacy requirements for voting. It is fair estimate that something like 150,000 Mexican Americans are prevented from voting in California alone because of the English-language literacy requirement for registration.

The fact that the Voting Rights Act overlooks disenfranchised Mexican Americans exemplifies the situation of this group of citizens.

Not long ago the head of a Mexican American social agency said:

The problems of our Mexican Americans are unique and plead for a clearer understanding by government agencies.

We can get an idea of how unique are the problems of Mexican Americans and of how difficult it must be for Government to understand these problems clearly if we should run through the list of basic policy aims determined at a recent nationwide conference of Federal officials and 1,500 Mexican Americans. The conference projected the following basic aims:

The cultural differences and background of the Mexican American community must be acknowledged and understood;

Bilingual education in all phases of instruction should be developed;

Federal agencies must develop and practice an "outreach" philosophy in bringing services to the Mexican American community;

Federal employment opportunities must be opened further to the Mexican American community;

The community must be involved in all aspects of program planning whether it is in school activities or model cities programs;

Problem solving must be undertaken through the cooperation of Government, private industry, and Mexican American civic and service organizations.

Government has tended to recognize inadequately the unique problems of Mexican-Americans because Mexican-Americans are grievously underrepresented in Congress, in State legislatures, and in administrative agencies. They are

grievously underrepresented despite the fact that 85 percent of Mexican-Americans are native-born U.S. citizens. And they are grievously underrepresented because, for one reason, so many are disenfranchised by literacy requirements for voting.

One Mexican-American said:

You have a lot of problems and they always go back to a problem being solved for the Mexican by another group, by Anglos, by another minority. That is the main problem I think we have.

Mexican-American citizens ought, in justice to be adequately represented in Congress and in State legislatures. They urgently require spokesmen of their own who understand their problems and aims.

Among Mexican-Americans there is increasing determination to unite in order to bring about changes through political action. Mexican-Americans are concerned to exercise their potential voting power.

A recent report published by the Civil Rights Commission stated:

The most pervasive force among Mexican Americans today is a growing sense of identity and a quest for unity to achieve equality for opportunity in every phase of life. In cities and towns throughout the Southwest, Mexican Americans are coming together in issue-oriented and action-committed organizations. The effects of these efforts for unity have not been lost on Federal agencies and private organizations.

The level of organization, of awareness, and of identity is constantly rising. The impact of improved communications through an increase in the chicanismo press, a struggling network of barrio newspapers and magazines, is a significant addition to the effort to develop philosophy and ideology among chicanismo groups. In fact, every aspect necessary to the development and sustaining of a movement is being activated and, most importantly, obtaining financial stability.

It is urgent, Mr. Speaker, that we make possible the political expression of this movement by enfranchisement of chicanos, who are literate in Spanish but who cannot now vote.

Today, I am introducing legislation to amend the Voting Rights Act to correct a long-standing inequity which has served to disenfranchise thousands of American citizens—primarily Spanish-speaking Americans.

My bill would amend the Voting Rights Act of 1965 to broaden the prohibition against the use of certain English language literacy requirements as a prerequisite to the right to vote.

Briefly stated, the amendment seeks to end the long-standing discrimination against certain groups of persons in California and other States who are literate in a foreign language such as Spanish.

It is estimated that in California alone the amendment would enfranchise over 150,000 people. These people are literate in Spanish rather than English. They have access to Spanish-language information and most are very much aware of political issues.

In America there can be no such thing as second-class citizenship. I promise that I will fight to assure that literate, Spanish-speaking Californians are made

first-class citizens by giving them the right to vote just the same as other Californians. I urge all Californians to support my amendment to the Voting Rights Act of 1969 and help me bring an end to second-class citizenship in our State.

BARBADOAN INDEPENDENCE DAY THIRD ANNIVERSARY

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, today we pause to honor the third anniversary of the independence of the beautiful island of Barbados: a gentle land of golden sandy beaches and rolling green hills, set in the sparkling blue Caribbean.

Settled by British colonists in 1627, the island holds fast a tradition of 300 years of parliamentary democracy, marked by continuing peace and political stability. After centuries of democratic and evolutionary progress toward self-government, this island people achieved internal autonomy from Britain in 1961, and declared total constitutional independence on November 30, 1966.

Upon attaining its sovereignty, the Barbados Government, under the able leadership of Prime Minister Errol W. Barrow, declared its commitment to working through international organizations toward the goals of world peace and rapid economic growth for all underdeveloped countries. To implement its ideals, this energetic little nation has taken an active role in the United Nations and the Organization of American States, as well as actively participating in British Commonwealth activities, and the West Indies Association of States.

Its major impetus has been directed toward fomentation of economic development both internally and within the Caribbean region as a whole. Since independence, Barbados has sought to diversify its own economy through encouraging manufacturing and light industry. At the same time, the island has taken the lead in forging a regional economic partnership with its Caribbean neighbors. Barbados is wholly committed to the concept of strength and human progress through economic unity, and as such has had a decisive role in the developing and strengthening of the Caribbean Free Trade Association and the Caribbean Regional Development Agency.

Our two peoples share a deep sense of friendship, united by traditions of democracy, justice and belief in the dignity of mankind. Today we salute the 250,000 citizens of Barbados, and fondly dedicate to them these words, spoken by the late President John F. Kennedy:

All the world owes much to the little "five feet high" nations. The greatest art of the world was the work of little nations. The most enduring literature of the world came from little nations. The heroic deeds that

thrill humanity through generations were the deeds of the little nations, fighting for their freedom.

A NEW SOFTWOOD LUMBER STANDARD

HON. JOHN DELLENBACK

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. DELLENBACK. Mr. Speaker, on December 1 the Secretary of Commerce announced that a revised softwood lumber standard sponsored by the American Lumber Standards Committee would be published in the Federal Register on December 5.

This important announcement culminates a 9-year struggle to have the present softwood lumber standard updated under the voluntary product standard program established by the Department of Commerce.

The current standard was published approximately 16 years ago and has long been inadequate, principally because it failed to relate size to moisture content. This made questionable the performance of various lumber items being sold in the marketplace.

I commend the Secretary of Commerce for taking this crucial step. I also commend those members of the American Lumber Standards Committee who persevered during the 9 years of effort to modernize a standard affecting all users of softwood lumber.

Because this is a landmark decision for the producers, users, and consumers of softwood lumber, I am today inserting into the RECORD a copy of the Secretary's announcement which briefly outlines the basis for his decision to publish a modern softwood lumber standard:

SECRETARY STANS ANNOUNCES NEW LUMBER STANDARD

Secretary of Commerce Maurice H. Stans today described "as an important step for the consumer of lumber" a revised softwood lumber standard which will soon go into effect as a result of Department of Commerce procedures for developing voluntary product standards.

"The new standard we are about to publish will replace the current standard, published 16 years ago, which has long been considered inadequate for consumers," the Secretary said. "The old standard failed to relate size to moisture content, so that the lumber user could never be sure of the performance of the product he was purchasing."

Two previous attempts to correct the acknowledged deficiencies of the old standard failed for want of agreement within the industry. The present revision stems from a recommendation supported by 21 of the 22 voting members of the American Lumber Standards Committee and approved by 87 percent of producers, distributors and users-consumers of lumber.

The Secretary added: "The public interest required this truly national standard. Such a standard enhances the consumer's security in selecting the type of lumber to satisfy his needs."

The Secretary pointed out that the new standard does permit slight reductions in several sizes of lumber. However, it avoids the present situation where seasoned and unseasoned lumber start off with the same

dimensions but wind up having different dimensions because of different shrinkage rates. The new standard takes account of the fact that lumber shrinks as it dries by requiring green lumber to be finished to a size sufficiently larger than dry lumber so that both will have the same dimensions after seasoning. The Secretary expressed the hope that the reduced sizes being permitted under the standard would increase the supply of lumber to meet consumer and other national needs.

"I am also hopeful that we will have widespread acceptance of an optional provision in the new standard which authorizes the machine grading of lumber," the secretary said. Machine grading will enable consumers to know the precise characteristics of each piece of lumber being purchased.

Still to be worked out, the Secretary noted, is the continued use of nominal designations, such as 2x4, rather than actual lumber sizes. "I am concerned about this practice which has come about through common usage and I am pleased that the American Lumber Standards Committee, which has done a fine job in the revisions announced today, has agreed to focus its attention on the nomenclature problem."

The Committee has plans for a broad educational campaign designed to acquaint all consumers, including the do-it-yourself occasional purchaser, of the actual dimensions of "standard" lumber.

Secretary Stans offered the full cooperation of the Commerce Department to the Federal Trade Commission in the development of appropriate trade regulations which might be necessary to protect consumers from the misgrading of lumber.

About five months ago the National Bureau of Standards, responsible for implementing the Department's Voluntary Product Standards program, requested the Bureau of the Census to conduct a statistical survey to determine the acceptability of the revision.

The Census Bureau report indicates that the revision is acceptable to 87 percent of the producers, distributors, and users-consumers of softwood lumber. Under the Department's procedures, an average acceptance of not less than 75 percent is required before a standard may be published.

The new softwood lumber standard will be identified as Voluntary Product Standard 20-70, "American Softwood Lumber Standard." It will become fully effective on March 1, 1970. No lumber will be graded under the existing Standard (SPR 16-53) after that date.

**MRS. WILLIAM N. PATMAN—TEXAS'
NEW NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC
COMMITTEEWOMAN**

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, soon Washington will become acquainted with a charming and energetic woman whom I have had the pleasure of knowing for quite some time. Mrs. William Patman, as I advised you earlier, has been appointed the new national committeewoman from the Texas State Democratic Executive Committee.

She is exceptionally well qualified for the job and will breathe a new exuberance into this position. In the November issue of Texas Today, Carrin Patman's lifetime interest in politics and public service is described in detail.

Carrin Patman has a living tradition of public service on both sides of her family. Her husband is State Senator William N. Patman and her father-in-law is the distinguished dean of the Texas congressional delegation, the Honorable WRIGHT PATMAN—and she is the daughter of former State Senator Fred Mauritz.

With this backdrop, I insert a reprint of the article:

NEW NATIONAL COMMITTEEWOMAN

Mrs. William N. (Carrin) Patman, the SDEC's choice to serve on the National Democratic Committee as Texas' committeewoman, has a unique political heritage.

She is the daughter of a State Senator, the wife of a State Senator, the daughter-in-law of Texas' ranking member of the U.S. Congress, a former member of the State Democratic Executive Committee—and a lifelong campaigner.

Mrs. Patman was born March 1, 1932, and grew up in Ganado and Austin. Her parents were Mr. and Mrs. Fred Mauritz of Ganado, both of whom are now deceased. He was a farmer, rancher and businessman who served in the Texas House of Representatives from 1935 to 1939 and then in the Texas Senate from 1941 until his death in 1947.

Her husband is an attorney who has represented the 18th Senatorial District in the Senate since 1961. They live in Ganado and are the parents of a daughter, Carrin Foreman, who is 13.

After being an honor graduate of Austin High School in 1949, Mrs. Patman won honors at the University of Texas in 1953 with a BA degree in Philosophy and English.

She has had an avid interest in politics all her life, springing—no doubt—from the times she campaigned door-to-door for her father when she was a little girl.

She was, of course, extremely active in her husband's two hotly contested races for the State Senate. She enthusiastically tackled a wide variety of political jobs from making speeches to writing ads to pounding the pavement in behalf of her husband's candidacy.

"I enjoy it all," she says, "but I think the political pastime I find most rewarding is visiting personally with the voters."

During her husband's first two sessions in the Senate, she wrote a weekly newspaper column for the district called "Austin Diary," which described life-behind-the-scenes at the Capitol. She now is the incoming president of the Senate Ladies Club.

Active in every Democratic presidential campaign since 1960, Mrs. Patman worked almost full-time in State Headquarters as a volunteer during the 1969 Humphrey-Muskie campaign.

She was especially active in helping and encouraging Young Democratic groups and has organized corps of teenagers to work in several presidential campaigns.

Despite her dedication to the Democratic Party, she has found time to become involved in a wide variety of church and civic activities.

Her proudest civic accomplishment in recent years was a two-year campaign which she started and led, resulting in a national award-winning elementary school library for the public schools of Ganado.

For this achievement, Mrs. Patman was made an honorary member of the area chapter of Delta Kappe Gamma, international honor society for outstanding women educators.

She has served as president of the Jackson County Hospital Auxiliary and of the Ganado Federated Women's Club.

She also has served on the boards of the Texana Scholarship Foundation, the Jackson

County United Fund, the boards of stewards and trustees of the First Methodist Church of Ganado and the executive committee of the Ganado PTA.

Her hobbies are water skiing, piano and folk guitar and horseback riding.

In accepting her latest honor, Mrs. Patman said:

"I am certainly thrilled and grateful to have this wonderful opportunity. I think this is an especially exciting time to be a Democrat in Texas. The Party obviously faces new challenges with great opportunities for growth and creative change."

"And the Democratic Party has always been at its best in rising to challenge. It will be great to have a seat on the 50-yard line as it happens."

"I also appreciate, particularly, the chance to serve in this capacity during Governor Smith's administration. I don't think Texas has ever had a governor who felt more respect for the power and authority of the 'grassroots' or made himself more accessible to people at that level."

"This coincides exactly with my own philosophy of politics and government. I am and, I guess, always will be at heart a precinct worker."

"That's where democratic government begins and ends. And, to me, it's where you find the strength and glory of the Democratic Party."

"As Texas' Democratic National Committeewoman, my main hope and concern will be to try to help bring the thinking of the 'grass-roots' into the national councils of the Party—and vice versa."

"Well, how about a definite plan—a formula—to aid our Democratic nominees in their races against Republican opponents next Fall."

"And how about the possibility of building our own state headquarters here in Austin to serve the Democratic Party of Texas?"

"Impossible dreams? No."

"Ambitious goals? Yes."

"And the way to take care of tomorrow—is to work hard today."

"This committee will be composed of all the subcommittee chairmen now serving on our State Committee."

"They will be aided by the advice and counsel of outside experts: elected public officials, Democratic county chairmen from all across Texas, authorities, in many different fields... specialists in many techniques."

"Now let me emphasize this:

"This group will have no other function than to advise our State Committee and to acquaint our committee chairmen with new possibilities which will give stronger direction and continued strength to our Party."

"Now, I know it is easier to criticize than to construct. It's easier to tear down than to build up. Easier to argue why something shouldn't be done than to figure a way how it can be done."

"You members of this committee were elected by your Democratic neighbors because they had confidence in your ability to do a good job for Texas. They have faith in your capacity to succeed."

"We are all different. We come from different parts of Texas. We represent different points of view. But we are united in the common goal of giving new strength to the Democratic Party of Texas, new vision to our future, new vitality to our leadership, new confidence of success."

"In January, when we last met, I said this to you: Coming together is a beginning, staying together is progress, working together is success."

"And the success of the Democratic Party of Texas truly is in your hands."

"And I want you all to know, that I think our future is in very good hands."

MARIHUANA AND THE LAW

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, recently the National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence made a number of suggestions with respect to eradicating the violence which besets our society by confronting the sources of alienation and the causes which manifest themselves in acts of violence, especially as this concerns the young people of this country.

Among the proposals offered by Dr. Milton Eisenhower and the Commission are two which are especially important to this Congress. They deal with marihuana. The first recommendation is that the National Institutes of Health, working with selected universities, greatly expand research on the physical and psychological effects of marihuana use. The second recommendation is that Federal and State laws make use and incidental possession of marihuana no more than a misdemeanor until more definitive information about marihuana is at hand and the Congress and State legislatures have had an opportunity to revise their laws in light of this information.

Both recommendations are similar to my proposal, H.R. 10019, which establishes a President's Commission on Marihuana. However, my proposal goes further by including a Presidential Commission examination of the broad social consequences of marihuana use.

Possession of marihuana is a felony, and present penalties for a first offense involving possession under Federal law range from a minimum of 2 years to a maximum of 10 years in prison. The sentence corresponds with a conviction for manslaughter. In many States a felony conviction, as the Commission points out, results in the loss of voting rights, jury service, and the right to enter various professional occupations, whereas a misdemeanor does not. The Commission's statement does not recommend a similar reduction in the penalty for those who traffic in marihuana for profit until further study has been made into the possible dangers of the drug, and I concur.

I can cite the growth percentage-wise of the use of marihuana to substantiate a call for the investigation of physiological and psychological effects of marihuana, as well as the broader social consequences stemming from its use. Present harsh penalties seem to have had little effect thus far in abating marihuana use, while at the same time, imprisonment is doing great damage to our young people who in many cases have merely experimented with this drug. As the Commission's report so amply states:

The present harsh penalties for possession and use of marihuana are a classic example of what legal scholars call "overcriminalization"—treating as a serious crime private personal conduct that a substantial segment of the community does not regard as a major offense.

And in the context of the Eisenhower report on violence such a condition contributes to a general disrespect for the

law, while the questions with respect to the possible dangers and hazards of marihuana use remain unanswered.

With the hope that it will interest my colleagues and encourage them to support H.R. 10019 now cosponsored by 77 Members of this House, I am submitting the report by Dr. Eisenhower's Commission on the subject of marihuana:

COMMISSION STATEMENT CHALLENGING OUR YOUTH

(Submitted by Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, Chairman, National Commission on the Causes and Prevention of Violence)

Our main concern in this statement is to stress the importance of challenging the young people of the nation to become full partners in the enterprise of building a better society. But we must also add a word on one increasingly acute aspect of the present "generation gap"—the problem of drugs, particularly marihuana.

The development of drug subcultures among many of today's youth is particularly troubling to those who are older. Increased education about the physical and psychological hazards of the use of addictive drugs, LSD, the amphetamines and other dangerous substances is essential if the health of young people and their children is to be properly safeguarded. In addition, the older generation must answer, in good faith and on the basis of better knowledge, the question raised by many young people as to whether present proscriptions on marihuana use go too far.

The startling recent increase in marihuana use by many young people has intensified the conflict between generations and posed enormous problems in the enforcement of drug laws. Possession and/or use of marihuana is treated severely by the law. In most states such possession or use is a felony, whereas the use or possession of the more dangerous LSD is only a misdemeanor.¹ This lack of elementary logic and justice has become a principal source of frustration and alienation contributing markedly to youth's often bitter dissatisfaction with today's society. We believe that action must be taken to put the whole situation into rational perspective.

Scientific knowledge about marihuana remains sparse, but some of its pharmacological properties have been established: marihuana is not a narcotic or an opiate and is not addicting.² There is as yet no evidence as to the relationship it bears to the use of harder drugs.³

We recommend that the National Institutes of Health, working with selected universities, greatly expand research on the physical and psychological effects of marihuana use.⁴

The Congress should enact laws and appropriate adequate funds for this purpose.

¹ A felony is a serious crime usually punishable by imprisonment for an extended period (under federal law for a year or more); a misdemeanor is a lesser offense punishable by fine or imprisonment of less than a year. In many states, a felony conviction results in a loss of voting rights, jury service, and the right to enter various professional occupations; a misdemeanor conviction does not.

² Addiction is a physiological and psychological dependence on a drug, with definite symptoms occurring when the drug is withdrawn.

³ In testimony on October 14, 1969 before the House of Representatives Select Committee on Crime, Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare for Health and Scientific Affairs, stated that "there is no scientific evidence to demonstrate that the use of marihuana in itself predisposes an individual to progress to 'hard' drugs."

⁴ A similar provision is contained in H.R. 10019 by Rep. Edward Koch, N.Y.

Much remains to be learned about the drug's psychological effects, particularly with respect to the expectation and personality types of users and the total emotional mood of the environment and the persons in it. Many experienced users have had at least one "bad trip" and some cases have been reported of extremely traumatic reactions to marihuana. It may be that marihuana use can be damaging to individuals with a history of mental instability or other personality disorders. Similarly, little is known about its possible psychological effects, including psychological dependency, on adolescents who are in the process of learning to cope with the demands of adult life. And we most assuredly need to know if marihuana users have a predisposition to use harder drugs.

Despite all existing evidence to the contrary, state and federal laws alike treat marihuana as a narcotic, and penalties for its sale and use in some states are extreme. In one state, the penalty is two years to life imprisonment for a first offense of possession. In at least two others, the penalty for an adult convicted of selling marihuana to a minor is death. According to the latest available Justice Department figures, the average length of sentence imposed for violation of state laws was 47.7 months. In 1967 the federal government made 706 arrests for marihuana offenses, as compared to the State of California alone which made 37,513 arrests, 10,907 of them juveniles under eighteen.

Erroneously classifying marihuana as a narcotic, this patchwork of federal and state laws, inconsistent with each other and often unenforceable on their merits, has led to an essentially irrational situation. Respect for the law can hardly be inculcated under these circumstances. Since many of our youths believe marihuana to be relatively harmless and, yet, are faced with legal sanctions, they are led into a practice of law evasion which contributes to general disrespect for the law. Furthermore, enforcement of laws generally deemed harsh and unjust seen nonetheless to encourage police practices—e.g., raids without probable cause, entrapment—which infringe on personal liberties and safeguards. The situation is reminiscent of the problems encountered in enforcement of Prohibition during the 1920's. The present harsh penalties for possession and use of marihuana are a classic example of what legal scholars call "overcriminalization"—treating as a serious crime private personal conduct that a substantial segment of the community does not regard as a major offense; prosecutors, judges and juries tend to moderate the severity of the statutory sanctions, and the resulting hypocrisy of all concerned diminishes respect for the law.

In view of the urgency of the marihuana problem, we believe that legislative reform of the existing marihuana penalty structure should not wait several years until further research is completed.

We recommend that federal and state laws make use and incidental possession of marihuana no more than a misdemeanor until more definitive information about marihuana is at hand and the Congress and State Legislatures have had an opportunity to revise the permanent laws in light of this information. (Pending further study, we do not recommend a similar reduction in the penalty for those who traffic in marihuana for profit.)

Instead of the existing inequitable criminal penalties (including imprisonment) for mere possession and use of the drug, interim legislation might well provide only for civil penalties such as the confiscation of the drug and fines. If the interim legislation does provide for prison sentences, it should at least grant wide discretion to the trial judge to suspend sentence or release on probation.

We were heartened by the recommendation recently submitted to the Congress by

several leading officials of the Executive Branch of the government—recommendations which seek immediate change in the provisions of federal law affecting drug use. Among other things, these officials indicated that use and incidental possession of marijuana should be declared to be no more than a misdemeanor.

The above recommendations should not, of course, be taken as suggesting either that we approve the use of marijuana, or that we favor any relaxation of society's efforts to discourage the use of the clearly dangerous drugs.

Expert testimony offered to this Commission indicates that the so-called hard drugs, such as heroin, do not in themselves make users prone to commit other crimes, but that the daily use of such drugs involves exorbitant costs; hence users often undertake lives of burglary and armed robbery in order to obtain funds for the continued purchase of drugs. Further, drug importation and distribution, like certain forms of gambling, constitute part of the life-blood of organized crime—an empire of its own, ruthless, rich, pervasive, corrupting, and skillful at avoiding the reaches of the law.

We cannot usefully add to all that has been written by other Commissions, the Department of Justice, and many State authorities about the need for stopping the importation of the hard drugs, and for vigorously prosecuting the traffickers in these drugs. Nor can we add to the urgent recommendations that have been made by others to eliminate from our society the empires of organized crime.

But we do most emphatically declare that classifying marijuana users with the users of the hard drugs is scientifically wrong, a wrong recognized by the young, a wrong that makes them contemptuous of the drug laws and to some extent of all law. They wonder why the federal and State Governments do not insist upon more widespread research to establish facts and to change laws in harmony with the facts as developed.

THE RETURN OF OKINAWA TO THE JAPANESE

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the President's recent negotiations on Okinawa with Premier Sato of Japan have been hailed as an act of statesmanship resulting in a net gain for American security in the Far East. The reversion of Okinawa to the Japanese has been presented as a logical action with both tactical and strategic benefits to the United States.

While there is no doubt that there are benefits, particularly short-term benefits, to the Okinawa agreement, at the same time we must recognize that the President has taken a calculated risk. Out of a myriad of disagreeable choices, the President has opted for the course of action which will maximize the benefits. Nevertheless, we must not delude ourselves. The Okinawa agreement is based upon some shaky premises, and we must be prepared to revise our policy at the first sign of a disintegrating situation.

The first point we must remember is that the Okinawa issue in Japan is not based upon reason, or historical principles, but upon emotion and manipu-

lated propaganda. To say this is not to disparage the Japanese people; we have seen a great deal of the same kind of activity applied to other issues right here at home. It is simply part of the modern phenomenon of mass manipulation. Even though the Okinawa agreement will temporarily defuse the emotionalism, we must realize that the same techniques can generate hysteria again when the time comes, for example, to claim some of our mutual security rights under this agreement.

The second point is that we have no guarantee that the Sato government will be reelected in 1970. The American press has widely predicted that this agreement will help Sato and his colleagues to defeat the leftwing socialist and Communist parties. The agreement may do so. On the other hand, politics is an unpredictable business. We may very well find ourselves without Sato and without Okinawa, too.

Mr. President, wise voices in the press have been warning us to keep the Okinawa question open. Among them is the distinguished editorial page of the State, the morning newspaper in Columbia, S.C. The State has a fine reputation for reasoned and moderate editorials. On the Okinawa question, The State argues that reversion prompts both hope and fear. The State says:

The feeling persists that President Nixon may have undercut the United States' military posture in the Far East by agreeing to return Okinawa to Japanese sovereignty in 1972.

Although The State is pleased with the support the agreement gives to the Sato government, the editorial is worried about the possibility of growing Communist influence in Japan. The State says:

Japanese resistance to Communism is nothing like as strong or effective as that of South Korea or Nationalist China, the two real bastions of the Free World against Communist aggression in that part of the world. Japan's overwhelming concern with economic development makes her a logical and desirable target for Communist agitation, whether of the Russian or Chinese persuasion. Unless and until the Japanese develop an internal resolve and capacity to cope with Communism—militarily and ideologically—the Free World has cause of unease.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the editorial entitled "The Return of Okinawa Prompts Hope and Fear," published in The State of November 28, 1969, be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

THE RETURN OF OKINAWA PROMPTS HOPE AND FEAR

The feeling persists that President Nixon may have undercut the United States' military posture in the Far East by agreeing to return Okinawa to Japanese sovereignty in 1972, but the issue is too complex for a hasty judgment based on incomplete information.

For one thing, it is apparent that the President's action greatly strengthens the position of Prime Minister Sato within his own government and assures the United States of a friendly regime. Mr. Sato's political neck was on the block as he negotiated with President Nixon, and there are strong

indications that his government may have fallen in the absence of favorable and affirmative action leading toward the reversion of Okinawa.

For another, the U.S. agreement to return Okinawa to Japan in 1972 and to remove nuclear weapons from the island imposes a new and substantial responsibility upon the Japanese to help provide for their own defense. Ever since the end of World War II, the Japanese have prospered in peace under the protective military shield maintained by the United States.

During that period, and partly because of the absence of any appreciable allocation of national funds toward national defense, Japan has grown into the foremost industrial country of Asia and one of the three largest in the world. One ironic by-product of this rapid and remarkable growth is the fact that Japanese exports to the United States now threaten the stability of a number of American industries, notably textiles.

Another irony lies in the fact that the Japanese leftists, who long have clamored for a return of Okinawa from U.S. control, are making no such fuss over Russia's continued possession of four major islands of the Kurile chain. Russia, by the way, has steadfastly refused to even discuss the possibility of a reversion of those holdings to Japan.

What worries us is the possibility that Communist influence in Japan, already strong, will continue to grow at the expense of U.S. interests in that country and in all of Asia. Japanese resistance to Communism is nothing like as strong or effective as that of South Korea or Nationalist China, the two real bastions of the Free World against Communist aggression in that part of the world.

Japan's overweening concern with economic development makes her a logical and desirable target for Communist agitation, whether of the Russian or Chinese persuasion. Unless and until the Japanese develop an internal resolve and capacity to cope with Communism—militarily and ideologically—the Free World has cause for unease.

THINGS OF GOOD REPORT

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, as the President's first year in office nears an end, it is well to look back on his accomplishments.

And there have been many.

Columnist Roscoe Drummond takes a look at the situation in his column of November 29 in the Christian Science Monitor which I call to the attention of my colleagues, as follows:

THINGS OF GOOD REPORT

(By Roscoe Drummond)

WASHINGTON.—Let's come right out and say it: Some important things are going very well—quite a few things:

1. With great tact and boldness the United States had dissolved the festering crisis of Okinawa which was at the point of undermining our vital partnership with Japan. The agreement showed great wisdom and maturity in high places in both countries.

2. In the contest for public opinion with the extremist, get-out-now doves—in Congress and in the country—the President is continuing to win ascendant national support for his steady and staged reduction of the American role in Vietnam.

NEGOTIATING

3. The United States-Soviet nuclear arms control talks have begun. That's pretty sensational in itself. They are going forward in a good atmosphere. That's good. Both sides are negotiating quietly and seriously, seeking progress not propaganda. That's even better.

4. Moscow and Washington already have agreed on a draft treaty to ban nuclear weapons from the seabed. And the nuclear non-proliferation treaty comes nearer to reality with the United States and the Soviet Union having just signed it.

5. Vice-President Agnew is stirring a valuable self-examination on the part of the TV network news reporters and commentators. It should have a beneficial effect because the networks already do too good a job to not want to do better.

Some commentators seem to think that if anything is going right, they must find something that's going wrong to prove how "realistic" they are.

DURABLE DECISIONS

All of these five events are in the right direction and, together with the Apollo 12's round trip to the moon, they constitute the biggest package of good news in a single week in a very long time.

Let's reverse the belief that nearly everything has to go wrong. It doesn't.

The Nixon-Sato talks didn't go wrong. Rarely, if ever, has territorial status achieved in war been peacefully altered. That is what Nixon did in returning sovereignty over Okinawa to Japan and in doing so he looked beyond next year in order to enable the Japanese to maintain a free and voluntary allegiance with the United States to keep the peace in the western Pacific. Now Japan is free to choose, and only freely accepted decisions are durable. Now Japan offers to help provide mutual peace-keeping machinery and affirms it is ready "to take a leading role" in providing economic aid to "the nation-building efforts of the Asian countries."

If the Nixon-Sato negotiations had not been wisely handled, none of this would be possible. They were wisely handled.

Nixon's exposition to the nation of his plan for steady and staged withdrawal of United States combat ground troops isn't going wrong. It is going very well. It is true that some of the bitter-end Senate critics, like Fulbright, Gore, Church, McGovern, McCarthy, are planning further harassment of the President, but public opinion is continuing to isolate them. In addition to decisive majority support in House and Senate for Nixon's way of ending the war, in addition to the polls which showed overwhelming public endorsement of his Nov. 3 Vietnam speech, comes the latest Gallup survey which finds 68 percent of the American people approving his handling of the presidency with only 19 percent disapproving. This poll was taken during and after the Nov. 15 peace demonstrations and marks a 12 percentage point rise since Oct. 17.

BALANCED APPRAISAL

As to Spiro Agnew and TV news, it is true that some of the criticisms and replies simply pass each other in the headlines without touching. But Agnew has touched the networks on the quick by stirring public alertness to one-sidedness. They often provide a

very lopsided picture of America, making government look most of the time as bad as it is some of the time. What is needed is not "garlands of flowers" from the TV commentators but balanced appraisal. These TV men are very able and intelligent. They know they can do better.

I KNEW E. M. MARTIN

HON. JAMES H. (JIMMY) QUILLEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, December 3, 1969

Mr. QUILLEN. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to submit the following eloquent remarks of Lt. George W. Lee, a friend of mine and one of the South's most widely known Negro gentlemen.

As a follower of Lieutenant Lee's colorful career and being fully aware of his background as a soldier, author, lecturer, civic leader, and successful businessman, I am pleased to share his remarks with the readers of the RECORD.

Lieutenant Lee always has warm, kind words for his friends and his remarks in the eulogy of his colleague, Mr. E. M. Martin, who was vice president and secretary of the Atlanta Life Insurance Co., are no exception. As a vice president and member of the board of directors of the Atlanta Life Insurance Co., Lieutenant Lee became closely associated with Mr. Martin, both as a friend and business associate, and therefore his remarks are only proper. Lieutenant Lee's magnificent oratorical ability is most certainly exemplified in this eulogy. I submit the following remarks:

I KNEW E. M. MARTIN

(By George W. Lee)

The passing of Mr. E. M. Martin, First Vice President and Secretary of the Atlanta Life Insurance Company is more than death. It is robbery by time of its noblest aspect. "In the hour of death hope sees a star and listening love can hear the rustle of a wing." He needs no praise, but he is a study in the achievement of character. During the time God gave him to live he has been like an oak, planted by the rivers of water, unmoved by the ceremonies of human judgment. He has carried with wisdom the understanding of unspeakable divinity and built his fortunes in the hearts of men. He has extended a hand as ancient as the sun and comforted an oppressed people in a land of liberty. He organized his ideas of the life insurance business and directed them with the sagaciousness of an outstanding success. He has supplied a name to a nation of great names and has written his where few others have ever been traced. We thank the Eternal God that Mr. Martin came along at the right time to serve us and along with us the nation, at a time when black men are struggling for a kindly but vigorous way of life in which the problems of second-class citizenship might be neutralized in the brilliant sunshine of

a democratic tomorrow. He takes his special place with those illustrious few in the business of life insurance who have given an enduring example of leadership in effecting significant change in making equal opportunity available to all so that an inspiring democracy will constitute the divine fire that will illuminate our presently fearful future. I know that his wife and family are comforted in the knowledge that their loss is shared by all in the industry of life insurance and that his mourners are as thick as grief. Surely they may find consolation, not only in the assurance of faith, but also in the honored memory of his life, a life characterized by ideals which in every generation constitutes a noble legacy to us all.

History will record him as a giant in his day and generation for he had a blend of talent and personality that made him unique and distinctive in the eyes of his fellowman. He had the depth of understanding that comes only to those who have labored long and hard in the vineyards of life insurance. He had the rare ability to pinpoint the meaningful, and in effect, to separate the chaff from the wheat. Although he was plagued by a long illness that dragged on through the years he had a heart stout enough to cast off the frustration of pain and perform nobly and effectively the duties of his office. As a person he had compassion and understanding, but he could be as hard as steel towards those who had strayed from the path of rectitude. He had a deep conviction that principle was an honored objective that must never be surrendered upon the altar of opportunism.

And now he has come to the end of his journey, weary of life and the battle is won, carrying the staff and the cross of redemption. My faith mothers the belief that somewhere beyond the purple horizons the Lord will understand and say, "Well done." Well done because he lit a million lamps for the hills of loyal and sublime devotion and kept them burning with the oil of human courage. A great soul like E. M. Martin is never forgotten.

His ideals will forever echo. Echoes will build on top of echoes like winged music through eternity. His success in the choice realm of business or in the battle to rescue black people from that strangling gulf of racism, is a shining, loving symbol that only the heart of red-blooded men can understand. Patience, determination, self discipline, work, love, and faith made his life deep and strong. Through the power of his creative imagination he played a significant role in helping to lift Atlanta Life up from the runways to oblivion to one of the nation's greatest businesses.

I think I know when Mr. Martin first caught a vision and dreamed a dream. It was when he met the late A. F. Herndon and became inspired by the founder's life and work, achieved in the never-ending shadows of suffering and agony. The spiritual essence of A. F. Herndon gave Mr. Martin the bold sweeping stroke of one increasing dynamic purpose.

The lines from Hamlet are appropriate in bringing down the curtain of his life: "Now cracks a noble heart. Good night, Sweet Prince, and flights of angels sing thee to thy rest."