

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TRIBUTES TO GEN. EARL RUDDER,
LATE PRESIDENT OF TEXAS A. & M.
UNIVERSITY

HON. RALPH YARBOROUGH

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. YARBOROUGH. Mr. President, on March 23, 1970, Gen. Earl Rudder, president of Texas A. & M. University, met an untimely death at the age of 59. He was truly a public man. He was a friend of mine; we worked closely on educational and conservational matters. He devoted his talents and boundless energies to all forms of public service. Since his death, many tributes have been written about him in the newspapers of Texas.

I ask unanimous consent that the following editorials from leading newspapers be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

[From the Lubbock Avalanche-Journal,
Mar. 25, 1970]

EARL RUDDER—"ONE FINE FELLOW"

Texas has lost one of its finest citizens, in peace or war, with the death of Earl Rudder, president of Texas A&M University.

The retired major general of the Army was an authentic, down-to-earth hero of World War II. As a lieutenant colonel and commander of a special Ranger force under Gen. Omar N. Bradley, he was given one of the war's toughest assignments—scaling Normandy cliffs as Allied troops landed.

General Rudder was twice wounded, and his unit suffered 50 per cent casualties. Later, he commanded an infantry regiment which helped repulse the last major German offensive in the Battle of the Bulge. He was one of the war's most-decorated soldiers, receiving awards from three countries, including the U.S. Distinguished Service Cross.

His peacetime days, also, were full of honors, many of them associated with the educational institution he loved so well. Young Earl Rudder played football for Texas A&M and was graduated in 1932. He became a successful businessman at Brady, and served as mayor.

His reputation was such that, after the Veterans Land scandal broke in 1955, he was a logical choice of Gov. Allan Shivers to clean up the General Land Office. He got the job done, then resigned as Land Commissioner in 1957 to become vice president of A&M. He was promoted to president in 1959. Two factors principally reflect his success. Enrollment almost doubled, from 7,500 to the present 14,000. The school expanded tremendously, developing space age education and research while offering what General Rudder described as "a good environment for the great student and scholar."

He handled A&M's abolishment of compulsory reserve officer training and its break with tradition in admitting women students. Both he did superbly.

He performed outstanding service to his country after assuming command, in 1955, the 90th Infantry Division, a reserve unit. In 1963 he was named deputy commanding general for Reserve components of the Continental Army Command. His formal retirement came in 1967 as a major general. Mean-

while, he had become head of the entire A&M System, in 1965.

Earl Rudder's loss is felt all the more keenly by the university because, at 59, he normally would have had more years of productive service.

In addition to all the rest, a long-time associate in Masonic Orders puts it simply: "He was an all-around fine fellow." That he was.

[From the Houston Chronicle, Mar. 25, 1970]

JAMES EARL RUDDER

The death of Maj. Gen. James Earl Rudder at 59 ends a life that was the embodiment of the American dream. His athletic prowess, his valor in battle, his success as a rancher and businessman, public servant, civic leader and educator placed him in the mold of a Horatio Alger hero. Whatever the task or the challenge, he accepted it and did well.

When great men pass, society is the loser. So it is with Gen. Rudder. Those who knew him or his deeds mourn the loss of this man.

Gen. Rudder served as mayor of Brady from 1946 to 1953, when he was named to a two-year term on the State Board of Public Welfare. In 1955, Gov. Allan Shivers named Rudder land commissioner. He served until Feb. 1, 1958, when he resigned to become vice-president of Texas A&M University in College Station.

As a soldier, he was highly decorated during World War II. He was the recipient of the Distinguished Service Cross, the nation's second highest military award. In 1967, President Johnson presented him the Distinguished Service Medal, this nation's highest peacetime honor.

As the commander of the Provisional Ranger Force, Gen. Rudder gained lasting fame on D-Day, 1944, when he led a select force up the 100-foot cliffs at Pointe du Hoc, France. This action played a decisive part in the success of the Normandy landing. Gen. Rudder was twice wounded in bringing off the difficult mission against fantastic odds.

In December of that year, he was given command of the 28th Division's 109th Infantry Regiment, later involved in fighting during the Battle of the Bulge in Belgium.

In 1954 he was promoted to brigadier general in the Army Reserve and the next year named commander of the 90th Infantry Reserve Division. In 1957 he was made major general. In 1963 he left the 90th to become assistant deputy commanding general for mobilization of the Continental Army Command. In the summer of 1967 he retired from the Army, ending a 35-year career.

For his undergraduate gridiron feats, Sports Illustrated magazine named him to its 1956 Silver Anniversary All-American football team.

Gen. Rudder's death is a particularly severe blow to Texas A&M. Gen. Rudder was more than just the president of the Texas A&M University System. He was an Aggie himself. He graduated in 1932 with a bachelor of science degree in industrial education and a reserve commission as a second lieutenant of infantry.

Moreover, he became president of the school in July, 1959, at a time when it was at an ebb, troubled with divisiveness. He ended the factionalism, rekindled school spirit, eliminated student unrest and focused the energies of the school on the continued improvement of education. With typical mental and physical vigor, he led Texas A&M to its finest days.

His death at a relatively early age is especially sorrowful since the school's period of greatest achievement—due partly to his personal work and vision—lies ahead.

Not only Texas A&M but American colleges and universities throughout this nation need leaders and friends of the stature of Gen. Rudder. And they are rare.

[From the Battalion, Mar. 24, 1970]

EARL RUDDER, 1910-70, TEXAS A. & M.
PRESIDENT

Almost a year ago today, this university mourned the passing of a famous general and a great American, Dwight Eisenhower.

On that day, more than 3,000 members of the university community crowded into G. Rollie White Coliseum to hear a tribute to "Ike" rendered by one who had served under the general during World War II.

With a wistful eye, the man at the lectern recounted some of his personal experiences with his former commanding officer; he dwelt upon Eisenhower's lofty accomplishments; he praised the general's strong character.

And then, near the end of his eulogy, the speaker said this: "General Eisenhower exemplified what millions of Americans would like to see their sons be."

Today we mourn the death of that speaker, our university president Earl Rudder, who in his own right is indeed a famous general and a great American.

And in the days to come, we will remember and recount our own experiences with the man, we will praise his lofty accomplishments, and honor his strong character.

But of all the things we could say, perhaps we would honor him most by characterizing him as he did Eisenhower: "General Rudder exemplified what millions of Americans would like to see their sons be."

For there was much within the man that deserved imitation.

A discussion of the merits of the president would necessarily involve such adjectives as "courageous," "tenacious," "fair-minded," "joyful," and "frank."

But if one could reduce to a single word the outstanding characteristic of the man, that word would perhaps be "energy."

The same man who scaled the Normandy cliffs and straightened out the general land office, practically turned this university inside out.

In a decade he turned a segregated military college into an integrated coeducational university, meanwhile doubling both the institution's number of colleges and enrollment.

President Rudder seldom walked anywhere he didn't have to—he moved faster if he could. His days at the university would almost always stretch to 10 hours, and more often, 12 or more. He was dynamic, he took charge and stayed in charge. The pace was often hectic, but he seemed to endure it.

As the state land commissioner, he once said, "For some reason or other, all of my life I have been like I am now. I seem always to have been under stress and strain."

Accustomed to the pressure, the president seemed to simply work his problems to death.

But as is too often the case, the vigorous life is the short life.

President Rudder died before his time at 59.

It is true that the good die young, and we must all bear the loss.

[From the Dallas Morning News,
Mar. 25, 1970]

EARL RUDDER

The death of James Earl Rudder deprives this state and nation of a great patriot and unselfish public servant. Ten years ago Dawson Duncan of The News wrote of him: "Rudder has never said no, when public service called."

That call saw him lead a Ranger battalion in the 1944 Normandy invasion in one of the most courageous and costly operations of the war. Directed to send his troops up the 90-foot cliff of Pointe du Hoe, Rudder insisted on leading them instead. He was wounded twice but remained in command.

A peacetime call to service came when Gov. Allan Shivers in 1955 appointed Rudder Land Commissioner of Texas after scandal had smeared that office. Rudder's integrity and administrative talent cleaned up the mess and resulted in his appointment as vice president of Texas A&M, his alma mater, in 1958. He rose to presidency, then to head of the entire Texas A&M University System.

That system, which permeates the entire state through its extension program and other activities, gained prestige under his leadership. And when threats of student disruption came, Earl Rudder said:

"They will have a hell of a fight and this potbellied president will be in the front ranks leading it. We must meet their power with power if they threaten our society. I would use whatever force I could command to continue the educational process at A&M in an orderly fashion."

The end of the career of the man born 59 years ago in Eden, Concho County, leaves an indelible inspiration for others never to say no when duty calls, and to meet that call, as Earl Rudder did, with courage, integrity and honor.

[From the Houston Post, Mar. 25, 1970]

JAMES EARL RUDDER

The untimely death of James Earl Rudder was a great loss to the state and the nation, but most of all to the Texas A&M University System, to which he gave such dedicated and able leadership.

President Rudder was imbued with the unquenchable Aggie spirit from his youth, when he graduated from A&M in 1932. He kept the spirit throughout his life, returning in full measure the values he received as a student by his wise guidance in his years as president.

Under his leadership, A&M doubled its enrollment, from 7,000 to 14,000 students. Of even greater significance was the manner in which President Rudder led the university into new paths of research and graduate study, achieving for it a growing national reputation.

Balancing President Rudder's contributions to education, and service to his state as Commissioner of the General Land Office for three years, was his distinguished record as a soldier in World War II, and afterward. He led the famed Second Ranger Battalion, "Rudder's Rangers," up and over the cliffs at Pointe du Hoe on the D-Day invasion of Normandy. For this and other exploits, he won the Distinguished Service Cross and other medals.

Later he received the Distinguished Service Medal, the highest peacetime honor. Continuing his military interests after the war, he rose to major general in the U.S. Army Reserve.

Texas mourn with his family the death of Gen. Rudder, who reached pinnacles of achievement in both war and peace.

[From the Dallas Times Herald, Mar. 26, 1970]

JAMES EARL RUDDER

The death of James Earl Rudder, president of the Texas A&M University system, ended a distinguished career of service to the nation, the state and to the youth of Texas.

Rudder began that career as a teacher in Texas schools. He continued it with valorous service in World War II, then as Texas land commissioner and finally as vice president of A&M, president of the school and head of the entire A&M system.

Rudder, who retired as a major general, was one of the genuine heroes of World War II. One of its most decorated soldiers, he was awarded the Distinguished Service Cross, the Legion of Merit, the Silver Star, the Bronze Star with oak leaf clusters, the French Legion of Honor with croix de guerre and palm and the Belgian Order of Leopold with croix de guerre and palm.

Though his exploits in the war were many, his courage and valor as leader of the famed Ranger battalion which scaled the cliffs at Pointe du Hoe during the D-Day invasion is most often recalled. Rudder was wounded twice during that engagement.

Returning to civilian life after the war, Rudder achieved an equally notable record of service to the state and, particularly, to education.

Gen. Rudder's death deprives Texas of one of its most valuable human assets. We join his many friends, colleagues and family in sorrow at this passing.

[From the Waco News-Tribune, Mar. 27, 1970]

GALLANT LEADER LEFT HIS IMPRINT LARGE ON TEXAS

It is difficult to sort out the highlights of Earl Rudder's life. There were so many of them. And all of them show Earl Rudder serving his fellow-citizens through the unstinting use of his great capacities.

When he led his Rangers up an impossible cliff to begin the liberation of Europe from Nazi bestiality . . . when he took over the General Land Office of Texas to restore integrity and order . . . when he accepted the presidency of strife-torn, disorganized Texas A. and M. College, he never looked back, he never stopped moving forward and he instilled courageous faith in those around him.

Lest a stranger gain the impression that Earl Rudder's leadership was exhibitionist, it should be said that he accomplished spectacular results unostentatiously. He put the spotlight on those around him, never on himself. He loved his fellow-Rangers and the youngsters at Texas A. and M. with a fatherly devotion that bound them to the causes he served: the causes of freedom, of truth, of learning, of discipline, of self-respect and of religious faith.

In his earlier triumphs and satisfactions, Earl Rudder left unforgettable marks but his crowning accomplishment undoubtedly is the manner in which he transformed Texas Agricultural and Mechanical College from a rural-oriented "cow college" to a national focus of major progress in the fields of nuclear science, space science, oceanography, life sciences, engineering and business excellence. If he had never done anything else in his 59 years, Earl Rudder earned a top position in any Texas Hall of Fame for his achievements as president of what is now Texas A. and M. University.

One of those achievements has particular value to Waco as well as permanent worth to the whole state: at the request of Gov. John Connally, President Rudder took charge of the creation of the state's first technical-vocational institute, starting with the first campus here at the James Connally Air Force Base. Rudder was an Aggie classmate of the late Col. James Connally, a fact that added significantly to his zeal in launching Connally Tech as a branch of A. and M. He also assisted in the separation of the technical institute system to independent status with four campuses today. All through the process involving the occupational training centers, Earl Rudder repeatedly voiced his firm belief in the bright future of Waco and Central Texas and acted accordingly. His impact on our progress has been decisive, a fact that becomes more apparent with every month that goes by.

Earl Rudder played the game of life to win—honorably, enthusiastically, unselfishly

and with a perceptive vision that focused his efforts on the main goals. He was a broad-gauged human being whose name will be honored so long as his ideals continue to be cherished in this land he loved so well.

RESOURCE CONSERVATION AND PUBLIC LAND USE POLICY

HON. DON H. CLAUSEN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. DON H. CLAUSEN. Mr. Speaker, on May 12, I was privileged to attend a luncheon with a number of my constituents given by the National Forest Products Association during the group's annual meeting.

The principal speaker at the luncheon was our friend and respected colleague, the Honorable WAYNE ASPINALL of Colorado.

Inasmuch as other Members of the Congress were unable to attend, I am taking this means of bringing the content of the speech to the attention of my colleagues.

I particularly want to emphasize the fact that the chairman's comments were, in my judgment, very timely, due to the fact that the report of the Public Land Law Review Commission will be presented to the Congress in the very near future. As chairman of the Commission, the remarks of the gentleman from Colorado have added significance.

I would also like to relate to my colleagues how well the speech was received. As a matter of fact, Mr. ASPINALL received a long and well deserved standing ovation following his speech.

Therefore, I am including the text of the speech in the RECORD at this point, and I urge my colleagues to heed the message that was conveyed by the gentleman from Colorado. Once again, he has made an outstanding contribution to the field of resource conservation.

The message follows:

REMARKS OF HON. WAYNE N. ASPINALL, CHAIRMAN, PUBLIC LAND LAW REVIEW COMMISSION, BEFORE THE NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS ASSOCIATION, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 12, 1970

It was with a great deal of satisfaction that I received and accepted the invitation to address you today. Much of this satisfaction came from the fact that your Association thereby demonstrated an understanding of my position last March on the resolution that would have brought before the House of Representatives for consideration the proposed National Forest Conservation and Management Act.

Some of the news media said that "the industry especially attacks" my action in suggesting that consideration of this legislation be postponed until the report of the Public Land Law Review Commission could be considered after it is submitted not later than June 30, 1970. I did not say then, nor do I say now that there is no need for legislation to assure better utilization and improved harvesting from the national forests. As a matter of fact, I know that we need some measures that will produce a greater yield of merchantable timber.

One of the requirements of the Act establishing the public Land Law Review Commis-

sion is that we compile data in order to understand the various demands on the public lands which now exist and which are likely to exist within the foreseeable future. Accordingly, one of the first manuscripts completed, as part of the research program conducted by or under the supervision of the staff, contained national projections of probable consumption to the year 2000 of all commodities producible on the public lands. Those projections did not attempt to relate requirements to the supply capability of the public lands. These projections were kept in mind by us as we proceeded with our work. In the meantime, other data were developed and other sources consulted by the staff.

The study program examination of individual commodities considered the supply picture for each and, at each step of the way, we asked for and received comments from members of our Advisory Council and Governors' Representatives. Then last fall, a manuscript was prepared for the purpose of tying the future requirements to the likely future output from public lands.

This background is furnished so that you can see the detail with which the Public Land Law Review Commission approached the problem. From our own work, we know, therefore, as stated by our contractor, that "if projected timber requirements in 1980 and 2000 are to be met, greater increased yields will be required from Federal lands." So, while it is comforting to know that the administration came to the same conclusion, we did not have to wait for the Second Annual Report on National Housing Goals, transmitted to the Congress by the President April 1, to understand this basic fact.

Our big task in the Commission was the question of how to accomplish these greater yields and at the same time discharge our responsibility to consider all other uses or possible uses of the public lands, while at least maintaining, if not enhancing, the quality of the environment.

In the last analysis, the Commission came up with conclusions and recommendations of uses and means to accomplish these multiple objectives. Two weeks ago this Thursday, our report was turned over to the Government Printing Office in order to assure that copies will be available for you and others interested at the same time it is presented to the President, the President of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Your officers knew when they invited me to speak that the Commission's work would have been finished by today and that I would not be able to tell you the results or the recommendations. They understood this and said you would understand that, aside from anything else, it would be discourteous to the President and the Congress to reveal the recommendations before we present them. In the time allotted to me, I shall, accordingly, discuss matters of interest to you without getting into our recommendations.

As the principal sponsor of the bill that led to the establishment of the Public Land Law Review Commission, I can tell you that it was not intended that the Commission would seek the dissolution of the National Forest System. By the same token, the law does charge us with the responsibility of examining all laws, policies, practices, and procedures in the light of an overriding congressional policy that the public lands of the United States shall be retained and managed or disposed of, all in a manner to assure maximum benefit for the general public. We, therefore, could not and did not assume that any one class of lands or another was exempt from this examination.

For every use, for every commodity, we asked the question whether the public good would best be served by retaining the lands in Federal ownership or disposing of them into non-Federal ownership. And within each class of lands, we had to think of and consider the different uses that could be made

of those lands. Parenthetically, it is well to keep in mind that the Commission always dealt in broad policy, trying to examine the various interrelationships among uses that exist in practice. This was in contrast to the fact that the studies undertaken by or under the supervision of the staff were, of necessity, concerned with individual or specific segments of public land policy. Accordingly, the study of Public Land Timber Policy dealt only with the use of timber as a commodity, while other studies, such as outdoor recreation, dealt with the use of forest lands for recreation purposes.

It was not, therefore, just a question of whether forest lands should be retained or disposed of, but it became a question of whether forest lands or, for that matter other lands, that were chiefly valuable for one purpose or another—timber production, watershed management, outdoor recreation, and so forth—could best serve the maximum benefit for the general public in either Federal or non-Federal ownership.

Constantly, we were faced with the competing needs, the competing uses for the same lands. While the needs of the American people have grown, with a companion growth in demand for the use of the public lands, the public land base itself has remained relatively stable.

In the absence of statutory guidelines to govern public lands generally, there has in recent years been little disposition. Likewise, in the absence of statutory guidelines to resolve differences between conflicting uses, there has been an understandable tendency on the part of the administrators to set aside rather than provide for consumptive use. Once the land or its resources are disposed of, they cannot be recaptured for Federal ownership except at tremendous cost. I think that any one of you sitting here today, charged with the same responsibility that Federal administrators have been charged with in the past, with no clear direction from the policymaking arm of Government—the Congress—would have reacted in much the same way.

The next main problem or policy consideration to be given attention by the Commission concerned management of those lands that are retained in Federal ownership. The subject is much too broad to talk about in all of its aspects. Let us, therefore, consider only those matters that pertain to the management of timber lands, and by timber lands, I mean those forest lands that are chiefly valuable for the production of commercial timber. Such lands, be they private, state, or Federal, are suitable for many forms of recreation, but their most important use is for timber production.

In the course of the Commission's work, we examined many different approaches to the management of such Federal public timber lands. We considered, based on projections that were made for us, the type of wood products that would be needed in the future. Another question presented for our consideration was the extent to which particular attention be given to the harvesting of old growth timber.

Other management practices which we had to consider—and which you must consider—included such matters as construction of access roads, the extent to which the Federal Government should act the same or differently than a private owner of commercial timber lands, the timing and frequency of timber sale offerings, the methods of determining the price of timber sold from public lands, and, among other things, whether we should continue, or possibly even expand, the restriction on the export of logs produced from timber harvested on Federal public lands.

All of this is called to your attention to point up the comprehensive nature of the review that we made. It also demonstrates that we had in mind the various factors that

must be taken into consideration before the allowable cut is ascertained by the management agencies. You are assured that every member of the Commission understood fully the importance of the determination of the annual allowable cut as established by the public land managing agencies, and particularly the Forest Service which is, of course, the manager of the greatest amount of Federal public timber land.

Many of these factors have been of great significance in my own Congressional District in Colorado. I, therefore, came to the Commission's consideration of these matters with a personal perspective in addition to the material we received from our contractor and from public witnesses.

On this latter point, I am sure it comes as no surprise to you that your industry did not always speak with one voice. There were several people among our advisers, that is, the Advisory Council and Governors' Representatives, who spoke for segments of the forest products industry. But, it was Bernard Orell who was the acknowledged spokesman for the industry generally and we know the difficult task he had in attempting to develop recommendations that would meet with approval from the various segments of the industry.

All of us, including your industry representatives, were from the beginning of the Commission's work concerned with enhancing, or at least maintaining, the quality of the environment. We continued to pay attention to this as we proceeded with our review and have given it attention in the recommendations contained in our report. A problem faced by all of us is that we do not lose perspective merely because, suddenly, protection of the environment has become a popular cause.

There are things that you as an industry, just like many another industry, should have done many years ago. There are other things that you could have done. But all of these would have cost money, and the big question was, and still is: Are the American people ready and willing to pay for protection of the environment? There is no doubt that years ago the primary emphasis was on developing and producing the materials with which to expand our Nation and its economy.

Many people tell me today that the public is ready to pay the price of a quality environment. Although a bit skeptical, I believe that, to some extent, this is true. My opinion is that we must still maintain a balance so that we do not establish impossible requirements which would, in the long run, have the effect of making operations uneconomical and thereby deny a product to the people.

I have attempted today to outline some of the policy considerations that the Public Land Law Review Commission has faced during its tenure. But, as I said earlier, the report, which represents a consensus, has gone to press and the next step will be its submission to the President and the Congress. After that, you ask, where do we go from here?

Because of the diversity of subject matter and the detail with which we have faced squarely the problems facing the United States in the use of the public lands, we do not expect unanimity of all interested people and groups on all 137 of the Commission's major recommendations and its many subsidiary recommendations. We do, however, hope that there will be understanding and that this understanding will recognize that the Commission's report and recommendations deal with a single unified subject matter that has been broken up only for convenience into a number of interrelated items.

We think it will take time for that understanding to come about. We feel that it will take at least a few months after the report is submitted in June for you and other user

groups to see how the pattern of recommendations fits together. We ask you not to look alone at those recommendations that appear in a chapter that happens to have the title of Timber Resources, but to first look at the recommendations that apply across the board as underlying principles, and then to the recommendations that apply to fish and wildlife, water resources, outdoor recreation, and all the others.

We cannot urge you too strongly to view the report and our recommendations as a unified whole—as one unit. Naturally we recognize your desire to focus on those parts that deal directly with timber. But remember we will be urging others to take the overall look too, and you will need their support—just as they will need yours—to have legislation enacted implementing the Commission's recommendations.

The word of caution here is that you not rush blindly forward asking your friends in Congress to sponsor legislation based on our report—regardless of whether we have recommended what you would like to have enacted—until you have given competing interests an opportunity to weigh the report as a whole. Unless exceptional circumstances dictate otherwise, it seems to us that orderliness indicates a logical program: I suggest that between the end of June and the start of the 92nd Congress in January you study and discuss the entire report; advise your friends and your competitors of what you like and what you do not like. Then, at the start of the new Congress, let us be prepared to start the legislative process.

If you, and others interested, pursue this course of action I think we will be well on the road to a constructive revision of the public land laws.

STUDENTS PRESENT PETITION ON PASSAGE OF H.R. 4249

HON. WILLIAM D. HATHAWAY

OF MAINE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. HATHAWAY. Mr. Speaker, last Friday I addressed a group of college students on the Bates College campus in Lewiston, Maine. The topic of my speech was recent developments in Southeast Asia. Upon leaving I was presented with a petition signed by 478 students attending college in Maine with hometowns in Maine and several other northeastern States.

The petition shows that Cambodia is not the only thing on the minds of our young people today.

I include this petition in the RECORD:

Whereas, American men are subject to the Selective Service System draft lottery beginning at the age of 18, and

Whereas, American men may risk their lives serving in the armed forces of the United States beginning at the age of 17, and

Whereas, many American men and women pay taxes to Federal, state, and local governments by the time they reach the age of 18, and

Whereas, it is absolutely essential that American youth be permitted to play a constructive part in the democratic process,

We, the undersigned, urgently request that you do everything in your power to ensure the immediate passage of H.R. 4249, leaving the provision intact that would lower the minimum voting age to 18.

MARTHA PETERSON,
RITA O'DONNELL,
CHARLOTTE HOWE,
MARYANN DE SOMMA,
CHRIS DOYLE.

CONTINUING INFLAMMATORY REMARKS OF CHICAGO CONSPIRACY SEVEN WHILE ON APPEAL BOND AFTER FELONY CONVICTION

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, since the convictions early this year of five of the Chicago seven for traveling interstate to incite riots, the American people have witnessed a continuing barrage of their incendiary language. Following the trial, Dellinger, Davis, Hayden, Hoffman, and Rubin embarked on an ambitious program to win a multitude of college students to believe in their distorted concepts. These men cannot be faulted for languor. They have been assiduously traveling from campus to campus to address pliable young minds which are eager to observe the spectacle of these now-prominent figures. Press dispatches for the last several months have provided us with a steady diet of their exhortations, both open and veiled, to violence.

These men who stand convicted are engaging in the same and often more aggravated activity than the charges on which they have already been tried and convicted. During the last several days I have detailed for my colleagues some of the grossly inflammatory language uttered by Dellinger and company. Taken together, their conduct would impel a reasonable man to ask why we must be so permissive. Surely we have not yet adopted a national philosophy of self-destruction. And surely we are not yet prepared to stand by idly while the legal process is mocked and made to look ridiculous. On May 5, 1970, I urged the Attorney General to consider the conduct of the Chicago seven in the light of the conditions of their bond with a view to revocation.

On February 28, 1970, the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Seventh Circuit ordered that the Chicago seven be admitted to bail during the pendency of appeals of their convictions. The Government argued that bail should be denied, and the district court ordered that they should be denied bail.

The order of the court of appeals pointed out that the Bail Reform Act, 18 United States Code section 3148 requires courts to admit to bail those persons convicted of known capital offenses pending appeal unless they "pose a danger to any other person or to the community." The order states:

As to the five appellants convicted of violating the Federal Anti-Riot Act, 18 U.S.C. § 2101, the Government has failed to show that said appellants are dangerous within the meaning of the Bail Reform Act.

And further:

I am not naive enough to underestimate the trouble-making propensities of the defendants. But, with the Department of Justice alert to the dangers, the worst they can accomplish in the short time it will take to end the litigation is preferable to the possibility of national embarrassment from a celebrated case.

The appellate court concluded that none of the conditions in the act which might require detention of appellants during pendency of the appeals appear to exist.

It would seem that the conduct of Dellinger, Davis, Hayden, Hoffman, and Rubin since they were admitted to bail evidences a factual situation which was not anticipated. It seems clear that their repetitious appearances at rallies and demonstrations, many of which have evolved into violent disorders, do pose a danger to other persons and to the community. Their troublemaking propensities need not now be estimated, but can be judged with hindsight. And with all due respect for the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals, it does not appear that the litigation will be concluded in the short time originally anticipated. I again urge the Attorney General consider a re-presentation of the appellants entitlement to bail pending conclusion of their appeals.

During the gathering in Washington, D.C. this last weekend, Dellinger urged our Nation's youth to launch boycotts, strikes, and to otherwise disrupt the machinery of Government until that machinery can no longer function. Dellinger told a large audience:

We're tired of fun and games and side-show running around in the streets. We didn't come here for speeches. Now is the time for action.

I want to report that the order of the Seventh Circuit Court of Appeals stipulated that:

Each appellant "shall notify the United States Marshal for the Northern District of Illinois of his destination and each change thereof when traveling beyond the jurisdiction of the State of his residence. . . .

It was further stated by the court:

It should be a sufficient guide to appellants while at large on bail, to keep in mind that if it becomes necessary, this order may be modified by imposing further conditions authorized by 18 U.S.C. § 3146(a) or bail may be revoked.

The court in its wisdom left itself the option of reconsidering the appellant's right to bail. Again I urge the Attorney General to make a thorough analysis of the matter of appellant's post-trial conduct, including the requirement of reporting their travel itineraries.

F-111 CALLED MOST EFFECTIVE COMBAT AIRCRAFT IN ARSENAL

HON. JIM WRIGHT

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, an ever-growing number of aerospace experts are coming to recognize the true merits of the Air Force's much maligned F-111 fighter-bomber.

Latest evidence of this trend is a penetrating article written by Marvin Miles, respected aviation and space reporter for the Los Angeles Times.

Mr. Miles "sets the record straight" on the F-111, recognizing the difficulties this advanced aircraft has encountered but keeping them in perspective. He points

out that despite all the vilification that has been heaped on the airplane, it nevertheless is "the most advanced and most effective combat aircraft in America's air arsenal."

In order that my colleagues may share this well-balanced assessment of the F-111, I include in the RECORD the Marvin Miles article as published in the Fort Worth Star-Telegram, May 10, 1970:

F111 HELD MOST ADVANCED—LA TIMES "SETS RECORD STRAIGHT" ON GD CRAFT

(By Marvin Miles)

Born in a storm of political struggle and developed in a fishbowl, F111 aircraft for years have been fashionable targets for criticism, a handy podium for scorn.

True, these aircraft—fighter-bombers and interim strategic bombers—are grounded for the most exhaustive safety tests ever ordered. But they will start returning to the air next month, the most advanced combat planes ever developed by this nation.

They don't deserve the vilification heaped upon them.

Take the interim bomber version, the FB111. Its role is to fill in for the aging B52 fleet in the latter years of the decade before the new B1 strategic bomber becomes operational.

It is conceded that the tiring B52 will not be able to cope with the advanced defenses of the late 1970s and that the FB111 will be the only aircraft in that era that can penetrate to primary targets.

Yet instead of the 263 FB111s estimated necessary to prevent a bomber gap and provide assured destruction of Russian targets, only 76 have been ordered and could represent the only immediately effective U.S. counterforce if our missiles should be thwarted.

The brawling history of the F111 is well-known, reaching back to 1962 when Robert S. McNamara, then secretary of defense, tangled with Congress over his award of a production contract to General Dynamics over the Boeing Co.

Known originally as the TFX, for Tactical Fighter Experimental, the unique design was conceived on the McNamara theory of commonality, wherein the same basic airplane would serve both Air Force and Navy and would have many common parts and systems.

The Senate permanent subcommittee on investigations, headed by Sen. John L. McClellan, D-Ark., waded into the McNamara decision and set the continuing high fashion for kicking the F111.

The airplane went into production—a modest 576 ships are funded today compared with approximately 1,700 envisioned originally—but then the swing-wing sophisticate ran into a series of upsets.

Its weight went up and the Navy used this as an escape chute to abandon its plans to use the plane. This after the assembly of seven Navy models by Grumman Aircraft.

Costs soared from a 1964 estimate of \$4 million per plane to \$8.7 million in January.

Three aircraft were lost in Southeast Asia in 1968 during a premature battle test of eight planes, but none was downed by enemy action.

Adding to its woes, the F111 showed deficiencies in some eight performance areas and 18 more crashes occurred.

Then there was the 1968 finding in a ground fatigue test of a weakness in the F111's box-like steel cross-structure to which the wing roots are attached—a flaw that did not affect immediate performance, but could reduce the lifetime of the plane.

Assuredly, the airplane has had its problems but there's always the other side of the coin. Its consideration in this case is called "setting the record straight" and this is how it goes:

The F111 remains the most advanced and most effective combat aircraft in America's air arsenal, a plane that would without a doubt be fighting tomorrow—problems notwithstanding—if World War III should break out.

It represents major technical advances as both a fighter-bomber and interim strategic bomber that outpoint all other aircraft in this class to marked degree.

Furthermore, the technology developed in the bomber version will be carried into the new B1 bomber of the 1980s, the swing-wing penetrator for which the Air Force will let a crucial development contract within about 10 days either to North American Rockwell here, General Dynamics, Fort Worth, or the Boeing Co.

Conventionally aerospace firms in planning their bids for plane contracts consider the potential performance of the plane they have designed, based on expected engine power, anticipated systems capability, weight limitations, and so forth.

Then, after a contract is awarded, it is traditional for the military service and the company involved to negotiate specific requirements that are somewhat relaxed from the original proposal on the basis of a wealth of details now introduced into consideration.

In the case of the F111 no such relief was forthcoming, because of the sensitive situation created by the political fight, and the company was held rigidly to the highest performance standards.

The cost of the airplane climbed from \$4 million to \$8.7 million per unit largely as the consequence of a reduced purchase—from the anticipated 1,700 planes to the current 516 total, all fighter-bombers except the 76 interim strategic bombers.

Costs were shoved upward also by economic spirals and calls for modifications and changes into seven different models of the swinging bird rather than just the two—Air Force and Navy—sought originally.

With the modifications and the unknowns encountered in developing the advanced plane, the weight of the F111 went from 69,000 pounds to 82,000 pounds. Nor were several other peak target values achieved.

With added weight the takeoff distance increased from 2,780 feet to 3,500, while the landing distance nudged up only slightly from 2,250 to 2,320 feet.

Ferry range dropped from the desired 4,180 nautical miles to 3,300, the combat ceiling came down from 62,300 feet to 58,000 and the maximum speed at altitude dipped slightly from mach 2.5 to mach 2.35 or approximately 1,550 m.p.h.

Acceleration also was down, at last with the initial engines, which require four minutes to pick up from 600 m.p.h. to 1,450 m.p.h. instead of 1.45 minutes. More powerful engines will go into the newer ships.

Dash radius, too, came down to 55 per cent of the desired value at 35 miles. This is the distance at which the F111 can fly at treetop level and supersonic speed (mach 1.2 or 900 m.p.h. plus) in final penetration to a target after having flown many hundreds of miles to begin its attack run.

But it must be remembered that no new and advanced combat plane delivers all the performance sought initially. Critics also should keep in mind that F111 types are not fighters in the sense of swirling dogfights and do not require extremes in climb or acceleration, for instance.

The fighter-bomber versions are designed for interdiction, to prevent an enemy from delivering resources for battlefield operations, and for strikes at enemy air fields to help assure air superiority through ground kills.

The FB111 mission is deep penetration of heavily defended enemy areas for nuclear strikes at strategic targets.

The great advantage of both types over other aircraft is the combination of their range, their bomb load and their ability to fly

automatically at treetop level with terrain-following radar to streak under enemy warning nets at night and in all weather conditions, navigate precisely and strike with devastating accuracy.

Four F111s in an all-weather force, it is estimated, can deliver a bomb load equivalent to that carried by 12 conventional fighter-bombers (operating only in visual conditions) and strike autonomously at one-sixth the cost annually without an extensive array of support aircraft.

Finally, in the field of safety, it should be pointed out that the F111 has had in 52,300 flight hours less than half the accidents (18 not counting those lost in Southeast Asia) averaged by other tactical fighters in the Century series (F100 through F106 and F4) in their first 60,000 hours.

And this despite the aircraft's short takeoff and landing capability from "austere," or unimproved, fields.

The fatigue weakness found in the wing carry-through box in 1968 was eliminated and the structure successfully tested to the equivalent of 40 years of operations, or four aircraft lifetimes.

Each F111 produced to date, together with those a certain distance back on the assembly line, will be put through the most torturous ground test program ever devised for an operational aircraft. As each airplane is checked out, it will be approved for operations up to 80 per cent maximum flight stress, a job that should be completed in December.

But additional air testing will be required in 1971 to determine exact aerodynamic load distributions on the plane under all conditions before the F111 is finally cleared for all-out operations, maximum performance.

By then there should be no doubt in anyone's mind that the swinging bird is exactly what its pilots have called it:

"One hell of an airplane!"

LEGISLATION TO AID U.S. MINK RANCHERS

HON. ODIN LANGEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. LANGEN. Mr. Speaker, 3 years ago I introduced legislation to put some semblance of order in the Federal treatment of U.S. mink ranchers. I warned at that time that a continuation of the policy of free and unlimited imports of mink skins would lead to a further deterioration of the American mink industry. The warning went unheeded and hundreds more of our ranchers have had to cash in their chips at a time when their contributions to our smaller communities are badly needed. That is why I am again introducing a bill to amend the tariff schedules of the United States with respect to the rate of duty on whole skins of mink. This bill would not only benefit our own mink ranchers, but foreign producers would benefit as well from stable prices and markets.

This history of the American mink rancher is a commendable one. Our ranchers have assessed their own sales receipts for well over 25 years to the extent of many millions of dollars for market development. The result was the building of a worldwide demand for mink. Our ranchers became responsible, taxpaying members of their communities, contributing much on the lo-

cal, State, and national levels. But this is a story very familiar to American agriculture. American farmers have, time and again, created their own markets, only to see their efforts usurped by foreign suppliers who then got on the bandwagon at the expense of our farmers.

The mink ranching problem really came to the forefront in 1959 when the U.S. Tariff Commission decided, unwise-ly, that duty-free and unlimited foreign imports of mink skins were not injuring the American ranchers. This policy has prevailed from that time forward and the results are alarming at the very least. With assurances that there would be no restrictions on our imports, foreign producers went into high gear, producing cheap and inferior pelts that flooded our markets.

Imports rose from 2.8 million skins in 1960 to 4.1 million in 1961. That was a percentage increase of almost 31 percent. In 1961, the American rancher, unable to generate new consumer demand for such unprecedented supplies, began tightening his belt from a price break of more than 23 percent. From that point onward domestic producers fell out of competition at the rate of several hundred each year. The situation hit another crisis point in 1966 when imports of undressed minkskins reached a peak of 5.7 million pelts. And following the disastrous 1967 pelting season, 1,000 domestic ranchers dropped out of business.

Up until 1967 there had been a continuous increase in imports. The domestic market was able to absorb these large numbers of mink pelts because of demand created by the fantastically successful advertising campaign conducted and paid for by U.S. mink ranchers. In this campaign they appealed directly to the consumer and developed a lucrative market for furrier's garments made from American raised mink sold by U.S. fur auctions.

During most of the sixties the opinion that mink was the ultimate fur along with the great affluence of the American public made it possible to absorb increasing quantities of mink at profitable levels and the image of mink remained relatively untarnished.

But in 1966 and 1967, the inevitable happened, imports captured 54 percent of the U.S. market. Even the tremendous image and desirability that had been so carefully and expensively nurtured by the American ranchers could not withstand the terrible weight of 11 million pelts imported in 2 years, especially since millions of these pelts were of low grade quality.

The result of all this has been the reduction in number of domestic mink ranchers from 7,200 in 1962 to 2,400 in 1969, with the number now estimated to be less than 2,000. The overall comparison of figures between 1959 and 1969 shows that imports have increased by about 22 percent, prices have fallen about 24 percent, ranchers have lost 11 more percentage points in a market which they originated and built, and well over 50 percent of the domestic producers have been annihilated.

Pelt prices have now reached disaster levels. After suffering the price break due to the flood of imports in 1967 the

market is now further depressed by slowing business, restricted credit, and a major decline in the stock market.

It should be noted that our domestic producers are not the only ones to feel the effects of falling prices. Some foreign producers have also become disturbed over declining prices for their mink pelts. Both American and foreign ranchers would benefit from realistic controls of imports. The market would stabilize, and the increasing annual U.S. consumption of mink, shared by both, would provide an orderly expansion. But under the present, uncontrolled conditions, everyone loses, including the U.S. Government through the balance-of-payments deficit.

Under the bill I am introducing today, the imports of minkskins in future years would be limited to the average number of skins imported over the past 5 years, and would be further limited to 30 percent of the domestic consumption for any particular year. These skins would be duty free, but any quantities that exceeded those limits would be subject to a 50-percent ad valorem tax.

This bill not only enables foreign suppliers to participate in the existing U.S. market at a fair level, but would assure foreign producers to share in any expansion of the U.S. market at approximately a 30- to 70-percent ratio. That market would surely be expanded once that the foreign encroachment has been arrested. American marketing associations would then be in a strong position to go back to surviving ranchers to raise the funds necessary to rebuild the market and to stimulate exports.

Otherwise, in the not too distant future, cheap foreign mink imports will surely bring about the total eclipse of mink as a prestige fur, and thus also, eclipse the entire fur industry both at home and abroad.

I ask early consideration of this bill, so badly needed by our mink ranchers who are literally with their backs to the wall. We must maintain these people who are paying taxes, supporting local schools and merchants, and contributing substantially to the economic well-being of our Nation, States, and local communities.

A bankrupt rancher can pay no taxes, can support no payroll, can provide no market for other farmers who provide feed, or merchants who supply equipment. A bankrupt rancher leaves no incentive for his children to remain on the farm or in the community; provides no jobs for others. This Nation simply cannot stand any further deterioration of the countryside.

HELPING PEOPLE HELP THEMSELVES

HON. BILL ALEXANDER

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, during a recent trip back to the First Congressional District of Arkansas, I had the opportunity to study one of our Federal programs in action and, I must say,

I was most impressed. The program to which I refer is the expanded food and nutrition program.

This program, which is being operated by the Agricultural Extension Service, has now been expanded into 28 counties in Arkansas, including eight in the First Congressional District. During the short time that the program has been in operation, it has already shown dramatic results.

The expanded food and nutrition program is being operated conscientiously and efficiently and, consequently, is receiving excellent responses. During a briefing in West Memphis—Crittenden County—I was told that the eating habits of persons being helped by the program have changed dramatically through the help of nutrition aides. I also had the opportunity to visit with the 17 nutrition aides in Crittenden County and heard excited and proud reports of progress being made through their efforts.

For example, a group of people being helped by the nutrition aides were asked at the beginning to recall their diets for the previous day. Of these people, 54 percent said they had had no milk the previous day and 20 percent said they had not eaten any fruits and vegetables. Six months later, only 28 percent said they had not had any milk the previous day and only 9 percent reported they had not eaten fruits or vegetables the previous day.

There is a problem of hunger in this country, Mr. Speaker, but I contend that the larger problem is one of malnutrition. The answer to this problem is education, the systematic teaching of proper dietary principles to large numbers of citizens in this country. This excellent program is making a good beginning in this regard, and it should receive our continued support and encouragement.

The entire theme of this program is summed up in the slogan that was before the group during the briefing I received. It said:

Give a man a fish and you feed him for a day, teach him to fish and you feed him for a lifetime.

This is a case in which a program has the proper direction, has the dedicated enthusiasm of the persons who are operating it on the local level, and has received the gratitude of thousands of persons who have seen their diets improved during the past several months.

PRESIDENT'S LIBERAL OPPONENTS AND MEDIA "BAMBOOZLED" THE COUNTRY

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while, amid the anti-Nixon, anti-Republican clamorings of a vast majority of the press, a refreshing voice is heard which presents the other side of a story that has been neatly packaged and presented to the American people

in a biased, one-sided fashion as "the truth."

Such is the case with a recent editorial from the Indianapolis Star entitled "Who Split the Country?" Using the example of the Supreme Court nominations of Judges Carswell and Haynsworth, this editorial points out how President Nixon's liberal opponents not only demonstrated blatant regional discrimination, but then turned the situation around to blame the President and, with the help of the media, "bamboozled" the country.

So that all my colleagues may have the opportunity of hearing an unusual voice of clarity, I insert this editorial in the RECORD at this point:

WHO SPLIT THE COUNTRY?

A slick trick perfected by liberals is to pin any transgression they are nailed with on the one who nailed them.

Out of the resulting confusion they seldom fail to emerge unscathed while the one who fingered them turns out to be the culprit.

A perfect illustration of this time-tested tactic was a recent cartoon by Herblock, a liberal political caricaturist, which appeared on the Star's opposite-editorial page. Herblock pictured an ax inscribed "Administration Efforts To Divide Americans," hewing the nation along a line roughly corresponding with the Mason-Dixon Line. The caption read, "We're Thinking of Renaming It the Mason-Nixon Line."

Now what were the actual events leading up to this distortion of the facts in which artist Herblock was merely repeating in pictorial form what had already been spouted again and again?

First, President Nixon proposed Judge Clement F. Haynsworth Jr. for the Supreme Court, but the liberal-dominated Senate rejected him, declaring his judicial rulings anti-labor, anti-civil rights and influenced in some cases by conflict of interest. The judge's record did not sustain these charges but his confirmation was denied just the same.

The President's next choice, Judge G. Harrold Carswell, likewise met rejection on grounds that years earlier he had uttered anti-civil rights remarks, subsequently retracted, and that he was a mediocre jurist. The mediocrity of his judicial standing was maintained on the score that some of his decisions had been overturned by the Supreme Court—a court swayed by a liberal majority of judicial nonentities appointed in most cases because they were outspoken liberals.

Both Haynsworth and Carswell are strict Constitutional constructionists—one of President Nixon's requirements. Both are Southerners.

The day after Judge Carswell's rejection, President Nixon commented, "With yesterday's action, the Senate has said that no Southern Federal appellate judge who believes in a strict interpretation of the Constitution can be elevated to the Supreme Court."

He added, "I understand the bitter feelings of millions of Americans who live in the South about the act of regional discrimination that took place in the Senate yesterday."

Then the liberals rose in righteous indignation. Of course they hadn't engaged in regional discrimination. What next? Of course they hadn't split off the South as an inferior region. What blasphemy!

But they had. It was history and they couldn't duck it.

What to do? Discrimination! Oh, horrors! Not that!

Then came the wise strategist. "Relax, gentlemen. The technique is well established. We simply pin the whole thing on Nixon." And so they did.

And pretty soon there was confusion. Who split the country? Did President Nixon do that? Well, he talked about discrimination, didn't he? And, after all, he hasn't picked another Southerner. Guess that must mean something.

Who split the country? Let's not be bamboozled by liberal trickery. The liberals split the country. That's who.

DEDICATION OF SCHOOL FOR HANDICAPPED IN CANTON, MASS.

HON. JAMES A. BURKE

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. BURKE of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, may I take this opportunity to bring to the attention of the Members of the U.S. House of Representatives the news about the dedication of a \$2.2 million high school for the physically handicapped children that was dedicated in Canton, Mass., yesterday afternoon. I am very proud of the accomplishments of the Massachusetts Hospital School in the town of Canton. The great work of Dr. Margaret Brayton for whom the school has been named is most impressive. I take leave to include a news item appearing in today's Boston Herald Traveler covering the ceremony:

DEDICATION IN CANTON: SCHOOL FOR HANDICAPPED

The \$2.2 million high school designed to meet the needs of physically handicapped children was dedicated yesterday at the Massachusetts Hospital School, Canton.

Present, and receiving a sterling silver platter as a memento of her service, was teacher-administrator Dr. Margaret Brayton for whom the school has been named.

Also present were state and local educational and medical leaders associated with the hospital school, including Mrs. Francis W. Sargent, wife of the governor, and Dr. Alfred L. Frechette, commissioner of the state department of public health.

The one-level concrete and masonry building, is designed to allow free movement of bed-cart and wheelchair student-patients.

The 500-person capacity auditorium, where the ceremonies were held, is ramped to permit students to move up and down the aisles as well as the stage with their vehicles.

A special feature of the Brayton school is the closed-circuit television system which permits bedridden children to attend classes regularly. The system also incorporates a two-way communications system between classroom and student.

Planned to incorporate 150 students, the school includes general classrooms, two science laboratories, an economics department, a language laboratory, a music room, a library, a study hall and a student lounge, where a collation was served following the dedication.

Among the speakers at the affair was Joyce Ann Hallan, an alumna who was graduated from Boston University with a Phi Beta Kappa, and who spoke from her wheelchair. She said self confidence was the key factor in any human's life, but especially the physically handicapped who find themselves "in a world not designed to our specifications." The MHS has provided this for stu-

dents, she said, and the new school will increase the degree of it they attain.

Nils "Swede" Nelson, a trustee, made the presentation to Dr. Brayton, who has been with the school since 1929, and is director of education and training. Other speakers included Patrick Reardon, MHS campus mayor, and Dr. William P. McHugh, superintendent, who also served as master of ceremonies.

DEDICATION PARTICIPANTS

School dedication participants in Canton yesterday included Dr. Margaret M. Brayton, Mrs. Francis W. Sargent, Joyce A. Hallan and Nils "Swede" Nelson. The new high school named for Dr. Brayton, will accommodate 150 physically handicapped students at the Massachusetts Hospital School operated by the State Department of Public Health. Dr. Brayton heads the school operation; Mrs. Sargent represented the governor; Miss Hallan is a Phi Beta Kappa Boston University graduate who attended high school there; Mr. Nelson is a trustee.

YOUNG AMERICANS SEEK PEACE WITH FREEDOM AND SUPPORT THE PRESIDENTIAL POLICIES

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, I am sure that every Member has been visited by delegations of college students in recent days expressing opposition to the President's policy in regard to the war in South Vietnam and, especially, his decision to eliminate the enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia.

In listening to these students and in watching the news reports on television, as well as reading about the activities of students in the newspapers and magazines, one could get the impression that this opposition to the President was virtually a unanimous view of all college students.

Such is not the case, of course, as evidenced by a full page ad appearing in today's edition of the Washington Post. The ad, entitled "An Open Letter to 100 Senators" was paid for by the Youth Committee for Peace with Freedom, a group made up of college students and other young people not attending college who support the President and who are also opposed to the effort now underway in the other body to severely limit the President's flexibility in his endeavor to disengage ourselves from the war.

I include the full text in the RECORD at this point:

MANY YOUNG AMERICANS SEEK PEACE WITH FREEDOM AND SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT'S POLICIES

Gentlemen: Over the coming days the Senate of the United States will be passing on two legislative amendments which may be fateful for the future of our country, for the wider cause of freedom, and for the peace of the world.

We take the liberty of addressing this letter to you because as students and young citizens, we are profoundly concerned over the crisis through which our country is passing. It is a crisis which has an internal component and an external component, and the two are clearly interrelated.

Like the students who have come to visit your offices, by the hundreds and by the thousands, over the past two weeks, we fear that we may lose our country if we fail to pay adequate attention to certain pressing national priorities. But we do not share their well-intentioned isolationism, their apparent belief that they can build a beautiful America even if the rest of the world crumbles around them.

Unlike them, we fear that we can also lose our country—and lose the peace of the world in the process—if we fail in our obligations as the free world's greatest power. Indeed, so strained and delicate is the balance in the field of world affairs that single blunder by our country may be enough to open the way to catastrophe.

We believe that the Senate's passage of the Church-Cooper Amendment and/or of the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment would constitute precisely such a blunder.

The protesters who have come to Washington have argued that the Senate must pass the Church-Cooper Amendment and the Hatfield Amendment because the great majority of our students and the Majority of the American people support them. We think that the premise on which this contention is based is false.

A Gallup Poll taken immediately after the President's speech, showed that two-thirds of those who took a stand supported the President's action in Cambodia. That the President's action is not without important support is also evidenced from the fact that AFL-CIO President George Meany and other leading trade-unionists have also supported the President.

As for the many campus demonstrations and the large number of students who have come to Washington, we note (1) that some 2000 out of 2400 colleges have not taken part in the current protest movement, (2) that strike votes were defeated in a number of colleges and carried only by slender majorities in other colleges, and (3) that substantially more than half of our young people do not go to college and have not been affected by the campus ferment. But even if the protesters were ten times as numerous and ten times as passionate in the advocacy of their cause, this by itself would not constitute a guarantee that they were right. Public opinion can be wrong. Indeed, there have been many occasions in the history of our country and in the history of other countries when courageous leaders have had to stand up against what appeared to be an overwhelming tide of public opinion.

The supreme example of such courage in the history of our own country was provided by President Abraham Lincoln in the latter part of the Civil War. By the middle of 1863 there was growing agitation against the war . . . The people were weary and tired of the inconclusive bloodshed . . . There were violent anti-draft riots in New York, in which scores were shot down . . . Increasingly vicious attacks on the President began to appear in the press . . . Salmon P. Chase resigned from the Lincoln cabinet and struck up an anti-Lincoln alliance which included congressmen, businessmen, officers and the distinguished editor of the New York Tribune, Horace Greeley . . . In August 1864, the Democratic National Convention adopted a resolution which read: "After four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war . . . justice, humanity, liberty and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities." . . . Lincoln himself was convinced that his administration would not be re-elected. But he persevered in his course because he was convinced of its correctness.

In modern times Winston Churchill provided us with a sublime example of the kind

of courage that is willing to swim full against the tide of public opinion. Despite the rise of Hitler, public opinion in Great Britain was predominantly pacifist and, at a later stage pro-appeasement. The spirit of the British campus was reflected in the so-called peace pledge, under which the members of the Oxford Union, by an overwhelming majority, voted to "never again bear arms for King and country." As Churchill commented: ". . . In Germany, in Russia, in Italy and Japan, the idea of a decadent Britain took deep root and swayed many calculations. Little did the foolish boys who passed the resolution dream that they were destined quite soon to conquer or fall gloriously in the ensuing war, and prove themselves the finest generation ever bred in Britain. Less excuse can be found for their elders, who had no chance of self-repudiation in action."

When Chamberlain returned from Munich with the shameful agreement he had signed with Hitler, there was no question that he had the support of the overwhelming majority of the British people—perhaps more than 90 percent of the people. The verdict of history is now in on the conflict between the Churchillian handful and the tide of British public opinion in the period preceding World War II.

In *Profiles in Courage*, our martyred President, John F. Kennedy, told the stories of a number of American Senators and American Presidents who displayed exemplary fortitude in standing up against misled majorities in Congress or against a misled public opinion. John F. Kennedy had this kind of courage himself, and he had it in abundance.

About the situation and the commitment which the Senate will be discussing over the coming days, President Kennedy had this to say in July of 1963: ". . . To withdraw from that effort (the defense of South Vietnam) would mean a collapse not only in South Vietnam, but Southeast Asia, so we are going to stay there."

This was not an isolated statement, but one in a series of many similar statements, remarkable for their consistency and continuity, going back to 1956.

If President Kennedy were alive today, there can be little question about where he would stand on the Church-Cooper Resolution, or on the McGovern-Hatfield Resolution.

Gentlemen of the Senate! We are young people, but we know enough about the history of appeasement and about the nature of Nazi and Communist totalitarianism, to be convinced that these two amendments, if they were ever approved by the United States Congress, would spell disaster both at home and abroad—not in decades to come, but in the next few years—perhaps in the immediate future.

For those two amendments are not a formula for peace; they are—we will mince no words about it—a formula for betrayal and capitulation, and for a neo-isolationism so rigid and so blind that it makes the "Fortress America" isolationism of the thirties look like the most radical internationalism in comparison.

The Church-Cooper Amendment not only demands that we get out of Cambodia by July 1; if rigidly interpreted, it would prevent the Administration from giving a single M16 rifle, or even a captured AK47 rifle, to the Cambodian government with which to defend itself against the North Vietnamese Communist aggression. In the eyes of the world it will be interpreted as saying that, so far as the United States Senate is concerned, the Communists can take over wherever they wish in Asia, and we will not lift a finger to assist their victims.

The McGovern-Hatfield Amendment would compound the mischief done by the Cooper-

Church Amendment. By calling for the termination of all military activity in Vietnam by the end of 1970 and the withdrawal of all American forces by the end of June 30, 1971, it sets up a timetable whose excessive tempo and absolute rigidity constitute a virtual guarantee of a Communist takeover—not merely in Vietnam but throughout Southeast Asia.

In less than a year's time, the President has withdrawn 115,000 combat forces; and he has pledged the withdrawal of another 150,000 American soldiers over the next 12-month period. While ambitious, the President's timetable gives the South Vietnamese government the time it needs to take over the burden of defense in an organized manner; and it gives Southeast Asia a precious breathing space in which to organize its defenses against the further encroachment of Communist imperialism. *It is a timetable which, if Congress does not undercut it, can bring peace with freedom for Southeast Asia and peace with honor for the United States.*

The debate to date in the Senate has distressed us and made us apprehensive. We know that Senators are weary of the war, as the American people are, and that they would like to see it terminated as soon as possible. But we cannot help wondering whether those Senators who support these two amendments out of a sincere desire for peace realize that *the manner in which we withdraw from Vietnam is all-important*—that, if we withdraw with honor, we withdraw with credibility, whereas if we withdraw in humiliation and defeat there will be nothing left of our credibility.

More than one authority has made the point that it is American credibility that preserves the peace of the world. For if a time ever arrives when our allies and friends feel that they no longer trust us, and when our enemies have come to regard us as a paralyzed giant or a paper tiger, World War III would become a serious possibility. Perhaps the first point of testing would be the Middle East, where the Soviet might react to an American defeat in Southeast Asia by intervening openly to crush Israel and impose its empire throughout the Arab lands, all the way from the Indian Ocean to Gibraltar.

We also wonder whether the Senators who support the amendments truly believe that a withdrawal in defeat from Vietnam would usher in a new era of domestic tranquility? We wonder whether they are not, at least, worried that the President might be right when he warned that such a humiliation, would produce a far more dangerous polarization in our society than the one we confront today.

Perhaps it would be better if the President had acted in greater consultation with Congress. Perhaps it would be better if there were a clearer delineation of the powers of the President and the role of Congress in the field of foreign affairs. But are the Senators who sponsor the pending amendments not at least concerned that their proposal seriously undercuts the President's authority as Commander-in-Chief at a critical juncture; that it creates a spectacle of division that can only delight and embolden our enemies; that if they push their contest with the President to its logical conclusion, they will stand responsible before history for the shattering defeat which is bound to result, and for all the tragic consequences that will flow from it?

We appeal to the Senators who have supported the President's program for withdrawal with honor from Vietnam to stand fast against the pressures—yes, and outright intimidation—that will be brought to bear on them.

We appeal to those Senators who have supported the pending amendments to reassess the relative risks of the President's course as against the course of surrender and humiliation.

We cannot at this point begin to match the massive and lavishly financed lobby which has been visiting Senate offices on a non-stop basis. The groups of the undersigned, and of other concerned young people from all parts of the country will be visiting your offices over the coming days. We hope that they will get the same respectful treatment that you have accorded to those who came before us.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT ON THE PRESIDENTIAL POWER IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The source of an effective foreign policy under our system is Presidential power. This proposition, valid in our own time, is certain to become more rather than less, compelling in the decades ahead.

The dynamic forces of the 20th century—communism, fascism, aggressive nationalism, and the explosive awakening of long quiescent peoples—are growing more and more unmanageable under the procedures of leisurely deliberation which are built into our constitutional system. To cope with these forces we must be able to act quickly and decisively on the one hand, and persistently and patiently on the other.

The President is the symbol of the nation to the external world, the leader of a vast alliance of free nations, and the prime mover in shaping a national consensus on foreign policy. It is important to note, however, that while this responsibility is indeed very broad, his authority is often infringed upon or thwarted in practice by unauthorized persons.

YOUTH COMMITTEE FOR PEACE WITH FREEDOM

Coordinating Committee: Charles J. Stephens, Allen Wood, Rebecca Boyd, Neil Salonen, Barbara Mikesell, Hal Mackenzie, Dan Ferrerman, Gary Jarmin, William Wyche, Barry Serrins, and Doug Aller.

Linda Anthenien, University of California, Berkeley.

Saralinda Alexandria, University of California, Berkeley.

Edwin K. Ang, Berkeley, California.

Marie J. Ang, Berkeley, California.

Robert E. Barreiro, New York University.

Judy Barnes, Denver, Colorado.

Louise M. Berry, American University.

Kristine Bick, Lawrence University.

John Biddy, Phoenix, Arizona.

Rebecca Boyd, George Washington University.

Virginia Brennan, Rockville, Maryland.

Philip Burley, Boston, Massachusetts.

David L. Carter, Washington, D.C.

Bonnie Cathcart, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Adrian G. Coffman, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Barry D. Cohen, College Park, Maryland.

James V. Cowin, University of Pennsylvania.

Judy Culbertson, Los Angeles, California.

Jay D. DeHaven, Alhambra, California.

Carroll Ann Dobrotka, Washington, D.C.

Lynne L. Doerfler, Lawrence University.

Marion Ellicott Dougherty, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Marlene V. Dudik, Washington, D.C.

George C. Edwards, Washington, D.C.

Cynthia Efaw, Washington, D.C.

Leslie D. Elliott, Berkeley, California.

Bruce D. Eho, Desert Hot Springs, California.

Daniel Fefferman, University of California, Berkeley.

George L. Fernsler, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

John Fitzpatrick, University of Maryland.

Justin Fleischman, University of California, Berkeley.

Gary Fleisher, Los Angeles, California.
George Franklin, Wheaton, Maryland.
Gaynell Frizzell, Berkeley, California.
Marshall B. Frontingham, Washington, D.C.
Vera Gatlin, Dallas, Texas.
John L. Harris, New Haven, Connecticut.
Regis Hanna, University of Maryland School of Social Work.

Roger Hellman, University of California, Berkeley.

David Hess, Washington, D.C.

Richard Hunter, University of Maryland.

Ronald Humbert, Isla Vista, California.

Helen Irland, University of California, Berkeley.

Carol Jaquith, Silver Spring, Maryland.

Gary Jarmin, Los Angeles, California.

Roy Wharton, Georgetown University.

Andre V. Starrett.

Linda Jarmin, UCLA.

John Jehle, American University.

Travis Jones, Washington, D.C.

Farley Jones, Washington, D.C.

Marilyn J. Kay, Los Angeles, California.

Theresa Klein, Washington, D.C.

Jack Korthuis, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Linda Marchant, American University.

Nora S. Martin, Kansas City, Missouri.

Lisa Martinez, Los Angeles, California.

Giovanna Mathis, St. Louis, Missouri.

Hal McKenzie, New Haven, Connecticut.

Barbara Mikesell, CUNY.

Susan Miller, Los Angeles, California.

Wilma Miller, Los Angeles, California.

Barbara Newman, New York, New York.

Elizabeth O'Neill, New York, New York.

Sylvia J. Norton, Golden, Colorado.

Robert F. Oswald, Creve Coeur, Missouri.

Oran Pope, University of Maryland.

Ann Rantovich, Wheaton, Maryland.

Carl Rapkins, Buffalo, New York.

Emma Reed, Hollywood, California.

Michael Richardson, University of California, Berkeley.

Robert Rogers, University of Maryland.

Michael Roth, Los Angeles, California.

Steven Schatz, Silver Spring, Maryland.

Joseph Sheftick, Los Angeles, California.

Nanette Semha, New York Institute of Art.

Wesley Samuel, New York, New York.

Dale Smith, New York, New York.

Jon Schuhart, Los Angeles, California.

Neil Albert Salonen, Denver, Colorado.

Anne Smith, University of Maryland School of Social Work.

Barbara Snell, Rockville, Maryland.

Richard Snell, Wheaton, Maryland.

Hugh Spurgin, Washington, D.C.

David Stadelhofer, University of California, Berkeley.

Shirley Stadelhofer, Berkeley, California.

Norman Stratton, Los Angeles, California.

Jeffrey Tallakson, University of California, Berkeley.

Alice Van Dyke, Denver, Colorado.

Martha Vertreace, Chicago, Illinois.

Blandina Watson, Los Angeles, California.

James Weeks, University of Maryland.

Noonle Baker, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

Susan Barnett, Miami, Florida.

Dee Beckner, Kansas City, Missouri.

Gene Bennett, Denver, Colorado.

David Charnow, Washington, D.C.

Adam Chornesky, Washington, D.C.

Dennis Cormier, New York, New York.

Stephen Deddins, Lemay, Missouri.

Joan Doffman, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

David Flores, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Diane Frink, Colorado Springs, Colorado.

Anne Johnson, Washington, D.C.

Mary Ellen Holmes, Washington, D.C.

Susan Hughes, Oakland, California.

Carole Johnson, St. Louis, Missouri.

Carolyn Libertini, University of Maryland.

Julie Lewis, Washington, D.C.

Sara Mazumdar, Washington, D.C.

Glenda Moody, Washington, D.C.

Wayne Miller, University of Rochester.

Peter Mullen, Washington, D.C.
Galen Pumphrey, Golden, Colorado.
Sandra Singleton, Washington, D.C.
Margie Stahon, Washington, D.C.
Joseph Stein, University of Rochester.
Fred Stock, St. Louis, Missouri.
Richard Woodard, Washington, D.C.
Louis E. Stephens, Jr., Los Angeles, California.

William Wyche, Colorado College.
Mark Whitman, Berkeley, California.

Thomas F. Flood III, Granite Springs, New York.

Neil Winterbottom, University of Maryland.
Charles M. Wright, Los Angeles, California.

Ray Barlow, Phoenix, Arizona.

WILL PROTESTING BECOME A CAREER?

HON. WILLIAM LLOYD SCOTT

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, Ed Grimsley, one of the feature writers in the Richmond Times-Dispatch, a daily newspaper serving my congressional district, has written an interesting column entitled, "Will Protesting Become a Career?"

The column discusses a serious subject in a light vein but does raise the question of whether there is a trend toward protesting for protest sake.

I believe the membership would enjoy reading what Mr. Grimsley has to say and it is set forth in full below:

[From the Richmond Times-Dispatch, May 15, 1970]

WILL PROTESTING BECOME A CAREER?

(By Ed Grimsley)

In an effort to predict what might happen if current campus trends continue, I have tried to imagine a scene in the year 2010 when a census taker questions a man to obtain personal information:

"Let's start with your age," says the census taker. "How old are you?"

"Sixty."

"And I suppose you're retired?"

"Oh, no."

"Where do you work and what do you do?"

"I don't work. I'm a college student."

"At age 60? What are you? A junior?"

"Senior?"

"I'm not sure. I think I'm a rising junior, but I'd have to check that out. Things have been a little confusing."

"I see. How long have you been a college student?"

"Forty-two years."

"What?"

"Forty-two years. Started when I was 18."

"Why is it taking you so long to finish?"

"Well, you see I'm extremely socially concerned about my fellow man and so forth."

When I was a freshman at the University of Virginia, back in the spring of 1970, I became upset about the war in Southeast Asia. I joined a group of students in a strike, and the college let us drop out of school to protest.

"We were supposed to make up any work we missed the next fall, but I was delayed by another student strike. I think it was to protest plans to send another mission to the moon, but I'm not sure. All the protests I've been in sort of run together in my mind."

"Anyway, when I finally did return to classes, somebody suggested we were not do-

ing enough to improve the environment. So I helped organize a massive strike against pollution.

"Somebody figured that if the more than 2,000 senior colleges in the country closed for an entire year, hundreds of millions of dollars ordinarily spent on higher education could be spent instead on environmental improvement programs. And college students could spend the year walking around the country picking up cans and bottles and participating in other programs to fight pollution.

"As my contribution, I spent one whole winter in Fort Lauderdale, walking up and down the beach wearing a shirt with a slogan saying: 'Save our Environment'. And I'll have you know that I was careful never to leave an empty beer can on the beach."

"Well, at the end of that year, I went back to Charlottesville. But the day I walked onto the campus, I met a band of students walking off. They were yelling, 'Strike!' and I turned around and went with them."

"That was good of you," says the census taker.

"What were they striking about?"

"Nobody seemed to know. But a true revolutionary humanitarian never let ignorance of a cause stop him supporting it.

"At any rate, when that strike ended, I joined another. Then another and another, and so on through the years, and I've always been behind in my classes."

"I suppose you've had a tough time supporting yourself—working at odd jobs here and there?"

"No, my father, who is eighty-four, is still supporting me. You see, when I was a freshman and participated in my first strike, my dear old dad patted me on the head and told me he respected my right to dissent, and he's been giving me money ever since. Of course, if I had had to work all these years, I couldn't have done a thing for humanity. I had a friend whose father cut off his money when he took part in his first demonstration, and he had to get a job to help pay his way through college. The last I heard of him he was a heart surgeon. Terrible, isn't it?"

CONTRIBUTIONS RESULTING FROM THE WATER RESOURCE DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS OF THE ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

HON. GEORGE H. FALLON

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Committee on Public Works, I am proud to note the contribution to the Nation's outdoor water recreation opportunities which has resulted from the water resources development projects of the Army Corps of Engineers—projects which the committee has recommended and which the Congress has authorized. These projects have created vast expanses of water areas and many miles of shoreline. Corps of Engineers' reservoirs alone store nearly one-quarter billion acre-feet of water, which provides an enormous potential for outdoor recreation.

The enthusiastic manner in which the American people have utilized the recreation facilities which the Congress of the United States has authorized as part of Corps of Engineers reservoir projects is indicated by the substantial year-by-year increases in attendance figures:

	Million
1960	109
1961	120
1962	127
1963	147
1964	156
1965	169
1966	194
1967	204
1968	227.5
1969	254.7

These figures include only the attendance at major lakes. Recreational use of small-boat harbors, marinas, canals, and other waterways provided by the Corps of Engineers has not been estimated, but is believed to be at least equally great.

Parks and water-related recreation facilities are available at 267 manmade lakes operated by the Army Corps of Engineers throughout the United States. Available to the public are picnic grounds, tent and transient trailer spaces, parking areas, swimming beaches, boat-launching lanes, sanitary facilities, foot trails, and rental boats. Roads, parking areas, water supply, and other basic facilities are generally provided by the Federal Government, while State and local governments and private concessionaries are encouraged to further develop the areas for use by the general public. As an overall average, non-Federal interest in the past have invested more than \$2 for every \$1 of Federal investment in park and recreation facilities.

At this point, I insert in the RECORD a release concerning attendance at Corps recreation areas recently put out by the Chief of Engineers:

VISITS TO ARMY ENGINEERS LAKES EXCEED QUARTER BILLION

Recreation visits to 189 Army Corps of Engineers lakes last year exceeded a quarter-billion for the first time—an increase of 10.5 percent over 1968. Last year's visits totalled 254,747,730 compared to 227,463,350 in 1968.

Topping last year's list of 14 projects where visits exceeded 3 million was Lake Sidney Lanier, formed by Buford Dam on the Chattahoochee River in Georgia, with nearly 11 million visits.

An additional 28 lakes each recorded more than 2 million visits and 35 others each topped 1 million visits.

Although the primary purposes of the man-made lakes and navigation pools built by the Corps are for other than recreation, the projects have become the Nation's most popular and heaviest visited recreation areas.

Boating and sport fishing—more than 1 million pounds of fish were caught at each of 12 lakes in 1969—are the most popular attractions at the reservoirs and waterways. However, most of the lakes provide picnic areas and camp sites for tents and trailers.

THE 10 PROJECTS WITH HIGHEST ATTENDANCE, 1969

Buford Dam-Lake Sidney Lanier, Chattahoochee River, Ga.	10,954,200
Denison Dam-Lake Texoma, Tex.-Okla.	9,073,300
Allatoona Reservoir, Etowah River, Ga.	6,242,300
Lake Cumberland (Wolf Creek Dam) Cumberland River Ky.	5,139,600
Old Hickory Lock and Dam, Cumberland River, Tenn.	5,002,300
Ferrells Bridge Dam and Reservoir Lake O' The Pines, Cypress, Tex.	4,919,454
Table Rock Reservoir (White River) Mo.-Ark.	4,876,800

Hartwell Reservoir, Savannah River, Ga.-S.C.	4,826,400
J. Percy Priest Reservoir, Stones River, Tenn.	4,818,500
Clark Hill Reservoir, Savannah River, S.C.-Ga.	3,722,400
OTHER PROJECTS WITH ATTENDANCE IN EXCESS OF 2 MILLION, 1969	
Somerville Reservoir, Yegua Creek, Tex.	3,690,600
Lavon Reservoir, East Fork of Trinity Creek, Tex.	3,171,800
Bull Shoals Reservoir, White River, Ark.-Mo.	3,156,800
Whitney Reservoir, Vrazos River, Tex.	3,030,000
Walter F. George Lock & Dam, Chatahoochee River, Ga.-Ala.	2,869,700
Barkley Dam & Lake Barkley, Cumberland River, Ky.-Tenn.	2,832,400
Eufaula Reservoir, Canadian River, Okla.	2,766,400
Black Warrior, Warrior, Tombigbee Ls & Dams, Ala.	2,745,800
Lock and Dam No. 26, Mo.-Ill.	2,684,700
Fort Gibson Reservoir, Grand River, Okla.	2,671,900
John H. Kerr Reservoir, Roanoke River, Va.-N.C.	2,666,700
Carlyle Reservoir, Kaskaskia River, Ill.	2,590,477
West Fork, Mill Creek Reservoir, Ohio	2,590,300
Texarkana Reservoir, Sulphur River, Tex.	2,515,869
Benbrook Reservoir, Clear Fork of Trinity River, Tex.	2,425,400
Lewisville Dam, Garza-Little Elm Reservoir, Tex.	2,408,000
Blakely Mountain Reservoir Lake Ouachita, Ouachita River, Ark.	2,403,600
Sepulveda Reservoir, Los Angeles River, Calif.	3,338,853
Grenada Reservoir, Yalobusha River, Miss.	2,329,900
Gavins Point Rec., Lewis & Clark Lake, Mo. River, S.D.-Nebr.	2,319,100
Center Hill Reservoir, Caney Fork River, Tenn.	2,289,600
Oahe Reservoir, Missouri River, S.D.-N.D.	2,281,365
Lake Okeechobee, Fla.	2,279,100
Kinzua (Allegheny River) Reservoir, Pa.-N.Y.	2,278,600
Grapevine Reservoir, Denton Creek, Tex.	2,266,600
Sardis Reservoir, Lake Tallahatchie, Miss.	2,255,700
Sam Rayburn Reservoir, Neches River, Tex.	2,218,600
Greers Ferry Reservoir, Little Red River, Ark.	2,207,000
Keystone Reservoir, Arkansas River, Okla.	2,152,200
Jim Woodruff Reservoir, Lake Seminole, Chattahoochee River, Fla.	2,100,000
Norfolk Reservoir, North Fork River, Ark.-Mo.	2,099,500
Beaver Reservoir, White River, Ark.	2,040,900

LEO "TAR" PAULIN TELLS IT LIKE IT IS

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in the May 13 edition of a Montgomery County Md., suburban newspaper, the Advertiser, the editorial written by Mr. Leo "Tar" Paulin is must reading for

everyone. I do not know Mr. Paulin, but he has certainly covered our present ills and responded to them in a brilliant way. Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include his editorial:

I COVER SUBURBIA

By Leo "Tar" Paulin

The Sorry Alternative—Depending on which of the apologetic TV commentators you viewed on Saturday there were 60,000, 100,000 and as many as 200,000 so-called peace demonstrators gathered under the hot sun of the Washington Ellipse last Saturday.

They left tons of litter behind, they shouted obscenities. Some of them frolicked in the nude in the Lincoln Memorial Reflecting Pool, giving others a better show than "I Am Curious-Yellow." Some smoked pot, and the mob urged mass sodomy on the person of President Richard M. Nixon. They saw, and some listened to, a girl introduced as Jane Fonda although she was not recognized immediately because she had her clothes on. This genteel lady perhaps set the theme for the entire day with her parting shout, "FTA."

They listened to the likes of David Dellinger and Rennie Davis, known communists. They tolerated the waving of the Viet Cong banner and they protested not against the American Flag hanging upside down. They had quite a day these young people from across the nation. Most of them, I'm sure, have a sincere desire for peace, as sincere and as passionate as the peace desire of the President and all of us "middle people."

Some of course were there for the lark. Others were not quite sure why they attended. A young lab technician who drew blood from my arm for a test yesterday morning told me she had attended. I ask her why. "I went to help end the war," she answered.

"How?" I pressed as she jabbed the needle into my arm. "Oh, I don't know, I just want it to end."

"Do you know anything about Dellinger and Davis?"

"No, who are they?"

Another girl, employed by us, also went to the big demonstration. "Why did you go?" I asked. "I just wanted to be on the scene. But I support the president."

Yesterday I had lunch with a woman who is advertising director for a large retail chain. She told me of her own 16 year old son who wanted to become involved. The family lives in Virginia. Her son announced on Friday that he was headed for the Monument Grounds to do his part to stop the war.

"Great," said his Mom, "I'll drive you."

"No, no! Mother," the boy answered. "It is too dangerous for you to drive there at night."

"You're right," agreed the woman. "Here, take this," she handed him a \$10 bill, "and get yourself a cab." Then she added, "But if you get into trouble don't call me. You're on your own."

Both puzzled and perturbed by his Mother's attitude he protested. "But what if it isn't my fault?"

"When you go out that door, Son, it is your fault."

They had dinner and the lad went upstairs, presumably to get ready for his thing. Some time later he came down all dressed and polished. He handed the ten spot back to his Mother.

Now it was his Mother's turn to be surprised. "How come?" she questioned.

"Aw, I went and took a shower, I'm all clean, I can't mix with that crowd."

I get a strong feeling that with the exception of Dellinger, Davis and their ilk, whose sympathies seem to be more with the enemy than with their own country, the masses

there Saturday were not gathered in the spirit of the Holy Grail. Most certainly their frolicking, their protestations, their obscenities, and their indifference to the President's conciliatory attitude didn't change the course of our policy in Viet Nam or Cambodia. It didn't help the poor nor did it ease racial tensions. It offered no solutions to the conflict except abject surrender thus turning the people of the involved countries over to the proven ruthlessness of the communists.

If the demonstration accomplished anything it did serve to further polarize the nation. And it did say that the government should relinquish its responsibilities in foreign policy and place them in the hands of college students aided and abetted by the Communist agitators.

Freedom of expression is a beautiful ingredient of our capitalistic form of government. I am glad the demonstrators were permitted to do their thing in the nation's capital. I only regret they lacked the sagacity to direct their vitriol to those who are really responsible for the prolongation of the war—the men who rule from Hanoi.

President Nixon has made tremendous progress in resolving our dilemma in that faraway world. He has decreased our involvement to the extent of 115,000 men. His move into Cambodia will assure the return of many thousands more. And you wonder why the protestors and some members of Congress, including our own Senator McC. Mathias, are so exercised over this move. The communists have occupied their sanctuaries in Cambodia for five years. Where are the anguished outcries over that violation of Cambodia's neutrality? One is almost tempted to ask, "Who's side are they on?"

But with it all let's not write off our young people. They have problems and frustrations. They are the victims of our affluent society. They have had it passed to them on a silver platter. They have been taught the Ten Commandments but they look about them and discover the adults of their society flaunt them with crass arrogance.

We hear much of generation gaps. But in reality the gap is largely imaginary. The young ones are breaking laws and defying authority just as are the adults. Witness the many members of Congress who embark on phoney junkets that's stealing from the people as positively as the hood who sticks a gun in your ribs and takes your wallet. The result is the same, only the method is different. Witness a large segment of used car dealers who turn back the speedometer. That's stealing also.

Witness the business and professional community who bilks the government out of billions in legitimate taxes. That's stealing. Witness the business giants who defy anti-trust laws through various devious dodges; example: the major newspaper manufacturers for years have raised the cost of newsprint at the same time and at the same rate. The polite name for the practice is collusion.

Witness the labor leaders who steal from their membership and take kickbacks from the employers. Witness the employee who steals time and materials from the employer. Witness the degeneration of morals in nearly all phases of communications and entertainment. Witness the disappearance of gentility in the world.

Small wonder there is unrest among our young people. They have been nurtured in permissiveness; they have not been forced into competitive situations to steel them for the battles of every day life. They are unsure and lack purpose and direction. And with it all the younger generation is an astounding noble group. In spite of all the forces seeking to tear down our traditional

codes of behavior the vast majority of them are fine youngsters who will, I'm confident, mold the future into a better society.

The alternative, that, offered by the speakers last Saturday—burn our universities, tear down our government, paralyze our economy is a most sorry alternative.

In spite of all our shortcomings, the duplicity of our adults in high and low places, in spite of all the immorality and dishonesty in the world, this country is making progress to a better world. And that older generation that holds the reins today has made fantastic progress towards the very objectives expressed by so many of the younger generation.

Let me quote at length from an address by Eric A. Walker, president of The Pennsylvania State University. Its title is: "Charge to Graduates."

"This ceremony marks the completion of an important phase of your life. It is an occasion in which all who know you can share in your sense of pride and accomplishment. But no one has more pride in your accomplishment than the older generation. But I am not going to tell that older generation how bright you are. Nor am I going to say we have made a mess of things and you—the younger one—are the hope of mankind. I would like to reverse that process. For if you of the graduating class will look over into the bleachers to your left or right. I will re-introduce you to representatives of some of the most remarkable people ever to walk the earth. People you might want to thank on this graduation day. These are people you already know—your parents and grandparents. And, if you will bear with me for five minutes, I think you will agree that a remarkable people they are indeed. Let me tell you about them.

"Not long ago an educator from Northwestern University by the name of Bergen Evans, a radio performer known to your parents, got together some facts about these two generations—your parents and grandparents. I'd like to share some of these facts with you.

"These—your parents and grandparents—are the people who within just five decades—1919-1969—have by their work increased your life expectancy by approximately 50 percent—who while cutting the working day by a third, have more than doubled per capita output.

"These are the people who have given you a healthier world than they found. And because of this, you no longer have to fear epidemics of flu, typhus, diphtheria, smallpox, scarlet fever, measles or mumps that they knew in their youth. And the dreaded polio is no longer a medical factor, while TB is almost unheard of.

"Let me remind you that these remarkable people lived through history's greatest depression. Many of these people know what it is to be poor, what it is to be hungry and cold. And because of this, they determined that it would not happen to you, that you would have a better life, you would have food to eat, milk to drink, vitamins to nourish you, a warm home, better schools and greater opportunities to succeed than they had.

"Because they gave you the best, you are the tallest, healthiest, brightest, and probably best looking generation to inhabit the land.

"And because they were materialistic, you will work fewer hours, learn more, have more leisure time, travel to more distant places, and have more of a chance to follow your life's ambition.

"These are also the people who fought man's grisliest war. They are the people who defeated the tyranny of Hitler, and who when it was all over had the compassion to spend billions of dollars to help their former enemies rebuild their homelands. And

these are the people who had the sense to begin the United Nations.

"It was representatives of these two generations who through the highest court of the land fought racial discrimination at every turn to begin a new era in civil rights.

"They built thousands of high schools, trained and hired tens of thousands of better teachers, and at the same time made higher education a very real possibility for millions of youngsters—where once it was only the dream of a wealthy few.

"And they made a start—although a late one—in healing the scars of the earth and in fighting pollution and the destruction of our natural environment. They set into motion new laws giving conservation new meaning and setting aside land for you and your children to enjoy for generations to come.

"They also hold the dubious record for paying taxes—although you will probably exceed them in this.

"While they have done all these things, they have had some failures. They have not yet found an alternative for war, nor for racial hatred. Perhaps you, the members of this graduating class, will perfect the social mechanisms by which all men may follow their ambitions without the threat of force—so that the earth will no longer need police to enforce the laws, nor armies to prevent some men from trespassing against others. But they—those generations—made more progress by the sweat of their brows than in any previous era, and don't you forget it. And, if your generation can make as much progress in as many areas as these two generations have, you should be able to solve a good many of the world's remaining ills.

"It is my hope, and I know the hope of these two generations, that you find the answers to many of these problems that plague mankind.

"But it won't be easy. And you won't do it by negative thoughts, nor by tearing down or belittling. You may and can do it by hard work, humility, hope, and faith in mankind. Try it."

TAX-FREE FOUNDATIONS SEEK MORE SPECIAL PRIVILEGES

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, a new commission—probably tax free—has urged more governmental loopholes to increase tax-free wealth for the foundations.

The committee should appropriately be called the John D. Rockefeller III Blue Ribbon Committee. They apparently consider their charitable progress not accomplished until violence and riots have completely destroyed the country.

No longer is there a need to explain their research and educational grants—they are demonstrable—burning all around us.

Mr. Speaker, I include a Los Angeles Times news clipping with my remarks:

PANEL URGES NEW TAX INCENTIVES FOR FOUNDATIONS

(By Bryce Nelson)

CHICAGO.—A national blue-ribbon commission has urged governmental tax incentives to give foundations new sources of

CXVI—1005—Part 12

funds so that they could avoid "the charitable crisis of the 1970s."

The Commission on Foundations and Private Philanthropy also urged that all foundations publish annual reports and that every foundation should be audited at least once by the Internal Revenue Service in the next three years to clear away "the air of the illicit that has settled on foundations generally."

The commission estimated that there were more than 22,000 foundations in the United States and that only 36 per cent of these have been audited by federal or state tax officials in the last 10 years.

The commission said that "a substantial portion of foundations pay out a very small per cent of their asset values." It reported that 47 per cent of foundations paid out less than 6 per cent of their asset values annually and that 17 per cent of foundations paid out less than 1 per cent of the value of their assets.

"The foundations in question clearly are not providing an adequate payout to society in return for the tax deductions society has given their donors," the commission concluded.

The commission was formed in late 1968 on the initiative of John D. Rockefeller III to provide an independent appraisal of American philanthropy and foundations. Its chairman is Peter G. Peterson, chairman of the board of Bell & Howell Co.

The commission said that the Nixon administration should ask a group of experts to propose new tax incentives to promote philanthropy for consideration by Congress in 1971. It also suggested a quasi-governmental, continuing advisory board on philanthropic policy composed of private members "to replace the haphazard development of government policy toward philanthropy and charitable organizations."

The creation of better tax incentives would help make philanthropy less elitist, the commission argued, and would help provide sorely needed foundations in areas of the country other than the Northeast.

The commission dismissed allegations that foundations give excessive amounts of money for international purposes, for individuals or for voter registration campaigns. Such charges have often been made in Congress during past years.

The commission stated that only 9 per cent of foundation grants went for international purposes and that only one-tenth of 1 percent of foundation grants went to voter registration and education activities. Of the grants going to individuals, the commission said most were for research and scholarship and "only a very tiny fraction were for travel-study grants."

SLOBS SPOIL IT AGAIN

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Worth-Palos, Ill., Reporter is a community newspaper noted for its spirited editorial page columns dealing with national as well as community interests.

In a Reporter article Thursday, May 14, columnist Pat Bouchard discusses the incident involving a teenage coffee house in Chicago Ridge. The dilemma of complications which brought this about reflect, I am sure, the behavior problems of

young teenage groups which have occurred throughout the country.

The article follows:

SLOBS SPOIL IT AGAIN

(By Pat Bouchard)

The teen canteen, or coffee house, in Chicago Ridge is closing again.

This is sad news for most of the teens in Worth and Chicago Ridge who had found a place to go on Friday nights to dance, talk, eat pizza and drink pop.

It is not closing down for a lack of interest on the part of the kids, the clergy, or parents. It is not closing down for a lack of a meeting place or enough chaperones. It is closing due to the apparent uncontrollable anti-social behavior of a few "rotten apples" who eagerly soured the whole barrel for the rest of the teens.

Because of a few malcontents who have showed up at the canteen and inflicted their self-destructive attitudes and irresponsible behavior on the adult chaperones and kids as well, the kids are losing a fun place. Young people who have no respect for themselves or each other, if one judges by their actions, who must prove their "manhood" by having infantile tantrums and screaming obscenities at the chaperones, threatening physical violence (to male and female alike) have spoiled a social meeting ground for their fellow teens.

What is the answer? Everyone agrees that those teens who can conduct themselves decently should not be penalized for the actions of a few overbearing punks.

We feel the kids must solve this one among themselves. They must set up some reasonable rules of behavior and then must enforce these rules themselves. Chaperones are always a necessary evil; but we feel that teens will cooperate more with their peers, if their peers show that unacceptable behavior means ostracism.

So come one kids—if you are really interested in having a canteen show the adults that you know how to run one. Set up the rules and show that you can enforce them and the adults will back you 100 per cent.

ALCOHOLISM—LET US HELP THEM

HON. JAMES M. COLLINS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, as I turned through my Sunday Dallas Morning News, I was impressed with a stimulating article on drinking. It had a byline of Abe Pivowitz, and the newspaper headlined across the entire page "For Millions of Women, Hitting the Bottle Means Hitting Bottom."

One of the greatest services of our preachers is the silent but effective work they do in bringing alcoholics back into society. Alcoholics need a friend they can trust. And above all, alcoholics need someone who can lead them to God and teach them the power of prayer.

We all appreciate the fine work of Alcoholics Anonymous. They have helped the lost to find their way back. To AA, the pastors in our neighborhood church, and to all who are giving a helping hand—America says thank you, because we have a big job ahead.

Here is this provocative story:

FOR MILLIONS OF WOMEN, HITTING THE BOTTLE MEANS HITTING BOTTOM

"I waved at my son and he waved back, until I passed out drunk in the grandstand," Joan, 37, a shapely housewife told an Alcoholics Anonymous meeting here.

"Mom," my son said afterwards, "I don't ever want you to see me play football again." Joan hesitated for a moment. She looked at her intent audience. They nodded encouragingly.

"That was my bottom," she said softly. "I joined AA. I started living when I stopped crying and started trying."

They understood.

Each of the women present had had her own bottom on the road back from "bottled hell." Each listened and identified with Joan and deep down their thoughts were of their own bitter, unhappy, destructive past.

They too had their stories. Their actions while drunk were tragic:

"I wrapped my car around a tree and landed in the hospital with a fractured skull."

"I battered my child against the wall in a fit of rage."

"I took an overdose of sleeping pills and slashed my wrists in a state of depression."

"I was caught shoplifting and landed in jail."

"I burned down my house while dozing with a cigarette and a cocktail glass in my hand."

Most had started drinking in their teens, had alcoholic parents and were insecure, fearful, bored, lonely and unable to communicate. They drank compulsively to cope with difficult situations, they said, and to relieve anxiety, tension and inner fears.

"I felt terribly guilty and full of remorse," said a 27-year-old television actress, mother of two children. "I was going crazy, but I couldn't control myself. I started to have the shakes. I hit bottom when my maid caught me sneaking a morning drink in the bedroom. I felt ashamed and degraded. I called AA. Here I am. I saved my marriage, I haven't touched a drop in eight months."

Of the 80 million people in the United States who drink alcoholic beverages—beer, wine, whiskey, liqueurs—from six to nine million are alcoholics in desperate need of help. Approximately one-third to one-half of these are women. They cross a strata of society and directly affect 30 million family members, friends, employers, colleagues and neighbors. Only about 3 per cent are Skid Row types.

Says Dr. Roger O. Egeberg, assistant secretary for health and scientific affairs of the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare: "Alcoholism is the number one health problem in the nation. It ranks with heart disease, mental illness and cancer as the top cause of illness."

According to the National Council on Alcoholism, a leading voluntary agency with more than 80 affiliates throughout the nation, alcoholism "makes a person more susceptible to such chronic diseases as cirrhosis of the liver, diabetes, emphysema, gout, high blood pressure and heart attack." Alcohol accounts for "50 per cent of all first admissions to mental hospitals," and for an enormous amount of social evils, from automobile accidents to divorce to assaults.

Alcoholics are not "bad," or immoral say medical specialists. "They are just sick." Everyone agrees the stigma is greater for an alcoholic woman. She is "the heart of the home."

"Many of these women," emphasizes Dr. Stanley E. Gitlow, associate clinical professor of medicine at the Mt. Sinai Medical School here, "are hidden alcoholics and secret

drinkers, unaware of the fact that their lives had become unmanageable because of alcohol. They draw the drapes when their husbands leave for work and start drinking."

"The earlier you recognize the signs," says Mrs. Marty Mann, founder and consultant to the National Council on Alcoholism and a noted authority in the field, "the earlier you can stop the terrible physical, emotional and financial damage." She adds: "It isn't necessary to 'fall in the gutter' before you stop drinking. Just watch for the signs." According to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare's National Center for Prevention and Control of Alcoholism, the following are some of the warning signals:

Need to drink before facing certain situations.

Frequent drinking sprees.

Progressive increase in consumption of alcohol.

Solitary drinking.

Monday-morning absenteeism.

Frequent disputes about drinking.

Blackouts or loss of memory.

Says the NCPA: "An individual may probably be considered an alcoholic if he continues to drink even though his drinking consistently causes headaches, gastric distress, hangover or consistently causes trouble with wife, employer or police."

There are approximately 425,000 members of Alcoholics Anonymous in 15,000 groups in 90 countries. Other organizations helping the alcoholic include Al-Anon, for spouses and members of the family; Alateen, for 13 to 20-year-old sons and daughters of alcoholic parents; the National Council on Alcoholism, state municipal and community clinics, church, employer and various social agencies.

WALTER REUTHER

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, I join with my colleagues in Congress today in paying tribute to an outstanding American and a real leader among men, Mr. Walter Reuther.

As a labor leader, Walter Reuther displayed a shrewdness and a driving determination which won him the respect of all those who knew him. His skill and dedication were invaluable in labor victories which improved the lot of the workingman in this country.

Indeed, it is apparent that the achievements of this man have made the United States a better place for all of us.

As great as they may have been, the accomplishments of Walter Reuther extend far beyond the labor field. Reuther was also a leader in forming the social conscience of this country. When lesser men protected their own interests or spoke timidly of what could be done, Reuther demanded the action necessary to bring the social justice which was so often lacking in our economy.

For this, we are especially indebted to him.

Because the times demand the leadership of such a man today perhaps more than ever, the strong leadership of Walter Reuther will be sorely missed by all

of us. Nonetheless, in these times, we will remember his example and the unfinished work he left behind.

To his loved ones goes our sincere sympathy.

THE AMERICAN FARMER—CONSERVATIONIST PAR EXCELLENCE

HON. DAVID R. OBEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, at a time when the protection of our environment is uppermost in many of our minds, from the President on down, I think we should pay our respects to one group of individuals which has been deeply involved in the conservation of our resources for many years—the American farmer.

A recent article in the Wausau Daily Record-Herald indicates, for example, that in the State of Wisconsin farmers have been spending over \$5 million per year in out-of-pocket costs for the reduction and prevention of pollution. Even with their limited incomes, our farmers still invest 5 to 10 percent of their profits in soil and water conservation. They install drainage structures to capture and carry off the water safely and to prevent silt and fertilizer contamination of our streams.

In short, Mr. Speaker, the farmer has respect for his land, and he has not been stingy in his efforts to preserve it. More than that, he has replaced rhetoric about our environment with action, to an extent most of us would do well to imitate.

Unfortunately, the farmer's ability to preserve and conserve our water and land resources may be seriously hampered if the President's 1971 budget becomes law.

That budget calls for the elimination of the agricultural conservation program—ACP—and provides no authorization to place additional acreage in the cropland adjustment program—CAP. These two programs have as their objectives the restoration and improvement of soil fertility, the reduction of erosion caused by wind and water and the diversion of land from the production of unneeded crops to uses that will promote the development and conservation of our soil, water, forest, wildlife, and recreational resources.

Mr. Speaker, I totally disagree with the decision to discontinue these programs. Furthermore, I cannot understand how the President can gut these land and water conservation programs in his budget, and at the same time, call in his message on the environment for more programs which would provide for the reforestation and increased use of farmland for recreational purposes.

Words cannot do a job that only adequate programs and funding can. Let us give the farmers the tools they have so effectively used in the past to conserve our environment by giving them the

funds they need for the ACP and CAP programs.

The above-mentioned Record-Herald article follows:

FARMERS LEADING POLLUTION FIGHT

(By Peter Laszewski)

The rural American businessman, more commonly known as the farmer, has been spending more in the fight against pollution than his city cousin.

In Wisconsin, records show that he has been spending over \$5 million annually in out-of-the-pocket costs for the reduction and prevention of pollution. Even here in Marathon County the farmers have been investing about \$250,000 annually on their land.

The farmer has been installing drainage structures such as sod waterways, ditches, terraces and stripcropping to capture and carry off the water safely so that there will be a reduction of silt and fertilizer entering our streams. He has been installing ponds in draws to capture and slow down the velocity of the rain waters at flood times. This enables the silt to settle before the water enters our streams and rivers. This businessman invests in his stream banks by hauling in riprapping, seeding and fencing the area from cattle. Needless to say these practices and many more reduce erosion and erosion and pollution are one and the same.

It is common to see farmers who net between \$4,000 to \$8,000 per year to spend five to 10 per cent of their profits back on their land for soil and water conservation each year. It is understandable why the farmer has been doing so much more for the care of soil and water. He is the caretaker or steward of every acre of soil, every spring or stream, each tree within his fence line. He realizes his very livelihood depends on this care. Unlike the urban person, he is more personally involved with nature, water and soil. He would not be a farmer long if he didn't have this sense of care.

Of course the fight against pollution is a never ending one. Much has been done by the rural American in the past 40 years and much more remains to be done especially by those of us who live in the cities.

As a society, because of our complacency in matters concerning pollution, we will probably live to see the day when our water bill will be greater than our other utility bills.

The dangerous aspects of pollution is that it doesn't appear all at once so we can notice it. Pollution, like cancer, sometimes occurs slowly so that by the time it's discovered it's too late to do anything about it.

SECRETARY HARDIN'S INITIATIVE APPLAUDED

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Agriculture Secretary Clifford Hardin's recent initiative in seeking to roll back illegal, price-depressing dairy product imports should be applauded by all who are concerned with adequate income for U.S. dairymen.

On May 13, Secretary Hardin declared that more loopholes have developed in dairy import control laws. He has therefore put the Tariff Commission to work investigating possible way to close them.

Mr. Hardin has reported that four products not covered by present dairy quotas are being shipped into the United States in telling new amounts, including an ice cream product, chocolate crumb, animal feeds with milk derivative base, and certain cheeses.

It is significant that all these products indicated by Secretary Hardin have only appeared recently on the international trade scene. One began in 1968 and the other three did not appear in international commerce until after January 6, 1969, a date on which new quota restrictions became complete.

Certainly, the seriousness of this whole dairy imports situation is illustrated by the fact that dairy imports rose 77 per cent in the January-March period from the first quarter of 1969. The imports amounted to 0.5 billion pounds of milk equivalent.

Obviously, Secretary Hardin's action could result in a crackdown on the exotic new milk derivative concoctions that have been dreamed up to circumvent U.S. dairy quota imports. Mr. Hardin's move to trigger a Tariff Commission investigation of these illicit items is certainly warranted and certainly welcome.

CAMPUS DISORDER—ACCIDENT OR DESIGN?

HON. LOUIS C. WYMAN

OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. WYMAN. Mr. Speaker, in recent years the more "sophisticated" of those teaching young people have taught them that any thought of a communist conspiracy is neanderthal thinking from the McCarthy era. Despite the undeniable fact that it is the Soviet Union—Communist—that finances North Vietnam's war against South Vietnam and the killing of tens of thousands of Americans and without which North Vietnam could not last 2 months—or the undeniable fact that it is the Soviet Union that supplies Nasser of Egypt with arms and now Soviet pilots for use against Israel—it is suggested and even stated empirically, that somehow detente with communism is today's new mode, and viable as well.

In this connection I commend the reading of Henry J. Taylor's recent column appearing in the Manchester, N.H., Union-Leader relating to campus disorders. Of course there is resentment against the widely misunderstood involvement in Indochina—but campus disorder has frequently had common organizers of violence. Who are they? Who pays them?

The column referred to, follows:

RED HAND IN CAMPUS DISORDERS

(By Henry J. Taylor)

Are part of the campus disorders a Red plot? You be the judge. For a perilous feature of our day is that too many people are either too civilized, too inexperienced, too distracted or too dense to grasp the documented truth.

We are being brainwashed whenever we are told that the thrust here is not organized. The CIA and FBI both know that the center for it is in Prague, within the shadow of the Ruzyně Airport. There the immense so-called International Union of Students, financed and brain-trusted by Moscow, is supporting university anarchists here and throughout the free world.

The Kremlin departmentalizes this place into "country desks." Each section supervises a country. Cunningly, each tailors the "issues" for each country. Naturally, the IUS drums on the Vietnam issue here and "Peace! Peace! Peace!" to further a Red victory in Southeast Asia.

A Pole, Vlod Konarski, a man with a bite like a saber tooth tiger, supervises the British thrust. The IUS vehicle there is the militant Radical Student Alliance in London. Two subdivisions are supervised by Jean Bougareau, a Frenchman, and Martin Abeln, who is Dutch.

In Elre the IUS thrust, locally called the International Movement, is based at Trinity College, Dublin. The IUS supervisor is Haridial Sinh Bains, a naturalized Canadian born in India.

A Bains sidekick is Ralph Schoenman, 34, the student shepherd of the Bertrand Russell Peace Foundation—the man who concocted the mock trial of President Johnson in Stockholm in protest against Vietnam. Iron-fisted Schoenman served a "martyr" stretch in Montjoy Prison, Dublin. Britain banned Schoenman and Scotland Yard caught him. To the dismay of the CIA and FBI, Schoenman had an American passport.

In West Germany the Berlin police documented the IUS's control of Rudolf Dutschke ("Red Rudi") when Dutschke was arrested on April 11, 1968, during riots in nearly all the West German universities.

In France the IUS thrust is supervised by Daniel Cohn-Bendit (Before you can build you must destroy), who is not even a Frenchman. He's German. The success, typified by the March 3 Natarre campus mayhem which saw Dean Paul Ricouer kidnapped and 125 policemen injured, has all but paralyzed French education. University faculty members are brutalized and kidnapped almost daily.

The French Parliament has enacted a university reform law. In it the campuses are supposed to be autonomous. But by staging demonstrations identical with those here the continued attacks have forced Education Minister Oliver Quichard to open France's campuses to police jurisdiction by declaring university grounds to be public thoroughfares.

President Georges Pompidou himself has stated, in desperation, that "there is no security on many major campuses in France."

I had lunch in New York not long ago with Italian Foreign Minister Aldo Moro. Italy, too, has enacted a new university reform law. Mr. Moro, himself a professor, sponsored it. "But what can we do?" he asked. "In my country, as in France, your country and throughout the free world, the Reds' technique is always to up their demands with every concession they gain."

Japanese Premier Eisaku Sato spoke similarly on his visit here. He said that last year student arrests in campus disorders exceeded 14,000 (ours exceeded 3,600) and that the IUS thrust has reduced Japanese education to a shambles. The IUS vehicle there is the immense Zengakuren student organization along with the five other factions.

In addition to its thrusts in Europe, Asia, Latin America and the United States the IUS now runs terrorist training centers for African students. The CIA has uncovered them in Budapest and Warsaw and Leipzig, Bernau and Bautzen, East Germany. These

May 18, 1970

have trained and sent back to their African homelands more than 1,000 students insurrectionists in the past six months. The IUS's anarchists are entrenched in the colleges all the way from Morocco on the Atlantic clear down to the border of the Union of South Africa.

There's no Alfred Hitchcock mystery in what is happening here, nor the brainwashing that accompanies it. Of course, none is so blind as one who will not see. But wake up, America! "It can't happen here" is totally dangerous philosophy. It will happen if we still refuse to wake up and call a spade a spade.

CAMBODIA, CONSTITUTIONAL CRISIS AND THE CONGRESS

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, in over 7 years as a Congressman, I cannot recall any issue which so prompted a massive show of public concern than has President Nixon's invasion of Cambodia.

As of this morning, my Washington office has received over 5,000 letters either condemning or praising this newest military adventure.

My district office in Los Angeles has been literally swamped with phone calls. Petitions are coming in at the rate of over 1,000 names a day.

Of course, most of these views come from young Americans.

But, I am extremely pleased that so many members of what they themselves term "the silent majority" also have responded—many of them, admittedly, for the first time.

And while it is understandably difficult to come up with a precise count, the overwhelming indication is one of shock, outrage, and vehement disagreement with President Nixon's position. At first, the mail ran around 26 to 1 against the President; recently, that ratio has narrowed down. But, even, say, a mere 10 to 1 ratio represents a massive repudiation of existing policy.

Yet, that is only one facet of the current situation.

On the surface the issue at hand is that of the Cambodian invasion—no matter how successful that move is. A bit deeper is the tougher question of the constitutional powers granted the President and the Congress to make and wage war.

By taking unilateral action, the President has, in fact, created a constitutional crisis—a testing of the will of Congress versus the will of the Executive to establish policy—a testing of the Constitution itself.

I believe with all my heart in the Constitution and in the rule of law—and I believe it must be obeyed by everyone in this country, including the President.

By ordering American troops into Cambodia without prior congressional authorization, the President clearly usurped the constitutional right of Congress—and only Congress—to declare

war. Richard Nixon's blatant usurpation of congressional authority could not be more clear cut.

First Vietnam. Earlier this year we found out about Laos—and we are still uncovering more and more about American military operations there. Now it is Cambodia. Still left, of course, is Thailand—and the uprising there in the northeastern part of that country has been raging for the last few years with relatively little public notice.

Indeed, what we are seeing is a true domino theory—but this time it is the American military strategists pushing down the tiles.

And where does it put us? Right on the threshold of ever-increasing involvement all over the globe, and the way things are happening, we could go over that threshold without Congress having any voice whatsoever in the decisions.

But, there is an alternative, a way open for the Congress to once again rightfully assert its role in direction of our Nation.

I see more than a fair chance that over the coming weeks Congress will force major and substantive changes in American military policy. Such changes would constitute a first step in removal of the American military power presence in Southeast Asia.

We must realize that the onus is upon Congress today. The students and other protesters gather here on Capitol Hill not because they like us and admire us but because we represent their last fading hopes, because they see that the executive branch will not adjust—in meaningful terms—to the rising tide of dissent.

We feel the brunt of the criticism and push today because we must assume our responsibilities—our constitutional powers—to end this wasteful tragic war which has so divided our country.

I do not doubt that the bulk of American troops could be brought back home by Labor Day if the Congress cuts back military appropriations—and I intend again to vote that way.

In simple terms, it is "put up or shut up" time for Congress. In the next few weeks we will be separating the men from the boys. Those Congressmen who fail to vote against military spending are as responsible for the mess in Southeast Asia as if they were sitting in the White House with Mr. Nixon.

If Congress showed guts, we could be out of Indochina, and, in fact, that is probably the only way we are going to "win" this war.

Mr. Speaker, today I sent to the Speaker's table two petitions from groups protesting the President's policies in Cambodia. These petitions reflect the voice of the people, and in the coming days, I plan to keep bringing this types of peaceful dissent before the Congress. We must listen now; we cannot afford the tragedy that ignoring the will of the people may force upon us.

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

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

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

How long?

CONGRESSMAN WENDELL WYATT REPORTS

HON. WENDELL WYATT

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. WYATT. Mr. Speaker, in these troubled times I think it is vitally important that we get the views of our constituents on the issues facing the Nation today.

I am sending out my questionnaires, as I do every year, polling the residents of my district on a few of the more crucial issues confronting us.

In this day of instant communication, I believe people are more aware of both national and international events than at any time in history. And I believe they are anxious for this forum to express their views.

I regret, because of the speed of events these past several months, that some areas which I would like to have included in my questionnaire are omitted. This is primarily because of the time element in getting a questionnaire drafted and printed. I believe, however, that basically the major areas of national concern are covered, and I would like to share these questions with my colleagues:

CONGRESSMAN WENDELL WYATT REPORTS
APRIL 1970

DEAR FRIEND: Perhaps never in this nation's history have we been confronted with issues as complex and pressing as those we face today. The Vietnam conflict, inflation, the environment, crime—these are but a few of the problems demanding the immediate attention of the Administration and the Congress.

For the sixth year in a row, I am asking for your guidance on issues with this questionnaire. Your views are of the utmost importance to me. While the final responsibility for my voting record rests with me alone, the excellent response to my previous questionnaires has been very helpful to me in formulating my legislative judgments.

A simple YES or NO answer may not fully express your feelings. In such case, your further comments are welcomed and will be of great value to me.

To return this questionnaire, simply fold it over and affix a six cent stamp. Please do NOT seal it with staples or tape. Thank you.

Sincerely yours,
WENDELL WYATT,
Member of Congress, First District,
Oregon.

1. Do you approve of the way the Nixon Administration is handling the conduct of the Vietnam War?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

2. Should the President order an immediate and unconditional withdrawal of U.S. forces from Southeast Asia?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

3. The United States has never established diplomatic relations with Red China. Do you favor softening of the U.S. position and talks leading to possible diplomatic recognition of mainland China?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

4. Do you favor the limited ABM system recommended by President Nixon?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

5. Foreign Aid:

(a) Should the United States continue to extend military aid to other nations?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

(b) Should the United States continue to extend economic aid to other nations?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

6. When the Vietnam conflict is resolved, would you favor abolishing the present draft system for an all-volunteer Army?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

7. Do you support President Nixon's action in closing the United States Consulate in Rhodesia?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

8. To get families off welfare, President Nixon has proposed a work incentive and job training program while guaranteeing a basic level of financial assistance. Do you favor this alternative to the present welfare system?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

9. What, in your opinion, are the top domestic issues confronting the United States today? Please rate them 1, 2, 3, etc.

(a) Inflation —

(b) Environment —

(c) Civil Rights —

(d) Drug Abuse —

(e) Law and order —

(f) Campus Disorders —

(g) Housing —

(h) Other —

10. Should the Congress place a ceiling on the total amount any one person may receive under the Federal farm subsidy program?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

11. Do you favor the President's proposal for automatic cost-of-living adjustments in Social Security benefit payments?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

12. Would you favor passage of a Constitutional amendment by the Congress to permit voluntary non-denominational prayer in public schools?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

13. Do you favor the proposal before Congress amending the Constitution to lower the voting age to 18?

Yes —

No —

No opinion —

14. President Nixon and Vice President Agnew:

How would you rate their performance in office?

President Nixon:

Excellent —

Good —

Fair —

Poor —

Vice President Agnew:

Excellent —

Good —

Fair —

Poor —

My sincere thanks for taking this time to answer my questionnaire.

Sincerely,

WENDELL WYATT,
Member of Congress.

TENNIS FANS

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow tennis fans will gather at the Washington Hilton Racquet Club to watch doubles teams from the executive branch meet teams from the Congress. This friendly confrontation is for charity, to help raise money for the Washington area tennis patrons' program of teaching underprivileged children how to play tennis. Last year, about 2,000 children and high school students in the Washington area learned the fundamentals of the game through this program.

For those interested in the lineup of players, I am inserting in the RECORD an article from the May issue of the Washingtonian magazine, in which C. Alphonso Smith rates "The Top 10 Tennis Players in Official Washington." Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Smith's judgments can be trusted, tomorrow's matches should provide some truly great moments in sport. As one of the game's top-rated spectators, I wish my colleagues well in their contests for a worthy cause.

The article follows:

THE TOP TENNIS PLAYERS IN OFFICIAL WASHINGTON

(By C. Alphonso Smith)

When Richard Milhous Nixon prepared to occupy the premises at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, it was widely predicted that he would name Sam Snead as Secretary of the Treasury, Dean Beman as Secretary of Commerce, and Arnold Palmer as Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare.

They might have made it, too, except for Bryce Harlow, an Oklahoma boy who went all the way to Congress and then to the White House, first as an assistant to President Eisenhower, then as head of Congressional liaison for President Nixon. Bryce is a politician first and a tennis player second. He can also count. Bryce explained to Mr. Nixon: "Mr. President, there are five million golfers in this nation. You have the vote of every one of them in the pocket of your golf bag, zippered up. But the sporting houses—I mean the sporting goods houses—report that seven million people in the USA play tennis—more than any other sport."

Bryce did not have to belabor the point. Mr. Nixon, who could teach FDR a thing or two about politics, passed the word: "Find me some tennis players." Bryce went to work, and soon National Airport was disgorging tennis players at a positively alarming rate.

Bryce was one of the first appointments made by Mr. Nixon. As "assistant to the President," his initial assignment was to refurbish the White House court. LBJ's beagles had looked upon the net posts as shortened telephone poles. When this was completed, Bryce was given carte blanche to rebuild the courts at Camp David. These were to be used as an out-of-town, away-from-the-prying-eyes-of-appointees to high administrative posts. We can now reveal that the reason Bryce was often slow in returning Congressmen's calls was that he was out on the court trying out aspirants to the Washington scene.

Once Bryce had interested the President in bringing tennis players to Washington, the question was how to stop him. When Mr. Nixon appointed Stanley R. Resor as Secretary of the Army because his wife had an excellent forehead, Bryce decided it was time to call a halt. He managed a compromise with the President, persuading him to name Emil Mosbacher, Jr., an internationally famed yachtsman, as Chief of Protocol. Mosbacher actually got the job because he is a tennis player, but at least the public knew him as the second best helmsman (next to "Corny" Shields) in yachting.

As soon as he had the golf and tennis vote well in hand, Mr. Nixon turned to football. In grateful appreciation for lining up the 12 million votes of golf and tennis players, Harlow was promoted to "counselor to the President" and was relieved of all responsibility for the sporting vote. Lack of Bryce's leadership was immediately evidenced in the Penn State incident which cost the President 62,867 Nittany Lion votes—fortunately a mere drop in the Whittier College water-bucket.

This loss was more than offset by Mr. Nixon's phone calls to every quarterback in the National and American football leagues. This program was recommended by Secretary of Commerce Stans. Mr. Stans hoped that these calls might halt the decline in AT&T stock, now jocularly referred to on Wall Street as the "widow's mite," and thus bolster the economy.

But on with the naming—and justifying—of our First Tens.

Joseph Blatchford, director of the Peace Corps, is clearly entitled to the number one position. He is the only top government official who has played in both the Wimbledon and Forest Hills championships. Joe quit playing tennis in the late 1950's when earning a living became of some importance. But when the White House inquired about his backhand, Joe rushed from the phone to the tennis court. His job permits him to play in Kabul and Katmandu and Kamala and Khartoum, but he has not escaped my scouts. They say he has regained enough of his former skill to get the nod as the best in official Washington.

It was magnanimous for Bryce Harlow to let Joe come to Washington, because the FBI report on Blatchford said simply: "Strong all-court game. No apparent weakness." But Bryce needed competition to improve his own game. As one might expect, the Harlow game is marked by craftiness. He rates the number two spot.

The number three rating goes to Alabama's rising star, Postmaster General Winton Blount. He wins hands down as the most avid tennis player in the Cabinet. Since the principal job of the Postmaster General is to oversee a decrease in mail service and a sizeable increase in the annual postal deficit, "Red" Blount has plenty of time to work on his own service. Wanting a readily available partner, Blount named Kenneth Houseman as one of his assistant postmaster generals. Ken can beat his boss but both avoid a direct confrontation by sticking to doubles.

Rogers Clark Ballard Morton, chairman of the Republican National Committee and Maryland's Congressman from the Eastern Shore, gets the number four ranking. Tower-

ing six feet, seven inches, Mr. Morton plays the "big game." His serve is hawkish, his backhand dovish and hits a forehand which has a tendency to escalate to the backstop. Although he moves about the court with the grace of a pregnant bear, he is tough to beat.

Vice President Spiro T. Agnew is the most improved player in our First Ten. On his recent trip to Southeast Asia, he won a hastily arranged match in Canberra against tough Australian opposition. It was a significant win since Arthur Ashe had just been beaten in the Victorian Open at Melbourne, and a victory was needed to restore U.S. prestige "down under." Mr. Agnew has flirted with golf in the past, but after his televised beaming of Doug Sanders in the Bob Hope Desert Golf Classic, it is believed the Vice President will confine his sporting activities to tennis. President Nixon sent the Vice President to Forest Hills last September to present the trophies at the first U.S. Open. Mr. Agnew told Nancy Richey (age twenty-seven), runner-up in the ladies singles, to keep practicing and she'd improve someday. Except for this backhanded remark, the Vice President acquitted himself well, and to be serious, Mr. Agnew's tennis game is distinguished by his remarkably agility. His improved play earns him the number five spot.

Secretary of Labor George P. Shultz and Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert H. Finch are what might be called furtive tennis players. Neither has ever been seen at Allie Ritzenberg's St. Albans Club or at the Racquet Club. Their tennis is played on private courts or on the White House court. A reliable informant says Mr. Shultz can handle Mr. Finch's case eight days in the week and twice on Sundays. Both are keen players. On the basis of our spy's report, we rank the Secretary of Labor at number six and the Secretary of HEW at seven.

The case of General William C. Westmoreland, Chief of Staff of the Army, deserves special comment. Three years ago, we asked General Maxwell Taylor, former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, to describe General Westmoreland's tennis game. General Taylor damned General Westmoreland with faint praise in summing it up in one word: "Enthusiastic." The accuracy of his comment was confirmed when General Westmoreland broke his arm playing tennis in Vietnam. Since returning to Washington, General Westmoreland has found partners plentiful, mainly majors and lieutenant colonels bucking for promotion, and his game has improved. He draws the number eight spot in our rankings.

George W. Romney, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, was first mentioned for the Cabinet when President-elect Nixon was on his "tennis binge." The man referred to as "Genial John" Hoover—because he isn't—was asked to come up with a scouting report. It was terse: "Mr. Romney jogs in the fall, hits red golf balls into the snow in winter, and plays an aggressive game of tennis in the summer. At a recent Governors' Conference his play was sensational." This was enough to land the Michigan flash in the Cabinet. The Detroit Rambler is expected to cut a wide swath on local courts this summer. He squeezes into the number nine position.

In his native habitat of New York, Emil Mosbacher, Jr., neglected his tennis for sailing on Long Island Sound. But one smell of the Potomac River in July was enough for the Chief of Protocol. He decided our local waterway was for garbage scows, not sleek racing yachts, and he reached for his tennis racket. He rounds out our First Ten, a narrow winner over Donald Rumsfeld, director of the Office of Economic Opportunity.

Ranking the First Ten in the Senate is a tougher job than positioning players in the Executive branch. There is actually little difference in ability between our number one player, Senator William B. Spong, Jr., of Virginia and our ninth ranked, Senator Charles H. Percy of Illinois. On a given day any player in the first nine might beat any other player.

Senator Strom Thurmond's (R-S.C.) tennis game has suffered since his marriage to the young lady who was a former Miss South Carolina. Having little time now for outdoor sports, the athletic sixty-seven-year-old Senator barely squeaks into the First Ten.

Three Congressmen dominate play in the House of Representatives: Brock Adams (D-Wash.), L. Richardson Preyer (D-N.C.), and Lowell P. Weicker, Jr. (R-Conn.). We happen to think Rich Preyer is the best of the lot, but we will defer to our scouts on various House committee staffs.

Congressman George Bush (R-Tex.) is a sought-after partner on the White House court. He draws down the number four ranking, edging out freshman Congressman James W. Symington (D-Mo.), whose game slipped in the heat of a tough race for Congress. This summer should see him ready to challenge above his number five ranking. Our scouts are high on two other Congressmen—John Conyers, Jr. (D-Mich.) and Michael Harrington (D-Mass.). Famed tennis reporter Bud Collins of the Boston Globe says Mike is a "comer."

There is only one way that the relative merits of our rankings can be tested—on the tennis court. The Washington Hilton Racquet Club has offered its facilities for a mid-May match pitting doubles teams made up from these rankings. It will all be for charity, with the Washington Area Tennis Patrons receiving a contribution from the exhibition to help carry on its program of teaching underprivileged children how to play tennis.

Five doubles teams from the Executive branch will meet teams from the Senate and House—both Republicans and Democrats. Most of our First Ten players, including Vice President Agnew, have already declared their readiness to help this worthy cause. In 1969, approximately 2,000 children and high school students in the Washington area were taught the fundamentals of the game in the WATP program.

The Racquet Club will offer a trophy to the winner of the Executive vs. Legislative team match, with individual trophies to all participants.

The radio and television networks are already surveying the situation around the Center Court at the Racquet Club. They remember the jockeying for space at Sixteenth and Kennedy with ABC, CBS, and NBC all fighting for preferred spots as Republican and Democratic Senators played a memorable match three years ago, to test my first WASHINGTONIAN rankings. Even Reuters and the BBC got in the act, with the latter holding a BOAC plane at Dulles for thirty minutes to get its film on board for showing in England the following day.

This year's donnybrook, featuring a surprise or two, is expected to outdo the inaugural encounter.

THE TOP TENS

The Executive Branch:

- (1) Joseph Blatchford, Director, Peace Corps.
- (2) Bryce Harlow, Counsellor to the President
- (3) Winton Blount, Postmaster General
- (4) Rogers C. B. Morton, Chairman, Republican National Committee
- (5) Spiro T. Agnew, Vice President of the United States.

- (6) George P. Shultz, Secretary of Labor
- (7) Robert H. Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, & Welfare

- (8) General William C. Westmoreland, Chief of Staff, United States Army
- (9) George W. Romney, Secretary of Housing & Urban Development

- (10) Emil Mosbacher, Jr., Chief of Protocol

The Senate:

- (1) William B. Spong, Jr., (Dem., Va.)
- (2) Howard H. Baker, Jr. (Rep., Tenn.)
- (3) Edward W. Brooke (Rep., Mass.)
- (4) Ernest F. Hollings (Dem., S.C.)
- (5) Claiborne Pell (Dem., R.I.)
- (6) Peter H. Dominick (Rep., Colo.)
- (7) Jacob K. Javits (Rep., N.Y.)
- (8) Walter F. Mondale (Dem., Minn.)
- (9) Charles H. Percy (Rep. Ill.)
- (10) Strom Thurmond (Rep., S.C.)

The House:

- (1) Brock Adams (Dem., Wash.)
- (2) L. Richardson Preyer (Dem., N.C.)
- (3) Lowell P. Weicker, Jr. (Rep., Conn.)
- (4) George H. W. Bush (Rep., Tex.)
- (5) James W. Symington (Dem., Mo.)
- (6) Robert McClory (Rep., Ill.)
- (7) Robert W. Kastenmeier (Dem., Wis.)
- (8) John Conyers, Jr. (Dem., Mich.)
- (9) Michael Harrington (Dem., Mass.)
- (10) Paul Findley (Rep., Ill.)

AID TO THE HANDICAPPED

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call to the attention of my colleagues and associate myself with the recent remarks of Vice President AGNEW made before the annual meeting of the President's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped.

We hear many voices in these days making demands and we hear much said about demands. Little is said about those in our society who, with no fanfare, quietly and unselfishly give of their time and of themselves to aid others.

The Vice President, in his remarks, expressed his feelings most eloquently toward those who volunteer to give aid to the handicapped and I include his statement in the RECORD today:

REMARKS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT AT THE ANNUAL MEETING OF THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITTEE ON EMPLOYMENT OF THE HANDICAPPED AT THE WASHINGTON HILTON HOTEL, APRIL 23, 1970

I am glad to be with you today because I have a great deal of admiration for all you are doing in behalf of the handicapped of our nation.

Now, I realize it is easy to admire people who do things for the handicapped, just as it is easy to admire handicapped people who do things for themselves. But, my admiration runs deeper.

I admire your spirit of voluntary-ism. I wish this spirit were stronger in the United States.

It is easy to come home after a hard day's work, eat dinner, then spend the evening half asleep in front of the television set—no, this isn't going to be another speech about television.

It is not easy to be a volunteer—to lead a busy life during the day, then to squeeze

something extra out of yourself not for your own sake but for the sake of other people who need you.

The dictionary defines a volunteer as a person who "enters into any service of his own free will." The dictionary doesn't go far enough—and I hope this won't bring down the wrath of dictionary-makers upon my head. I define a volunteer as a person who "enters into any service of his own free will, not for his own well-being but for the well-being of others." And I offer this synonym for volunteer: "A person who really is his brother's keeper."

Second, I admire your spirit of giving rather than getting.

For so many people in this world, the key question to any activity seems to be, "What's in it for me?" You've rephrased the question: "What's in it for somebody else?"

The way you measure success is based on giving rather than getting. How many handicapped people did you help find jobs? How many handicapped people received new hope from you? How many handicapped people feel life is worth living because of you? Look at the man we honor this morning—not for what he did for himself in overcoming his disabilities, but for what he did for others.

Third, I admire you for your many-sided attacks on the problems of the handicapped.

If two heads are better than one, then maybe an entire army of heads are better than two. Look around you—volunteers representing every conceivable walk of life in America, all of you bringing your diverse thinking and diverse approaches to bear on the single problem of greater opportunities for the handicapped.

This many-sided approach has been responsible for your success over the years. You have dramatized that problems of the handicapped are *everybody's* problems; they are not the kind of problems you can suggest "let George do it."

I have already changed a dictionary definition this morning. Now I will change an old adage. They tell you "too many cooks spoil the broth." But not in our case. We are not making broth. We are forging hope and opportunity. It's not a matter of too many cooks. For us, it's a matter of "the more the merrier."

And fourth, I admire you for your emphasis on the concept of work.

I am sure there are many approaches to helping the handicapped. You can give welfare. You can give benefit shows in their behalf. You can give advice and counsel. You can give housing. You can give tender loving care. You can give bigger and better institutions. They are all important, but when all's said and done, perhaps the best thing you can give is work.

The great Sigmund Freud put it this way: "Work has a greater effect than any other technique of living in binding the individual more closely to reality. In his work he is securely attached to a part of reality, the human community."

So here you are, promoting work for the handicapped. And your activities have such richer measurements than mere dollars and cents. Your activities give the highest dignity to the human spirit. Your activities bring the truest form of equality to the handicapped, an equality that comes with employment. Your activities lead to the greatest democratization of our society, based upon work. Work is not the great leveler of the people. Rather, work is the great elevator of the spirit of the people.

By this time you should have a pretty good idea of why I admire all of you here this morning, and why you have my full support, and the full support of President Nixon. Now you know why we are with you, and why we shall always be with you. I felt this way when I supported the Maryland Governor's Committee to Promote Employment of the

Handicapped and I feel even more strongly today.

I believe America is moving in your direction. As I look back over the years, your gains have been heartening. But I don't feel that we have yet reached that blessed state of total support and total commitment. We still have a good way to go before we can proclaim our country's total commitment to full opportunity for the handicapped.

There still are a good many "half-way" people in our country. The work of this President's Committee and of Governors' and local Committees won't be complete until these "half-way" people move over to the ranks of "all-the-way" people.

I have in mind folks like these:

"Half-way" employers—not too many, but still enough to be concerned about.

These are some who will hire the disadvantaged and other special groups under demonstration manpower programs, but who won't hire the handicapped. These are men who will build large-scale community relations programs, who will staunchly support all the right civic campaigns and causes, who will encourage their employees to volunteer in behalf of the less fortunate of their communities—but who won't hire the handicapped.

Some times the companies of these men have rigid physical and mental exams that screen out the physically and mentally handicapped. Sometimes the companies worry about the costs of hiring the handicapped—high insurance rates, high training expenses (but they are wrong, all wrong). And sometimes these men have misguided notions about the capabilities of the handicapped.

These men will tell you they are "for" the handicapped, and I believe them. But they must be convinced that they must be "for" the handicapped all the way, rather than part of the way. And this goes also for government officials at all levels who sometimes are long on talk and short on hiring.

Then there are "half-way" handicapped people themselves.

Let's be realistic. Above all, the handicapped are human beings; and like all human beings they have strengths and weaknesses. If I point to a weakness now, it's not to criticize, but to enlighten.

I have in mind some handicapped people who seem reluctant to go all-out in selling themselves to employers, people easily hurt by that ugly word "no." Job-hunting is salesmanship. The handicapped have to sell harder. And they have to expect more than their fair share of "no" answers. They have to develop ingenuity in approaching employers. They always have to put their best foot forward on the job—not for themselves but for all the handicapped who might follow, if they favorably impress their bosses.

This means going all the way and never giving up. Never. It's not easy, but often there is no choice. Not only their future depends on going all the way, but the future of others who follow.

I also have in mind "half-way" volunteers.

You won't find any in this hall. The ones I am thinking about are those who limit their activities to the easy and "right" causes—arranging for teas and parties to raise money for handicapped people they never see; collecting for health organizations; giving when asked to give. There is nothing wrong with that, but why stop there?

There is another dimension for volunteering, an "all-the-way" dimension—going into a sheltered workshop and getting your hands dirty showing the retarded how to assemble soft drink cases; going into a mental hospital and spending hours with patients, letting them know they won't be forgotten when they come out; going into a rehabilitation center, spending tortuous hours teaching

paraplegics how to swing their bodies into wheelchairs. And there is more: serving on local committees and on Governors' Committees, doing all the things that need doing—putting posters in store windows, distributing writing contest materials to high schools, arranging publicity, convincing peer groups—all the other less-than-glamorous tasks.

America has become great because of our tradition of being "all-the-way" people rather than "half-way" people.

If we had been otherwise, we probably still would belong to the British; we probably still would have no vast industrial complex; we probably still would be without national transportation systems or national communications systems—not even television. There would be no President's Committee and no program for employment of the handicapped, for there would not be enough national concern to do anything about it.

But we are "all-the-way" people. We are committed to the handicapped. We do want to go all the way for the handicapped. We are moving in that direction.

You are pointing the way.

It is the American way, the moral way, the right way.

It is the way of total commitment by all. Yes, it is the way to a better world for the handicapped—a better world for all the people, everywhere.

May you have the strength and the power to bring about this day soon.

WALTER REUTHER

HON. HUGH L. CAREY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. CAREY. Mr. Speaker, the sudden death of Walter P. Reuther in a tragic airplane accident last week deprives the country of a major force in labor and politics; a reformer of the finest kind; a man of principle and brilliance; a leader in the battle for workingmen's rights and equal opportunity.

It is a commonplace to say, in response to all such unfortunate events, that the departed will be sorely missed. But on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, the remark has a special meaning, a special truth; and we will, in fact, be many years finding another man of his abilities. He was the true genius of the American labor movement in our time. He was the man who showed the way in the solving of a hundred economic and political riddles. His honesty was overwhelming; his spirit a blessing to the country.

To Walter Reuther, labor leadership never meant the old-fashioned limited approach of getting a few more cents an hour for the boys in the shop. He had a lot more in mind than that. During his long leadership of the United Automobile Workers he did his best to involve his followers not only in industrial production, planning, and profit sharing, but also in the great political and social movements of the Nation.

For this, he was, of course, assailed on many occasions. For this, he was pronounced a demagog. But the charges were false, without exception.

He was, in fact, a man who understood

the needs of labor; who recognized the frailty of mankind—that when a workingman is hungry he will fight for a principle in his own behalf, but when his hunger is gone he is likely to be less inclined to fight for the same principle so that someone else might prosper to a similar extent.

Under Walter Reuther's leadership, the workingman was made to understand that principle means nothing unless applied to everyone; and that the struggle for labor's rights is basically a struggle for the benefit of some stranger you may never even see or talk to. This was the grand crusade of Walter Reuther, for which the Country should be forever grateful.

Born to West Virginia parents, he grew to manhood in the midst of the labor movement. In the forefront of the organizing drives of the UAW, in the mid-1930's, he helped to smash the arrogance of the industrial barons with forceful aggressive measures; and when the Communists endeavored to move in and claim the cause of labor as their own he turned his energies against them, driving them from the scene.

As a young man he had visited Soviet Russia and found it wanting. Upon returning home he would become the apostle of democratic capitalism, but a major critic of those who sought to undermine the rights of labor while preaching democratic dogma.

In the civil rights crusade of the 1960's he was a major supporter of the late Martin Luther King and of all the spokesmen of that cause, none was more aggressive nor sincere than he.

His interest was international as well as democratic. As president of the World Auto Workers' Council, he emphasized the commonality of labor's interests throughout the world. Just last week, he was planning to announce with U Thant, Secretary-General of the United Nations, the first international antipollution conference.

Walter Reuther's interests were many, his abilities great. He was a credit to his country at all times, and we have good reason—extremely good reason—to lament his passing.

EDITORIALS COMMENDING THE PRESIDENT'S CAMBODIA DECISION

HON. JOHN J. RHODES

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. RHODES. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's decision to send troops into Cambodia to destroy enemy sanctuaries has been praised widely by reasonable critics as necessary for the success of our troop withdrawal in Southeast Asia and the saving of American lives.

Beyond this, the action is completely logical in a war situation to prevent the

enemy from using neutral territory as a base for supplies and troops.

At this point, I insert in the RECORD three of the many editorials commending the President's decision. One, from the Nashville Banner, was written just after the President's announcement of the movement into Cambodia, and praises his candid explanation to the American people, as well as his "personal and official courage" in "shunning the alternative course of national cowardice, defeatism, added jeopardy of more lives on that battlefield, and ultimate catastrophe."

The second editorial, from the Atlanta Journal, was written a week later and also commends the Cambodia move and the President's "wisdom and courage" in meeting this challenge. The third, from the San Francisco Examiner, also praises the President's courage and statesmanship. I commend these editorials to the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Nashville Banner, May 1, 1970]

CAMBODIA STRIKE NECESSARY REGARDLESS OF POLITICAL CONSEQUENCES

For valid reasons, clearly spelled out last night in a point-by-point factual review and policy definition, President Nixon has ordered U.S. combat troops on attack into a Communist staging area in Cambodia.

In elementary fairness to the American position thus altered only in degree—a fairness that should begin at home, on the part of all Americans—it should be noted that this is not an invasion of Cambodia. It constitutes no violation of that nation's claimed neutrality. It is not a "new" war—nor initiated as an escalation of the old one.

The Chief Executive could not have pinpointed the place and the reason more precisely for national and world understanding. He described the area of this authorized U.S. ground attack as "the headquarters for the entire Communist military operation in South Vietnam."

It is a decision according with the reasoned policy—which hasn't been followed as it should have been from the outset of that conflict—of granting the enemy no privileged sanctuary.

The Viet Cong and North Vietnamese have used these pockets—on the periphery, and expanding into the interior—as such a sanctuary; for hit-run operations killing Americans on the Vietnam front. The areas in question also have been utilized as transportation arteries—the supply lines of men and equipment. They would be the source of peril to remaining U.S. forces after the next scheduled withdrawals totaling 150,000 men. Eradication of these enemy nests is, therefore, an essential rear guard action, looking, not to an expanded war, but to its successful termination—at the minimum of cost in American blood.

Who objects to that? Not the American people, surely, whose sons are over there. Objectors, congressional and otherwise, could well be asked the question: What is so sacrosanct about those few square miles of Cambodian real estate as to forbid a purifying attack that can shorten the war and save American lives?

Yes, it is a serious step, and the President did not seek to discount the fact. So has been each step undertaken, to terminate honorably a war he did not start, but which he was committed to ending in the shortest time possible.

He is not seeking to second-guess nor out expert America's professional military

advisers. The military affairs committees of Congress know that. Such key men as Chairman L. Mendel Rivers, and John Stennis, are aware of it and behind him—as is Sen. Richard Russell of Georgia, who was for many years chairman of the Senate committee. As these know, and as the President pointed out last night, the extension into Cambodia is not a new war—but all part of the same war; where conclusion must not be to the peril of remaining forces there after the major withdrawals.

President Nixon delivered no oration. It was a factual accounting—with both words and map amplifying the message and the explanation.

It is a maneuver—defensive or offensive—necessitating caution; and the American forces under this administration have not been recklessly assigned. It is equally obvious now that they are not to be subjected to added danger by indulging the enemy a privileged sanctuary or series of such.

The President could not have been more candid in his analysis—and in the declaration of nonpartisanship, non-political objective. Note his language:

"Whether my party gains in November is nothing compared to the lives of 400,000 Americans fighting for our country and for the cause of peace and freedom in Vietnam. Whether I may be a one-term President is insignificant compared to whether by our failure to act in this crisis the United States proves itself to be unworthy to lead the forces of freedom in this critical period."

There was personal and official courage in that decision. The reasoning people of America surely will back it—shunning the alternative course of national cowardice, defeatism, added jeopardy of more lives on that battlefield, and ultimate catastrophe.

[From the Atlanta Journal, May 8, 1970]

WAR IN CAMBODIA

President's Nixon's momentous decision to take the war to the enemy and deny him the sanctuary granted by an absurd and arbitrary boundary is militarily sound.

Until now it has been only the United States and the South Vietnamese who have respected the Cambodian border line. It has been strictly unilateral on our part.

The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese have had no respect for it for years. They invaded Cambodian years ago and encouraged the fictitious theory that since Cambodia is neutral our side should not cross the line.

That is why it is so incredible that so-called national leaders have condemned the President's actions so vociferously. That is why it is utterly unrealistic for all the emotional hysteria over the move.

There has been no widening of the war. There has been no real change in the war. We are still fighting the same enemy and we are fighting him in essentially the same territory—Indochina. We are still fighting him for the same reasons.

The only change that has come about is our decision to fight the enemy where he is.

The enemy chose to invade Cambodia—and there was no outcry to be heard anywhere.

Having successfully invaded Cambodia and not been censured by anyone, he then chose to use Cambodia as a base for military operations against our forces. He would strike out from the Cambodian bases and then hastily retire to them, in the meantime waggling his finger at us that we could not cross the boundary and strike back at him.

And so for years he has lived in safety because it was okay for him to be an aggressor, an invader, but it would be the crime of crimes for us to reply in kind.

Then there came a change in Cambodian governments. The new government told the invaders to get out. The Viet Cong and North Vietnamese, being what they are, refused. Instead, they began fighting the Cambodians.

Demonstrating both wisdom and courage, Mr. Nixon elected to aid the new Cambodian government and at the same time improve our own position by erasing the fictitious barrier the enemy hides behind.

Thus far the action has gone well and has justified the President's stand.

The course he has chosen is that realistic one and he deserves the overwhelming support of the American people.

[From the San Francisco Examiner,
May 1, 1970]

THE COURAGE OF THE PRESIDENT
(By Charles L. Gould)

President Nixon did not take the fighting to Cambodia.

The Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese did.

In both world wars hundreds of thousands of American troops fought across Europe.

They were not concerned with invisible national boundaries. They were concerned with meeting the enemy and destroying him.

In 1917 and again in 1941 our nation made open declarations of war. War-time rules were imposed at home. Dissent was stifled. Battle goals were established. And power at our command was used to achieve them.

Had we fought Hitler as we have fought Hanoi, our troops would still be mired down in the battlefields of Europe. Or—we would be saluting the swastika.

For six long years our men have fought in Vietnam under a weird, one-sided code of Marquis of Queensbury rules.

Our men were not permitted to fight to achieve victory. Our fighting men and their allies were not permitted to pursue the enemy into North Vietnam. They were not permitted to pursue the enemy into Laos and Cambodia.

Thus the enemy was given the right of initiative. He could pick the time and place and method of his attacks. He could strike and run.

Our men could lose but they could not win.

The danger of the fighting escalating into a worldwide conflagration was our alibi for not defining the enemy's defeat as our goal.

The danger that the war would erupt on a global scale was present the moment we committed our first fighting man to the conflict.

The same danger is implicit in each of the pacts we have with fifteen nations of Europe and with numerous other nations in Asia and the Middle East.

These pacts were established to protect weak friends and allies from the repeatedly declared aggressive aims of the Communists.

All should recognize that the danger of a third world war is ever-present. This danger was born the moment following World War II that the Communists again restated their goals of global domination.

If World War III comes it will come when the Communists believe the time is right.

They may believe the time is right if our country is so hopelessly divided that we—as a people—fail to support our President in supporting our fighting men as he did last night.

Let it be clear that President Nixon has not established victory as a goal in Vietnam. Months ago he mapped plans for honorably extricating our troops from the conflict and turning the defense of South Vietnam over to the forces of that nation. He has not changed those goals.

However, if the Viet Cong and the North Vietnamese were permitted to expand and perpetuate their sanctuary in Cambodia, President Nixon saw grave danger that his carefully planned timetable of de-escalation would be destroyed.

He saw a stepped-up threat to the safety of our fighting men. He saw the danger of expanded war through failure to act.

He acted with courage and statesmanship. He merits our support.

INDIANA UNIVERSITY STUDENTS
CELEBRATE "WORLD'S GREATEST
COLLEGE WEEKEND"—GOOD OB-
JECT LESSON FOR OTHER
CAMPUSES

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker—

I have left me seven thousand in Israel, all the knees which have not bowed unto Baal.—I Kings 19: 18.

May is a festive month in Indiana. The month preceding Memorial Day and the 500-mile auto races is filled with many gala events of interest to Hoosierdom and the world. Not the least of these events is the "Little 500" at Indiana University, described as the "world's greatest college weekend." It consists of such events as the style show, regatta, golf jamboree, cream and crimson football game, mini extravaganza, bicycle race, and the variety show.

The mini tricycle race, which takes place on Friday evening, is made up of 48 teams of four girls each from various sororities and dormitories who compete in a relay race in the field house. Many thousands attend. The crowd is hilarious, competitive, enthusiastic. The colorful parade based on a specific theme of history, mythology, or show business precedes the race. The ingenuity of these youth reaches heights that would do justice to any great showmen.

The main event is the bicycle race which takes place on Saturday in the stadium. This year it was attended by over 20,000, mostly students and their friends. The same enthusiasm, excitement, and good-natured competition prevails.

The net profits from the events of this weekend go into a scholarship fund to help needy students get a college education. We personally knew many of the students—some of whom are working their ways through school, others whose parents are working hard to assist them. These youth did not resemble the pictures that the news media is giving of college youth of today. Rather here are young men and women who have had great fun participating and giving of themselves and hopefully helping themselves and others toward higher education. These were a youth that causes you to thrill with pride. It is a youth such as we saw at these events that through the ages have explored the great expanses of

earth and sea and air. It is such youth that have unselfishly dedicated their minds and bodies to the building, to achieving, to helping make a better world.

At each of these events solemn prayer was offered. Everyone stood in silent reverence; the "Star-Spangled Banner" was played; everyone was respectful. The Vietcong flag was not in sight; there was no foul four-letter word; no jeers or boos. These youth showed signs of strong individualism with various hair styles and casual sport clothes in gay colorful array. But they were clean, they were interested and enthused; they carried themselves with a pride and a well-being that befitted the youth who have had the advantage of higher education. Yes, untold millions of youth today have not "bowed their knees to Baal." If youth such as these can prevail, our country will have a greater and brighter tomorrow.

Yes, there are also at this great university those who as of yesterday would have been termed "sons who hate their fathers," but they did not attend such events. Every generation has produced such types. Many with proper instruction, discipline, and leadership will become worthy members of society. Some, unfortunately, will not. There has been far too much attention given to those who hate and would destroy mankind, and too little to those who would love and build for a greater society. Society has always spent too much time publicizing the Benedict Arnolds and the Judas Iscariots.

KENT DEATHS VIEWED

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, many things are said in the press about campus unrest. Every concerned editor in America has spoken out, I am sure. In the wake of the tragic Kent State deaths, there were countless appraisals. For particularly lucid comments which maintain perspective, I commend to my colleagues the following editorial which appeared in the Fort Smith Southwest Times Record, May 7, 1970:

THE PRICE OF VIOLENCE ON A CAMPUS

So at last it's come—rioting students have been killed by gunfire from troops they were reportedly attacking with bricks and chunks of concrete.

And the nation can well take a sober look at the situation. Of those involved in the mob at Kent State University in Ohio, there were almost certainly two distinct factions: Those seeking to promote disorder and violence—and those merely foolish enough to be led along into a situation which resulted in tragedy.

The promoters of disorder very likely have no regrets about the tragedy. They may even be pleased at the creation of new "martyrs." But the remainder of the disorderly mob confronting the troops could also well be doing some thinking and wondering about what they have been led into.

The whole thing should have a sobering influence on other campuses for, if the mob actions continue, it's about as certain as night following day that there will be more deaths and injuries as a result.

Asked a Cleveland newspaper editorial, as it called for an investigation: "How could these deaths have been avoided?"

The answer to that is as clear as daylight. They could have been avoided by there never having been disorders on the campus, by all students observing the law as most other citizens do, by there being no destruction by fire of one of the University buildings, and by there being no confrontation with the troops.

There will, of course, be investigations as to the justification for the National Guardsmen using firearms. But if it's shown that they had sufficient reason to believe their lives and safety were in danger, then it should be remembered that when citizens are called from their homes and jobs, at great inconvenience and danger to themselves, to enforce the laws and the safety of society, they do not surrender their own right to "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness". Can they be expected to submit without resistance to injury and possible death without protecting themselves? The answer to that also is clear.

But, aside from the outcome of those investigations, it's certainly true that there would have been no occasion for them and the dead students still would be alive if there had been no disorders on the campus.

The whole thing is a tragedy. And the burning of the University building was a tragedy. And the fact that a mob formed among a group enjoying one of America's greatest privileges—its educational opportunities—also is a tragedy. And there's no way for those who promoted the disorders to escape the full blame for all the ensuing events.

Said President Nixon: "This should remind us all once again that when dissent turns to violence it invites tragedy. It is my hope that this tragedy and unfortunate incident will strengthen the determination of all the nation's campuses, administrators, faculty and students alike, to stand firmly for the right which exists in this country of peaceful dissent and just as strongly against the resort to violence as a means of such expression".

The country needs to think seriously about that expression. All students need to think about it. And turn their influence against promoters of discord and violence.

And all university administrators need to think about it and seek quick and strong means of ridding their schools of those who advocate violence—or who join in it.

For, as we said, if violence continues, more tragedies are certain. Because, to quote Mr. Nixon again, violence itself invites tragedy. And we'd add: It assures it.

NEBRASKA STUDENT FEELS UNITED STATES IS IN BETTER SHAPE THAN AGITATORS WANT IT TO BE

HON. GLENN CUNNINGHAM

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, in this time of strife on our Nation's campuses, it is heartening to receive a breath of fresh air from Nebraska.

Most of my colleagues have been receiving mail in great quantities regarding the President's recent decision to send troops into Cambodia. So have I.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to share one of these letters. It makes me proud to be a Nebraskan and an American.

The letter follows:

Mr. CUNNINGHAM: Last week I wrote you a hastily conceived letter opposing Cambodian invasion and the Vietnamese War in general. Since that time I have been doing some harder thinking as well as watching and listening to President Nixon more closely. Maybe he is doing the right thing. His plan of action in Cambodia does seem to be justified, and at the moment it seems to be working. At least it should be given time to prove itself. I am guilty of judging too quickly, and many others are sharing this guilt I am afraid.

Also, in my letter of last week I specifically asked: (1) What is wrong with an admitted defeat in the War? and (2) Is it better that our country should suffer civil war? It seems that whether they are valid questions or not, they are representing only one side of the issue. I should have also asked whether the United States can afford to adopt an isolationist policy? Can the world even be entirely peaceful—without any war? Can the United States afford to allow communism to spread unchecked? The United States may not be entirely right or humane in its foreign policy, but who can say what is right or humane? Should we concentrate on "now" situations or possibly contribute to the freedom and rights of future generations?

I don't know the answer to all of these questions, and I don't know if there is an answer to all of them. I do know that for the present the United States seems to be in better shape than many agitators would like it to be. Freedom of speech and the right to dissent are perhaps stronger than they have ever been. I am grateful for this freedom, and I hope no minority group manages to cut down rights to free speech through irresponsible acts. Also, compared to many places in the world, Latin America in particular, our current rate of inflation is almost negligible. The United States in spite of many faults is still the best nation in the world to be alive in today.

Again, and I sincerely mean it, thank you for listening.

LAUREL JIZBA,

Student, University of Nebraska.

CAMPUS MILITANTS AT CROSSROAD

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, because of its timeliness I include an editorial from the May 7, 1970, San Diego Union in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for consideration by my colleagues:

CAMPUS MILITANTS AT CROSSROAD

The violent death of four students at Kent State University in Ohio leaves a nation shocked with a sense of tragedy, but with one sobering thought beyond that.

There, but for the grace of Providence, could have been any campus or educational institution in the United States of America today.

If the violence and revolution that scar the ideals of our nation continue on their present course, the tragedy of Kent State can be repeated many times in the future, perhaps on a much larger scale.

Kent State has seized our attention not because death on campus is new, but because

four young people on the threshold of adulthood died during a single incident.

We also were sobered by the evident willingness of the dissidents to attack the National Guard with impudence and even relish.

The day before yesterday the revolutionaries were attacking only the unarmed campus police. Yesterday it was city and county law officers. Today it is the National Guard. It is not difficult to see where this road can lead.

Our sense of tragedy is further compounded by the realization that it is a relative handful of students at Kent State, or at any other of our numerous campuses, who are grinding education back into the mud.

We would be less than honest if we blamed the young National Guardsmen who actually pulled the triggers for the deaths of the four young students.

No shots would have been fired if students were not challenging law and assaulting the young citizen-soldiers called in to give assistance to campus authorities.

The seeds of the tragedy were planted long before, when students decided to take the authority into their own hands—when they decided to leave their classrooms to create battlefields on the commons.

Nor is it enough to say that if demands of the militants were met, the violence would not occur. The foreign policy of the United States cannot be determined on the basis of who is most violent on which campus.

Obviously, the lesson that the student minorities assaulting, burning, destroying and ruining our campuses have yet to learn is that it is in their interests to seek their goals through legitimate channels.

If progress under law and order sometimes seems slow to impatient youth, it is an advantage of a republican form of government. In fact, the very deliberation that at times appears to be dilatory is one of the essential checks and balances that safeguard against excesses.

The alternative is unthinkable. If students continue to resort to force in increasing numbers, they will be met with larger force. The ultimate loss could well be in the waste of more young lives and the end of higher education as we know it, as well as a tragic erosion of the kind of government that has been tolerating their excesses with understanding and patience.

ARGUING FOR END TO THE DRAFT

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, many Americans have come to realize the inequities in our present draft system. The Gates Commission's findings have focused attention on the desirability and feasibility of installing an all-volunteer army.

One of those individuals who has come out in favor of an all-volunteer army is Mr. Carl Rowan, a former Ambassador, and now a leading columnist. As he notes:

Forced military service in peacetime, or during a terribly unpopular, undeclared war, is tearing this country apart.

Mr. Rowan then goes on to give the reasons why he had previously opposed such a military system and the rebuttals which the Gates Commission makes to these charges.

I insert Mr. Rowan's column as published in the Sunday, May 17, Detroit News in the RECORD so that it will come to the attention of a broad range of citizens:

ARGUING FOR END TO THE DRAFT
(By Carl Rowan)

WASHINGTON.—After weeks of study and soul searching I have concluded that the United States must go to an all-volunteer armed force. The present policy of conscription is full of injustices and the best evidence is that it will continue to be, even under a lottery system.

More important, forced military service in peacetime, or during a terribly unpopular, undeclared war, is tearing this country apart. What a blessing if those helmeted construction workers could show their "patriotism" by volunteering to fight in Indochina instead of flagwaving down Wall Street and beating up students.

It is not just civilian society that is torn by unpopular requirements for military service. The armed forces themselves are experiencing grave morale problems, for white dissenters as well as blacks who feel mistreated or feel that they carry an unfair share of the burden have come to constitute political and social time bombs in many units.

I have been inclined to oppose an all-volunteer force for these reasons:

The cost. I am reluctant to endorse anything that adds \$3 billion to \$4 billion a year to the Pentagon budget. But I concluded that the additional cost of an all-volunteer force is puny compared with the cost of tearing the country apart.

I am further impressed by the fact that the principal beneficiaries of improved pay will be first-year men who now are grossly underpaid—so much so that 50,000 military families are on welfare.

Fear that an all-volunteer force might become a gung-ho elite that would undermine civilian control of the military.

The Gates commission, which recommended an all-volunteer force, argues convincingly that professional officers are the key and that even now they are recruited, for the most part, from a variety of regional and socioeconomic backgrounds. So our armed forces would have about the same attitudes and the same political clout, whatever the system.

Worry that an all-volunteer force would be only a gimmick through which the affluent people would pay enough taxes to make military life appealing to blacks and poor whites. The effect would be that rich Americans would indirectly hire poor Americans to do the dirty, dangerous work of protecting "our way of life."

A look at the record shows that under the unjust functioning of the draft an unfair military burden is being carried by middle and upper-middle class blacks and, to a lesser degree, by middle class whites.

This is so because 30 percent of those eligible (mostly from the poor, disadvantaged classes) are rejected for mental and physical reasons. On the upper end of the socioeconomic scale, young men escape service through student and other deferments.

In the case of the black community, especially, the draft is grabbing middle class men with the best potential to become engineers, doctors, teachers, physicists. The likelihood is that these middle class blacks are not going to opt for the armed forces.

So there is not likely to be any major increase in the present 10.9 percent blacks in the enlisted ranks of the military. Any great upsurge of volunteers would come only through upgrading the education, nutrition and standard of life of that large pool of blacks who have been so disadvantaged that they cannot meet military standards.

In any event, black men would go into the military by choice and not at the whim of some lily white draft board.

There are those who argue that moving to an all-volunteer force will lower force levels and thus endanger national security. The Gates commission and others reply that with adequate pay and other benefits to make military service attractive, enough volunteers will come forward.

I doubt that the number of volunteers would be adequate. But it can be argued that a moderate decline in force levels might enhance rather than endanger national security. There have been instances where commitments were too easily made simply because we seemed to have the available manpower.

The all-volunteer force offers risks but we must give it a try.

TYSON'S DAY-CARE CENTER

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, in Arkansas, we are particularly proud of the initiative and self-reliance displayed by our industries. One of these is Tyson's Foods of Springdale, a major producer of chickens, and an employer of literally hundreds of residents of north-west Arkansas.

Many women, including a large number of mothers, find employment at Tyson's. For these working mothers there is a problem of child care. To meet that problem in a modern and progressive manner Tyson's is constructing, without Federal assistance, its own child day-care center.

I commend to my colleagues a report of this most praiseworthy project as carried in a recent issue of the Arkansas Poultry Times:

TYSON'S TO ESTABLISH CHILD DAY CARE CENTER

Baby sitting as a major subject for an industrial executive meeting may sound like something for the "birds", but that happens to be the case at Tyson's Foods, a major producer of birds (chickens).

Tyson's is going into the "baby sitting" level, as a modern Child Development Day Care Center for pre-school age children is being established at Springdale.

Pioneering in a new field of endeavor for industry in this area, plans originally were merely to provide a baby sitting service. However, Company executives decided to make the project serve a dual purpose—not only providing a place for the mothers to bring their children while at work, but to make it a community-related improvement project from the standpoint of pre-primary education for the youngsters.

The project, one of the few of its kind in the United States, is under the jurisdiction of H. D. Baird, Vice President of Industrial Relations. A steering committee was established to formulate plans and to develop a curriculum for the center.

Members of the Committee include Dr. Irvin Ramsey, head of the Early Childhood Development at the University of Arkansas, who will be assisted by Dr. Barbara Chessner of the Early Childhood Development at the U of A; Mrs. Sarah Burnside of the Northwest Arkansas Child Development Center; Mrs. Irene Burt, kindergarten teacher at the U of A, and Mrs. Bonnie Whitmore, graduate student in early Childhood Development at the U of A.

Baird said the new facility, modern in every respect, will accommodate 50 children.

Among its outstanding features will be the elimination for interior walls in the classroom area, having been patterned after the modernistic Butterfield Elementary School in the area. Plans call for the three separate classes.

The concrete block building, 64 feet by 48 feet, has been so designed for possible expansion to double the accommodations to 100 should the need arise, Baird explained. The required 35 square foot per child will be provided.

The facility also will include a reception area, director's office, dispensary, kitchen to serve two meals daily, and rest rooms.

Although the exact number of staff members has been undetermined, it is anticipated that a minimum of five and possibly six persons will be needed. Plans call for establishing a rotating schedule in order to include children of hatchery employees who start work as early as 5 a.m.

The staff will consist of a qualified preschool educator as the director, three teaching aides to be trained by the directors, and a combination first aid nurse, cook, and teaching aide.

"Any Springdale area child between the ages of two through five is eligible to attend as long as the mother is employed by Tyson's Foods," Baird pointed out.

"Our purpose for the Child Development Day Care Center is to make employment with Tyson's as attractive as possible and is only one of the many major changes and improvements that we have been making in this direction.

"The project will be operated on a non-profit basis. It is the Company's intention to merely ask the participants a nominal fee for the service."

Numerous child day care schools considered successful were observed and studied in making plans for the Company's new center, including the curriculum.

The children of Tyson's working mothers will be taught such things as number concepts, reading readiness, to develop interest in music, literature, arts and science, how to get along with each other, observing rules, sharing, how to play games. The children will be divided into age groups. Regular rest periods will be provided.

Humorously referred to as "Baird's Baby Farm" and "Operation, Diaper", Baird remarked, "It's really hard to believe that baby sitting has been a major topic of discussion for our executive meetings, but it was."

The new facility will be located between Tyson's North Hatchery and Freezer Plant on Randall Road in the northern section of Springdale. A year-round operation, the building will be properly heated and air conditioned and adequate window space will be provided. Playground equipment will be enclosed with a sturdy chain length fence.

Contractor for the project is Whillock Brothers Construction Company for Fayetteville, Ark. Completion is expected in April of this year.

DAYTON BOARD OF EDUCATION HONORED BY NEA'S ASSOCIATION OF CLASSROOM TEACHERS

HON. CHARLES W. WHALEN, JR.

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. WHALEN. Mr. Speaker, the Dayton Board of Education has been selected as the national first place winner of the Thom McAn National School Board Awards by the Association of Classroom Teachers of the National Education Association. The Dayton board was singled out for its leadership excellence in pro-

viding quality education in a school system of over 6,000 but under 70,000 enrollment.

I can wholeheartedly endorse the association's action since for many years I have had the opportunity to work with the board and observe firsthand the innumerable contributions it has made to the educational growth of the Dayton community. It is with great pride and pleasure, therefore, that I bring to the attention of the House this reward which the board has received for one particular effort—its living arts program.

In its national recognition program, the association aptly describes the project which the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare designated the most innovative ESEA title III project in Ohio in 1969. I include at this point in the RECORD the association's citation:

DAYTON BOARD OF EDUCATION DAYTON, OHIO:
NATIONAL FIRST PLACE—SYSTEMS WITH ENROLLMENTS OF OVER 6,000

Believing that the public schools should offer students the opportunity to develop creative as well as academic talent, the Dayton Board of Education initiated a program in the Living Arts. Functioning after school and on Saturdays, the program has involved more than two thousand students and is growing steadily.

Living Arts provides experiences in creative writing, dance, drama, music, and the visual arts. In small classes instructed by specialists, students work in depth in their chosen media. Through round-table discussions they consider the relationships of the arts to man's existence and to one another. Guest professionals in each of the arts share their knowledge and experiences with the young people. The Living Arts staff and guest artists conduct an in-service program for teachers and administrators.

From the time it was first proposed, the Living Arts program received the wholehearted support of the Board of Education. When opponents in the community argued that the program was unnecessary and expensive, Board members gathered support from local educational leaders and state and national officials. By 1969 community acceptance and interest were widespread; in 1970 the Board plans to undertake full financial support of the program. In nominating its Board of Education, the Dayton Classroom Teachers Association stated that this program could not possibly have been successful without the wholehearted commitment and full cooperation of the Board of Education.

Mr. Speaker, I extend my congratulations to the Dayton Board of Education and to all those in the Dayton community who have contributed to the success of this program. I would hope that their efforts will prove to be a model for many school districts throughout the Nation which also desire to provide an outlet for the creative talents of our children.

GREEKS HELP RECLAIM STRIP-MINE DEVASTATION

HON. TIM LEE CARTER
OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. CARTER. Mr. Speaker, on April 11, 1970, the members of Phi Delta Theta fraternity at the University of Kentucky participated in planting several thousand

tree seedlings near Pineville in Bell County, Ky., in an effort to eliminate soil erosion caused by strip mining. This project was part of a nationwide community service day conducted by the respective chapters of Phi Delta Theta.

I, for one, wish to commend their efforts and call to the attention of Members an account of their activities as it appeared in the Kentucky Kernal:

GREEKS HELP RECLAIM STRIP-MINE DEVASTATION

(By Ron Hawkins)

The "exploitation" of Eastern Kentucky was viewed first-hand by members of the Phi Delta Theta fraternity as they planted tree seedlings Saturday on the slope of a 10-year-old strip mine site.

The mine was on the headwaters of the Redbird River, near Pineville, Ky.

Under state laws effective 10 years ago, the strip mine fulfilled its legal reclamation obligation.

But when the fraternity arrived Saturday morning, the site was barren, with only an occasional sprinkling of grass interrupting the coarse uneven slope.

The dusty, dirt road surrounding the mine was cluttered with worn-out automobiles and young, dirty children.

The difference between a fraternity member's life and that of a poor person from Eastern Kentucky impressed several of the Greeks.

Old, weatherbeaten wooden shacks located at the juncture of two slopes were a common sight.

Laurence Holbert, activities director of Phi Delta Theta, arranged the planting of tree seedlings. He said he wanted the fraternity to do something other than "paint the walls in a home for unwed mothers."

During the course of the day, the Greeks managed to plant 2,000 black locusts and 1,000 white pines. Although the number was not as large as forestry officials had hoped, they expressed gratitude for what had been done and the attention it drew to the problem of old strip mines.

A writer for United Press International expressed the opinion that he was glad to see that the fraternity people were "different" from others on campus "who go around carrying placards."

However, Holbert countered this what the fraternity was doing and what the November Vietnam march on Washington attempted were quite similar. He said, "I wish protesters would go out and do something like November in Washington . . . It's good, it's changed things."

Holbert said the fraternity members were "pretty depressed by the shanties and shacks" of the area. He commented that the Greeks were also "awed" by the condition of the land, noting that over 100,000 acres in Kentucky were as barren as the mine they visited Saturday.

The fraternity may try to do something along the lines of strip mine reclamation for their Community Service Day project next year, Holbert said. He added although there was no "personal" gain, it "meant a lot to everybody" to visit and work in the area.

LIEUTENANT TUCK REPORTS

HON. W. C. (DAN) DANIEL
OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. DANIEL of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, the Record-Advertiser, printed at Halifax, Va., in the district which I have the honor to represent, published a letter on

May 14, from Lt. James E. Tuck, Jr. Lieutenant Tuck's letter gives a first-hand account of a subject which has been prominent in the news in recent weeks. Any comment by me would detract from the message which he has so timely brought to the readers of this newspaper. I insert the complete text of his letter in order that others may have an opportunity to read and reflect upon its message.

LT. TUCK EXPLAINS REASONS FOR CAMBODIA—"TO BRING A QUICKER PEACE"

While the leftists and their followers demonstrate and disrupt the educational process at colleges and universities in Virginia and across the nation in protesting the action in Cambodia, a young South Boston serviceman who is actually fighting there "tells it like it is."

In a letter written to this newspaper from Cambodia May 7, Lt. J. E. Tuck Jr. said the United States has been fighting the war in Vietnam without getting at the "real root of the problem—" the sanctuaries and supply points of the enemy in Cambodia.

Lt. Tuck said that it was difficult for him to understand why the American people are so against the movement.

"We could fight this war for ten more years unless we break up these strongholds in Cambodia. This move by President Nixon was one to bring a quicker peace to South Vietnam and to bring our fighting men home."

And speaking of the demonstrators, he said: "If these people would stand up, take pride in their country and back our President, this war would be brought to a much quicker end."

The complete text of his letter follows:

I write this letter in hopes that I can help give the people back in South Boston a better outlook on the American operation into Cambodia. I am presently with the 2/47th Inf. 3rd Brigade 9th Division. We are working about seven miles inside the Cambodian border around the village of Memut.

The United States has tried to fight a war in South Vietnam without getting to the real root of the problem. We have fought the N.V.A. in South Vietnam, but let them keep their sanctuaries and resupply points untouched in Cambodia.

As we crossed the border, we found many regimental size base camps only a few hundred meters across the border.

The American people are so against this movement that it is very hard for me to understand. We could fight this war for ten more years unless we break up these strongholds in Cambodia. This move by President Nixon was one to bring a quicker peace to South Vietnam and also to bring our fighting men home.

The people condemn everything about Vietnam. If they would back our efforts and men in this struggle it would make a great difference. As we fight this war from day to day all we read in the newspapers is anti-war demonstrations and marches for peace. If these people would stand up, take pride in this country and back our President, this war would be brought to a much quicker end.

The question is not if we should be in Vietnam because we are already there. The question the people should be asking is how can I help in the war effort and the effort to get our men home? One way not to help is to demonstrate and condemn our President.

If these people think that the situation in this country is so bad then maybe they should leave. A man that doesn't believe in his country and doesn't heed the call of our armed forces shouldn't be allowed to be a citizen of this great country.

The men that fight and serve in Vietnam are proud. These men are sick of hearing about demonstrations and peace marches.

These men want support from home and they rightly deserve this support.

As for my personal opinion, I think this was the greatest step Mr. Nixon could have made. My tour in Vietnam is almost over, but I would like to say that I am proud I got a chance to serve my country and represent South Boston in the war effort.

Yours truly,

Lt. J. E. TUCK, Jr.

NATIONAL SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, today marks the first day of Small Business Week, and I want to join with others in paying tribute to our Nation's 5 million small businessmen—the foundation of our competitive free enterprise system.

In this age of giantism and economic concentration, the mission of small business in our economy was never more important.

Chain stores, joint ventures, exodus to suburbia, urban renewal dislocations, discount houses, big business shopping centers, automation, electronic computers, and the general trend toward giantism remind us that the competitive status of the small business segment of our economy must be constantly observed in order to maintain a truly competitive free enterprise system.

Our independent small businessmen are a viable and strong force in the preservation of our democratic system of government and our great free enterprise system.

The strength and vigor of the small business sector of our economy is underlined in these statistics:

Small business provides 37 percent of our total gross national product.

Small business provides more than 40 percent of U.S. employment.

The members of the House Small Business Committee and the staff are diligent in serving American small business.

The committee has provided assistance in the securing of thousands of loans to small business and in the securing of contracts involving thousands of dollars in Federal procurement for small businessmen. Provisions like the SBA set-aside program—earmarking contracts for awards to the small business sector—have been sponsored and supported by our committee.

Small business is the door through which Americans who aspire to own and operate their own business can move into our competitive economy.

In carrying out this responsibility the Small Business Committee is following the mandate of the Congress that:

Government should aid, counsel and assist and protect . . . small business concerns in order to preserve free competitive enterprise, to assure that a fair proportion of the total property and services for the Government is placed with small business . . . (and) to maintain and strengthen the overall economy of the nation.

During Small Business Week a number of outstanding events have been scheduled.

The National Advisory Council of the Small Business Administration will meet with SBA officials and members of the House and Senate Small Business Committees this week to discuss small business problems.

A small business subcontracting conference attended by more than 100 representatives of the largest prime contractors will be held.

The Smaller Business Association of New England will make its annual presentation to the House and Senate Small Business Committees this week.

Additional activities emphasizing the importance of our small business to the Nation's economy also will be held.

Again, I want to commend and congratulate the Nation's small businessmen—they deserve the commendation and congratulations of the Congress and the Nation for their important and vital role in promoting, perpetuating, and preserving the small business sector of our economy and our great free enterprise system.

THE NIXON CHOICE

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I wish to include in the RECORD at this point the May 2 editorial from the Sheboygan Press, one of the outstanding papers in my district. The editorial, entitled "The Nixon Choice," deals with the President's decision to act against the North Vietnamese sanctuaries in Cambodia.

As the editorial notes, the President really had no other choice if he was to fulfill his commitment to end the Vietnam War. He went directly "to the heart of the trouble—the illegally dug-in military headquarters of North Vietnam in Cambodia." While there are those who are unwilling to believe the President when he says he will withdraw the troops from Cambodia by the end of June, I for one am willing to trust him.

The editorial follows:

THE NIXON CHOICE

President Nixon, in his Thursday evening address on Cambodia, said that he had three choices. He could do nothing; he could extend massive aid to Cambodia or he could go to the heart of the trouble. He chose to go to the heart of the trouble, as he saw it, a choice which he granted was very risky from a political standpoint. We have no doubt, however, that as America thinks the chances through, the nation will agree with him in spite of the instantaneous, noisy clamor of opposition.

The President, in reality, didn't have three choices. He had campaigned and was elected on the assurance that he had a way to end the Vietnam war. With the Paris negotiations on dead center, his only way seems to have been the pacification of the countryside, the Vietnamization of the war and the bringing home of the American troops as quickly as

was feasible. Each commitment to bring home more men narrowed the presidential choices, as long as he insisted, as he did again Thursday night, that "We will not be humiliated. We will not be defeated," an insistence on which, we are convinced, he would have the overwhelming backing of the country. The last Nixon announcement of the withdrawal of 150,000 more men by May, 1971, attempted to buy a bit of flexibility. There was no month by month nor other intermediate time table, just 150,000 within a year. Along with the announced pullout, he had given Hanoi another sober warning that he would not allow the remaining troops to be placed in jeopardy.

But Hanoi couldn't wait. They moved thousands of troops into Cambodia, whose neutrality Hanoi had guaranteed. Their military headquarters, from which they fought the Vietnam war, was a scant 35 miles from Saigon, the capital of Vietnam. If one moves the threat from far away Southeast Asia to eastern Wisconsin—what would we of Sheboygan think if our enemy had established his military headquarters in a supposedly neutral area just north of Milwaukee and directed all of his operations from there? Shall we do nothing and let them assail American troops, encamped like sitting ducks? Give aid to Cambodia? We are not engaged in any Cambodian war. The only Nixon concern, the only American concern, was the protection of our troops, the continuance of the pacification and Vietnamization so that our troops could come home in an orderly fashion. So, he had only one choice—to go to the heart of the trouble—the illegally dug-in military headquarters of North Vietnam in Cambodia.

Granted—it is a risky decision, not only politically, as the President stressed, but also militarily. If it succeeds, if the enemy is brought to the peace table and actual hostilities cease a bit earlier, it will be a fine political success. But there are no military guarantees, as other nations and other American presidents have found out before Mr. Nixon.

We agree with Mr. Nixon that diplomacy seems to be a complete failure. We agree with his continuing stand—the stand of John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson, by the way—"We will be patient in working for peace; we will be conciliatory at the conference table." We also agree that there comes a time when patience and conciliation seems to be of no avail. It must be admitted by all that so far our willingness to end the bombing of the north and to lower the tempo of the fighting in the south has had no tangible results. It could well be that now is the time to go right to the heart of the trouble and we are willing to trust our Commander-in-Chief.

AMERICA'S CHALLENGE IN THE ENVIRONMENTAL DECADE

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, the ongoing struggle of man against his environment must be brought to an end in the near future or man may eliminate the delicate balance of the environment and humanity with it.

As President Nixon stated in his New Year's day message:

The 1970's must be the years when America pays its debt to the past by reclaiming

the purity of its airs, its waters and our living environment. It is literally now or never.

I have joined in cosponsoring a number of measures proposed in the President's message on the environment. I am glad to report that many of his suggestions for air quality and solid waste disposal have already been acted upon by the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee on which I serve.

The new measures which the Congress will consider this year are a great addition to the legislation we have on the books starting from the Air Pollution Act of 1955 and followed by the Clean Air Act of 1963. The research performed under these laws has served as a guideline for Federal agencies in establishing source-emission limits and air quality standards. Amendments in 1965 and 1966 added funds and specific research tasks.

Of great importance was the authorization of the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare to set national emission standards for motor vehicles. These regulations became effective with the 1968 model year though there have been problems with implementation and enforcement.

The House Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee now has before it a version of the Clean Air Act of 1970 which would embody several Presidential recommendations concerning air quality standards and the regulations of gasoline additives which affect exhaust emissions. Hopefully, the full House of Representatives will have an opportunity to consider this bill in the near future.

In the field of solid waste disposal, the Interstate Committee has also been active. The Solid Waste Disposal Act of 1965 established Federal research and training programs, grant support for demonstration projects, and planning funds for State and local programs. Our committee now has before it a bill which would significantly broaden the scope of these efforts.

In the field of water pollution, Congress acted first in 1948, but this was, admittedly a mild beginning. In 1956, Congress expanded and strengthened the 1948 law by passing the Federal Water Pollution Control Act which for the first time authorized Federal grants for the construction of municipal waste treatment plants.

In 1965 the Water Quality Act amended this law and established the Federal Water Pollution Control Administration which is now under the Department of the Interior.

This agency was authorized to grant funds for research and development in the area of pollution of our waterways and it was commissioned to establish water quality standards for interstate streams and lakes.

Clearly, active Federal involvement in pollution control is not something new. However, this involvement has received vital new stimulus through the strong national leadership provided by President Nixon and others. Some of the highlights of the bills he has proposed, and

which I have cosponsored, would provide for a \$10 billion, 4-year program to bring every community in the Nation up to Federal Water Quality Standards. Under this new legislation, it is estimated that 1,500 new sewage treatment facilities would be constructed. In addition, the funds will help finance the modernization, expansion or upgrading of 2,500 existing waste treatment plants.

Under the President's proposal, a new Environmental Financing Authority would be set up the help provide the market for municipal obligations which would be sold to raise the funds for the local government's portion of the expense of added control facilities. It would be set up as a self-financing institution and would cost Federal taxpayers little or nothing.

Mr. Speaker, there are no easy solutions to the problems of environment maintenance, but we must recognize that the costs for pollution control are, in the long run, less than the costs of a devastated planet. Today we pay the costs of lung disease, crop destruction, and corrosion from air pollution. We pay the costs of dead wildlife, disease among humans, and lack of recreation because of polluted waters.

We must recognize, too, that the out-of-pocket costs will not be small. The only source of these funds is the American citizen. If business bears the cost of certain pollution controls, the consumer must pay in higher prices. If government pays for the equipment, the taxpayer bears the cost. Only if Americans are willing to say, "Yes, we must do it, and we are willing to pay for it," can our Nation move with the necessary speed to solve the growing problems of pollution.

GENERAL ANDERS: IN MEMORIAM

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, last week Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, leader of the Polish army, passed away in London. He was an outstanding military leader and one of the hero figures of World War II. Yet due to the diplomatic decisions over which military leaders have no control, he and his Polish army fought in vain for the restoration of peace and freedom to their country. General Anders is properly eulogized in an editorial in the Chicago Polish American, Saturday, May 16.

GENERAL ANDERS: IN MEMORIAM

This past Tuesday General Anders of World War Two fame died. His family remains in Britain, where they settled with the General after World War Two.

In these times, when the military is feared and even hated in various countries of the world, and sometimes with good reason, we should recall this great Polish General, and do honor to his memory.

General Anders gained world-wide fame as the founder and leader of the Polish Army in the East. During the War years, Anders

went into Russia (at that time an ally) and rescued over forty thousand Poles from the camps of Siberia, where Russians held them captives. He led them to Iraq, where he formed an army out of them which was to be used against the German and Russian foe in the World War. By common consensus it was the sharpest, the best force of Polish soldiers then in existence.

It was General Anders, who, on May 11, 1944, launched the Polish II Corps (the famous Drugi Korpus) against the impenetrable Monte Cassino. It was the Second Corps which planted Polish and British flags atop that monastery.

But after the war was over, and his homeland had not regained her independence, Anders continued fighting for it, doing what he could as a civilian.

General Anders belongs to that invaluable and minutely small group of men in this world who fought for their country with greatest honor not only when hope was at its highest, but also when there was no hope. He belongs to the rank of Polish Generals-statesmen—scholars who understood the golden mean between the need for war and the need for peace. Undoubtedly Polish history and the history of the free world will put him on an equal footing with such great Polish leaders as General Marian Kukiel, General Kazimierz Pulaski, General Thaddeus Kosciuszko, Marshal Pilsudski, and General Kazimierz Sosnkowski.

With the passing of General Anders this past week and the passing of General Sosnkowski not too long ago, as well as with the recent and not-so-recent deaths of many of the valiant leaders who fought for the freedom of Europe and the world, the tangible substance of that era of great international conflict is passing. Our whole attention must now shift from that era of war to our times. We can not but wonder, as we look around us, what did the prodigious effort of those millions of men in World War Two change for the better. More countries are enslaved now than had been before the War. More little wars are raging now than had been going on before the War. More people are hungry now than had been before the war. The danger of the annihilation of mankind is greater now than when Hitler began his invasion of Poland on September 1, 1939.

It is at times such as our own, that we can look back with fond memory on the deeds of such as General Anders, whose efforts produced results, concrete results. Many of those he rescued from the internal cold hell of Siberia are alive today, living in the West. The freedom he gave them they continue to cherish and hold. Monte Cassino today is still free, after General Anders captured it for the Allies when all the other Allied troops: British, French, American and others, could not budge it. General Anders was a man who intuitively knew how to bring back freedom, and retain it where he brought it back. That there would be more men of his genial intuition in this world today.

RESULTS OF PUBLIC OPINION SURVEY IN 21ST TEXAS DISTRICT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent questionnaires to all the people whose names appear on the 1970 voter

registration lists in the district I represent. The number of responses was exceedingly gratifying.

It can be said with assurance that the results represent a fairly accurate cross section of public opinion on the issues covered, and reflects the prevailing views of more than a half million people.

I am indebted to my constituents for making this survey such a success. The returns include thousands of comments on a variety of topics. I shall refer to some of these in a moment.

The questions and the results of the tabulation follow:

1. Vietnam. Which of the following al-

(In percent)

ternatives do you prefer? (Choose a, b, or c).

[In percent]

- | | |
|---|------|
| a. President Nixon's present plan of gradual withdrawal..... | 40.3 |
| b. Immediate, unilateral withdrawal of all U.S. forces..... | 12.1 |
| c. Take necessary steps and strive for decisive military victory..... | 47.6 |

	Yes	No	Undecided		Yes	No	Undecided
2. Labor. Do you favor increasing the minimum wage to \$2 per hour?	32.0	59.7	8.3	14. Welfare. Regardless of how you answered the last question, do you believe the welfare program should be overhauled to assure that only the truly deserving receive help?	97.9	1.9	0.2
3. Labor. Some maintain that labor unions which cover whole industries are in a sense monopolistic, and should come under antitrust laws. Do you agree?	80.6	12.0	7.4	15. Crime. 2 years ago the Federal Government began annual lump-sum contributions to the States to supplement local outlays in the war on crime. President Nixon has requested this be raised to \$426,000,000 per year. Do you favor this program?	72.3	18.5	9.2
4. Labor. Should the Federal Government enact laws to prevent strikes by public employees?	69.8	23.7	6.5	16. Peace Corps. In 1961, the Peace Corps was created, which up to now has cost in excess of \$1,000,000,000. Present budget bureau has requested \$98,000,000 for the next fiscal year. Do you think this program should be continued?	24.6	61.1	14.3
5. Postal. Do you think the Post Office Department should be turned into a public corporation or authority, with power to set rates and postal wages?	40.3	49.0	10.7	17. Poverty. In 1964, the so-called antipoverty (OEO) program was begun, which up to now has cost more than \$8,000,000,000. The President has requested \$2,000,000,000 for OEO during next fiscal year. Do you think this program should be continued?	22.3	64.4	13.3
6. ABM. Based upon what you have heard and read, do you favor the President's limited anti-ballistic missile (ABM) System?	55.2	25.5	19.3	18. Agnew. Do you think Vice President Agnew's criticism of certain news media was justified?	73.6	15.5	10.9
7. Voting age. Should the voting age be reduced to 18?	38.3	56.9	4.8	19. Supreme Court. President Nixon has said he favors appointment of men to Supreme Court who are strict constructionists of the Constitution, and who would give that Court a better balance. Do you subscribe to this concept?	79.5	11.0	9.5
8. Cross-busing. Do you favor cross-busing of school children to achieve a better racial balance?	5.2	93.5	1.3	20. How do you rate President Nixon's overall performance in office?			
9. Pollution. Should we step up Federal spending programs to combat water, air, and noise pollution?	82.9	13.0	4.1	Excellent.....			15.1
10. Space. Do you think the Nation's space program should continue at about the present level (\$4,000,000,000 annually)?	45.4	44.3	10.3	Good.....			40.5
11. Campus disruptions. Should Federal scholarship and loan funds be denied students who take part in unlawful and disruptive campus behavior?	93.9	5.3	.8	Fair.....			34.1
12. Foreign aid. Last year the President recommended \$2,700,000,000 for foreign aid. The Congress appropriated \$1,800,000,000. Do you believe that at least this much reduction should be continued?	87.5	8.7	4.8	Poor.....			10.3
13. Welfare. Do you believe the Federal Government should guarantee an annual income to heads of families whether or not they are working?	4.4	91.8	3.8				

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME

Mr. Speaker, a total of 91.8 percent of my constituents want no part of the guaranteed annual income plan.

The administration's pending welfare reform proposal, which includes a \$1,600 a year guaranteed annual income—plus \$800 in food stamps—for the head of each family of four, was recently approved in the House.

If finally enacted, this scheme would add 3 million families, or 15 million people, including fully employed fathers, to the relief rolls. The added cost would be astronomical.

I am convinced this program would be unfair not only to taxpayers but also to those who presumably would be helped. It would tend to lock the recipient into welfare as a way of life. There are simply too many people in this country who would rather have a handout than a job. And a disservice is rendered when they are encouraged to pursue that course.

One other thing: Once the concept is written into the law, pressures demanding an increase are sure to mount. Already the National Welfare Rights Organization and the radical Americans for Democratic Action—ADA—have demanded that the minimum guarantee be \$5,500 a year, and several Senators have insisted on far more than the \$1,600 base figure.

I have fought this guaranteed income concept for years. It is encouraging to note that a Senate committee, where the House-approved bill is pending, has recently raised serious doubts about the provision.

I recently received a lengthy letter from Gov. Ronald Reagan in which he expressed grave concern about the pend-

ing bill and its probable exorbitant cost. He stated:

My opposition to the Welfare Reform Act stems from a deep, philosophical antipathy toward a government-guaranteed income and increasing federal intervention into state operations . . .

UNIONS SHOULD BE UNDER ANTITRUST LAWS

It will be noted that by a margin of 80.6 percent to 12 percent the people feel that labor unions should be made to conform to antitrust laws now applicable to private corporations and business enterprises.

I strongly support this position. I am convinced it would be best for labor, best for management, and best for the general public.

I introduced a bill on this subject (H.R. 815), which is designed to prevent unions from conspiring to restrain trade. Such concerted actions by unions would become unlawful. In addition, H.R. 815 would put bargaining on an individual union-employer basis, and hopefully end the practice of industrywide bargaining and the resulting nationwide strikes.

Last year the National Federation of Independent Business submitted my bill to the 267,000 who comprise its business membership. A poll revealed that 92 percent of them favored the measure, while only 6 percent opposed it. At least 39 daily newspapers have endorsed the proposal.

The simple fact is that labor unions have grown up. They are now big business. They no longer need to be wet-nursed and coddled. They do not need and should no longer expect special treatment by enjoying exemption from our antimonopoly laws. The public interest must be protected against harm

that comes from conspiracies in restraint of trade, whether it be by big business or big labor.

DAYLIGHT SAVING TIME

A rather large number of constituents expressed opposition to daylight saving time. I share that viewpoint. It should be understood that it is the national policy for each State to determine whether it is to have or not have daylight saving time. The Congress does not legislate on that subject. Each State makes its own decision.

UNLAWFUL STRIKES

By a margin of 3 to 1 the people in the 21st District are opposed to strikes by Government employees. Such strikes are already illegal, as applied to Federal workers. In fact, it is now a felony for anyone employed by Uncle Sam to engage in a strike. The penalty is 1 year in prison and a fine of \$1,000, plus discharge and nonemployment rights for 3 years.

"Public employees," as used in the question, include non-Federal workers such as schoolteachers, firemen, policemen, garbage collectors, and so forth.

Press reports indicate the Department of Justice holds in abeyance prosecution of those who engaged in the recent unlawful postal strike, and also the strike by air controllers who work for FAA.

Several comments asked how many pay raises postal employees have received in recent years. There have been 17 since 1945, plus enactment of some fringe benefits. Those of us who have favored these raises felt they were deserved, to bring the pay more in line with comparable work in private industry.

CAMPUS DISRUPTIONS

Residents of my district—93.9 percent of them—want none of their tax money used for scholarship and loans in behalf of college students who engage in unlawful and disruptive behavior on campuses.

A prohibition against helping such applicants last year accounted for denial to 676 of them.

Campus riots, many of them traceable to leadership by pro-Communist Students for a Democratic Society, have erupted in scores of colleges. Others have been led by anarchists among the Black Panthers. These campus rebellions have included illegal occupation of rooms, destruction of furniture, burning of buildings, blocking of streets, throwing of rocks and bottles at police while the latter were in the line of duty, defiance of established authority, and various forms of malicious mischief.

Most of this form of crime is against local and State laws. So far as I am aware, there has been no rational explanation of why school authorities do not expel the troublemakers.

The vast majority of college students are law abiding and go to college to gain an education. Many students have written me that because of the repeated disruptions the pursuit of their educational goals is in many instances being made most difficult.

CROSS-BUSING

Mr. Speaker, I would hope this administration, particularly Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare Robert Finch, will take note of the fact that 93.5 percent of those in the 21st District of Texas oppose the cross-busing of schoolchildren to achieve a better racial balance.

This unwarranted and oppressive practice was imposed during the preceding administration, and has been continued relentlessly by the HEW, which administers funds for school programs. The Secretary simply withholds funds appropriated for certain school purposes, unless the affected schools comply with his whims about racial mixtures.

Only recently, after the House had approved antibusing riders to the annual HEW appropriation bill, Mr. Finch went before the Senate committee to urge that the nonbusing language be stricken because the amendments "would impede Federal programs."

PRESIDENTIAL PENS

In a lighter vein, a Uvalde housewife inquired about the history of Presidents giving bill-signing pens to the authors of such measures.

That is a current courtesy, as applied to more important legislative enactments. The pens are relatively inexpensive. The Library of Congress informs me the practice probably began during the McKinley administration, and has been done more extensively since the Hoover days.

The pens make interesting souvenirs. I have been given several, including at least three that were presented to me by President Eisenhower when he signed important measures of which I was the author. These included the Amistad Dam legislation and the bill which authorized

the Twin Buttes—Three Rivers—flood control and reclamation project on the Conchos. Another—shared by other Texans—was the tidelands bill which confirmed our title to the submerged gulf area, and has enriched the State school fund tremendously.

PEACE CORPS PROGRESS REPORT

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, although the Peace Corps is not getting as much press as it did in its early days of unfettered idealism and boundless enthusiasm, it continues to grow and mature as an organization and is probably making a greater contribution today than ever before in its history. This is due in large part to the efforts of its new 35-year-old director Joseph Blatchford, a man who organized his own private volunteer agency in Latin America before being appointed Peace Corps Director by President Nixon.

When Joe Blatchford took over the helm of Peace Corps last year he found that the agency had lost much of its early momentum: New ideas and programs were scarce, recruitment had fallen off and foreign requests were also declining. Blatchford immediately formed several task forces to analyze the situation and come up with new ideas, and he embarked on his own world fact-finding tour to examine the situation firsthand. As a result of these studies, comprehensive reforms were undertaken to reshape and revitalize the Peace Corps. These included putting more emphasis on the actual needs and priorities of the host countries as defined by them, recruiting more skilled volunteers as well as more volunteers from American minority groups, and improving efficiency by attracting outstanding business executives with managerial skills.

I want to take this opportunity to commend Mr. Blatchford and his new team at Peace Corps on this new look and new thrust, and I also want to convey the gratitude of the Congress and the American people to the thousands of volunteers who are currently serving throughout the world. At this point in the RECORD I include three recent articles on the Peace Corps:

[From Reader's Digest, May 1970]

A FRESH SPARK PLUG FOR THE PEACE CORPS
(By Blake Clark)

Under the direction of Joe Blatchford, 35, this global operation is regaining its original luster, vigor and drive.

One morning last May, a young man emerged from the Washington, D.C., railroad station, jumped into a cab and said, "Take me to the Peace Corps building, please."

The driver turned around, eyebrows raised. "You kidding?" he asked. "Didn't that outfit disappear long ago?"

The passenger, Joseph H. Blatchford—dynamic, 35, a relative newcomer to Washington—smiled grimly, for the question under-

scored the tough assignment ahead of him. The very next day, President Nixon would announce his appointment as the new director of the Peace Corps. His job: to revitalize that floundering agency, to build it into a new, heads-up team responsive to the changing needs of America's friends around the world.

Later that day, in his office across Lafayette Square from the White House, Blatchford dug into a depressing situation. The number of Peace Corps volunteers was down for the third straight year, to an alltime low. Requests for Corpsmen also were falling off. The organization's Washington headquarters seemed quietly and helplessly to be running down. New programs and new ideas were scarce. It looked as though the Peace Corps, once a shining and idealistic instrument of help and hope, had lost its momentum.

What had gone wrong? Joe Blatchford, youngest agency chief in the Nixon Administration, spent his first six months in office finding out. To begin with, he handpicked 50 Peace Corps staff members, former volunteers, men and women outstanding in various fields—and divided them into small task forces. Their mission: to study the organization's problems, its needs—and its decline—and to come up with recommendations for bringing it back to life. This done, he took off on a first-hand investigation of his own: a flying field trip to Africa and the Middle East.

Interviews with national leaders—from prime ministers to school superintendents in remote areas—got him some of his answers. While acknowledging the good work done by generalist volunteers, African officials wanted more highly skilled, experienced technicians and specialists, so that Peace Corps projects could be integrated into high-priority local development plans. Cabinet ministers in Kenya, for example, asked for experts to help develop their water resources; Libya's Minister of Education wanted professionals in the production and programming of educational television.

Blatchford and his task forces studied the reports, discussed changes, painstakingly redefined the role and the goals of the Peace Corps. By September, they were ready. From 60 nations Blatchford summoned his directors to Washington for a conference. There, in seminars that lasted for five days and nights, he unveiled the ambitious, far-reaching design that he and his task force members had fashioned for the bold new Peace Corps of the '70s.

Record of Accomplishment. The driving force behind the remodeling of the Peace Corps may have been new on the Washington scene, but he had behind him an outstanding record of innovation and accomplishment, particularly in the field of U.S. relations with Latin American nations. The son of a businessman, Joe Blatchford grew up in Los Angeles and enrolled at the University of California at Los Angeles to study political science. He worked his way through becoming president of the senior class and the university's outstanding tennis player. His team won the national collegiate championship three years in a row and he competed at Wimbledon his senior year.

After a year of active duty in the Army, Blatchford got a summer job in the Washington office of Congressman Ralph Gwinn of New York. Working with the Education and Labor Committee whetted the young man's appetite for public service. In the fall, he entered the University of California Law School in Berkeley.

Then came the tumultuous day in May 1958 when an angry mob in Caracas, Venezuela, stoned and spat upon then Vice President Nixon. Joe was shocked that U.S.-Latin relationships were so combustible. He persuaded seven college friends, all musicians, to take a year off and make a good will tour of South America.

With \$15,000 in expense money raised from "corporations, foundations, little old ladies," the group visited 30 cities. In each, Joe challenged the local tennis champion to an exhibition match, which was followed by a modern jazz festival featuring two trombonists and a rhythm section. In this way the young Americans met the people—students, sportsmen, musicians, labor leaders, politicians. They also got a sobering look at South America's appalling slums and poverty.

Returning to Berkeley to finish law school, Blatchford started talking about a community action program for Latin America. He called it ACCION, and persuaded heads of corporations doing business in the sister hemisphere that these poor could be taught to help themselves. In 1960, with \$90,000 raised from 24 private firms, Blatchford took 30 volunteers, most of them college students, to Venezuela. Living among the slum dwellers of Caracas, the volunteers showed them how to organize themselves to do what was needed: to replace uncovered ditches with sewers, to make playgrounds out of littered lots, to set up literacy classes for adults and training courses in the building trades.

Today, a decade later, more than 1000 workers have joined this "private peace corps," backed by contributions of nearly nine million dollars from some 3000 companies. In all, ACCION has carried out 45,000 different self-help projects in Argentina, Peru, Venezuela and Brazil. Most important, the North Americans have now withdrawn, and Latin volunteers, backed mainly by Latin money, are running the show themselves.

Among the first to go to the Caracas barrios, or shantytown slums, was Winifred Marich, a tall, attractive blonde of Yugoslav descent, a graduate of U.C.L.A. who speaks five languages. She later helped set up ACCION in Rio de Janeiro, and there she and Joe were married. Living today in Georgetown, they like discotheques, opera and modern jazz. (Joe plays guitar.) They zoom around Washington on a Yamaha motorcycle, Winnie clinging on from behind, sometimes stopping for Joe to join in a ghetto basketball game incognito. He keeps fit—5 feet 11 inches, 177 pounds—and still plays a fast game of tennis.

WORKER WHO THINKS

When the assembled Peace Corps overseas directors met their new chief last September, some were cool, others skeptical. But they recognized in Blatchford a fellow field man—"not a bureaucrat who thinks he's working," as one of them happily put it, "but a worker who thinks." When their five-day session was over, they were a team again. Here, as they look ahead into the '70s, are their new targets:

Create a needed, lasting resource. The starting point for any Peace Corps program from now on must be a specific need in the country to be served. The receiving nation will identify its own problems and set priorities. Then the Peace Corps and the national representatives will agree on the best contribution that volunteers can make to create a new resource that will remain after the Peace Corps departs.

For example, a unit may help a country start its own volunteer service. Or, volunteers from U.S. farm areas will introduce developing nations to our system of county agents and 4-H Clubs, and train local people who will carry on, expanding and multiplying the benefits. At every level, in fact, local people—their businessmen, students, doctors, tribal leaders, housewives—will be enlisted. Local committees will decide how our volunteers are recruited, selected, trained, placed in the field and supported. Indeed, Blatchford hopes to see the day when half the Peace Corps' overseas staff is made up of local citizens.

Share America's technical know-how. Recruiters are rounding up a larger percentage of highly trained people such as 25-year-old Dick Kirby, a 1966 graduate of Pratt Institute, noted for its industrial engineers. Assigned to city hall in Barcelona, Venezuela, a city of 80,000, Kirby discovered that garbage collection was swallowing up half the budget for municipal services. Getting up at 5 a.m., Kirby rode the trucks, eventually re-routed them to call on 400 customers instead of 120, and brought costs into line. Or such as Francis Wilgen, a 24-year-old agricultural engineer who put into operation, and trained a crew to run, a pasteurization plant providing the inhabitants of Kabul, Afghanistan, with the cleanest, safest milk they ever drank.

Accept a wider variety of volunteers. Doors are now wider open for older people such as Aubrey Foster and his wife, who are at work in the Central American country of Honduras. A Ph.D. with 25 years' experience in plant pathology, Foster is testing vegetable varieties and determining the best methods of fertilizing, watering and cultivating in the Honduran climate. Seeds of varieties proven best will be given to small farmers throughout the country. Mrs. Foster, with three sewing machines donated by CARE, started a sewing class for women and girls in a local church. The children came to play and help with the garden, and soon the project grew into a community center.

Blatchford sees a huge new pool of skilled and professional talent opening up through sabbatical arrangements with corporations and labor unions, which would protect employees against loss of seniority and fringe benefits during their two years with the Peace Corps. The more flexible Corps will also include the doctor who wants to volunteer to spend the summer in an African village, the experienced architect who can donate a few months to a community development project in a Peruvian *barrio*, the dietitian whose teaching would be invaluable in the villages of the Andes, even if she is available only for a short time.

Increase efficiency. Swiftly, authoritatively, Blatchford has tightened administration. Headquarters' costs are already down 20 percent, and red tape is being cut. No more rules that "Peace Corps members can't have children," or that they must be single or have a wife who is also a volunteer—provisions that kept out thousands of good candidates. The formidable 15-page application form, "which only a computer programmer could figure out," has been simplified. More responsibility for recruiting now goes to regional offices, so that recruits will hear in days rather than months whether or not they are accepted. Paper work has been cut by treating the volunteer in the field as a responsible adult who should not be required to itemize bicycle-repair expenses, travel time or dentist bills.

Train foreigners here for service at home. The Peace Corps' work as a catalyst could be speeded up, Blatchford says, by bringing in volunteers from other countries to work on, and observe, U.S. domestic projects. For example, 60 percent of all Latin Americans will soon be living in cities; they need people trained in community action. Many of our cities, in turn—Philadelphia, Baltimore, Los Angeles, New York—need Spanish-speaking teachers. Latin Americans could teach here, and work with members of *vista* (Volunteers in Service to America) in our ghettos, learning to unite a community to solve its problems. Then they would return to set up similar programs at home.

Form a domestic Peace Corps. Why send all our volunteers 5000 miles from home when we have our own shabby ghettos, and our own worn out farm areas? Many Americans, aware of the problems bedeviling their city or country, think, "I'd like to help."

Blatchford looks to the time when every city and town in America will give volunteers an opportunity to do just that—for teachers to lend a hand to youngsters falling behind in their reading, doctors and others to care for the aged and ill, lawyers to protect the poor in the courts and the ignorant from usurious rates of interest, people to help make our streets and homes safer, to help safeguard our environment.

A national survey shows that five million volunteers could be put to work on the urgent needs of our society today. To find and direct the energies of this force, Blatchford would like to see a "White House Volunteer Service." Anyone who has time to give free—three months, a year, two years—could fill out a White House application form, listing his background and qualifications, and then be guided by the Volunteer Service to a spot where his contribution could count.

Thanks to Joe Blatchford, things are looking up for the Peace Corps—and for all Americans interested in making this a better world.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Apr. 27, 1970]

PEACE CORPS RECRUITS BUSINESS EXECUTIVES TO MANAGE PROGRAMS: SOME COMPANIES GIVE LEAVES FOR SERVICE OVERSEAS; PAY RANGE IS \$10,000 TO \$30,000

(By Ronald G. Shafer)

WASHINGTON.—The typical Peace Corpsman is a young idealist fresh out of college, aflame with desire to set the world straight, willing to work for a pittance.

And then there's John Guyer. John Guyer is idealistic enough. But he's 39 years old and a vice president of an investment counseling company. And his new job as a Peace Corpsman pays around \$20,000 a year.

With his company's blessing and two-and-a-half-year leave, Mr. Guyer has left for Bombay to be a regional director of Peace Corps operations in India. He wasn't fed up with his Los Angeles job, but "I've always wanted to go abroad with my family" as well as wanting "in some degree to serve my country." So when Peace Corps Director Joseph Blatchford extended the invitation, it was gratefully accepted.

Mr. Guyer is one of the first recruits in a Nixon Administration search for business executives who might improve the management of the 10,500 Peace Corps volunteers at work in 62 countries. Vacancies are occurring faster than usual on the supervisory staff of 1,350 people at home and abroad because Congress passed a law in 1965 limiting service to five years. As one official puts it, "this is the first year of the five-year flush."

Recruiting middle-aged administrators from the business establishment to fill these slots might alarm the Peace Corps' traditionally youthful and liberal-minded volunteers. Nonetheless, Director Blatchford, 35 years old, who used to operate a private Peace Corps-type service in Venezuela, insists:

"Government and social services tend to bring in people who are very idealistic and highly motivated but who lack management experience. They're good people," but "we need more management ability."

Duties of Peace Corps managers vary widely. One supervisor says she helped set up an accounting system for the finance ministry in Malaysia, for example, while another might administer a volunteer program to improve chicken production and marketing in India.

The executive recruiting is just getting fully under way. So far, the agency has corralled about 15 businessmen, including several vice presidents, from such concerns as Irving Trust Co., IBM, General Foods, Quaker Oats, A. C. Nielsen and Monsanto. The goal is to install businessmen in about 200 of the 350 or so staff openings expected in the next year, says Glenn Randall, director of staff recruitment. The agency also is recruiting

among the professions, labor unions and educational institutions.

Peace Corps representatives are to contact scores of companies during the next few weeks. One "loan-an-executive" pitch will be the possible benefit to a company's own recruiting among college students. Mr. Blatchford explains: "Say Company A went recruiting and said 'Some time in your first 10 years, we'll give you two years off to be a Peace Corps supervisor'. Young people are likely to say, 'That's the company for me' rather than Company B, which emphasizes a pension plan at age 65."

So far, companies contacted have supported the idea, although a few initially were reluctant to part with executive talent. Recruiting top administrative management for the Peace Corps "makes a lot of sense," says George Murphy, chairman of Irving Trust. An executive's experience with the agency "will be of great value to him and to us after he returns to his banking post," Mr. Murphy comments.

The Peace Corps has always had job slots for managers, but few businessmen have joined. There was a mistaken belief, agency officials feel, that the only openings were for young college graduates to serve as volunteers at token pay. "They weren't aware that you don't have to live off the land on a subsistence level," says Charles Bryant, personnel director. "We're talking about staff jobs paying \$10,000 to over \$30,000 a year." And the Peace Corps provides free housing and schooling in the host country.

Some businessmen turned Peace Corpsmen admit to the misconception. "I wasn't aware that staff positions were even available until one day I happened to drop into the Peace Corps office in Washington," says John Mills, formerly development director of Monsanto's international division. Now the 47-year-old executive heads up a new Peace Corps program to train specialists for spot assignments in fields ranging from agriculture to urban planning. Unlike most recruited executives, he doesn't plan to return to his former company.

Many businessmen are attracted by a chance "to get away from the rat race and vent their social consciences," a Peace Corps official says. William Inglis, a former vice president of Irving Trust, says he views the Peace Corps as a way to "make a social commitment—not just a token one part-time, but a 100% commitment." He signed on as director of administration and finance in Washington, a post that he believes also offers opportunities in management that will help his banking career.

The decision can be a tough one. For executives like Mr. Guyer, the Los Angeles investment counselor, it generally means a sharp pay cut. And two and a half years away from their companies could slow their careers. "I lose a lot of ground," Mr. Guyer concedes. He remarks that, when news of his decision got around, "there was a lot of response from my peers. They wanted to do the same thing, but they also had a reluctance to leave careers in midstream."

Executive recruiting is part of the broader effort by the Nixon Administration to attract more older and more skilled volunteers, including blue-collar workers, to the Peace Corps. This approach is already controversial. The agency says a majority of returning volunteers support the shift, but some returnees and ex-staffers complain that it has "turned off" young people previously attracted by the Peace Corps' idealistic image.

[From Business Week, Apr. 13, 1970]

CAN BUSINESS AID THE PEACE CORPS? NIXON TEAM ASKS COMPANIES TO LEND TOP TALENT TO FILL KEY STAFF JOBS

The Peace Corps, once a loose amalgam, of well-intentioned liberals, idealistic youths,

and assorted academicians, has embarked on a controversial plan to make itself more efficient. In the Nixon Administration, that means more businesslike. As a result, the corps is shifting its recruiting thrust away from liberal arts campuses and toward U.S. corporations.

The new recruiting drive is the brainchild of Joseph H. Blatchford, the 35-year-old Californian appointed by President Nixon last year to head the agency. Blatchford will try to lure talented managers away from business to serve short-term volunteer stints as high-level Peace Corps staffers.

This is where the controversy comes in. Critics recall the demise of Operation Tycoon, a program run by the Agency for International Development in the early 1960s to send businessmen overseas. The skeptics claim that Tycoon turned up more duds than economic development, and think the Blatchford plan also is doomed to failure. Newspaper columnist Frank Mankiewicz, a onetime country director for the Peace Corps in Latin America, sums up the doubts of many onlookers who feel that cost accounting and national development do not mix. He characterizes the new recruiting effort as "a disaster."

A new breed. Despite the skepticism, Blatchford is determined to tighten up corps operations with a new breed of managers. To succeed, however, he will have to work fast, because the agency is about to be scoured by a rule that limits service to five years. By October, replacements will be needed for 18 country directors, 12 deputy directors, and 33 associate representatives—all key staff jobs. Country directorships, for example, pay salaries that can exceed \$30,000 a year.

With time running short, Blatchford reorganized his agency and placed Glenn C. Randall, 37, a former track and field star and recruiting director for the U.S. Office of Education, at the helm of a new staff recruiting office. Randall, in turn, set up a computerized "talent bank" designed to match an expected crop of talented managers with staff assignments. In the meantime, the corps is pressing the search for its "supercandidates." Blatchford hopes he can enlist "vice-presidents of corporations, possibly international corporations," for what Randall describes as a team of "practical idealists."

What the Peace Corps has in mind are men like William W. Inglis, 38, one of a wave of former Californians whom Blatchford already has coaxed into service. A financial whiz kid who became an Irving Trust Co. vice-president at 34, Inglis recently took a two-year leave of absence to head the Administration & Finance Dept. of the corps. John D. Guyer, 39, left a Los Angeles post with American Investment Counseling Co. under a similar arrangement and is headed for India this month for a stint as deputy director for the Bombay region.

John E. Mills, 47, who holds a doctorate in economics from Berkeley, came aboard in January from Monsanto Co., where he had been manager of new foreign investment and manufacturing ventures. At the Peace Corps, he became director of program development and will work up binational assistance programs overseas. Another new-wave man is Robert N. Jorgensen, 55, who left a \$40,000 job as president of his Livingston (Mont.) wholesale firm for a \$23,000-a-year staff post in Ghana. Jorgensen now advises entrepreneurs in Accra on small business techniques.

For months, staff recruiter Randall has quietly been meeting with executives at PepsiCo, Quaker Oats Co., Ford Motor Co., and Irving Trust in attempts to snare more socially conscious managers. He wants corporations to channel young executives to the agency for two-year volunteer stints, allowing them to keep their seniority intact. Negotiations also are under way with the International Executive Service Corps, a private

group using AID funds to send retired executives overseas for short-term assignments in developing countries. Blatchford hopes IESC—or, as it is better known, "the Paunch Corps"—will lend his agency a few top men to supervise selected Peace Corps volunteers overseas.

Skepticism. Predictably, the new Peace Corps recruiting effort has met with criticism from some former staff members. Mankiewicz is convinced that Blatchford and his crew of Californians will only serve to "conservatize the Peace Corps." Vernon K. Richey, a former Peace Corps public information specialist, snorts: "There are a lot of good things happening, the work of 'impractical idealists,' and bitterly adds: 'I would hate to see the Peace Corps lie down in the same bed with some of the corporations that have been exploiting Latin America for years.'"

But a former head of the corps' overseas recruiting branch grudgingly concedes that Blatchford's plan is "a good idea." "If Blatchford gets 10 top executives," he says, "that's a quantitative accomplishment, quite different from what has been done before."

Last week the Senate Foreign Relations Committee voted to cut the Peace Corps budget by 10% to \$90 million. But Blatchford insists "we're very optimistic" about the executive recruitment plan. The big question, however, is whether Blatchford will be able to find many of his "visionaries with their feet on the ground" from the business world. In the opinion of one former Peace Corps recruiting chief, he will not. "Corporations," he says, "just don't take their bright young guys and send them to India."

TELEGRAM TO NEW YORK STATE ATTORNEY GENERAL

HON. SEYMOUR HALPERN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. HALPERN. Mr. Speaker, I wish to call my colleagues' attention to the decision last week of the New York State Court of Appeals, refusing to allow graduating law students of both New York State and other law schools the option of waiving their final examinations.

In the light of our country's crisis, and these students' deep commitment to let their views be heard, I sent a telegram last week to Attorney General Louis J. Lefkowitz, voicing my objections to this ruling. I applaud the efforts of these young adults, who have dedicated themselves to legitimate means of working within the constitutional framework of our Government, and I take this opportunity to lend my voice in their support. Following is the text of the wire:

MAY 15, 1970.

HON. LOUIS J. LEFKOWITZ,
Attorney General, State Office Building,
New York, N.Y.:

I urge you to have Court of Appeals reconsider decision of May 12th and allow graduating law students to waive final classroom activity and exams and be permitted to take bar examination. The climactic events of the past few weeks have polarized these students to set priorities, with their country first, and they have dedicated themselves to dramatic and committed efforts in voicing their dissent. I support their efforts and implore you to have the Court of Appeals reappraise their findings.

Congressman SEYMOUR HALPERN.

PEACE CORPS AS INTERNATIONAL
PEACE-KEEPING FORCE

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the U.S. Peace Corps, because of the extremely controversial and undesirable behavior of its members, continues to deteriorate with "emerging nations."

The United Nations Organization continues seeking a peacekeeping force, a reconstruction-type army of occupation, to draw the first violence and bullets—in case of "nonviolent" cultural and ethnic dissent from those who resist internationalization.

A perfect merger—give the Peace Corps to the United Nations if the U.N. backers will accept it.

Most Peace Corps members are already internationally oriented and as U.N. representatives, instead of Americans, our people would be spared embarrassment and our image abroad improved.

Several related clippings follow:

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1970]

PEACE CORPS TROUBLED IN AFRICA

(By Stanley Meisler)

NAIROBI, KENYA.—Last year, the Somali Army team upset the Peace Corps to win the annual basketball tournament in Mogadishu. Young army officers in the crowd clasped each other. Several wept for joy.

"We have beaten the Peace Corps!" others shouted.

The depth of emotion astonished Peace Corps officials at the tournament.

A few weeks later, the Army took over the government of the Somali Republic. One of the first acts of the new military regime was to oust the Peace Corps and its 60 volunteers.

The story illustrates a surprising tide of resentment in Africa toward volunteers and, in fact, Americans and whites in general, that has made the continent the most troublesome area in the world for the Peace Corps.

In the last few years, the Peace Corps also has been ousted from Mauritania, Gabon, Tanzania and Libya.

It now faces political troubles that threaten its existence in Malawi, Lesotho, Ethiopia and Nigeria.

In a recent interview in Nairobi, Walter Carrington, the director of the Africa region for the Peace Corps, tried to analyze the core of these problems.

"I could generalize and say we have been caught in a general wave of anti-Americanism," he said, "but it's not as simple as that."

"Young Africans often have a resentment against Europeans, against whites, and they resent having to depend on them so much. We're often the most visible evidence. Africans resent us doing a job that they feel they ought to be doing themselves."

Other Americans who know the Peace Corps well, while agreeing with Carrington's analysis, usually add two other reasons for the troubles in Africa:

The programs have been too large. Nigeria and Ethiopia, for instance, had more than 500 volunteers. They became too obvious a target for young Africans resentful of outside help.

The Peace Corps has put too much energy in one kind of work—teaching. Two-thirds of the volunteers in Africa are teachers. It has always been that way.

But a look at the troubles of the Peace Corps in Africa needs perspective. Despite its political woes, the program in Africa is still one of the most important the Peace Corps runs.

At the end of 1969, the Peace Corps still assigned 2,682 of its 9,146 volunteers and trainees to Africa, the same as in years past. Officials insist they still get more requests from governments than they can meet.

While some countries were ousting the Peace Corps, others, like Mali, the Congo and Upper Volta, were asking the Peace Corps to end volunteers for the first time. But the Peace Corps does have troubles in Africa as this brief rundown of some of the sensitive areas shows.

Nigeria—Once the largest program in Africa, with 719 volunteers in 1967, the Peace Corps in Nigeria dwindled after the civil war broke out that year. There are now 66 volunteers, all teachers in the northern states, and the government has not asked for replacements when they leave.

Ethiopia—Volunteer teachers have run into a great deal of abuse from striking, demonstrating students who oppose Emperor Haile Selassie and believe that the U.S. government is the main prop under his regime.

The Peace Corps, which had 565 volunteers in Ethiopia in 1966, shrank to 312 volunteers at the end of 1969.

Tanzania—The last Peace Corps volunteer left Tanzania in November. President Julius Nyerere, according to some observers, had become angry with the United States over the war in Vietnam. In addition, he was trying to fashion a Socialist, agricultural, non-elitist system of education and did not believe Peace Corps volunteers fit in.

Malawi—President Hastings Kamuzu Banda has asked the Peace Corps to leave after its 141 volunteers finish their tours next year. The Peace Corps has long worried Banda, mainly because a number of volunteers tended to sympathize with the young, educated nationalists who oppose him.

Somali Republic—The civilian government of the Somali Republic had asked the Peace Corps to double the number of volunteers there. But, soon after the coup last October, the military rulers, Soviet trained and intensely nationalistic, ordered the 60 volunteers to leave.

Lesotho—At the close of last year, the Peace Corps had 65 volunteers in Lesotho, a tiny enclave caught in the midst of South Africa. The South African government evidently considers them a subversive element in southern Africa and wants them to leave.

Libya—Soon after its coup last September, the new military regime ousted the 143 volunteers in Libya, all teachers of English. This was in line with the new government's policy of discouraging English teaching and encouraging the use of Arabic. But it is likely that the government, intensely nationalist and anti-American, would have pushed out the Peace Corps even if the volunteers had been in some other kind of work.

Mauritania—In June, 1967, after the outbreak of the Arab-Israeli war, Mauritania broke off all diplomatic relations with the United States. The 12 volunteers were withdrawn.

[From the Washington Post, May 17, 1970]

THANT URGES INTERNATIONAL VOLUNTEER
CORPS

UNITED NATIONS.—Creation of an international volunteer corps of 1,300 young people by mid-1971 to work in developing countries has been recommended by Secretary General U Thant.

The recommendation came in a report to the U.N. Economic and Social Council (ECOSOC), which had requested Thant to examine the feasibility of a suggestion originally made by Iran.

Called the United Nations Volunteers, the corps would aim at giving youth a constructive outlet for skills in helping countries which requested assistance in carrying out national development programs. The volunteers also would help train local personnel.

Thant recommended that the corps be created within the U.N. development program headed by Paul G. Hoffman, and that initially its work be confined to U.N.-assisted projects. ECOSOC will consider Thant's report at a meeting in Geneva in July, and will make its own recommendation for approval of the U.N. General Assembly next fall.

Volunteers would have to be over 21 and in good health. They would be asked to sign a pledge of commitment to respect international standards of conduct.

Persons enrolled, who would have to be approved by the countries where they were stationed, would be paid only expenses and pocket money. Countries being assisted would be expected to pay local subsistence costs of \$1,500 to \$3,000 annually per volunteer, although a U.N. trust fund would be set up for contributions to help countries that could not afford to pay local costs.

Under procedures endorsed by Thant, volunteer agencies in various countries would undertake the job of finding candidates for opportunities in participating countries as advertised by the U.N. The volunteer agencies also would pay external costs of recruitment and would provide initial training which would be supplemented by the U.N.

[From the Atlanta Journal and Constitution, May 10, 1970]

GENERATION GAP—U.N. LACKS MEET CASH
FOR YOUTHS

UNITED NATIONS.—Early this year the United Nations set about wooing the youth of the world to prove that on its 25th birthday it wasn't too old to be of use to the coming generation.

It invited youth groups from all nations to send delegates to a world youth assembly here July 9.

But, to its intense embarrassment, the United Nations now finds it can't get governments to donate the relatively modest \$700,000 it had budgeted for the parley. Only about \$30,000 has been contributed in the past three months—less than 5 per cent of the budgeted total.

Delegates from several of the big powers admit privately that their governments are not very enthusiastic about the assembly. With big governments hanging back, non-governmental donors are doing likewise.

U.N. Secretary General U Thant has tried to shame governments, businesses, foundations and corporations into doing something to rescue the foundering assembly.

He said that if the money could not be collected the United Nations would have to cancel the nine-day youth meeting.

Such a cancellation, Thant asserted, would be "likely to affect the relations between generations for a long time to come."

Mike Cavitt, a young Kansas Republican who is serving as organizer for some 43 U.S. youth groups now selecting the American delegation to the U.N. parley, was more blunt than Thant about the youth assembly fund shortage.

"We narrowed our applicants from 250 to 28 last weekend," he reported, "by next week we will have our five delegates and five alternates picked. We've spent a lot of time and effort on this. If the assembly fails because of lack of money, you can be sure that a lot of youth organizations usually thought of as 'safe' or 'square' are going to be very, very disappointed."

The Nixon administration appears to be of two minds about the U.N. gathering.

On one hand, the State Department has approved a liberal policy to supply 30-day

C-2 visas to all participants. That means that youths from such unrecognized lands as Communist China, North Vietnam, North Korea and East Germany will be eligible to tour any part of the United States without restriction for about three weeks following the youth assembly.

On the other hand, the U.S. government so far has turned down pleas from some American youth groups that it donate some or all of the \$150,000 it has earmarked for hosting selected youth delegates on cross-country tours after the July parley closes.

ADDRESS OF HON. EUGENE T. ROSSIDES

HON. J. WILLIAM STANTON

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, I commend to my colleagues attention the recent address by the Honorable Eugene T. Rossides, Assistant Secretary of the Treasury for Enforcement and Operations, on the Nixon administration's reform program to combat the illegal use of secret foreign bank accounts.

As H.R. 15073, the bank records and foreign transactions bill, is before us for consideration this week, I think my colleagues will find Mr. Rossides' comments extremely enlightening.

The address follows:

REMARKS OF THE HONORABLE EUGENE T. ROSSIDES, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE TREASURY FOR ENFORCEMENT AND OPERATIONS BEFORE THE EIGHTY-NINTH ANNUAL BANQUET OF THE PHI DELTA PHI OF COLUMBIA LAW SCHOOL

Tonight I want to discuss with you the Nixon Administration's reform program to combat the use of secret foreign bank accounts by organized crime and white collar crime to violate U.S. tax and other laws.

When this Administration took office, it decided to do something about this problem. We point out with pride that this is the first Administration seriously to study the matter and recommend action designed for correction of this long-standing problem area. We take further pride in the fact that the Treasury is in the forefront of this effort. Treasury organized a Task Force to attack the problem on a concerted basis. It is the first of its kind of which we are aware.

Our overall aim is to build a system to deter and to prevent the use of secret foreign bank accounts for tax fraud, their use to screen from view a wide variety of criminally related financial activities, and their use to conceal and cleanse criminal wealth. Our immediate aim is to combat organized crime and white collar crime in their use of foreign banks to achieve criminal objectives.

This Administration recognizes the widespread moral decay that would result if these practices are permitted to continue and expand. We are determined to do something about them.

The Administration has acted in four interrelated areas:

First: The development of solutions has been elevated from an ad hoc case-by-case approach to the foreign policy level. Treaty discussions have been undertaken with the Swiss authorities and we are in the process of contacting other governments.

Second: The Treasury is carrying out a comprehensive administrative review of current procedures and an analysis of what further can be done under existing statutory authority.

Third: The Treasury has made, on behalf of the Administration, certain legislative proposals regarding this problem.

Fourth: The Treasury is working with the private sector to develop cooperative measures against this illegal activity.

Before discussing our actions in these four areas, I must emphasize three fundamental concerns that predominate in formulating Treasury's enforcement approach to this problem.

First, the United States dollar is the principal reserve and transactions currency of the world. Foreign holdings of U.S. dollars are huge, amounting to some \$43 billion in liquid form. This fact itself is a mark of the confidence which others have in the political and economic stability of the United States and is a tribute to the success of the international trade and payment system we have been creating—a system of progressively fewer restrictions to the flow of goods and capital. The overwhelming bulk of the rapidly growing volume of international transactions by Americans and foreigners alike are not only legitimate business and personal transactions, but serve the larger interests of the United States in effective monetary arrangements and freely flowing trade and payments. It has, therefore, been of paramount concern to us that the proposals we are making will in no way restrict the regular and efficient flow of domestic and international business, or personal transactions, or diminish the willingness of foreigners to hold and use the U.S. dollar.

The second consideration is that consistent with our determination to deter tax and other evasion by U.S. persons involving foreign financial transactions, we have sought to develop proposals under which the benefits to our tax collections and to our law enforcement objectives exceed the direct and indirect costs which these proposals bring about.

Finally, we have not lost sight of traditional freedoms, many of which are set forth in our Constitution, others which have become identified with our way of life. In strengthening enforcement, we must not jeopardize these principles.

BACKGROUND

Just what is a secret foreign bank account? It is an account maintained in a foreign banking institution in a country which has laws which strictly limit the conditions under which information concerning an account will be made known to governmental authorities.

There is no certainty as to the exact dimension of the use of foreign bank accounts by U.S. citizens and residents, or the number being used for illegal purposes or the size of the tax fraud and other criminal violations shielded by such accounts. Even though the number of persons involved and the amounts of tax fraudulently evaded by these means may be small in comparison to total U.S. taxpayers and tax collections, the principle involved is central to proper tax administration: any tax fraud scheme must be attacked vigorously.

We all have the right to demand that all Americans pay their proper amount of taxes as determined under the revenue laws. If tax fraud fostered through the illegal use of foreign bank accounts is not curbed, our self-assessment system of taxation could be seriously impeded.

Rapid means of international transportation and communication have greatly facilitated the free flow of funds and commerce across what were once thought to be great distances. These technological advances have added to the problem of tax fraud through the use of secret foreign bank accounts.

The anonymity offered by foreign accounts has been used to conceal income made in connection with various crimes that have international features. They include the smuggling of narcotics, black market currency

operations in Southeast Asia, and illegal trading in gold. These illegal undertakings frequently involve tax fraud.

USE BY ORGANIZED CRIME

Racketeer Money: There is strong evidence of a substantial flow of funds from racketeers in this country, particularly those associated with gambling, to certain foreign banks. Some of these funds appear to have been brought back into the U.S. under the guise of loans from foreign sources. This may be providing a substantial source of funds for investment by the criminal element in legitimate business in the U.S.

Money from Narcotics: In March, 1969, Treasury Agents of the Bureau of Customs broke up a major international heroin smuggling scheme by intercepting 115 pounds of heroin in New York City. Cash transfers of this organized crime enterprise were run through secret foreign bank accounts. One of the defendants alone admitted to forwarding half a million dollars from the United States to Geneva.

If adulterated at the usual ratio of five to one, the 115 pounds of pure heroin would have yielded 690 pounds of diluted heroin mixture. It is estimated that one such pound will yield 7,000 one-grain doses. The 690 pounds would have put 4.83 million one-grain doses into the hands of pushers on the streets with a total value of about \$24,000,000 (\$5.00 per dose). I am sure that you can understand why we feel so strongly that something must be done.

USE IN CONNECTION WITH WHITE COLLAR CRIME

Foreign bank accounts are opened to facilitate tax fraud by some people who otherwise appear respectable and law abiding. They are used in an effort to hide unreported income from commercial operations in the United States or income from investments made through a foreign bank.

Personal Accounts: Accounts in foreign banks are used as repositories for money representing income not reported on United States tax returns, much in the same way as bank safety deposit boxes have been used in this country. For information on the existence and nature of the accounts, dependence has been placed upon informants and the subsequent tracing of transactions through banks in this country.

"Arrangements" with Foreign Customers and Suppliers: In some cases, United States taxpayers have arranged with their foreign customers or foreign suppliers for the preparation of false commercial documents overstating amounts received from the United States taxpayers or understating amounts paid to them. The funds placed in the hands of the foreign conspirators as a result of these falsifications are deposited with banks in bank-secrecy countries for the credit of the United States taxpayers.

Transactions in Securities: Taxpayers, by opening accounts with foreign banks and financial institutions, have been able to buy and sell on the United States stock markets without disclosing their interest in, or taxable income from, such transactions.

Let me now turn to the Nixon Administration's reform program.

FOREIGN POLICY—SWISS TREATY NEGOTIATIONS

The recent discussions with Swiss officials have centered upon the development of a proposed mutual assistance treaty to provide information and judicial records, locate witnesses and provide other aid in criminal matters. However, the U.S. and Switzerland already are parties to a convention for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to income taxes which is relevant to bilateral cooperation for obtaining bank records to prosecute tax fraud. Article XVI of this latter treaty provides for the exchange of information for the prevention of fraud or the like in relation to income taxes which are the subject of the convention.

We have only recently become aware that Swiss law makes an important distinction between simple tax evasion and tax fraud, which is an aggravated form of tax evasion. Whereas individuals guilty of simple tax evasion under Swiss law are not considered to have committed "crimes" as we know the term, and thus are not subject to jail sentences, tax fraud in connection with the Swiss federal withholding tax on interest and dividends and the income tax laws of sixteen of the twenty-five Swiss cantons, including the economically more important cantons, is deemed a criminal offense which can result in the imposition of jail sentences and which is handled in criminal rather than administrative proceedings.

This distinction between tax evasion and tax fraud becomes of essential importance because under Swiss law the obligation of a bank to observe secrecy about the affairs of its depositors is superseded by the duty to furnish information, give testimony, or produce documents in criminal proceedings which include tax fraud proceedings.

Speaking on behalf of this Administration, I can assure you that we are actively exploring with the Swiss authorities the obtaining of the same information, including bank records, as can be made available to Swiss authorities.

ADMINISTRATIVE REFORM

I believe that a primary responsibility upon taking office is to determine how current law is being administered and whether administration can be improved. In early 1969, in conjunction with work for discussions with Switzerland, I authorized a review of existing practice and statutory authority to see what improvements and additional action could be taken administratively. It was concluded that much along the following lines could be done to combat this problem even without legislation.

No matter what treaty, legislation, or regulations might be implemented, efficient and effective prosecution of law evaders is an important element in curbing the illegal use of foreign bank accounts. Law enforcement agencies are increasing efforts to uncover individuals who have made illegal use of foreign bank accounts. The new United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York, Whitney N. Seymour, Jr., has been in close contact with key officials in Washington to implement a vigorous attack against individual offenders.

The Internal Revenue Service presently is thoroughly reviewing its operations, including its audit procedures, to develop more effective internal procedures for uncovering cases of tax fraud involving the use of foreign bank accounts, as well as for compiling and constructing solid evidentiary records in these cases. New guidelines are being established to aid Treasury Agents of the Internal Revenue Service in handling investigations of tax payers who employ or are believed to employ secret foreign bank accounts.

New Regulations and Administrative Practices: Another means of attacking the problem under existing law is to implement new effective regulations and administrative practices.

One significant measure that this Administration has already taken under existing authority will be to require on next year's tax return that U.S. citizens, residents, and certain other persons effectively doing business in the United States identify their direct or indirect interests in foreign bank accounts. I believe that this will be an effective deterrent to the use of these accounts to evade taxes, since the failure to reveal the existence of such interests will result in the imposition of criminal penalties apart from those otherwise applicable to the filing of fraudulent tax returns.

In conjunction with this disclosure requirement, this Administration has under consideration a proposal that, pursuant to

regulations, taxpayers with interests in foreign bank accounts be required to maintain specified records of transactions they have with these accounts.

Another related proposal which is being given consideration is that taxpayers who report interests in foreign bank accounts on their tax returns at the same time personally would authorize the foreign financial institutions in which the accounts are maintained to forward any information which might be requested by the U.S. law enforcement officers pursuant to the same legal process required to obtain bank records in the United States.

Still one more area being thoroughly considered by the Treasury Task Force is the extent to which evidentiary presumptions could be implemented through regulations which would make funds flowing through foreign bank accounts be deemed to be untaxed income unless taxpayers provided sufficient information and records to the contrary. This area is very closely related to comparable legislative proposals which I shall mention shortly.

I believe that this recitation of what already has been done by this Administration with respect to administrative measures and regulations, and to further international assistance to curb the illegal uses of foreign bank accounts clearly demonstrates our seriousness of purpose and that we have accomplished more than ever before. Even apart from the legislation on this subject presently before this Congress, administrative action and international cooperation hold promise of substantially curbing the illegal use of these foreign accounts.

LEGISLATION

This is the first Administration in recent history to support the concept of development of effective legislation which would provide valuable additional statutory tools to counter the illegal use of secret bank accounts. In this connection, this Administration has strongly supported the objectives of those aspects of the legislation of the House Banking and Currency Committee chaired by Congressman Wright Patman, H.R. 15073 that are intended to ameliorate this problem. However, in my testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee on March 2, 1970, I pointed out several key changes of H.R. 15073 which were necessary to make it responsive to this problem, only some of which were implemented by the Committee before it reported the bill out at the end of March.

As originally introduced, H.R. 15073 suffered from numerous and obvious shortcomings. In general, it maximized burdens upon the public and the economy while minimizing enforcement effectiveness. More specifically, the bill would have made mandatory the photocopying, at least once and possibly twice, of every check written in the United States—at least 20 billion and possibly 40 billion items annually—and it further would have permitted uninhibited official government rummaging through the records of certain banks without regard for the privacy safeguards provided by established discovery procedures.

We presented to the Committee amendments and, later, a substitute bill. Our proposals would have maximized enforcement and minimized burdens and offered further advantages of brevity, clarity, ease of application and flexibility not shared by H.R. 15073. Our proposals would have strengthened the bill in several ways, including amendments to lessen wasteful and counterproductive recordkeeping, and limit incursions upon the right of privacy.

Those amendments to the Patman legislation suggested by the Treasury, which were accepted, considerably improved H.R. 15073 as it was initially introduced. For example, key amendments of H.R. 15073 broadened recordkeeping requirements to encompass various types of other financial institutions

engaged in international transfers of funds, as well as commercial banks.

In my testimony before the House Banking and Currency Committee on March 2, 1970, I specified records of types of international transfers which the Treasury Department recommended be maintained by these institutions pursuant to regulations issued by the Secretary of the Treasury, for a period of six years. These included records of remittances transferring funds to and from the United States, both records of checks negotiated abroad and foreign credit card purchases in excess of \$1,000, records of foreign checks transmitted abroad for collection, records of foreign drafts, and records of international letters of credit and documentary collections.

I believe that the Committee should have adopted a number of desirable suggestions made by the Treasury which are needed to limit the scope of the legislation to its intended purpose—to assist criminal, tax, and regulatory investigations and proceedings.

The Treasury recommended recordkeeping, reporting and disclosure requirements which would have a high degree of usefulness in criminal, tax, or regulatory investigations, and which were directly related to the problem of the illegal use of secret bank accounts.

It has only recently come to the fore that the legislation is intended to deal not only to some extent with the problem of secret foreign bank accounts, but that a basically separate problem area with which H.R. 15073 also is concerned is the trend on the part of domestic banks not to maintain microfilm records of all checks drawn on them.

The Treasury Department urged amendments that would have limited all recordkeeping and reporting requirements of H.R. 15073 to those which are likely to have a high degree of usefulness in criminal, tax, or regulatory investigations or proceedings.

However, the Committee adopted this significant limitation only in connection with the recordkeeping requirements imposed upon banks and other financial institutions. It failed to accept the same standard with reference to the reporting requirements imposed.

This refusal is significant, especially in view of the growing concern in America over possible incursions by Government into individual privacy. I believe it is generally accepted that the right of privacy is not absolute, but must be balanced against the need for information inherent in the governing process. For example, few of us would quarrel with the need for the Government to require individuals to file tax returns which, to some extent, of course, contain private information. Nevertheless, this right of privacy must be protected against any unnecessary incursions.

However, the reporting requirements of the Patman Committee legislation possibly could result in unnecessary inroads into this right of privacy. For example, consider the requirement of reporting domestic currency transactions in the Patman legislation. An analogy can be made between reporting of such transactions by financial institutions to the Government and searches through the records of these institutions without the transactions of a particular taxpayer in mind.

If such reporting requirements are limited, as the Treasury recommended, to those transactions likely to have a high degree of usefulness in criminal, tax, or regulatory investigations or proceedings, the potential unnecessary incursions on personal privacy would be limited; such might not be the case under the present H.R. 15073 language which permits the requiring of reports of any domestic currency transactions without any comparable limitation.

The Patman Committee testimony indicated that H.R. 15073 would require the

microfilming of at least twenty billion checks per year. There have been conflicting and unsupported views expressed as to the cost of such a requirement, as well as to the additional number of checks which would have to be microfilmed, in addition to those presently being copied. However, there was no substantial testimony indicating that the records of such checks would be of sufficient value to counter the additional record-keeping costs whatever they, in fact, may be. The cost of any burdensome recordkeeping or reporting requirements would be likely to be passed on to the public, including everyone with a checking account.

This apparent willingness of the Committee to enact legislation with only meager study or factual basis is even clearer with respect to Title III of H.R. 15073 which would extend the applicability of margin requirements under section 7 of the Securities Exchange Act to the purchasers of stock as well as to broker-dealers and financial institutions who lend money for that purpose. This significant provision was added to H.R. 15073 only in March, over three months after the original bill was introduced, and was accepted by the Committee without any testimony being presented on it by concerned parties.

One legislative proposal which the Treasury Department has been fully considering (if the remedy, as I discussed earlier, cannot be achieved administratively), which we believe could be of significant assistance in curbing the illegal use of foreign bank accounts, and which would not pose any conflict with a right of personal privacy, is the establishment in the Internal Revenue Code of rebuttable presumptions that U.S. citizens, residents, and certain other taxpayers engaging in certain foreign transactions, and not furnishing upon request adequate information to the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate, are dealing with their own untaxed income. As an alternative proposal, Treasury also has under consideration an excise tax which would be applied in situations where no adequate information of the foreign transactions is provided by the taxpayer.

The presumptions would be in the nature of evidentiary presumptions which could form the basis for a determination of civil tax liability (including interest and penalties) unless the taxpayer establishes by the clear preponderance of the evidence that his untaxed income is not involved.

It is the Government's understanding that most persons who use foreign financial institutions, even in countries where bank secrecy is strictly observed, can themselves obtain full information about their accounts and transactions. Therefore, it is assumed that U.S. taxpayers will be able, without difficulty, to satisfy the Secretary of the Treasury or his delegate as to his foreign transactions so as to avoid the application of either the presumption or excise tax if either is implemented.

COOPERATION OF THE PRIVATE SECTOR

As is true in developing any public policy as expressed by legislation or administrative rule-making, final action is taken only after securing views, information, and—hopefully—cooperation from those sectors that would be primarily affected. In the instant case, in developing a legislative and administrative approach to this problem affecting primarily the financial community, we believed it incumbent upon us to work with representatives of the banking industry, brokerage houses, and other related businesses involved in the transmittal of funds to and from foreign secret bank accounts. As stated in a December 27, 1969, *Washington Post* editorial referring to the Patman bill as originally introduced:

"This is a subject, of course, on which bankers ought to have their say. The strange thing is that they had not been consulted while the bill was being drafted. Though it is

of great importance to curb the misuse of hidden bank accounts abroad, it is equally vital to protect the free flow of international commerce and to avoid the imposition of unnecessary burdens upon the banks."

I would be remiss not to publicly thank these members of the business community for the high level of cooperation we received, and I would especially like to thank the large banks which are members of the New York Clearing House. They provided us with much valuable background information on possible avenues of illicit activities, on foreign banking operations, and they offered many new and constructive suggestions on more effective legislative and administrative approaches that would benefit our enforcement efforts.

Clearing House member banks further indicated that on a voluntary basis, even before any legislative or regulatory action, they will comply with almost all of the record-keeping requirements in connection with international transfers of funds that we desire, which records would, of course, only be available to governmental representatives in accordance with existing discovery procedures. I believe that this spirit of cooperation between the public and private sectors will continue to grow, and that working together we shall effectively meet this priority enforcement problem.

To sum up, the Nixon Administration has acted to attack this critical enforcement problem in four interrelated areas:

First: The development of solutions has been elevated from an ad hoc case-by-case approach to the foreign policy level. Treaty discussions have been undertaken with the Swiss authorities and we are in the process of contacting other governments.

Second: The Treasury is carrying out a comprehensive administrative review of current procedures and an analysis of what further can be done under existing statutory authority.

Third: The Treasury has made, on behalf of the Administration, certain legislative proposals regarding this problem.

Fourth: The Treasury is working with the private sector to develop cooperative measures against this illegal activity.

This is the first Administration to support the development of effective legislation which would provide additional authority to deal with the illegal use of secret foreign bank accounts. My major concern is that the legislation should be responsive to the problem and be limited in scope to its intended purpose—to assist criminal, tax, and regulatory investigations and proceedings. If limited as I have stated, there should be no concern over possible incursions by government into individual privacy.

In closing, I also wish to restate the three fundamental concerns of the Treasury which are foremost in its consideration of this issue:

1. The proposals should in no way restrict the regular and efficient flow of domestic and international business, or personal transactions, or diminish the willingness of foreigners to hold and use U.S. dollars.

2. The proposals should deter tax and other evasion by U.S. persons in such a way that the benefits to law enforcement objectives exceed the direct and indirect costs that the proposals would bring about.

3. In strengthening enforcement, the proposals should not jeopardize traditional American freedoms.

FOR AN ELITE PRESS

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to memorialize

here the achievements of two men who have made distinguished contributions to the political thought of America through their journalistic and scholarly efforts, one as editorial page editor of the *Washington Post*, the other as contributing editor to the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*. I refer, of course, to Philip L. Geyelin of the *Post* and Marquis Childs of the *Dispatch*, recent recipients of the Pulitzer Prize. Geyelin has been editorial page editor of the *Post* since 1967 and is the third person in that position to have received the award. A native of Devon, Pa., a U.S. Marine veteran and Yale alumnus, he was with the *Wall Street Journal* for 24 years prior to joining the *Post*, during which time he took turns as White House correspondent, chief European correspondent, and Vietnam war correspondent. He is widely known for his urbanity and wit. Marquis Childs received the Pulitzer for distinguished commentary during 1969. A native of Clinton, La., with a doctor of letters degree from the University of Wisconsin, his scholarly and journalistic writings from and about Washington have helped shape informed American opinion for nearly two generations. He received the Sigma Delta Chi award for best Washington correspondent in 1944 and has published more than a dozen books of political commentary. These two men are truly a credit to their profession and to the two great newspapers for which they work. If the Vice President had men like these in mind when he spoke of elitism in the press, I say let us be thankful for it and let there be more.

WALTER REUTHER

HON. JAMES C. CORMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 11, 1970

Mr. CORMAN. Mr. Speaker, the death of Walter Reuther, like the death of every great leader, left a void in America that will not easily be filled. He was invaluable to America not only in his work as a labor organizer but in his efforts to bring peace, unity, and justice to all people living on this earth.

Throughout his years working with labor, Reuther directed his efforts toward achieving more than just higher wages and better working conditions. He envisioned a world other men thought was a dream and demonstrated the zeal which was required to make that dream a reality. He firmly believed that the economic needs of workers were tied directly to politics and constantly fought for political and social progress in the United States.

Walter Reuther spent his life battling the evils of poverty, hunger, racism, and war. He contributed greatly and was an inspiration to us all. He equally does not exist, but the values and truth for which he fought live on. The greatest honor we could bestow upon him in death would be to assume the challenge to which he was dedicated—the challenge of seeking new and broader horizons.

THE CHINESE IN HAWAII—AN OUTSTANDING EXAMPLE OF AMERICANIZATION

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, the story of Hawaii Nei is one of a multiracial society which, through the harmonious assimilation of its diverse people and cultures, has achieved the building of our dynamic and progressive 50th State.

The people of Hawaii are justly proud that their State is a melting pot for people of many different backgrounds, and that the sympathetic climate of understanding between the various races has resulted in the advancement of all.

This is nowhere better illustrated than by the example of the Chinese in Hawaii. In a recent article for the Honolulu Advertiser, staff writer Rebekah Luke gave a most interesting and informative commentary on why Honolulu is regarded as the U.S. community in which this ethnic minority has achieved the most. She pointed out that, while comprising only 5 percent of the total population, the median income of Chinese families on Oahu for the period 1964-66 was the highest of all races. During the same period it is also significant to note that 26.7 percent of the Oahu Chinese 25 years of age and older completed one or more years of college. Rebekah Luke attributed the high measure of success of the Chinese Americans in Hawaii to "good mixing, or integration," and noted that they were scattered and intermingled throughout the community with other races.

The article made mention of a recent feature in Newsweek magazine which outlined the turmoil being experienced in the Chinatown ghettos of San Francisco. I too read the Newsweek article and was deeply concerned to note the problems being experienced in that community, for, as John Donne wrote:

No man is an island, entire of itself; every man is a piece of the continent, a part of the main . . . because I am involved in mankind.

As we seek to remove social and legal barriers imposing segregation upon any racial group, I believe my colleagues and others will find the Island State a model in race relations. It is hoped that other communities may follow Hawaii's example to achieve that harmonious integration of races which has proved to be so significant to the progress of our young State and its people.

I am pleased to take this opportunity to salute the Americans of Chinese ancestry and congratulate them upon the contributions they have made to our way of life in Hawaii. I wish also to commend the efforts of the Chinese community as it continues to set high standards of citizenship for our State and the Nation.

The article, "Chinese in Hawaii: Integrated, Content," from the April 11, 1970 issue of the Honolulu Advertiser, follows for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

CHINESE IN HAWAII: INTEGRATED, CONTENT (By Rebekah Luke)

Good mixing, or integration, is why Oahu's Americans of Chinese ancestry don't have the problems the Chinese in San Francisco Chinatown have.

And if things continue as they have in the past, the situation seems likely to stay that way.

The Chinese here are scattered throughout the population in a situation unlike that described in a recent Newsweek article which cited poverty, lack of education, high unemployment, high density, suicide and substandard housing for people in San Francisco Chinatown.

The article stated how the Chinese youth are rebelling in a radical and even militant way. No longer will they stand for the "Chinified" ways of their elders nor remain oppressed by whites who won't let them get work outside the ghetto.

Hawaii's Chinese have long been in a different situation. They came earlier, for different reasons and into a different society—an integrated and more relaxed society.

A quick look and comparison of Chinese people in both cities starts to explain the two worlds.

The idea is that Honolulu is more Westernized. Newsweek reporter Min Yee called it being "whitewashed." Here, the general feeling is that Hawaii Chinese nowadays don't really think of themselves as being Chinese. It has also been observed that Honolulu is the U.S. community in which the Chinese have achieved the most.

Here is a hurried profile sketch:

The Chinese first came to Hawaii in 1789 as common laborers. Most of the other races initially came to the Islands for the same reason, and many intermarried. The San Francisco Chinese first arrived in California during the mid-1800s to labor on the transcontinental railroad and later settled in the Gateway City.

Since then, Chinese have emigrated from China, bypassing Hawaii. It is said that chances for immigrant Chinese to succeed are greater in San Francisco. Newsweek reported that 33,000 new immigrants have poured into the ghettos since 1965 when immigration quotas were abolished.

There are 40,000 Chinese in Hawaii, as of 1966, who make up around 5 per cent of the total population. This number is scattered and intermingled throughout the community with other races. San Francisco Chinese "stick together more," and because they stick together more, they can get by without learning English.

By contrast, not many Hawaii Chinese live in Chinatown proper, nor do they clump together in any other single environment. Chinatown is not an actual residential district. The New China Daily Press here has a circulation of 9,000, but it is getting more and more difficult to find Chinese people who can speak Chinese.

The crime rate for Hawaii Chinese is relatively low. But "Chinese morality in San Francisco is hard to control," said Ka-kim Cheung, a refugee from Canton now attending the University of Hawaii.

Cheung has experienced the life of both Chinese communities. He said the San Francisco Chinatown neighborhood includes lower-class nightclubs and the underground world. "They are not learning the good things about America," Cheung said.

There are still Chinese schools in Hawaii, but students learn mostly the language and rarely attend after they are 14 or 15 years old. In San Francisco, the children generally do not lose the interest that early.

26.7 percent of Oahu Chinese 25 years old and over during 1964-66 completed one or more years of college. (From "Modern Hawaii: Perspectives on the Hawaiian Community,"

edited by Andrew W. Lind, Nov. 1967). They were second to the Caucasian group which had 45.2 per cent.

In contrast, two-thirds of the adults in San Francisco Chinatown have less than a seventh-grade education, Newsweek reported.

The median income of Chinese families on Oahu for 1964-1966 was \$9,372, the highest for all races. Newsweek reported of San Francisco Chinatown, "One-third of the families earn less than the Federal poverty level."

State Statistician Robert C. Schmitt commented on home ownership in a November, 1967, report entitled "Shifting Occupational and Class Structures: 1930-1966":

"Chinese are unusual in this respect. They have by far the highest home ownership rate and the lowest income-rent ratio on Oahu. I don't know about the other Islands, but most Chinese live on Oahu. This means that virtually all Chinese own their own homes and those that don't are paying the minimum."

Hawaii is witness to intermarriage, children go to school with other races from the very start, and generally Chinese stress education.

"The Chinese are very shrewd in business, and when they thought Hawaii's schools not good enough for their children, they could afford to send their children abroad to Mainland schools where they were integrated even more," Chung pointed out.

In his report, Schmitt put forth today's situation in a nutshell:

"I am sure that today no one would feel that the Chinese, for example, are in a subordinate position. Most Chinese are now Hawaii-born, high in professional, governmental and technical jobs and frequently big businessmen. Groups other than the Chinese have also done quite well . . ."

DISSENT AND THE CAMPUS

HON. ELMFORD A. CEDERBERG

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. CEDERBERG. Mr. Speaker, during the past 2 weeks university students across the Nation have used legitimate methods of protest to express dissent with the policies of the President with regard to the Vietnam conflict. Most of these students have expressed themselves peacefully, both in large groups and as individuals in the Halls of Congress.

Some, however, seem to think that their right to express dissent empowers them to deny rights to other people. Just a few miles from this great Capitol we know how a few students contrived to deny the citizens of Maryland the use of one of the main trunklines into Washington. One would have hoped that the toleration of the first incident would have allowed sufficient vent to dissenters to avoid further denials of the rights of other citizens. But that was not to be and, when the law was finally applied, the initial barrage of bottles and stones from the dissenters sent a dozen law enforcement officers to the hospital.

And along these lines I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues an article on dissent which appeared in the Star. Much has been written about the demonstrations which have taken place over the past few months here and elsewhere. Most of the news reports

have gone out of their way to "congratulate" the dissenters—where applicable—on their "peacefulness" or "law abiding" activity. It seems strange to me to go out of our way to make a point about how nice people are for obeying the law. That is what the law is for—it protects the rights of all citizens and I do not think that it is necessary to congratulate people for doing what is right.

I include in the RECORD Mr. Kilpatrick's article for the attention of my colleagues:

[From the Evening Star, May 14, 1970]

BEING PEACEFUL IS DUTY, NOT
ACHIEVEMENT

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

Once more we are being exhorted by the Washington Post, among others, to lower our voices and to keep our dissent planisimo. It is excellent advice, especially for the Washington Post, but in the context of these "student demonstrations," the advice can be taken only to a point.

On the record of its performance since the Nixon administration came to office, the Post is not likely to heed its own counsel at all. For the past 16 months, the Post has been snarling at the President, howling at him, and hurling invective upon him not by the ounce or by the pound, but by the ton.

It is in fact a brilliant paper, but if you are a conservative, and incline toward the Nixon administration, you feel like a pin boy in an old-fashioned bowling hall. Every day is crash, bang, zowie—duck—and set 'em up again in the other alley. This is the outfit that now is hollering at everyone to quiet things down.

Okay. But before the Post put on its choir boy face last week, its verbal gun-slingers were blasting the President on this matter of "bums." The record ought to be kept straight; and we ought not, in the name of sweet conciliation, to retreat one inch from ugly reality.

In his impromptu chat at the Pentagon on May 1, Mr. Nixon expressed his scorn for "these bums blowing up the campuses." The Post chose to infer that the President had lumped all dissenting students into a pile labeled "bums." Bosh.

Let us draw a few distinctions. The great bulk of the 80,000 young people who came to Washington this past weekend were engaged in precisely the kind of dissent that has to be accepted as part of a free society.

Their speech was free speech; their placards and banners were manifestations of free press; and their presence in the Ellipse was fully in keeping with "the right of the people to peaceably assemble, and to petition the government for a redress of grievances." All this was fine.

But it is an odd sense of values that heaps adulation on the 98 or 99 per cent because they were orderly. There is no greater insult, the elder Dumas once remarked, than to praise a man for doing his duty. Let us not get so overcome with psalm-singing, pianissimo, that we seem to condone or to minimize the outrages perpetrated by the bums.

Thus, when I am told to marvel at the gentleness of these visitors, I will speak a word for Pvt. Charles Robzak of the Park Police; he tangled with a broken wine bottle and wound up with 56 stitches in his arm.

When I am lectured on the "intelligence" and "concern" of the demonstrators, I will insert a couple of footnotes. Thousands of these flower children, lapsing into mob obscenity, joined publicly in a gutter chant against the President. A few of them re-

sponded to Nixon's effort at conciliation by waving Nazi banners. Some demonstrated their intelligence by stripping naked.

Nonviolent? Some of the bums went on an orgy of window smashing up at Dupont Circle. Others threw stones and bottles at police. An unidentified visitor voiced his dissent by leaving a charge of dynamite at the National Guard Association. Seventy large plate glass windows were destroyed.

I cite random examples only. Surely, let us calmly acknowledge the good behavior of the 98 percent. But we do a disservice to the truth by papering over the acts of the hard-core few who are pigs, punks, barbarians and bums. Against these destroyers, the contempt of a nation must keep coming through, loud and clear.

Along the same lines the Washington Evening Star on Saturday, May 16, 1970, published a column by Mr. Jenkin Lloyd Jones describing what I consider to be an absolutely deplorable condition which arose on the campus of a great university in my home State of Michigan. At this great institution a handful of students closed a classroom building while the administration of the university took no action to prevent this flagrant abuse of the rights of other students. I submit that it is this type of lack of action which is contributing in great measure to the continued disruption of our academic and governmental institutions across the Nation.

I do not for a moment intend to give the impression that I would deny anyone the right to dissent. As a matter of fact I believe that those who do disagree with policies put forth by Government leaders should make their concern known. And they should be heard. They have a right to an honest and forthright discussion of their views with responsible Government officials. But they do not have the right to in any way interfere with the operation of a university or the right of other students to go about the business of education, or the right of Government to continue to function.

I submit the account of Mr. Jones to my colleagues for their consideration:

[From the Evening Star, May 16, 1970]

WHEN A UNIVERSITY GOES CROOKED

(By Jenkin Lloyd Jones)

What happens when a college quits searching for objective truth and begins to crawl before bullies?

It gets out of the education business, that's what. And instead of being the enlarger of human wisdom and the extender of human freedom it betrays those in high and low estate who have believed in it and supported it.

A few weeks ago Prof. Gardner Ackley, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers and ex-ambassador to Italy, laid it on the line before the literature, arts and sciences faculty of the University of Michigan.

He bluntly said that that great university is being destroyed by the actions of its administration. Any cause, theory or ideology, he charged, becomes "truth" at Ann Arbor in direct proportion to the willingness of its proponents to disrupt the university.

Ackley outlined the lessons of the last year:

"That violence either cannot or will not be punished by the university.

"That the big lie, loudly proclaimed, can become truth.

"That the desires of the overwhelming majority of students—who only want to learn—and of the overwhelming majority of the faculty—who only want to teach and investigate—count for little or nothing."

Ackley pointed out that at Michigan during the past year the administration conceded that the SDS, which is dedicated to the destruction of the university, could only be disciplined by the Student Judiciary. This, he maintained, was "like asking the Mafia to investigate organized crime."

Teaching fellows who went on strike were reappointed and student workers who had destroyed university property were hired again.

Said Prof. Ackley:

"Last Wednesday I watched the faculty of my own department, assembled in the chairman's office, consider a demand that all classes in our building be shut down or else! We discussed this while the entrances to the building were sealed, while the halls outside the room were patrolled by men carrying pipes and clubs. We sought guidance from the college, and we were told, 'Do what you think best; you will have no protection.' So we cravenly capitulated. The truth lay in those clubs!"

Perhaps the University of Michigan will continue to be run, not by minds, but by clubs, until the people of Michigan make it plain through the state legislature that that isn't exactly the kind of university they had in mind.

There are only two excuses for a university. One is to find out what is. The other is to find out what works.

Superstition is inferior to knowledge because it ignores both. It imagines that the thunderbolt represents the anger of Jove and that the way to keep it away is to sacrifice a goat.

Knowledge is the business of understanding the true nature of things and through that understanding bending natural laws or inventing workable devices for the service of man. Penicillin was not invented. But its beneficial natural properties were only recently understood. It proved better than a dance in a devil mask or a bag of asafetida because penicillin works.

But consider the truth-seeking condition of Yale this month.

Yale President Kingman Brewster doubted that Black Panthers can get a fair trial anywhere in America. This is a most serious charge. This is tantamount to asserting that justice in America has broken down and that the nation is under lynch law.

And student leaders of the Yale walkout said it was designed "to devote more time to the study and consideration" of the fairness of the trial of Black Panther Bobby Seale for the murder of Alex Rackley.

How do you decide whether a nation is under lynch law? How do you ascertain the guilt or innocence of Bobby Seale? You examine the evidence, not merely in Seale's case but in previous cases involving Panthers. You re-read the "kill the pigs" pamphlets admittedly distributed by the Panthers. You ponder the Panthers who blew themselves up by badly made bombs. You attempt to judge the credibility of state witnesses and the fair application of the rules of evidence.

Did Brewster do this? Did the demonstrating Yale students do this before they closed down the university? Don't be silly. This was an emotional binge in which the American courts were convicted with a shout.

In a few years the end product of feeble college administrations and collegiate storm troopers will be in charge of the judicial processes of America. If they don't learn anything in the meantime, God help the next generation.

THE FUTURE OF AMERICA: A VIEW FROM LONDON

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Anthony Lewis of the New York Times News Service staff in London recently wrote an article published in the Nashville Tennessean concerning the impact of the current unrest in our Nation in historical perspective.

The article expresses deep concern over the continuing polarization of major segments of our society—a concern which many Americans share at this time as our Nation continues to be divided in many dimensions.

Certainly this is a time when conciliation and a unifying influence are needed to heal wounds and bring our Nation together.

In this connection, I include the article from the Nashville Tennessean in the RECORD, because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this vital and important matter.

The article follows:

SOME DISPUTE OVER WHETHER AMERICA IS FINISHED

(By Anthony Lewis)

LONDON.—Judging by the reaction of the educated Briton, the United States faces a crisis of confidence among her friends in Europe. The Cambodian invasion and its consequences have aggravated the long-standing worry that America, in her obsession with Southeast Asia, will forget Europe.

To that has been added a new uneasiness about the predictability and the judgment of the most powerful man in the world, the President.

But the deepest concern, among the many who love the U.S., is with the state of the American people. Again and again the British—in government and out, men and women—mention their fear at what is happening to our society.

Is the turmoil within the U.S. a result of passing trauma, or does it reflect some long-term historical phenomenon? The latter view is taken in a book to be published shortly in New York. "The End of the American Era," by Professor Andrew Hacker of Cornell. It is an apocalyptic work.

According to Hacker, America has begun a period of irreversible decline. It is "about to join other nations which were once prepossessing and are now little more than plots of bounded terrain." Americans still believe in their country's world ascendancy, but that is finished.

The reason is a historical process by which a people grows powerful, then rich, then so selfish that individuals will no longer sacrifice for common concerns. They cease to share ideals and so will not undertake public obligations.

"The American temperament," Hacker says, "has passed the point where self-interest can subordinate itself to citizenship . . . contemporary Americans simply do not want—and will not accept—political leadership that makes more than marginal demands on their emotions or energies. A society so inordinately attached to personal pursuits cannot be expected to renounce them just because social survival demands."

In foreign policy, Hacker sees two choices for the U.S. in future.

One is to go on trying to "impose order in far-flung places of our choosing," using "men and money and materials to compensate for

our declining moral conviction." But failure may frustrate us so much that we hit out wildly, abandoning diplomacy and risking unlimited war.

"The other option," Hacker says, is for a majority of Americans "to admit that our nation is in a state of moral enervation; that we have no more lessons to impart to others; that the way of life we have created has ceased to be a model for people beyond our borders; that we lack the will to carry out a worldwide mission of redemption and reform."

It is an arresting book, full of sharp insights and right in its basic judgment that unwillingness to spend for public needs is a main cause of our social decay. But are American idealism and generosity and public-spiritedness really forever finished? Hacker would doubtless put this down to American optimism, but I think they need not be.

The history of nations does not always show a curve steadily rising and then falling. Other countries have had terrible periods and then recovered. England, for example, bled herself white in the Hundred Years' War in a futile attempt to keep French territory under the crown. And there was the American Revolution.

Correlli Barnett, an English military analyst, drew a parallel in a recent issue of *Horizon* between English feelings over the revolt of the American colonies and ours over Vietnam. George III and Lord North, he wrote, were "no less ironbound in their sense of righteousness about the supremacy of crown and parliament" than American presidents in their commitment to Vietnam.

The British hawks of the day, sounding like a Pentagon briefing, dismissed the American rebels as "contemptible." But gradually British forces got bogged down on an alien continent, and discontent—even riots—flared at home. Anti-war politicians flourished.

At length the British gave up. Their sense of failure was acute. But what happened: Barnett says:

"Once the American war was liquidated, Britain's mood changed with astonishing speed. National hope and self-confidence were reborn. Instead of the decay and disintegration to which men had looked forward, Britain's greatest wealth, greatest power and greatest influence in the world were yet to come."

The parallel is far from exact. The world is an infinitely more dangerous place now than in 1783, and the responsibility of the U.S. infinitely greater than Britain's then. An end of the Vietnam war would still leave America with great social problems. But no one should underestimate the energies that would be released, the hopes reborn, the idealism renewed if we were to get out of Vietnam.

AN OPEN LETTER TO 100 SENATORS

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, in today's Washington Post appears "An Open Letter to 100 Senators" a full page plea that the Senate support President Nixon's efforts to bring a lasting peace to Southeast Asia. The letter, sponsored by the Youth Committee for Peace with Freedoms, praises the President's timetable to end the Vietnamese war and warns of the catastrophic results to be brought by the alternative course of surrender and humiliation. I commend the letter to my colleagues:

AN OPEN LETTER TO 100 SENATORS
YOUTH COMMITTEE FOR PEACE WITH FREEDOM

Washington, D.C.

GENTLEMEN: Over the coming days the Senate of the United States will be passing on two legislative amendments which may be fateful for the future of our country, for the wider cause of freedom, and for the peace of the world.

We take the liberty of addressing this letter to you because as students and young citizens, we are profoundly concerned over the crisis through which our country is passing. It is a crisis which has an internal component and an external component, and the two are clearly interrelated.

Like the students who have come to visit your offices, by the hundreds and by the thousands, over the past two weeks, we fear that we may lose our country if we fail to pay adequate attention to certain pressing national priorities. But we do not share their well-intentioned isolationism, their apparent belief that they can build a beautiful America even if the rest of the world crumbles around them.

Unlike them, we fear that we can also lose our country—and lose the peace of the world in the process—if we fail in our obligations as the free world's greatest power. Indeed, so strained and delicate is the balance in the field of world affairs that single blunder by our country may be enough to open the way to catastrophe.

We believe that the Senate's passage of the Church-Cooper Amendment and/or of the McGovern-Hatfield Amendment would constitute precisely such a blunder.

The protesters who have come to Washington have argued that the Senate must pass the Church-Cooper Amendment and the Hatfield Amendment because the great majority of our students and the Majority of the American people support them. We think that the premise on which this contention is based is false.

A Gallup Poll taken immediately after the President's speech, showed that two-thirds of those who took a stand supported the President's action in Cambodia. That the President's action is not without important support is also evidenced from the fact that AFL-CIO President George Meany and other leading trade-unionists have also supported the President.

As for the many campus demonstrations and the large number of students who have come to Washington, we note (1) that some 2000 out of 2400 colleges have not taken part in the current protest movement, (2) that strike votes were defeated in a number of colleges and carried only by slender majorities in other colleges, and (3) that substantially more than half of our young people do not go to college and have not been affected by the campus ferment. But even if the protesters were ten times as numerous and ten times as passionate in the advocacy of their cause, this by itself would not constitute a guarantee that they were right. Public opinion can be wrong. Indeed, there have been many occasions in the history of our country and in the history of other countries when courageous leaders have had to stand up against what appeared to be an overwhelming tide of public opinion.

The supreme example of such courage in the history of our own country was provided by President Abraham Lincoln in the latter part of the Civil War. By the middle of 1863 there was growing agitation against the war . . . The people were weary and tired of the inconclusive bloodshed . . . There were violent anti-draft riots in New York, in which scores were shot down . . . Increasingly vicious attacks on the President began to appear in the press . . . Salmon P. Chase resigned from the Lincoln cabinet and struck up an anti-Lincoln alliance which included

congressmen, businessmen, officers and the distinguished editor of the New York Tribune, Horace Greeley . . . In August 1864, the Democratic National Convention adopted a resolution which read: "After four years of failure to restore the Union by the experiment of war . . . justice, humanity, liberty and the public welfare demand that immediate efforts be made for a cessation of hostilities." . . . Lincoln himself was convinced that his administration would not be re-elected. But he persevered in his course because he was convinced of its correctness.

In modern times Winston Churchill provided us with a sublime example of the kind of courage that is willing to swim full against the tide of public opinion. Despite the rise of Hitler, public opinion in Great Britain was predominantly pacifist and, at a later stage pro-appeasement. The spirit of the British campus was reflected in the so-called peace pledge, under which the members of the Oxford Union, by an overwhelming majority, voted to "never again bear arms for King and Country." As Churchill commented: ". . . In Germany, in Russia, in Italy and Japan, the idea of a decadent Britain took deep root and swayed many calculations. Little did the foolish boys who passed the resolution dream that they were destined quite soon to conquer or fall gloriously in the ensuing war, and prove themselves the finest generation ever bred in Britain. Less excuse can be found for their elders, who had no chance of self-repudiation in action."

When Chamberlain returned from Munich with the shameful agreement he had signed with Hitler, there was no question that he had the support of the overwhelming majority of the British people—perhaps more than 90 percent of the people. The verdict of history is now in on the conflict between the Churchillian handful and the tide of British public opinion in the period preceding World War II.

In *Profiles in Courage*, our martyred President, John F. Kennedy, told the stories of a number of American Senators and American Presidents who displayed exemplary fortitude in standing up against misled majorities in Congress or against a misled public opinion. John F. Kennedy had this kind of courage himself, and he had it in abundance.

About the situation and the commitment which the Senate will be discussing over the coming days, President Kennedy had this to say in July of 1963: ". . . To withdraw from that effort (the defense of South Vietnam) would mean a collapse not only in South Vietnam, but Southeast Asia, so we are going to stay there."

This was not an isolated statement, but one in a series of many similar statements, remarkable for their consistency and continuity, going back to 1956.

If President Kennedy were alive today, there can be little question about where he would stand on the Church-Cooper Resolution, or on the McGovern-Hatfield Resolution.

Gentlemen of the Senate! We are young people, but we know enough about the history of appeasement and about the nature of Nature of Nazi and Communist totalitarianism, to be convinced that these two amendments, if they were ever approved by the United States Congress, would spell disaster both at home and abroad—not in decades to come, but in the next few years—perhaps in the immediate future.

For these two amendments are not a formula for peace; they are—we will mince no words about it—a formula for betrayal and capitulation, and for a neo-isolationism so rigid and so blind that it makes the "Fortress America" isolationism of the thirties look like the most radical internationalism in comparison.

The Church-Cooper Amendment not only demands that we get out of Cambodia by July 1; if rigidly interpreted, it would prevent the Administration from giving a single M16 rifle, or even a captured AK47 rifle, to the Cambodian government with which to defend itself against the North Vietnamese Communist aggression. In the eyes of the world it will be interpreted as saying that, so far as the United States Senate is concerned, the Communists can take over wherever they wish in Asia, and we will not lift a finger to assist their victims.

The McGovern-Hatfield Amendment would compound the mischief done by the Cooper-Church Amendment. By calling for the termination of all military activity in Vietnam by the end of 1970 and the withdrawal of all American forces by the end of June 30, 1971, it sets up a timetable whose excessive tempo and absolute rigidity constitute a virtual guarantee of a Communist takeover—not merely in Vietnam but throughout Southeast Asia.

In less than a year's time, the President has withdrawn 115,000 combat forces; and he has pledged the withdrawal of another 150,000 American soldiers over the next 12-month period. While ambitious, the President's timetable gives the South Vietnamese government the time it needs to take over the burden of defense in an organized manner; and it gives Southeast Asia a precious breathing space in which to organize its defenses against the further encroachment of Communist imperialism. *It is a timetable which, if Congress does not undercut it, can bring peace with freedom for Southeast Asia and peace with honor for the United States.*

The debate to date in the Senate has distressed us and made us apprehensive. We know that Senators are weary of the war, as the American people are, and that they would like to see it terminated as soon as possible. But we cannot help wondering whether those Senators who support these two amendments out of a sincere desire for peace realize that the manner in which we withdraw from Vietnam is all-important—that, if we withdraw with honor, we withdraw with credibility, whereas if we withdraw in humiliation and defeat there will be nothing left of our credibility.

More than one authority has made the point that it is American credibility that preserves the peace of the world. For if a time ever arrives when our allies and friends feel that they no longer trust us, and when our enemies have come to regard us as a paralyzed giant or a paper tiger, World War III would become a serious possibility. Perhaps the first point of testing would be the Middle East, where the Soviets might react to an American defeat in Southeast Asia by intervening openly to crush Israel and impose its empire throughout the Arab lands, all the way from the Indian Ocean to Gibraltar.

We also wonder whether the Senators who support the amendments truly believe that a withdrawal in defeat from Vietnam would usher in a new era of domestic tranquility? We wonder whether they are not, at least, worried that the President might be right when he warned that such a humiliation, would produce a far more dangerous polarization in our society than the one we confront today.

Perhaps it would be better if the President had acted in greater consultation with Congress. Perhaps it would be better if there were a clearer delineation of the powers of the President and the role of Congress in the field of foreign affairs. But are the Senators who sponsor the pending amendments not at least concerned that their proposal seriously undercuts the President's authority as Commander-in-Chief at a critical juncture; that it creates a spectacle of division that can only delight and embolden our enemies; that if they push their contest with the President

to its logical conclusion, they will stand responsible before history for the shattering defeat which is bound to result, and for all the tragic consequences that will flow from it?

We appeal to those Senators who have supported the President's program for withdrawal with honor from Vietnam to stand fast against the pressures—yes, and outright intimidation—that will be brought to bear on them.

We appeal to those Senators who have supported the pending amendments to reassess the relative risks of the President's course as against the course of surrender and humiliation.

We cannot at this point begin to match the massive and lavishly financed lobby which has been visiting Senate offices on a non-stop basis. The groups of the undersigned, and of other concerned young people from all parts of the country will be visiting your offices over the coming days. We hope that they will get the same respectful treatment that you have accorded to those who came before us.

SIGNERS

Coordinating Committee: Charles J. Stephens, Allen Wood, Rebecca Boyd, Neil Salonen, Barbara Mikesell, Hal Mackenzie, Dan Fefferman, Gary Jarmin, William Wyche, Barry Serrins, Doug Allen.

Linda Anthenien, University of California, Berkeley.

Saralinda Alexander, University of California, Berkeley.

Edwin K. Ang, Berkeley, California.

Marie J. Ang, Berkeley, California.

Robert E. Barreiro, New York University.

Judy Barnes, Denver, Colorado.

Louise M. Berry, American University.

Kristine Bick, Lawrence University.

John Biddy, Phoenix, Arizona.

Rebecca Boyd, George Washington University.

Virginia Brennan, Rockville, Maryland.

Philip Burley, Boston, Massachusetts.

David L. Carter, Washington, D.C.

Bonnie Cathcart, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Adrian G. Coffman, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Barry D. Cohen, College Park, Maryland.

James V. Cowin, University of Pennsylvania.

Judy Culbertson, Los Angeles, California.

Jay D. DeHaven, Alhambra, California.

Carroll Ann Dobrotka, Washington, D.C.

Lynne L. Doerfler, Lawrence University.

Marion Ellicott Dougherty, Las Vegas, Nevada.

Marlene V. Dudik, Washington, D.C.

George C. Edwards, Washington, D.C.

Cynthia Efav, Washington, D.C.

Leslie D. Elliott, Berkeley, California.

Bruce D. Eho, Desert Hot Springs, California.

Daniel Fefferman, University of California, Berkeley.

George L. Fernsler, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

John Fitzpatrick, University of Maryland.

Justin Fleischman, University of California, Berkeley.

Gary Fleisher, Los Angeles, California.

George Franklin, Wheaton, Maryland.

Gaynel Frizzell, Berkeley, California.

Marshall B. Frontingham, Washington, D.C.

Vera Gatlin, Dallas, Texas.

John L. Harris, New Haven, Connecticut.

Regis Hanna, University of Maryland School of Social Work.

Roger Hellman, University of California, Berkeley.

David Hess, Washington, D.C.

Richard Hunter, University of Maryland.

Ronald Humbert, Isla Vista, California.

Helen Irland, University of California, Berkeley.

Carol Jaquith, Silver Spring, Maryland.

Gary Jarmin, Los Angeles, California.

Roy Wharton, Georgetown University.
 Andre V. Starrett.
 Linda Jarmin, UCLA.
 John Jehle, American University.
 Travis, Jones, Washington, D.C.
 Farley Jones, Washington, D.C.
 Marilyn J. Kay, Los Angeles, California.
 Therese Klein, Washington, D.C.
 Jack Korthuis, Las Vegas, Nevada.
 Linda Marchant, American University.
 Nora S. Martin, Kansas City, Missouri.
 Lisa Martinez, Los Angeles, California.
 Giovanna Mathis, St. Louis, Missouri.
 Hal McKenzie, New Haven, Connecticut.
 Barbara Mikesell, CCNY.
 Susan Miller, Los Angeles, California.
 Wilma Miller, Los Angeles, California.
 Barbara Newman, New York, New York.
 Elizabeth O'Neill, New York, New York.
 Sylvia J. Norton, Golden, Colorado.
 Robert F. Oswald, Creve Coeur, Missouri.
 Orah Pope, University of Maryland.
 Ann Rantovich, Wheaton, Maryland.
 Carl Rapkins, Buffalo, New York.
 Emma Reed, Hollywood, California.
 Michael Richardson, University of California, Berkeley.
 Robert Rogers, University of Maryland.
 Michael Roth, Los Angeles, California.
 Steven Schatz, Silver Spring, Maryland.
 Joseph Sheftick, Los Angeles, California.
 Nannette Semha, New York Institute of Art.
 Wesley Samuel, New York, New York.
 Dale Smith, New York, New York.
 Jon Schuhart, Los Angeles, California.
 Neil Albert Salonen, Denver, Colorado.
 Anne Smith, University of Maryland School of Social Work.
 Barbara Snell, Rockville, Maryland.
 Richard Snell, Wheaton, Maryland.
 Hugh Spurgin, Washington, D.C.
 David Stadelhofer, University of California, Berkeley.
 Shirley Stadelhofer, Berkeley, California.
 Norman Strattan, Los Angeles, California.
 Jeffrey Tallakson, University of California, Berkeley.
 Alice Van Dyke, Denver, Colorado.
 Martha Vertrease, Chicago, Illinois.
 Blandina Watson, Los Angeles, California.
 James Weeks, University of Maryland.
 Noonie Baker, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 Susan Barnett, Miami, Florida.
 Dee Beckner, Kansas City, Missouri.
 Gene Bennett, Denver, Colorado.
 David Charnow, Washington, D.C.
 Adam Chornesky, Washington, D.C.
 Dennis Cormier, New York, New York.
 Stephen Deddins, Lemay, Missouri.
 Joan Doffman, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
 David Flores, Colorado Springs, Colorado.
 Diane Frink, Colorado Springs, Colorado.
 Anne Johnson, Washington, D.C.
 Mary Ellen Holmes, Washington, D.C.
 Susan Hughes, Oakland, California.
 Carole Johnson, St. Louis, Missouri.
 Carolyn Libertini, University of Maryland.
 Julie Lewis, Washington, D.C.
 Sara Mazumdar, Washington, D.C.
 Glenda Moody, Washington, D.C.
 Wayne Miller, University of Rochester.
 Peter Mullen, Washington, D.C.
 Galen Pumpherly, Golden, Colorado.
 Sandra Singleton, Washington, D.C.
 Margie Stahon, Washington, D.C.
 Joseph Stein, University of Rochester.
 Fred Stock, St. Louis, Missouri.
 Richard Woodard, Washington, D.C.
 Louis E. Stephens, Jr., Los Angeles, California.
 William Wyche, Colorado College.
 Mark Whitman, Berkeley, California.
 Thomas F. Flood III, Granite Springs, New York.
 Nell Winterbottom, University of Maryland.
 Charles M. Wright, Los Angeles, California.
 Ray Barlow, Phoenix, Arizona.

SENATOR FULBRIGHT ON THE PRESIDENTIAL POWER IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The source of an effective foreign policy under our system is Presidential power. This proposition, valid in our own time, is certain to become more rather than less, compelling in the decades ahead.

The dynamic forces of the 20th century—communism, fascism, aggressive nationalism, and the explosive awakening of long quiescent peoples—are growing more and more unmanageable under the procedures of leisurely deliberation which are built into our constitutional system. To cope with these forces we must be able to act quickly and decisively on the one hand, and persistently and patiently on the other . . .

The President is the symbol of the nation to the external world, the leader of a vast alliance of free nations, and the prime mover in shaping a national consensus on foreign policy. It is important to note, however, that while this responsibility is indeed very broad, his authority is often infringed upon or thwarted in practice by unauthorized persons. (J. William Fulbright, Cornell Law Quarterly, Fall, 1961.)

GEN. WLADYSLAV ANDERS

HON. CLEMENT J. ZABLOCKI

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Speaker, today is the 26th anniversary of the World War II capture from the Germans by Polish and British troops of the Monte Cassino stronghold near Rome.

On this occasion I would like to pay tribute to the memory of Gen. Wladyslaw Anders, the able leader of the famed Polish II Corps in that battle. General Anders, known as the commander in chief of the Polish Forces in exile, died in London last week at the age of 77.

A military man of exceptional ability, General Anders led a cavalry squadron in World War I and in the Polish-Russian fighting of 1919-20 which followed Polish independence. After the German invasion of Poland in 1939, he commanded a cavalry brigade. Wounded numerous times, he was captured and held in solitary confinement in Moscow until 1941 when after the German invasion he was freed and appointed commander of the Polish prisoners of war who were freed from Soviet camps at that time.

It was while he was forming these men into divisions to fight the Germans that General Anders and his staff compiled evidence that the Katyn Forest massacre of thousands of Polish soldiers had been done by Soviet troops, not by Germans, as the Soviet Union had alleged.

The Polish II Corps or "Free Polish" Army led by General Anders fought side by side with the Allies in Italy and Africa. Their 1944 battle for the Italian monastery of Monte Cassino, which had become a German stronghold, was a highlight of their military campaigns.

Decorated for his military service by the United States, Britain, and France, General Anders lived in exile in England

rather than return to a Poland dominated by the Communists.

Mr. Speaker, it is a source of grief to us that the people of the country which General Anders defended with such courage and conviction are under the yoke of communism.

Undoubtedly the memory of General Anders will serve as an inspiration to the Polish people and to all men who love liberty—the denunciations of him by the Polish Communist government notwithstanding.

"WE ALSO LEARN AND BUILD ON FAILURE"—DR. WERNHER VON BRAUN

HON. JOE L. EVINS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. EVINS of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, the Christian Science Monitor recently published a speech made by Dr. Wernher von Braun concerning the Apollo 13 flight in which he places the Apollo 13 accident in the perspective of progress.

Because of the interest of my colleagues and the American people in this flight, I place the article in the RECORD:

[From the Christian Science Monitor, May 14, 1970]

MISSION POSSIBLE

(NOTE.—"We also build on failures," Dr. Wernher von Braun told a recent gathering of the American Newspaper Publishers Association, at which he outlined the major U.S. space plans for this decade. In this way he put the aborted Apollo 13 flight in the perspective of progress. In March Dr. von Braun became deputy associate administrator of NASA. Excerpts from his remarks to the publishers follow.)

Now that the Apollo 13 astronauts are safely back on mother earth, some commentators have started singing the swan song for manned space flight. Others want to press forward ever more energetically. Those of us responsible for developing the nation's spacefaring capabilities and exploration of space have been given a jolting reminder, if we needed one, that success in flight and exploration is paid for in eternal vigilance and painstaking attention to detail.

The problem we have is an old one constantly with us: how to beat "Murphy's law." As many of you no doubt have heard, this is the principle that if anything mechanical can go wrong, sooner or later it will.

You can appreciate that in dealing with eight or nine million parts as complex as those in the combined systems of Saturn 5, Apollo, and the Lunar Module, the odds are pretty heavy that "Murphy" will win sometime. The fact that the "law" has operated only in a few minor instances in the six manned Apollo flights that preceded 13 is, I think, a tribute to all who participated in the program, and particularly our great national resource, the American aerospace industry, and its tens of thousands of men and women.

So I think Apollo 13 should be regarded as no more than a temporary setback, the loss of a mission objective but not of our mission in space.

The thing I believe we should remember is that we don't build just on successes. We also build on failures. Jack Swigert, whose

first experience in space might well have produced a more restrained outlook, remarked that "Apollo 13 has increased my confidence in this nation's taking the space program and doing something with it."

I think we learn something very important about ourselves, about the human capacities and capabilities for innovation that are in everyone when the need arises. Sometimes we should be reminded of these qualities, but also I want to point out the part training and self-discipline played, almost unnoticed, behind the swift decisions and moves made by the astronauts and ground crews in a rescue effort that has no precedent in human history.

The Apollo 13 incident also brought out the admirable part played by the domestic and international press. Over the years of the space program it has demonstrated some very responsible reporting, and this is only the most recent example. I think I appreciate the difficulties of describing so complicated and relatively new activities as space science and engineering projects for public consumption. I believe it is largely through your efforts that the youngsters of this country and the world are so knowledgeable about the space age, and accounts for the enthusiastic letters and interest we in the agency receive from these young people here and abroad.

There is a considerable gap in understanding the true values and meaning of going into space because few people can visualize how space science and a capability to send men on missions to the moon or the planets can touch them personally. Few people understood the true significance of the airplane, either, when the Wrights first flew at Kitty Hawk; not even the Wright brothers themselves. They had much more limited notions of the airplane's utility, and part of the reason for this was that men were venturing into an entirely unknown environment as a transportation medium.

The same is true of space transportation today. Our mental concepts and life habits are earth-oriented. The ability to go to the moon or Mars is regarded as something less than important, and this is only natural. But I am firmly convinced that the space program will prove to be one of the most important, creative, and beneficial to mankind ever undertaken by the United States.

SKYLAB PROGRAM

I think we must clearly establish in this new decade our goals and objectives as an agency first, and then define the hardware needed only after we know exactly where we are headed. So let us now review briefly some of the highlights of our space exploration plans for 1970 and thereafter in the present decade. I am sure most of you have heard about the Apollo Applications Program started several years ago, whose purpose it was to apply Apollo knowledge and hardware to new science and applications to be performed in earth-orbit. Well, times change and we have a new name for it, the Skylab Program, which we think is more descriptive of its purpose.

The overall purpose of Skylab will be to not only perform experiments, but to find out how men and equipment perform in the space environmental condition of weightlessness for an initial period of 28 days. You may recall that our longest previous stay in this condition was 14 days in Gemini 7 back in 1965 when Jim Lovell and Frank Borman made the longest earth-orbit on record.

Skylab will consist of four flights. The first will be an unmanned flight, boosted by a two-stage Saturn 5—only the first and second stage of a Saturn 5; the third stage is to be replaced by what we used to call the Orbital Workshop, now called Skylab. It will be this country's first orbital space station.

Skylab will have attached to it an airlock module and a multiple docking adapter so that the arriving command and service modules can dock for crew exchange. And also

attached to Skylab will be the Apollo Telescope Mount, or ATM, which is a manned solar observatory to be serviced by the people living in the Skylab.

The crew of three will arrive one day after Skylab has been launched into orbit and has deployed its solar panels, both on the ATM and the Skylab itself. A Saturn 1-B will boost the crew in the command and service module which will dock to the multiple docking adapter, and they will slip through the adapter and the airlock into the workshop. When the 28 days are over, the three will crawl back into their command module, detach, and use the service module to deboost themselves back into a reentry, making a normal Apollo landing on the ocean.

Three months later, another flight will go up, and this time the crew will stay in the space station for 56 days. And finally, there will be a third visit, again of 56 days, after which the third crew will descend. The Skylab will then go into storage, but can be reactivated any time thereafter if more visits are planned.

The next space station to succeed Skylab will be modularized, each module accommodating 12 people. These modules can be stacked together, so that the station can grow as more modules are brought up, and the beauty of this arrangement is that different activities or experiments can be carried on in the several modules.

SPACE-SHUTTLE VEHICLE

The most important aspect of this second-generation space station will be the space-shuttle vehicle, a logistic supply spacecraft that will make repeated trips back and forth from the ground to orbit.

Everyone is aware of the high cost of using a one-shot Saturn 5, or even smaller one-shot vehicles, to boost a spacecraft and crew into orbit or on a lunar mission. So one of the basic steps in bringing down these costs is to build a reusable vehicle that can be refueled and fly again.

As we see it now, we probably need a two-stage vehicle. A typical example would be a big glider-like craft, carrying its own propulsion, to which a smaller glider, also carrying its own propulsion, would be side-strapped. The unit takes off vertically, like Saturn 5, and at about six times the speed of sound the first-stage propellant tanks would be depleted. At that point, the reusable booster would simply peel off and return to the ground, landing like an airplane. Only the reusable orbiter craft would reach orbit and join the space station. Then when it had delivered its cargo and/or personnel, it also would return to earth.

In addition to bringing down the costs of space operations, the reusable orbiter and booster is necessary to placing space flight on a practical footing, and it would have many uses in earth-orbital missions. I think it is fairly obvious that the space station and shuttle will provide the United States with several options for later space objectives.

EXPLORATION OF MARS

Another NASA objective for the early part of this decade is to continue the series of Mariner flights, particularly to the planet Mars. For 1971, we have two Mariners on tap, and instead of making flyby trips, it is planned to have them each orbit Mars. This is a pretty important step and in the right direction for obtaining the kind of coverage we got of the Moon with the Lunar Orbiters.

A flyby is rather limited to useful scientific time, as we know. With an orbit, instead of getting just one small swath of the planet's surface, you can map the whole planet. We hope to get weeks and possibly months of useful time with the orbiting Mars Mariners.

After the two orbiting Mariners, the agency plans to send a Viking spacecraft to Mars. This vehicle not only will orbit the planet, but it is designed to peel off a small lander

segment. This lander will be provided with sensors and will radio its data up to the circling Viking for transmission to earth. The two landers from the two Vikings will be dropped down onto different Martian areas to supply scientists with data from more than one region. The Viking is now planned for 1975.

TRIP TO OUTER PLANETS

Another very exciting program is one based on a rare line-up of the outer planets of Jupiter, Saturn, Uranus, Neptune, and Pluto. I say "rare" in terms of our human framework, for actually it occurs about once every 177 years, which in the heavenly reference is fairly frequent. Now, the interesting thing about the Grand Tour, as it is called, is that we will use the powerful gravitational field of Jupiter, the biggest planet in our system, to boost our spacecraft on to the next planet, Saturn, and from there on to Pluto. Another similar spacecraft will approach Jupiter a little differently, and have Jupiter swing it around so that the probe is sent flying to Uranus and onto Neptune.

By stealing some of the energy from the gravitational field of Jupiter in this manner we shall be able to visit all the outer planets in something like nine years instead of the approximately 40 it would require if we made one shot at the farthest planet, Pluto. And this means we can do with a much smaller rocket.

So far I have talked about manned space flight and scientific spacecraft, but while it is important to study the solar system and the earth-sun relationships that affect conditions here on the ground, the other side of NASA's objectives is, of course, an earth-related applications program.

Three of the most important objectives are communications satellites, and applications spun out of them, such as navigation or combined navigation and aircraft communications satellites; second, the family of earth-resources satellites that deal with crop surveys, mapping and geography, mineral prospecting, and the like; and finally, the weather satellites where the objective is to build up a worldwide weather forecasting system that will enable us, hopefully, to reliably predict the weather as much as two weeks ahead.

Now, we have only touched on our general goals and objectives for this decade, and I would like to emphasize that a well-balanced space effort includes both manned and unmanned programs. Rather than being competitive, manned and unmanned spacecraft complement one another in their particular strengths. To deny man his rightful and necessary role in space exploration is to ignore his peculiar gifts of mind and spirit which no machine can reproduce.

DR. JEROME L. RAFFALDINI
HONORED BY UNICO

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, my good and dear friend, Dr. Jerome L. Raffaldini, was recently honored by the Newark Chapter of Unico International as the recipient of that organization's "I Am An American Day" award. The award is granted each year to that naturalized citizen who has achieved distinction in a profession or community service.

I am pleased to congratulate Dr. Raffaldini, for I can think of no one who deserves this honor more.

Born in Milan, Italy, and naturalized in 1957, Dr. Raffaldini, who originally came to the United States representing Italy's most prominent corporations at the first postwar industrial exposition of Italy, decided to remain in this country and was the architect of Walter Kidde Corp., as it is today.

Our community is the beneficiary of his decision, for Dr. Raffaldini is a warm and generous individual who cares deeply for his fellow man. His selfless dedication and concern, his compassion and sensitivity have served our community measurelessly.

Dr. Raffaldini exemplifies the invaluable contributions of the immigrant to his chosen land to which this Nation is deeply indebted.

My warm, personal congratulations are extended to a man who I am privileged to call my friend as well as to his wife, Theresa, and their children who are rightfully proud of Dr. Raffaldini.

Dr. Raffaldini is also the recipient of the New Jersey Man of the Year Award, 1967, and the Author Award from the Automotive Industry magazine in 1964.

I wish also to offer my sincere congratulations to Mr. Thomas J. Rosalanko, recipient of the 1970 Newark Unico Scholarship and to Miss Deborah Pauline Strack, recipient of the Columbus Nursing Scholarship for academic excellence. I wish them continued success and fulfillment in their future endeavors.

IT IS SIMPLY TOO EASY TO CONDEMN THE GUARD

HON. BENJAMIN B. BLACKBURN

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. BLACKBURN. Mr. Speaker, in this day of criticisms of law enforcement officers, it is unfair not to consider both sides of the issue. I think that John Crown, associate editor of the Atlanta Journal, makes some rather pertinent observations which should be considered in the interest of fair play.

I am taking the liberty of inserting a recent column of his in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY: IT'S SIMPLY TOO EASY TO CONDEMN THE GUARD

(By John Crown)

For the past week it has been open season on the National Guard. The emotions aroused by the shooting deaths of four college students at Ohio's Kent State University has understandably sparked high feelings.

And to people already steamed up for one reason or another over military action in Indochina, it has been extraordinarily easy to transform those feelings to young men wearing the uniform of the U.S. Army in the National Guard.

That is just the point. It has been too easy to make the Guard the target of abuse and vituperation. It is only too easy to take one isolated incident and transform it into a general condemnation of the entire National Guard organization.

Violence begets violence. An act of violence is going to bring forth a reaction of violence. And people are going to get hurt.

Who was behind the violence at Kent State University has not yet been brought out. It

is a safe bet it was not the four students who were shot to death. It is usually the innocent bystander who suffers. But someone or some organization whipped up the violence at Kent State, violence which justified the presence of the National Guard.

It was inevitable that in the recurring acts of violence on college campuses across the nation that someone was going to become a martyr sooner or later. Those deliberately inspiring the acts of violence counted on that.

And so four students at Kent State University died.

The investigation is not yet finished, but already there has been a question raised on whether it was a National Guard rifle that fired the fatal bullet.

But for the sake of argument let's assume that it was a National Guard bullet. I am somewhat nonplussed that so many people think that National Guardsmen must stand there and take rocks hurled at them as though they were confetti. Granted National Guardsmen should be disciplined, should be restrained, should be a cut above the screaming students who are throwing chunks of concrete at them. But they are not supermen who have no feelings. They can take just so much like any other human being.

National Guardsmen are first and foremost civilians, citizen soldiers who at the whim of a governor can be called away from job and home and family on virtually no notice at all and thrust into a confrontation with rioters and demonstrators. They are there to restore and maintain law and order. They generally do it without bloodshed.

In fact, that is one reason for the emotional reaction to the death of the four students—it was so completely out of character, so completely unusual, so completely extraordinary that there was an emotional reaction to it.

I am glad that one high official with the National Guard stuck his neck out to say so. South Carolina Adjutant General Frank Pinckney took issue with what he called "any notions of the guardsman as an untrained, unrestrained and trigger-happy do-it." He termed the death of the four students "a terrible tragedy," which it was.

"I am not here to condemn or condone what happened at Kent State," Gen. Pinckney said. "I don't have all the facts and neither does anyone else at this stage."

But he noted that some 200,000 National Guardsmen have been called out in the past two years throughout the nation because of civil disturbances and "there hasn't been a single incident to blot the performance of these 200,000 men."

Since someone has to be condemned for the death of the four students, it is remarkably easy to condemn the National Guard as a national organization. It is easy. But it would be more realistic to consider those who whipped up the students into such a frenzy that somehow the ROTC building at Kent State was burned and somehow there were an awful lot of rocks flying through the air toward the National Guardsmen.

Whoever fired the fatal bullets at Kent State is not beyond condemnation. But there is more to it than whoever might have pulled the trigger.

SILENT MAJORITY FACULTY, TOO

HON. ANCHER NELSEN

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. NELSEN. Mr. Speaker, Kenneth Berg, editor of the Mankato Free Press, Mankato, Minn., has taken note of the rather puzzling disparity between what college instructors presumably think about campus disruptions and what they

actually do about them. I wish to include this thought commentary in the RECORD at this point in my remarks:

SILENT MAJORITY FACULTY, TOO

A Carnegie Commission survey of 60,447 college instructors shows that more than 80 per cent believe campus demonstration threaten academic freedom.

Results showed further that more than 76 per cent favored, either strongly or with reservations, the expulsion or suspension of students who disrupt schools.

Of those questioned, 5.5 per cent described themselves as "left," 41.5 per cent as "liberal," 30 per cent as "middle of the road," 22.2 per cent as "moderately conservative," and 2.2 per cent as "strongly conservative."

The research team was headed by Martin A. Trow, sociology professor at the University of California at Berkeley.

He said that so many factors were involved in the survey that "caution should be exercised in reaching any conclusions."

So we'll take Dr. Trow's advice and withhold a conclusion or two that normally would appear obvious in face of the findings.

But we will ask one question.

If it is true, as 80 per cent of the instructors insist, that campus demonstrations threaten academic freedom, why does not more than a handful (if any, in fact) of the faculty on any one campus openly and publicly voice their objections to these disruptions?

Demonstrations in the past, be they at Mankato State College or Columbia University, have been marked by the conspicuous absence of the faculty in support of even the most enlightened administrations attempting to weather the given storm.

Ninety-three per cent of the surveyed instructors regard themselves as something less than the radical left or right. Are they also a part of the great silent majority that has the capacity and the prerogative to speak out positively, but elects not to—except in confidential non-incriminating polls, of course?

DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL COMMITTEE IS ESTABLISHING A CAMPAIGN CLEARING HOUSE

HON. ANDREW JACOBS, JR.

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. JACOBS. Mr. Speaker, I insert the following statement of Lawrence F. O'Brien, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, Thursday, May 14, 1970:

STATEMENT BY LAWRENCE F. O'BRIEN

WASHINGTON, D.C.—I am announcing today that the Democratic National Committee is establishing a Campaign '70 Clearing House—a vehicle for young people and other concerned citizens to put their energies and talents to work in the American political process this fall.

Our Clearing House will be a channel for students and all others who wish to participate meaningfully this summer and fall in general election campaigns throughout the country, and at all levels of government from Senate and Congressional races to gubernatorial and state legislative contests.

We will collect and organize systematically the names of persons who contact us, and we will make sure they are given the chance to work for the candidates of their choice. We will contact the candidates and offer the services of the volunteers who sign up with the Clearing House.

We will give our volunteers a variety of campaign materials and manuals, and we will conduct training sessions. The volunteers, as a result, will be going into these campaigns not only with high hopes but with essential information on how to raise money; how to use opinion polling; how to canvass a community and build up voter registration; how to use television and radio most effectively; how to advance and schedule a candidate to maximum advantage, and how to get out the vote.

We will not ask for the party affiliation of anyone who signs up with us. In fact, I want today to extend an invitation to the Republican National Committee to cooperate with us—either in a joint Clearing House, or at least in a separate effort to channel citizen participation into Republican campaigns.

I want to emphasize that while the student movement of the past two years really generated the idea of a Clearing House, it is intended for all to use—students, housewives and their husbands, business and labor, farmers and workers—all Americans.

Furthermore, the Clearing House stands ready to coordinate and cooperate with other organizations that are being formed for citizen participation in the 1970 general election campaigns.

I'm pleased to announce at this time that Philip M. Seib has agreed to serve as national coordinator of the Campaign '70 Clearing House. Phil has just completed a term as president of the student body at Princeton University. He's a 21-year-old Washingtonian, a former VISTA projects director, who will be graduated from Princeton next month with a degree in politics.

I was most encouraged to note that Princeton has decided to recess for two weeks prior to Election Day next fall so that students will be free to take part in campaigns. A number of other schools are considering this idea.

I strongly urge them to follow the Princeton example. These critical times demand the participation of young people in our democratic process. And that participation in turn, will provide an education not to be found in any classroom.

By taking these actions today, the Democratic Party is recognizing the fact that the vast majority of some seven million American college students has reached the age of political maturity. No one can seriously doubt their intensive desire to work for change and no one should underestimate their vast potential in reshaping and improving the political system in our country.

In many cases, the activist students and other concerned citizens have been frustrated by an old, established system that can be slow and stubborn in the face of change. The responsiveness of both major political parties has been seriously questioned, and thus the parties have become the targets rather than the vehicles for new political activist.

Particularly in the last two years, we have seen the energies of young people expended in demonstrations—for the most part in peace and for the cause of peace. Great energy, organization, planning and discipline have gone into these efforts. And yet, when the shouting stops, many of the people involved have been left to wonder the next morning: "What did we accomplish?"

The purpose of the Clearing House is to allow these concerned Americans to work in the most meaningful way for the election to public office of candidates whose views on peace, environment, poverty, the economy and the other crucial issues of our time, reflect their own hopes for their country.

We will begin to organize this project right now. We look to the participation of Young Democratic Organizations throughout the country to help in its implementation. A number of states have already completed their primaries and the general election campaigns are starting.

Interested citizens should write Campaign 170 Clearing House, Box 2300, Washington, D.C. 20013.

Through advertising and other methods we will be publicizing our Clearing House and we will be asking those to whom this appeals to let us know of their availability and of their particular interests.

CONGRESS VERSUS THE PRESIDENT

HON. DEL CLAWSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. DEL CLAWSON. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Sunday Star for May 17 contains a penetrating discussion of the points at issue in the current debate on limiting the powers of the President which in my opinion clears away some of the miasma of unreasonable rhetoric of the past few weeks. I commend it to the attention of my colleagues at this point in the RECORD:

THE WAR POWER: CONGRESS VERSUS THE PRESIDENT

The current furor in and outside the Senate over funding the Cambodian operations after June 30 is larded with irrational emotion and political opportunism. Yet the issue at stake—the warming power of Congress as opposed to the authority of the President as Commander in Chief—is real, complex and of far-reaching importance.

Paragraph 11, Section 8, Article I of the Constitution clearly allocates to Congress the right "to declare war." The problem is that the five post-World War II presidents of both parties—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon—not to speak of earlier practitioners of the fine art of gunboat diplomacy, have neatly finessed the issue by committing or keeping American troops in combat situations abroad when they felt it was in the national interest, without seeking the assent of Congress or asking for a declaration of war.

The great majority of these adventures—the 1958 landing in Lebanon and the 1965 intervention in the Dominican Republic are two recent examples—happily did not become conflicts of major significance, at least in terms of casualties abroad or political impact at home. Two others, however—the Korean "police action" and the Indochinese conflict—mushroomed into undeclared wars which resulted in the deaths of more than 75,000 Americans. The Vietnamese war, with its related conflicts in Laos and Cambodia, has divided this uneasy nation as has no other similar issue since brother took up arms against brother in the American Civil War. It is a repetition of this sort of tragedy which some senators hope to prevent through congressional control of the purse strings.

The primary difficulty lies in the definition of what involves American participation in a war. If, as Senators Cooper and Church maintain in their amendment, furnishing advisers to a friendly country (Cambodia) amounts to direct involvement, then the United States was a belligerent in the Greek civil war of 1947-49. If loss of life defines involvement, then the United States was indeed at war (with whom?) in the Dominican Republic in 1965. And yet no reasonable man would hold to either of these theses.

By the same token, this hypothetical reasonable man (so much distinguished by his apparent absence from the United States these days), would have to admit that, despite the lack of ringing calls to arms from Capitol Hill, we were at war with North Korea and Communist China in the 1950s and we have been at war, at least since 1964,

with North Vietnam. In neither case could diplomats burn their official papers before asking for their passports, as was the style in a more mannered age, since we have had diplomatic relations with none of the nations which we have been fighting.

Since American presidents have sent U.S. forces into action abroad more than 150 times without a declaration of war by Congress, the common sense of the matter, it seems to us, is that an undeclared war becomes reprehensible only when it is lost, or when it becomes politically impossible for the President to prosecute it. While such a theory obviously can be found neither in the Constitution nor in the canon of international law, it seems as demonstrable as the fall of Newton's apple. The Korean war, for instance, over a shorter period resulted in almost as many American deaths as the Indochinese fighting. Yet there was no significant popular or congressional outcry against that war. Boys who had no more desire to be shot at than today's draft dodgers in Canada went docilely if not joyfully to that war because it did not, could not, occur to them to do otherwise.

While the great majority of this generation have done the same, the situation and the ethic have altered. It is clear that, in the eyes of many Americans, the Indochinese war has become odious, partially because the government of South Vietnam is regarded by such people as unworthy (would that of Syngman Rhee have stood up to close scrutiny?) and partially because this war, like all others, involves an element of risk and inconvenience to the participants. Hence the war in a practical political sense no longer is possible, which is precisely why, we would suggest, the President is trying to end our direct involvement in it.

What some members of the Senate and House are trying to do now is to reassert an atrophied congressional prerogative, which understandably is dear to members of Congress, at the expense of the implied powers of the President as Commander in Chief, which equally understandably is a popular thesis with occupants of the White House. The Supreme Court has been commendably wary of trying to delineate the line between the Executive and Legislative powers.

The trouble is that the world has changed since the founding fathers wrote the Constitution. In illustration, the same paragraph which authorizes Congress to declare war grants it the right to issue "letters of marque and reprisal," which authorized private entrepreneurs to engage in naval warfare for their own profit. Very few letters of marque have been granted in recent years.

In effect, in an era of instant mass communications and push-button warfare, the senators are resting their constitutional case on a document forged to deal with contingencies in the age of sail. The founding fathers were wise men but they were not prophets. Only a lunatic in the 18th Century could have predicted the world in which we live today. The problem, then, is to interpret the Constitution to deal with the world as it is, not as it was or as we might wish it to be. It happens to be an extremely dangerous world.

We cannot believe it is the intention of Congress—or the wish of the people—to restrict the President's ability to protect the lives of American troops in Vietnam. The point is not whether they should be there; the point is they are there, despite what we believe to be Mr. Nixon's sincere desire to bring them home as rapidly as possible. On this basis alone, the Cooper-Church amendment, which would outlaw any future operations by U.S. troops in Cambodia after June 30 and ban virtually all aid to that country, is wrong and ought to be defeated. We hope that no more American expeditions will be necessary, but we would support them if we felt they would save the lives of

American soldiers who might otherwise die in Vietnam.

As to the larger question of future undeclared wars, we noted in these columns a few days ago that the alternative to an undeclared war often is not peace but a declared war. Given the temper of the times, President Johnson almost certainly could have obtained a declaration of war against North Vietnam at the time of the Tonkin Gulf incident.

It would be useful—most of all to presidents—to have constitutional provision for some exigency short of war. But such does not exist and there is little chance of creating one. Any President's practical need for popular political support for his policies, doubled with the infinite capacity of Congress to make life miserable for the Chief Executive, seems to us to provide an adequate curb on the Presidential powers.

In the end, despite the Constitution, power belongs to him who is willing and able to exercise it. Presidents of both parties have sent troops into foreign countries primarily because Congress has been unwilling or unable to act. If congressional action were necessary before a solitary Marine could land, there would be much talk, few casualties and fewer freedoms, in this country and the world.

It seems to us that the Senate would do better to support the President in his efforts to extricate us quickly and honorably from a war which almost everyone agrees, probably including most of those who to their credit have had the courage to fight it, has lasted too long.

IOWA CITY STUDENTS FIGHT UNSOLICITED THIRD-CLASS MAIL

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, the American history class of Mr. A. W. Zimmerman at City High School in Iowa City, undertook a rather unique project for Earth Day. The students attempted to collect a ton of junk mail. They did not quite reach their goal; however, they did collect a rather large amount of unsolicited third-class mail. All of the mail collected was returned to the sender at his expense.

These young people and their instructor are certainly to be commended for their efforts to focus public attention on this problem.

The students have drafted the following proposal with respect to the problem of "junk" mail:

A BILL PROVIDING FOR THE REVIEW OF U.S. POSTAL RATES

(By the American history class of City High School, Iowa City, Iowa)

We propose that the House and Senate of the United States Congress:

A. Maintain at present levels all first class mail rates:

1. Any additional increase in taxpayer support for other classes of mail, as has been proposed by President Richard Nixon, should be avoided.

2. First class mail is now the only class that pays its own way.

B. Review present second and fourth class rates:

1. Upward adjustments should be considered so each class of mail will be delivered without financial loss to the Post Office Department.

2. Consideration should be given to the holding of rates for educational materials at the present level.

a. This would continue the indirect subsidy to education.

b. Such a step would be justified by the reasoning behind federal educational assistance programs now in operation.

C. Review present third class postal rates:

1. The present rate structure for non-profit organizations should be maintained.

2. Bulk mail rates for all profit making organizations should be revised upward.

a. The present system of tax support for private enterprise, through support of its advertising campaigns, should be abolished.

b. The taxpayer should be relieved of his financial support for unsolicited mail designed to make a profit for the sender.

Also, I am inserting in the RECORD, news items from the Iowa City Press-Citizen further explaining their efforts:

JUNK MAIL PROJECT AT CITY HIGH—STUDENTS WAGE WAR ON "POSTAL POLLUTION"

(By Linda A. Svoboda)

People who want to try to get off the "junk mail" lists should take their bag of third class mail over to City High School where "Postal Pollution '70" is underway.

The object there—to collect a ton of unsolicited mail by April 22. That fits in well with a quickening pre-Earth Day trend in Iowa City: collecting junk for anti-pollution demonstration purposes.

This project sponsored by a City High American History class, has a twist. Every piece of mail that can be sent back at expense of the original sender will be returned.

The idea of collecting unsolicited junk mail occurred to students of the 22-member class as they were discussing the postal strike. The extra twist of sending it back was the contribution of their teacher, Alvin Zimmerman.

How, wondered the students during discussion, would the government finance pay increases to postal employees?

They talked about the deficit with which the U.S. Postal Department operates every year and looked into postal publication figures for 1968 and 1969.

There they learned, said Zimmerman, that the federal government loses two cents on every piece of third class mail and the loss is supposed to be made up by first class mail. The normal letter-writer subsidizing the third class mailer in a continuing deficit situation, didn't sit well with them, said the teacher.

There has been some speculation in Congress this past year that first class rates may go up to 10 cents.

The class will contact other secondary schools in the district, seeking permission to collect junk mail regularly at each. The collection point at City High is the library. Deadline for contributions is April 22, Earth Environmental teach-in Day.

The kind of material involved includes give away or sweepstakes offers, record club inducements advertisements, and similar unsought items.

If every City High student brings an ounce of mail per day from now until the deadline, the class will have about 1,100 pounds of mail. The students hope to collect the balance from other members of the community.

At the close of the project, the class will have to sift through the mound to find out what can be returned to the sender at his, or its, expense.

As a by-product, "We might even get some people off some mailing lists," said Zimmerman.

POSTAL POLLUTION

That campaign against "postal pollution" by an Iowa City High School class in Ameri-

can history has real possibilities. The class plans to send back all the "junk mail" it can gather on which the sender has to pay the return postage.

But there's a problem, too. If "junk mail" going one way taxes the capacity of the Post Office Department and runs up the deficit to its present alarming level, what will "junk mail" going both ways do?

READER COMMENTS—ABOUT JUNK MAIL TO THE EDITOR:

In response to your recent editorial on postal pollution, I would like to offer the following information:

Third class ("junk") mail does place a financial burden on the Post Office Department, and therefore indirectly on the taxpayer. However, the efforts of City High students to collect 2,000 pounds of unsolicited mail to be returned to the sender will place no additional financial burden on the Post Office Department.

The mail to be returned will be mailed in the business reply envelopes enclosed with the unsolicited mail. These envelopes are provided by the sender for those who respond to the advertisement, and are returned to him via first class mail at his expense. In addition, the Post Office Department collects a 2-cent penalty for each piece of mail in order to cover the cost of collecting the postage. Thus the total cost to the original sender is 8 cents for a letter and 7 cents for a postcard.

Those pieces of third class mail that have the words "Forwarding address requested" printed on them can be returned at a cost of 10 cents to the original sender. No "junk" mail will be returned that will place an additional financial burden on the Post Office.

A. W. ZIMMERMAN,
Teacher, City High School.

SECRETARY HICKEL SPEAKS OUT ON POLLUTION

HON. HOWARD W. ROBISON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. ROBISON. Mr. Speaker, with each day that passes, the problem of pollution takes on new dimensions. There can be little doubt that the problem affects not just America but the entire industrial world. Just as one small example, it has been estimated that the works of art in Venice are being literally eaten away at the rate of 5 percent a year because of the sulphuric acid released into the air from nearby industry.

Just as significant is the loss of plant and animal life in this country. Rapidly, our natural resources are being depleted because of our failure in the past, and refusal in the present, to recognize the necessity for conserving those gifts of nature. These resources have now reached such an advanced state of deterioration that some are now questioning our ability to restore the balance of nature. Secretary of Interior Walter J. Hickel has, without a doubt, become one of the leading voices in the fight against environmental waste and pollution. I include in the RECORD his remarks before the American Society of Newspaper Editors on May 13, 1970, dealing with this important question:

REMARKS BY SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR
WALTER J. HICKEL

In the last twelve months America has experienced a great environmental awakening.

The broad base of the public has begun to realize that "standard operating procedure" threatens to destroy the very quality of life we have struggled for decades to create.

Suddenly we are confronted with an expensive bill to pay.

Responsible living, responsible manufacturing, responsible public utilities are going to cost more.

All of us as private citizens must face the real cost of producing a product and be prepared to pay more for essentials even if it means we must sacrifice a few luxuries.

A shift in public awareness has begun. Some credit for this goes to eminent ecologists and conservationists, like those who are sharing this panel with me today.

I am very pleased to be participating in this discussion with Professor Barry Commoner and David Brower even though we do not agree on many things.

Both have made significant contributions to the nation's environmental consciousness.

Mr. Brower was one of my severest critics when I was appointed as Secretary of the Interior and continues to be.

But one thing has become abundantly clear—the problem is too serious for us to waste time attacking each other.

Those of us who are committed to conservation in its highest sense must attack the problem together.

In the last fifteen months, thanks to the involvement of youth and the news media, a new voice of concern is being heard.

I commend the youth for their leadership, and I salute the men and women of the newspapers, magazines, radio, and television of this country.

Many of you here have dramatized the environmental crisis so graphically it has won national attention.

Equally important, you have highlighted the answers and solutions which are beginning to emerge.

You have been strong, but you have not left our people hopeless.

In meeting with college and graduate school students I have been repeatedly impressed by their eagerness to jump the generation gap . . . to communicate with the establishment . . . to work shoulder to shoulder with anyone who really cares.

Where this shift is really being felt is in Washington, D.C.

Last week I sent a letter to President Nixon which received some publicity.

There has been debate about that letter. Whether I had indeed written it at all.

Whether I meant what I said.

A few thought it might have been merely fast footwork to avoid violence last weekend.

Most, I trust, recognized it resulted from a deep moral conviction.

As already reported in some of the press, I did write the letter.

It was . . . and is . . . the product of a deep belief on my part.

As a businessman in Alaska, as Governor, and as Secretary of the Interior, I have made it a policy to surround myself with young or young-thinking people.

We live in a world that changes drastically over night.

To interpret that world, to keep a balanced judgment, to make wise and relevant decisions, demands a flexible, unprejudiced mind.

Anyone can have such a mind. But I most often find such "seekers" and "creators" among young people.

Also for this reason I make a conscious effort to get out from behind my desk at the Department of the Interior to meet with student editors and leaders, to listen to their

criticism, both positive and negative, and to share my own beliefs with them.

Of course, as Interior Secretary, my attention has centered on the environmental issue.

I participated in public sessions in which some heckled, but the broad base of the student community welcomed a chance to hear my views first hand.

I welcomed and profited from hearing theirs.

The problems now being debated are so important to the future of our nation . . . and of the world . . . that we must deal with them creatively and with open minds.

I was most grateful for the spirit in which the President received my views.

I am one of his most ardent supporters. I have utmost confidence in his leadership.

Some think the crisis is on our campuses. But let me ask: Are student demonstrations the disease? Or are they the symptom?

I refuse to look at any situation as a problem. I believe every challenge presents a positive opportunity.

The challenges we face demand an effort on the part of all our people.

We must take stock of what are the priorities for man.

The space voyages have shown us one overriding truth—we are all fellow passengers on one beautiful, but very tiny, globe hurtling through space.

The globe—our earth—is endangered by man's environmental abuses, and also, and very clearly, by our current approach to living together in a way which will assure our survival.

The time is here for all of us to leave the "fortress philosophy" of life behind and to enter a new era in which *how man lives* is approached positively and creatively.

We must move from the *age of security* to the *age of opportunity*. We must have the courage to set those priorities that are necessary not only in America but in the world so that most of our time, energy and money is spent on the living of life rather than on the destruction and defense of life.

I have been working for months to open up new channels for funneling public sentiment, especially the ideas from the young, to the top levels of our government.

To help meet the environmental challenge we set up SCOPE (Student Councils on Pollution and the Environment) and a task force within my office to work on the input we have been receiving from thousands of college students.

SCOPE is something we will expand so that every university campus that wants to be involved can participate. It is a new departure in common action taken by the youth and government on a vital national need.

Similar listening posts and clearinghouses exist in other departments, but often the public is not even aware that they exist.

Those of us in government have the mandate to lead. We also have the responsibility to listen.

This is the way, I believe, we can begin to carry out the convictions I expressed to the President when I wrote, "let us give America an optimistic outlook and optimistic leadership. Let us show them we can solve our problems in an enlightened and positive manner."

Let me cite an example.

Early this month we received more than 550 letters and telegrams thanking us for the action we took in Hilton Head, South Carolina, where the German chemical company B.A.S.F. is planning to build two \$100 million factories in the beautiful resort area near Charleston.

This project promises to be a boost to employment and the overall economy of the State.

However, the plants were not designed with adequate environmental safeguards.

The adjacent estuary with its fish and plant life were threatened.

I wrote B.A.S.F. saying in effect: If you're going to use our water, do it responsibly.

It belongs to the public, and you can borrow it. But return it like you found it.

That is the cost of doing business.

The company decided to postpone their plans for a year. They want to study our regulations and see how they can meet them.

Please make no mistake—we are not out to stop progress . . . we want to make it responsible.

On April 27, a shrimp boat arrived in Washington from Hilton Head carrying a two-foot-high pile of petitions thanking us—45,000 people had signed those petitions!

This is what makes our efforts worthwhile.

Public demand and public support is giving us the go-ahead to work for tough legislation to protect our natural environment.

Congress is now holding hearings on vital environmental legislation proposed by President Nixon.

These bills include stringent emission control standards for the automobile. . . .

A \$10 billion funding program to build and update the municipal waste treatment plants throughout the country. . . .

Fines of up to \$10,000 a day for those who continue to pollute. . . .

Full funding of the Land and Water Conservation Fund for buying park lands.

I recently urged Congress to increase this fund from \$200 million to \$300 million a year.

We need these added funds now or we could lose forever valuable additions to our park and recreation land reserves.

The President's initiative in this Congress marks, I believe, a turning point in governmental leadership in caring for our national habitat.

Is our program going to be sufficient to save the environment?

Of course not. It will require the total effort of America—not only those who are individually or privately concerned—nor is it just the responsibility of youth to bring the issue forward. All Americans must participate.

And the government has an obligation to provide leadership. And this we are committed to do.

I am a firm believer in the rights of the individual and the rights of the states.

President Nixon's emphasis is more and more on moving responsibility and power from the Federal government to the local level . . . where government is closest to the people it serves. However, we face problems in the environment which are bigger than any of us alone.

First we must catch up. Then we must keep up.

The Federal government must help industry catch up; then set the standards that make sure we keep up.

You cannot clean up part of a river, or one section of the sky. It's unfair to our people as a whole to permit negligence by one element of our citizenry.

That is why we need authority to regulate water quality standards, not state by state, but by entire river-basins.

We can't permit one city to clean up its pollution while the town upstream refuses to do the same.

There must be enforcement at the Federal level.

I see this as an extension of personal liberty . . . not an encroachment.

We can be free again to breathe pure air in our cities and swim in unpolluted waters in our rivers and lakes only if the Federal government sets responsible standards . . . and enforces them.

I am convinced that sound national planning is required to deal with a task as complex and interrelated as protecting the environment of 200 million people.

The American environment belongs to all of us.

Use it and enjoy it . . . but above all, respect and protect it.

President Nixon has asked us to work with him in repairing the damage to our environment and in seeking a new quality of life.

We in the Department of the Interior dedicate ourselves to renew and conserve our natural and cultural heritage. Please join us in this endeavor.

HEALTH CRISIS IN AMERICA

HON. BENJAMIN S. ROSENTHAL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. ROSENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon recently spoke about a massive crisis in health care and warned that we will have a breakdown in our medical system "which could have consequences affecting millions of people throughout the country." He was wrong, for the breakdown has already occurred, and the consequences are already affecting our people.

While there has been considerable improvement in the quality of life for most Americans, the fact still remains that a large proportion of the 20 million blacks, 5 million Mexican Americans, and 500,000 American Indians, and millions of others, spend their lives in conditions we would not let animals endure while the system of care for people with diseases associated with such conditions seems mainly to obstruct their receiving needed care.

Two eminent physicians, Drs. Lester Breslow and Paul Cornely—the president and president-elect of the American Public Health Association, in 1969 led a tour of public officials, private individuals, and media representatives to examine health conditions throughout the United States.

They visited Indian reservations, inner city slums, adult detention centers, and pockets of rural poverty. They went to these places, not because they were special, but rather because they were typical of conditions which characterize the lives of millions of Americans—and which are—seemingly designed to break the human spirit. Furthermore, everywhere they went, local health and welfare officials seemed as trapped by the rules as the people they supposedly were serving.

Jesse Jackson has written that hunger is not a hurting thing, it is a halting force with respect to the progress of a nation toward goals of unity, cohesion and growth.

The report of this group entitled "Health Crisis in America," illuminates the problem well. I include today the introduction and conclusions of that report in the RECORD:

HEALTH CRISIS IN AMERICA

INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1969, as President and President-elect of the American Public Health Association, we undertook a tour to examine in microcosm health conditions in the United States.

Starting in a Mexican-American barrio in Houston, we journeyed to a rural community in the Central Valley of California; juvenile and adult detention quarters in Atlanta, Georgia; the Potomac River in Washington, D.C.; homes of off-reservation Indians in Great Falls, Montana; and the inner-city community of Kenwood-Oakland on the Southside of Chicago, Illinois.

Our aim was to investigate, firsthand, typical environmental and medical care situations directly related to the rise of serious health problems. We believed it was time for health professionals to see, hear and smell these situations which characterize the lives of millions of Americans, rather than to limit our view of the problems to health statistics, patients in clinics and laboratory specimens.

People from the neighborhoods, concerned professionals, some health and welfare officials, national and state legislators, and representatives of the news media joined our tour. Their participation reflects the rising and already substantial demand for improvement of health conditions in our country—improvement in housing, nutrition, air, water, jobs and medical care.

As public health physicians, we thought we knew pretty well the nature and extent of those conditions. But frankly, we were shocked, and are still reeling. Circumstances that can only be called health brutality pervade the lives of millions of American people who live in communities that seem designed to break the human spirit.

When viewed closely, the national and state programs which purport to deal with these conditions appear to represent a policy of domestic brinkmanship. They simply skirt disaster and do little to ameliorate underlying problems. President Nixon recently spoke about a "massive crisis" in health care and warned that we will have a breakdown in our medical system "which could have consequences affecting millions of people throughout the country." In fact, the breakdown has already occurred, and the consequences are already affecting our people.

We recall with pain—

Approximately 50,000 persons of the Kenwood-Oakland area of Chicago, who live in rodent- and insect-infested housing, with broken plumbing, stairs and windows. Today, these people pay from one- to two-thirds of their incomes for rent and are served by a total of five physicians in their community—a physician-to-population ratio less than one-tenth of the country as a whole—with the county hospital and clinics eight miles away.

A 53-year-old American Indian in Great Falls, Montana, veteran of the South Pacific in World War II, raising a family of six children (and one grandchild, whose father is now in Vietnam) on a pension and what he can scrounge by salvage in a junkyard. He can neither afford to buy food stamps nor return to the hospital for post-cancer treatment—closure of his bowel, which now opens on his abdomen—because his family would not have food while he is gone.

The farmworker in Tulare County, California, who said that exposure to pesticides from airplane spraying of fields, contrary to regulations and often leading to illness, was frequently not reported. "What's the use?" he asked. "We lose wages going to the doctor, get better in a week usually, and get no compensation, and they don't stop spraying."

The woman in Tulare County, eight months pregnant, whose Medi-Cal (Medicaid) eligibility had been cancelled last month because her husband had just found a temporary job, thus forcing her to seek care at the County Hospital which previous experience had taught her to hate.

The young woman in Houston, whose welfare check for a family of eight had been cut from \$123 to \$23 a month.

A therapist in the Child Treatment Center, Atlanta, Georgia, where excellent work

with youngsters in trouble was underway, but "the main difficulty is that the kids have to go right back to the same life that got them into trouble in the first place, and we can't do anything about that here."

An "uncooperative" chronic alcoholic who carried a card from Grady Hospital identifying him as an epileptic, but who, a few days before our visit, had occupied the "hole"—a 4 foot by 8 foot solitary confinement cell—in the Atlanta City Prison.

Dead fish floating in the dirty water of the Potomac, the "Nation's River," which flows through out capital city so polluted by untreated and inadequately treated sewage that fish cannot live there, and the spread of human disease-causing bacteria appears as a serious threat.

Everywhere we encountered lamentable excuses offered by local health and welfare officials, who seemed as trapped by "the rules" as the people they were supposed to serve.

While there has been considerable improvement in the quality of life for most Americans, the fact still remains that a large proportion of the 20,000,000 blacks, the 5,000,000 Mexican-Americans, the 500,000 American Indians, and millions of others live day in and day out in conditions we would not let our animals endure; and the "system" of care for people with disease associated with such conditions seems mainly to obstruct their receiving the care that is needed.

We visited the particular places mentioned because they are typical, not unique. The gross pollution of the Potomac exemplifies what is happening to the rivers and lakes of America. Atlanta treats her alcoholics essentially the same way such very sick people in cities across the land are treated, and Atlanta provides facilities for juveniles in trouble that are better than in many other places. These conditions characterize the lives of millions of Americans; they are not just isolated pockets of disaster.

The following separate reports on each of our visits indicate these disgraceful situations that millions of Americans now endure.

LESTER BRESLOW, M.D.,
President, APHA, 1969.
PAUL B. CORNELLY, M.D.,
President, APHA, 1970.

CONCLUSION

If any should think that we present an exaggerated picture, or too harsh a judgment based on "isolated" instances, let him spend as we did, a few full days actually looking, listening, and smelling. The conditions we describe are all too pervasive.

They speak for themselves and require no discussion. They are the basis for the disillusionment of millions of Americans with the "Establishment," especially with agencies of government that fail to take effective action on glaring health difficulties that deeply depress the whole quality of life.

We were struck by the utter inadequacy of our social response. The agencies that are supposed to deal with the problems appear to exist mainly as enforcers of rules that are carefully framed legalistic subterfuges to avoid providing needed services. Often these rules, of course, are there to guard against expenditures from the grossly insufficient budgets that are appropriated by legislative bodies.

The apathy of professional personnel in practically all the agencies of human services, with a few striking exceptions, was particularly disconcerting. Most of them seemed weighted down to the point of indifference by the system in which they work. The major challenge comes from professionals who are outside the official system linked up with grass roots organizations of people. Those in governmental agencies generally do not even seem concerned with the severe inadequacies

of health information, especially among the poor.

As physicians knowing something about Medicaid's shortcomings, we were appalled to see how harshly it works against the medical interests of individuals. Termination of benefits without reasonable notice and by arbitrary application of welfare rules that completely ignore medical realities is especially outrageous.

Overshadowing in health consequences even the problems in medical care for the poor was the lack of attention to environmental conditions. While adverse environmental conditions affect all persons to some extent, as in the case of the Potomac, the living conditions of the poor in America constitute an ever greater national disgrace when one considers the capability of our country and the living conditions of most people in the country. Housing literally not fit for animals, residences in sections of the cities marked for future industrial or commercial development and hence really abandoned for human habitation—these are typical scenes. Enforcement of local zoning and housing codes, if these even exist, is not seriously attempted. In fact, the only rule that seems to be systematically enforced is that the people continue to pay rent. The regulatory agencies do defend the interest of those who derive income from the property and the environment in which the poor live so miserably.

Now we wish to propose some lines of action, for health professionals such as ourselves and for the legislative and administrative branches of government. We share the conviction of many in our country, often expressed these past few months, that a nation with the technological ability and governmental resources to create a satisfactory environment for an Apollo space capsule on a trip to the moon must find a way to provide healthful living conditions for the people in Houston, Tulare County, Great Falls, Chicago, Washington, Atlanta, and everywhere else in this country.

As professional public health workers, we should first recognize our own deficiencies. Like others in professional and technical fields of endeavor, some of us have become closely identified with agencies and institutions whose bureaucratic interests may contradict the interests of the people we are supposed to be serving. Of course, we must be loyal to the agencies for which we work. But callousness in accepting the "rules" and the budgets, developed possibly as a protection against our own feelings of guilt as workers in too feeble programs, has insensitized us to the point where we no longer press vigorously to achieve adequate programs. We tend to resist the "community take-over" of health programs by people in impoverished neighborhoods, who have found that they must participate in setting the rules as a means literally, of survival. For too long the programs have stifled their participation; and the rules, established by others who do not understand the problems make less and less sense.

To avoid such professional myopia, we urge that public health professionals, no matter what their type of work or employment, devote some time each year to observing directly the conditions of life that generate health problems. It is one thing to treat a child in a clinic with a cut eye, but another thing to encounter him as we did in a Chicago neighborhood, with a patched eye, and to hear him describe and then see the broken stair rail at his house which permitted him to fall from the second floor onto glass on the ground adjacent to his house.

Further, we believe that health professionals should join hands with organizations of people that are emerging in neighborhoods throughout the country to fight for

better health conditions. Everywhere on the tour we found that neighborhood organizations are springing up and arousing new hope. The advancement of public health today requires the development of effective alliances between such groups and those having technical competence in health work. Alliances of this sort would energize the efforts of all.

Although we knew before the tour that our health programs needed a drastic overhaul, the visits added a depth of understanding and feeling that we could not have obtained otherwise.

A health care program for the poor based on a month-to-month means test to determine indigency is unacceptable in a decent society. We can only begin to understand the indignity suffered by those who seek to qualify under a means test. But apart from that, the means test system requires the cancellation of eligibility for benefits because of slight temporary increases in income. This is standard practice under Medicaid throughout the country. Thus, access to medical care is often cut off just when it is most needed to boost a family out of the poverty-poor health cycle.

This makes no medical sense. Getting the information, keeping the records, and making the judgments each month, according to rules which are changed often with little or no notice by state and county officials, costs a substantial amount which could go a long way toward providing benefits on a yearly basis. The latter would be much more sensible from a medical standpoint and in the long run probably more economical. One must ask whether the present arrangement is designed to aid the poor or to perpetuate a bureaucracy. Medicaid as a whole—its system of eligibility, loose budgeting, crazy-quilt pattern of benefits, and failure to set standards for care—was fashioned out of the mold of old-fashioned, welfare-oriented programs. It is probably the most colossal excrement of a welfare system that has long outlived its usefulness and, as President Nixon has indicated, must be revamped. What better place to begin the revamping than to set free the provision of health services for the poor from a welfare system that grossly distorts its purpose? Few would deny that health care for the poor is important and that a health care system should make medical sense.

It is time for Congress to assert that health care for the poor must be approached systematically; responsibility for the health care system must no longer be parcelled out in an uncoordinated way among dozens of Federal, state, and local public agencies. More than six per cent of the Gross National Product now is devoted to health care. With an increasing proportion of that directly out of government funds, it does seem timely that we develop a national policy and program on health care, instead of drifting and taking pot shots at drug prices and physicians' fees, horrendous as some of these may be. Our tour convinced us that health care for the poor, at least, in this country has broken down. The crisis is not coming; it is here.

The American Public Health Association would be pleased to join in the development of a national policy and program of health care for all.

In the meantime, convinced of the urgency by our tour, we make the following recommendations as beginning steps to relieve the chaos in health care:

1. Establishing eligibility for Medicaid on a yearly rather than monthly basis.

2. Channeling funds from Medicaid and other governmental health care programs to build comprehensive primary medical care services in poverty neighborhoods, linked to hospital services for cases in which the latter are needed.

3. Offering young physicians opportunity for service in poverty neighborhoods as an alternative to military service.

We would note, however, that health *per se* is only one part of what is needed to meet human health needs, and not the most important part. Again, the tour reinforced this point in our minds.

A national program to improve housing for the poor is urgently needed as a health measure. It is simply impossible to maintain health in houses that are physically unsafe and without elementary sanitation features. Such are the houses where millions of Americans now live. A national housing program must be more than what "urban renewal" has meant in many places: namely driving poor people out of dilapidated dwellings to make room for public and commercial buildings and residences for people of means, with little or no improvement in housing for the poor who are merely scattered by the "renewal."

The main housing program for the poor consists of welfare benefits which include an itemized amount for rent. Many hundreds of millions of dollars of this money goes to support housing that does not meet any standard. This means, in effect, that present national welfare policy subsidizes shockingly bad housing without any effort at quality control; it actually encourages landlords to continue making profits without improving the housing. We now spend an estimated \$4.2 billion of Federal funds in public assistance payments. President Nixon's welfare reform proposal would add \$4 billion, or double our expenditures. But the welfare reform proposal does not provide for the reforms that are needed to insure that Federal payments for housing do not continue to subsidize substandard dwellings.

Medicare provisions stipulate funds may not be used to pay hospitals failing to meet a standard of quality. Since housing may be at least as important to health as hospitals, we believe health interests require the same approach to housing as that taken to hospitals. Poor people are beginning to see the whole "establishment"—welfare agencies and law enforcement agencies—in support of rent payment but not decency in housing.

As a first step toward better housing for the poor, we recommend:

4. Prohibiting the use of money in individual welfare assistance budgets for payment of rent in housing that fails to meet local regulations.

5. Developing a national minimum-standard setting program for quality of housing in which monies derived from general tax revenues can be used as rent.

That hunger and malnutrition exist on a wide scale among the people of America is now openly acknowledged by the President and Congressional leaders. Food subsidy in this country, however, has meant and still means payment to agricultural interests either for not growing food or maintaining the price of food. The direct surplus food distribution program and the food stamp program have been relatively minor by-products of the subsidy to agriculture, designed largely for price control.

To overcome hunger and malnutrition in this country it will be necessary to convert the current "food program" that offers some assistance to a relatively narrow range of people into programs based on genuine need. On the tour, we encountered situation after situation in which people were obviously poor but did not qualify for the food program assistance (they lived in the wrong county or someone in the household got a temporary job last month); or they were so poor that they could not get enough cash at one time to purchase the minimum quantity of food stamps sold.

We, therefore, recommend as immediate steps:

6. Increasing by at least 50 per cent the amount of monies available for food stamps, and eliminating the requirement of a minimum quantity of food stamps to be purchased at any one time.

7. Establishing for all persons in the nation a guaranteed annual income sufficient to insure opportunity for adequate nutrition and other essentials for healthful living.

National policies and practices toward the American Indian have continued to be one of the most shameful streams in American history. The brutality continues, for example, in forcing Indians struggling to live off the reservations to return to the reservations for needed medical care; and in the statements which Secretary of the Interior, Walter J. Hickel, was quoted as making at the 1969 Annual Western Governor's Conference; namely, that the government had been a "little overprotective" of Indians and that his administration might reverse the trend because they "always have that crutch of being able to go back" to the reservations.

It is tragic that Indians must still depend for essential medical care upon "that crutch" which Mr. Hickel suggests taking away, but until something better is available they must fall back on it even when that means traveling more than 100 miles. No policy could be better designed to drive those Indians who are trying to "make a go of it" in the towns and cities of America back to the reservations than the policy of denying them urgently needed medical care. Yet that is exactly what we do.

Since responsibility for Indian health care was transferred to the Public Health Service, tremendous improvement has occurred in the health of Indians still living on the reservations. But just when that care is most needed, during the transition to off-reservation life, it is frequently denied because of the limits of the Federal program and the failure of state and local government to acknowledge Indians as citizens.

Pending further development of national social policy to assist Indians who want to achieve off-reservation life, we recommend as an immediate health measure:

8. Expanding the Public Health Service program for Indian health care to include adequate funds to pay for medical services for Indians in need for at least five years after they leave the reservation.

Degradation of our environment now has become a national issue. Hardly a day passes without major reference in the news media to the demand expressed by some national political figure or concerned group that one or another aspect of the environment be cleaned up. Our tour yielded us the opportunity to see, smell and hear the basis for this outcry: grossly polluted water, even in the nation's river, the Potomac; garbage and debris strewn not only over the landscape but accumulating in the vacant lots and alleys where children of the inner cities spend most of their time; air increasingly filled with physical and chemical waste—and noise—from what we call "advances" in industry and technology. This deterioration of America's living space results from our failure to respond to the collision between the growth and concentration of our population and our capacity to produce and use things. Our waste is drowning us, in the absence of control measures.

America must clean up. This will require a major alteration in our current policies on land development and use. Ineffective rules and enforcement machinery, established for a time when air, water, and land seemed "free" and more than plentiful, must now be sharply brought up to date. We can no longer tolerate leaving these responsibilities in the hands of governmental agencies attuned to the short-term interests of industry and land developers.

We recommend:

9. Making the health of people (broadly defined, not just specific disease control) the paramount criterion in developing and implementing much-needed national policy on the environment. As a first step the Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare should promptly develop and promulgate a comprehensive set of standards based on health criteria and without regard for any presumed ability to meet such standards, for the air, water, and land of our country.

Social advances such as those made in the United States bring changes in attitude toward many problems, including fundamental alteration in how we characterize problems. Not many years ago, for example, chronic alcoholics were drunken bums to be dealt with by the policeman and the jailer. Now, the chronic alcoholic is a sick person, provided he happens to be in the right social class. The rich chronic alcoholic goes to a private sanitarium run by psychiatrists; the middle-class chronic alcoholic goes to the clinics that are being established under health auspices; but the poor chronic alcoholic still goes to jail for drunkenness or some related offense.

This is true nationwide, not just in Atlanta where we saw it on our tour. Meanwhile the judiciary, as one branch of Government, is beginning to consider chronic alcoholism as a health problem.

In preparation for the social decision that alcoholism is a health problem we recommend:

10. Appropriating Federal funds on a large scale to support community services for treatment of the chronic alcoholic as a sick person.

It should be emphasized again that spending more money for health care services in the absence of fundamental changes in the organization and delivering of health services is not the answer. Our three-fold increase in HEW health expenditures between 1963 and 1970 is not the answer. Nor is the doubling of welfare payments the answer in the absence of fundamental changes in the welfare program. We are pouring money down the drain when we continue to subsidize substandard housing with Federal welfare payments.

Human needs in health are not being met and much more than the provision of health care services is involved. A strategy for health progress must be based upon improvement in the quality of life for all people—improvement in housing, nutrition, medical care and all the factors that determine health. As a nation, we must decide whether freedom in the pursuit of narrow economic advantage or devotion to the common good, health for all, is to be the guiding force of social life.

HARVARD SOPHOMORE OFFERS RIOT REPORT

HON. O. C. FISHER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, what on earth has happened at the once highly respected and prestigious Harvard University? The same question can be asked about Yale, Princeton, Columbia, and several others which were formerly highly regarded. Recently those schools have fallen to the depth of the jungle in many respects. Let us hope that this is a temporary flash in the pan, and those great institutions will restore themselves to the degree of public confidence they once enjoyed.

Under leave to extend my remarks I include a column by William F. Buckley, Jr., which appeared in the San Angelo, Tex., Standard-Times on April 26. The article follows:

HARVARD SOPHOMORE OFFERS RIOT REPORT (By William F. Buckley)

I turn this column over to a sophomore at Harvard, Mr. Laurence T. May, who writes about the events in Cambridge on April 15:

Dear Mr. Buckley: You probably read the piece in the New York Times concerning the riot in Harvard Square last Wednesday. The article was a bit brief for an event described by the Commissioner of Public Safety as "the worst civil disturbance in the history of the state." I was there for a lot of the action and will agree with the statement. The mob was the most ugly I have ever seen. The ferocity, the determination, the hatred they felt for the police was frightening. People who think that these kids are only frustrated youths, upset about the war or whatever, have no conception of what they are really dealing with in situations like this riot. I don't think I'm at all astray if I say that what I witnessed was nothing more than the collective expression of the criminal mind.

These kids were, a lot of them anyway, on drugs. I have never seen groups of "kids" quite as literally mad as I saw Wednesday, yelling; the ones with painted faces added to the barbaric imitations. The defiance was unmatched; even in prison where you would expect a hell of a lot more frustration than what is caused by a war 5,000 miles away, the inmates would not repeatedly return, repeatedly club cops, repeatedly throw wine bottles or whatever. Convicts at least exhibit some cunning in riots; the Harvard riots have none of that, unless you count the attempts by professionals to firebomb buildings. Imagine, if you can, kids so passionate as will run through clouds of tear gas to hurl cobblestones at retreating police.

The mob arrived in Harvard Square at 7 p.m., there being four officers on duty there. One officer tried to "reason" with the group near him and they simply laughed in his face: "pig m-f." By 7:30 Cambridge police were lined up behind the "MBTA" Kiosk. Above them, on the wall surrounding Harvard Yard 10 feet off the ground, were at least 150 "streetpeople." The rioters threw rocks, bottles, boards, bricks . . . you name it . . . down onto the police who simply stood in rank. Down went one cop, hit by a brick, down went another. Still they didn't move from ranks.

Behind the wall Harvard University police moved to clear the kids off. Incredibly, a senior tutor and an assistant Dean of the College told the University police to leave the kids alone: "We don't want any trouble. Don't start a riot." This while a full riot was in progress. The incident has caused understandable friction between university and city police. A university cop told me last night that he is afraid that if they need assistance from Cambridge some day, it will not be given quickly.

Harvard students generally abstained from actual rioting, though there were a number of identified exceptions. Mostly, they were just stupid: stupid not to stay off the streets, so they got clubbed or gassed or obstructed police. The rioters were mostly those the press rather charitably called "hippies"—the drop-outs, the long-haired welfare recipients, the panhandlers, the druggies, and the ubiquitous professionals.

George Wald, Harvard's Nobel-winning flower child, was of course in the middle of things. He actually went up to policemen in the streets, demanded that they stop, demanded that they "use reason" with the kids. While he was so engaged, a kid hit a cop with a baseball bat painted black (doesn't show up at night, nor in news photos usually).

Wald, by the way, says he fears "lower-class Catholics becoming outraged." Imagine if I told him I feared middle-class Jews rioting in the streets!

The next target is New Haven on May 1st. Unless the Panthers are freed and \$10 million indemnity paid to the party, the "political dissenters" say they'll destroy the city.

Do you think there are Communists involved? My fellow students don't, even when the Communists say they're Communists! You see, the riot was caused by the frustrations of the kids in the Harvard ghetto. Perhaps we'll have a federally-sponsored summer program soon, or a swimming pool in Harvard Yard. Better, a Head Start course for Harvard students.

MOTHERS DAY 1970

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, a Mothers Day sermon delivered by Dr. Walter R. Courtenay of the First Presbyterian Church of Nashville has captured the role of the modern-day mother.

I would like to include this sermon in the RECORD because I feel it has something to say to all of us. Dr. Courtenay addressed his words to all mothers, but particularly to those mothers of soldiers in Southeast Asia, and to the mothers of students on troubled campuses, hit by demonstrations and violence.

I insert the article at this point in the RECORD:

[From the Nashville Banner, May 11, 1970]

MOTHERS DAY 1970—(JUDE 1:17-21)

(By Dr. Walter R. Courtenay)

Today is Mothers Day, a day when we speak appreciatively of those who were our first nursery, our first pantry, our first playground, and our first means of transportation.

Whenever we deal with the subject of motherhood, we always confront two problems, first, what mothers should we talk about on a day like this, the young mothers with their little children around them; the not so young, whose teenage children confuse them with their attitudes and philosophy of life; the still older whose children are now grown, some successes, some failures; or the older mother whose silver hair turns gold in the glow of the after sunset? Every woman who has reached the age of 60 knows the tremendous changes that occur between the birth of the first baby and the time when life is mostly the history of yesterday.

The second problem is that we tend to idealize mothers, who are only slightly related to reality. Few mothers achieve the ideal, even as very few fathers, sons, and daughters achieve the ideal. Mothers, after all, are persons of flesh and blood. They are people who have vices as well as virtues, weaknesses as well as areas of great strength. But, in the main, the mothers of America have achieved accomplishments that are both high and wholesome. It is because of this that we pause to honor motherhood today. It is well that we do so, and I am pleased to do so, because I remember all too well my own mother and the wonderful girl who became the wonderful mother of my sons.

As we pause to observe Mothers Day we do so in the midst of disturbed conditions throughout our country. The America that I see around me today is completely foreign

to the America that I have known all my life. The war in Vietnam goes on with its staggering cost of men and money. The entire nation is shackled to it, and our society is being dragged down and plunged into attitudes and moods that are uncomplimentary to us and which give the world a distorted picture of this land we love.

In all of this, the mothers of all ages and conditions are involved, some having sons and daughters in colleges, some having sons and daughters who this fall will enter college, some having husbands and sons in the armed forces, and some having loved ones on the battlefronts of Asia. Some have sons who may soon have to break away from normal vocations and avocations and learn the arts of brutal war.

Mothers cannot help but be worried as they look out of their windows upon a world that is so jumbled and as messy as a city dump. We cannot blame them for asking the questions, what is ahead for our loved ones, what is ahead for our nation, what is ahead for the world? Are we now doomed to anarchy and a peaceless America? Is there no way, and is there no one, who can alter the streams of events carrying us swiftly toward the rapids and the plunge of the mighty waterfall?

Today we cannot avoid thinking of the mothers of the four Kent State students who this past week were killed. Regardless of the factors, their loss is a staggering, irreparable one. We, of course, assume that these youngsters were innocent. We assume that they shouted no obscenities, threw no bottles, rocks or steel slugs, hurled no profanity and insults. We assume that they did not curse the soldiers or patrolmen, nor spat upon them. We assume that they were fringe people who understandably gather to observe these absurd displays of temper and terror. Innocent they may have been but they were part of that noisy minority group led by hard core radicals from off and from on the campus, who were determined to create a situation that hopefully would end bloodshed. I agree that bottles, bricks, rocks, steel slugs and profanity are not the same as bullets, but they are weapons of offense.

It is to be regretted that the leaders who created the disturbances were not where the action was when young Guardsmen, hearing shots and fearing for their lives, opened fire in self defense. The facts are not all in, and in all probability we will never know the actual facts of what created the death of these students at Kent State. But we can pause on this day to extend our sympathy and our prayer to the mothers of those who died, and the mothers of the young people who were stupid enough to become part of that senseless mob.

BE REALISTIC

Here we must be realistic about campus disturbances. First, they never involve the majority of students. Second, they seldom involve the students who are on the college campus to get an education. Third, the disturbances are rarely spontaneous. They are planned, they are fanned, they are fomented, they are created. Fourth, they are never non-violent. The lighted fuse of a dynamite charge may seem non-violent, but you and I know that that fuse, once lighted, will eventually explode the dynamite. Of course, the leaders on our campuses claim non-violence even while they are collecting the bottles, the rocks and the steel slugs with which to confront the patrolmen and, if necessary, the National Guard. After heads are broken and members of the mob are arrested, naturally they cry out against police and guard brutality, and loudly protest their own innocence.

There is a hard core of anti-order, anti-America radicals on every campus and in every community. Their contribution to America's prosperity, security and peace is

nil. Their contribution to America's disunity, disorderliness, and disgraceful conduct is beyond measure. They organize, they incite, they motivate, they spread false rumors, information and charges. They foment alienation and senseless antipathy. They do all they can to arouse the beast in students and to give it liberty. They begin the rallies, and they they lead until the action gets too hot. They encourage sabotage and subversion. They draw into their ranks idealistic, impulsive, excitable students who know little of the facts but whose emotions are aflame. Thus, they create a mob and when confrontation comes, the hard core leaders put the idealistic, excitable students in the front ranks of the battle and seek safety for themselves. They are seldom beaten and bruised. They are trained to use others, but never to get hurt themselves.

Let it be clearly understood that the organizers, the fomenters, who lead the idealistic, excitable, venturesome students are in no sense representative of their campuses. By any measure, they are not loyal, informed, clear thinking Americans. They are the paid servants of subversive forces. They are the manipulators of situations. They are the managers of chaos. They are anti-America, anti-decency, anti-democracy, anti-justice, anti-free speech, anti-law, anti-authority, anti-church and anti-God.

BUT ONE GOAL

They have but one goal, to so disrupt our normal ways of life that institutions in America cannot function with success. And all of this is blamed on the war in Vietnam.

Let me read part of an editorial that appeared not long ago in the Nashville Banner: "In the 5500 years of recorded history there have not been more than 230 years of peace, and in the relatively brief history of the United States, there have been fewer than 20 years in which one of our armed services has not been engaged in some military operation. Despite these facts, most Americans still cling to the delusion that peace is normal and war is abnormal."

We are in Vietnam because of a solemn and sacred treaty. We are there because the Viet Cong are the paid henchmen of Hanoi, and Hanoi is but the satellite of Moscow and Peking. If the border created by treaty had been honored by Hanoi and her expansionist allies, if the border created by Great Britain, France, Russia, the United States and others had not been crossed, and if the South Vietnamese people had been left to develop their own way of life as Hanoi and the rest of us had agreed, we would not be in Vietnam today.

And now we are in Cambodia. The adolescent intellectuals in our midst, the critics of our current Administration, and the hard core hirelings of subversive forces have joined ranks to create further division in our midst. Now, we are not fighting Cambodia. We are fighting the same enemy that we have been fighting for five years. The drive to destroy the sanctuaries with Cambodia makes sense. Actually we have not invaded Cambodia. We have invaded communist territory held for the past five years by the Viet-Cong and the soldiers of Hanoi. Cambodians have not owned nor controlled this area of their country during the last four or five years. We have invaded Hanoi territory. We have invaded Viet Cong territory. We have not invaded Cambodian territory, and we are not at war with Cambodia. The war has escalated only in the sense that we have finally decided to do what we should have done a long, long time ago.

No one can rejoice over our presence in Asia, least of all the mothers who have husbands and sons in the armed forces in Vietnam. On this Mothers Day I am all too conscious that such mothers are not being honored publicly as they have been in all the other wars that we have fought. Many hus-

bands and sons will never return to these mothers, and many husbands and sons will return but never to a normal way of life again. The tears of such American mothers today are truly salty, and their vision has to be misty, and their hearts have to know pain.

MOTHERS DAY 1970

Mothers Day 1970 is a day fraught with danger. Never has our unity been so seriously jeopardized, nor citizen responsibilities held so cheaply. The moral fibre of our people seems flabby in the face of the forces that disrupt law and order, decency and loyalty, fairmindedness and fair delivery. Standards of value long held valid are now trampled in the mud along with the ashes of burned American Flags and hopes. Respect and good manners seem to have evaporated in heat of bad tempers. Vulgarly and cheapness are honored rather than condemned. God and His Law mean little as radical students and their idealistic followers seek to jerk the rug of honor and respect from under our feet. Quicksands have been substituted for hard trails, lies for truth, revolution for renewal, and a hog's view of life for that of mature, informed, responsible people.

Nor do many of our leaders in Congress, college and church seek to improve our situation, for they demand the impossible while believing with all their hearts in the improbable. They subsidize and support subversion and arson. They add fuel to the social fires that threaten to destroy us, and not once have I seen a fire extinguisher in the hands of any of them seeking to put out the flames that threaten our land. Students and others who call policemen "pigs" and National Guardsmen "bastards" and "s.o.b.'s" now become angry when a leader in high responsible position refers to certain students as "bums." We have always had bums. They have always been part of our campuses. We have always had bums in our communities. Let's call them what they are, and not quibble about it. We have more on our college campuses today because we have admitted to our campuses people that should never have been admitted in the first place. Many are there for no other purpose than to disrupt the tranquility of the campus, and to bring our institutions to a state of helplessness.

I could believe neither my eyes nor my ears the other morning when a law professor of the University of California stood on a platform and exhorted students to go on with their violence, and concluded his remarks by saying, "We are either going to liberate this country from within, or we will do it from without."

DIFFICULT TO RESPECT

I find it difficult to respect the TV commentators of our national chains who speak of student unrest as if the majority of students were involved, who speak of student riots as if most of the students on the campus were part of the riots. None supports the administration nor the people responsible for law and order in our nation. To me it is most unfortunate that faculty members, congressmen and churchmen join these people to further disturb and disrupt our normal way of life.

I say to you this morning with all the conviction I possess that when dissent becomes descent into ways and words that dishonor the sacred and belie the sensible, it is time for American leaders to take strong action. When mobs feel free to throw bottles and rocks, steel slugs and profanity, not to mention Molotov cocktails, why should they resent the use of our more normal weapons of defense on the part of our policemen and our National Guard? It seems sensible to them to curse, to riot, to burn, and create disorder, but irrational for policemen and guardsmen to defend themselves and the honor and security of our society.

TO THE MOTHERS

To the mothers of this church and community who have tried to do a good job in rearing their children to respect God and their citizenship, and to carry their responsibilities with a real sense of commitment, I tender my sympathy, my encouragement and my prayers. To the mothers of America who are striving to do the same I offer them my help. To the mothers of the slain Kent State students I can only offer my tears and my regrets, my sympathy, and my hope for better things. To the mothers whose children have exchanged a heritage of value for a mess of communistic pottage, and a normal faith in the cross for an absurd faith in the hammer, I can only send my sympathy and my encouragement. To the mothers whose husbands and sons and daughters are on the front lines of Vietnam and Cambodia today, I can only remember them in prayer before God that they will have the strength to endure.

This is indeed a strange Mothers Day, but it ought to remind us that emotions are seldom rational, that anarchy destroys but never builds, and that a life or a program that is not built in accordance with the absolute laws of God and the universe cannot long endure.

I hope, therefore, that the events of the past week will motivate us to prevent further deterioration within our nation, and to cancel out the repeats of Kent State. We must do all in our power to rededicate ourselves to the task of character building, of Christian nurture, and of loyal American citizenship. We must dedicate ourselves anew to the creation of American unity and the building of security. We must get on with the church's main task, that of bringing men into a full commitment to Christ to the end that they may then go out into the world to live lives that honor God and elevate the standards of men. We must return to America's major task of making this land of ours the land of the free and the home of the brave.

"The greatest battle that e'er was fought—
"Shall I tell you where and when?
"On the maps of the world you'll find it not;

"It was fought by the Mothers of Men."
I repeat again the words of Jude, "Now do remember, dear friends, the words that the messengers of Jesus Christ gave us beforehand when they said, 'There will come in the last days mockers who live according to their own godless desires.' These are the men who split communities, for they are led by human emotions, and never by the Spirit of God. But you, dear friends, build yourselves up on the foundation of your most holy faith, and by praying through the Holy Spirit keep yourselves within the love of God."

POLLUTION—A DIRTY WORD

HON. JOHN D. DINGELL

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to permission granted I insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an excellent editorial appearing in the Dearborn, Mich., Press, an outstanding publication edited and published by Mr. Robert F. Smith, a distinguished citizen of Dearborn, Mich., entitled "Pollution—A Dirty Word."

I believe this fine editorial expresses well the concern so much abroad in our land on man's incredible destruction of his environment.

POLLUTION—A DIRTY WORD

What are we going to do about pollution? Shall we stand by while the verbal tirades pass back and forth between industry and the concerned government officials and citizens? Or, do we, who constitute the vocal minority and the silent majority, take some action?

Each year the destruction of the environment progresses geometrically. In the early '60's Rachael Carson was looked on with interest, but without concern, as she forecast the peril of environmental destruction in her book "The Silent Spring."

At that time, the environment was still relatively clean. But, today, a hot, windless day in New York City or Los Angeles takes its toll in lives. Scientists can accurately state that within the next generation death due to air pollutants will become an everyday occurrence.

Yet, pollution extends further. It is the oil slick on the Atlantic or Pacific coast beach. We can live with black, gooey beach. All we have to do is move down the beach to a cleaner spot.

But, migrating birds and seals move in and become saturated and suffocated by the mess. We can live with their deaths, but we must remember that their passing is not an isolated incident.

It is a symptom of a world-wide sickness. Perhaps we could even rationalize and live with the extinction of entire species. Their deaths, though, are the signs of an impending destruction which, so far, we have been able to outrun.

The handwriting is on the wall, written in the foreboding script of death. This is not a problem which will pass if we look the other way. We can not let this one slide.

In spite of the danger, industry continues to spoil the atmosphere. Their problem, though, is just as difficult. Many of the April 22 marchers demanded an immediate halt to activities of offending industries.

Think about it. What if someone came into your house today and told you to stop washing dishes and clothes, and demanded that you stop using electricity which is made by polluting power plants? What if they further demanded that you leave your car in the garage because of the carbons it emits?

You couldn't do it and neither can industry.

We must end pollution of the air, the soil and the sea. We must stop the noisy assault on our ears by car and truck horns, jet aircraft and the cacophonous din of urban complexes. We have to learn how to handle the exploding population, the disposal of hard pesticides, the conservation of the dwindling stock of trees, and the filthy mass of litter which has now penetrated as far as the deepest trench in the Pacific Ocean.

But, if we demand that industry cease polluting operations immediately the economy will collapse. We must move quickly, but with intelligent alternatives for the rebirth of the dying world.

Protests without intelligent proposals behind them are useless. The federal government has begun the process of halting pollution but its first steps are feeble and slow instead of strong and rapid. \$100 fines, \$1000 fines, even \$100,000 fines are ridiculous, especially when levied against a billion-dollar corporation.

The federal government must enforce stringent measures ranging from monitoring and surveillance to on-the-spot checks and large fines handed out on the basis of units of pollution.

Large corporations which boast of \$150 million pollution control projects should be prodded onward instead of patted on the back. If a corporation can spend more than \$250 million for changing the signs on its offices, then it can surely afford to lay out as much, or more, for pollution control.

Each of us must be conscious of the prob-

lem, not politically, not as a tax deduction, but as a personal problem which is just as serious as having a revolver pointed at your temple.

If we accomplish some of our aims, we have no reason to be proud. We are not gaining a thing. All we must attempt to do is break even. We must give back what we have taken.

WASHINGTON NOTES "ECKHARDT OF TEXAS"

HON. ROBERT O. TIERNAN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. TIERNAN. Mr. Speaker, in the current edition of Harper's, there is a rather apt narrative of our distinguished colleague from Houston, the Honorable Bob ECKHARDT.

The author of this article is Edwin Yoder, Jr., associate editor of the Greensboro Daily News. Mr. Yoder's objective and pertinent sketch of Bob ECKHARDT is well drawn as he easily catches the spirit, personality, and brilliance of my good friend from Texas.

I have sat next to Bob in committee since my arrival here in the House over 3 years ago, first on Science and Astronautics and presently on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, and I could not agree more with Mr. Yoder's high appraisal of this thoughtful and conscientious Member of Congress.

I commend this article to the House and include it as part of my remarks here today:

WASHINGTON NOTES: ECKHARDT OF TEXAS
(By Edwin M. Yoder, Jr.)

When Representative Bob Eckhardt of the eighth district of Texas entered the U.S. House of Representatives in early 1967, he encountered a lot of problems—the cards are always stacked against the new boys, especially if they are already fifty-three years old and stand little chance of achieving seniority. But the worst problem was that his natural political allies in the House could not believe Eckhardt was a liberal.

In the first place, he speaks in the soft drawl of East Texas, and even after his real political sympathies had been suspected he would still horrify a correct Yankee liberal by going over to the Senate side to testify on a bill and bandying genial colloquialisms with people like Senator Sam Ervin, Jr. of North Carolina, laughing and saying things like, "But *Senatah*, isn't that like sending the possum to chase the *daug*?" Usually there is a gold watch chain strung across the waistcoated paunch of his three-piece suit; and above the unvarying bow tie the vaguely Claghornish hair tends to tumble down to eye level. The truth is, Bob Eckhardt looks like a Southern tory, and when you first meet him you expect him to think like an Allen Drury caricature of a Southern Congressman.

In the second place, Eckhardt isn't a liberal. He is actually an almost quaint example of the genuine federalist who flourished in the early days of the Republic but began to become extinct during the stresses of the 1830s. He really believes in the balanced system of state and federal power that Madison & Company put together, but he differs from most Southerners of that apparent persuasion in that he is usually for the underdog rather than the top-dog. In a twelve-year legislative career (which included sev-

eral terms in the Texas Assembly before his election to Congress) Bob Eckhardt has worked for industrial safety legislation, civil rights, arms control, conservation, consumer protection, and other generally un-Texan causes.

Still, it was quite a while after he took his seat in Congress for metropolitan Harris County (Houston), in a seat he had in fact helped design as a member of the Texas House, before the suspicious Congressional liberals began to notice him. "The hardest group to crack," surprisingly, "was the Democratic Study Group," a loose confederation of House liberals who supply each other with study papers and voting positions in an effort to dent the well-fortified House committee establishment.

Some of this suspicion was allayed, last June, when the U.S. Supreme Court delivered its decision in *Powell v. McCormack*, with Chief Justice Warren delivering the last of his great libertarian opinions and holding that the House had illegally deprived the Harlem Congressman of his seat. In reaching that verdict, the Court quoted at length from an elegant discussion of the parliamentary issue written by Bob Eckhardt in the University of Texas law review. Typically, Eckhardt regards Powell as a rogue but believes that even a rogue has his rights under the Constitution. Powell never bothered to thank Eckhardt for his pains, but that hardly matters to Eckhardt.

His advocacy of Powell's unpopular cause is only one in a series of improbable positions in which Bob Eckhardt has found himself. When the omnibus crime-control bill came to the House floor in the summer of 1968 on a tide of "law-and-order" sentiment, he joined a small group of liberals in opposing its riot-control section, believing it to be a departure from the Bill of Rights and as important to a real federalist—an unprecedented and uncalled-for expansion of federal criminal law.

The same considerations, basically, governed a recent decision that put him among the Tories. He opposed—persistently—the Constitutional amendment, passed overwhelmingly by the House last September, providing for the direct popular election of Presidents.

"I think you're being countryslicked," he told the New Yorkers, Californians, and other urban Congressmen who voted for the amendment, noting that the five largest states, containing a third of the people, control only six committee chairmanships in Congress—15 per cent. Under the electoral college, he argued, the President is a "super-legislator" whose "innovative quality" the country needs. He voted in a minority of seventy.

As his progressive colleagues in the House began to perceive that Eckhardt is a man of rare independence, they began to admit him to those almost conspiratorial little cells of the like-minded that operate beneath the huge, unwieldy surface of the House. Eckhardt is active in several informal bands, in addition to the large and rather inchoate Democratic Study Group, which he mysteriously designates as the "True Believers," the "Hard Core," and another so ultra-confidential that no stranger is admitted—the "Group."

When I visited Eckhardt in Room 1741 of the Longworth Building for a week last September, I found myself barred from any spying on the Group, which was then mapping legislative strategy on defense procurement. (At that time the procurement bill, which had been debated by the Senate for three months, seemed likely to pass the House in a few days, and it did.) I did manage to visit the Hard Core, a somewhat less serious group of House activists who gather weekly over Danish rolls and coffee to intrigue against the inertia of the committee establishment.

On that particular morning, Eckhardt had ridden his bicycle all the way from his house on N Street in Georgetown to Capitol Hill, his route taking him past the little red town house where John Kennedy once lived, by the reflecting pool and the Lincoln Memorial. During those morning bicycle rides, Eckhardt ponders the coming day on the Hill and sometimes writes verses—he is an amateur versifier and cartoonist—about House colleagues. Two years ago, pedaling the same 35-minute route, he got to thinking about Representative H. R. Gross, the Iowa Republican watchdog whom he admires at a safe ideological distance, and wrote:

It's good enough for Mr. Bow
To just preserve the status quo.
And Dr. Hall will gladly tell 'em
His status quo is antebellum.
"What bellum, then?" cries Mr. Gross.
"The Civil War is much too close.
I'd fain retreat with right good speed
To England prior to Runnymede."

"Mr. Gross," Eckhardt says, "sees the world as not having changed much from the days when it was ruled by the British Navy. Mr. Gross, you know, is the one who combs the Congressional Record to find out how much tax money's being spent for those limousines he sees parked below the Capitol steps."

Mr. Gross, comfortably established by virtue of the seniority system, is the kind of Congressman Eckhardt isn't—and couldn't be—both because of his orthodox power in the House and because of his outlook. But it isn't as if the House were a strange place to Eckhardt, even if its usual entrees to power are shut to him. His maternal uncle, a Republican named Harry Wurzbach, was there under Harding and Coolidge, and as a boy Eckhardt once campaigned with him. "Some fool fired a pistol at him during a speech, and another time they tried to count him out but he demanded a recount and claimed his seat after the House had already convened." Another uncle on his father's side, a Bryan Democrat, sat during the Teddy Roosevelt era. His father's cousin, a "Southern bloc conservative," was in the House in New Deal days. Eckhardt's constituency in northeast Harris county provides a further variation on the family legacy. It is a labor-minority district, which reelected Eckhardt last year with a 70 per cent majority, even though there was considerable Wallace sentiment among the oilworkers and steelworkers. His thumping majority was all the more remarkable in that Bob Eckhardt has never disguised the fact that he isn't a segregationist. (In a Houston television debate thirteen years ago, he dismissed the then-fashionable revival of "interposition" as "digging up John Wilkes Booth and trying to run him for President.")

When Bob Eckhardt pedaled his bike up Constitution Avenue on the September day we were to breakfast with his friends of the Hard Core, a more or less routine week in the House was in prospect—no large dramas or dilemmas but a good window on the House as an institution at this stage in its history. Most of the week's newspaper headlines generated on Capitol Hill would, as usual, dwell on the Senate. Senator Charles Goodell would pass a milestone in his countermarch toward reelection by introducing his resolution to extricate the U.S. from Vietnam. Judge Clement Haynsworth, Jr., President Nixon's nominee for the Fortas seat on the Supreme Court, would explain his stock portfolio to the Senate Judiciary Committee.

On the House side, there would be little business on the floor worth remembering, although Bob Eckhardt would speak briefly for a bill to revive railway passenger service, recalling a trip through the Rockies in a decrepit Pullman car when he and the ancient porter sought to raise the temperature above freezing. (In some ways, the House

floor is nearly as removed from a Congressman's hour-by-hour concern as the Senate, which by custom is never called anything but "the other place." Every few hours the bells would ring and the lights flash on the clock above Sam Houston's portrait behind Eckhardt's oval desk, and the Congressman would scurry over for a quorum call or a vote. To a stranger looking down from the well-invigilated galleries—you may not rest your elbows on the railings or take notes—the House chamber, in its dim reds and browns, suggests a railway depot of the last century where some berserk station master is droning about legislation rather than train schedules.)

The Longworth Building, where Eckhardt parks his bike every day for a quick elevator ride to the seventh floor, is one of three House office buildings. Its offices are arranged four-square about a courtyard planted with three forlorn rows of shrubs, and looking down from a fourth-floor window you half expect to see a queue of prisoners taking the air.

On this morning, the Hard Core were meeting in the offices of Representative Dave Obey of Wisconsin, a newcomer whose office walls are decorated with peace emblems and anti-DDT posters, and whose credentials no doubt permitted him quicker entree into the inner cells of House liberalism than Eckhardt's. In fact, Eckhardt is the only Southerner in the Hard Core. Others—Representative Ed Koch of New York, Abner Mikva of Illinois, Patsy Mink of Hawaii, Brock Adams of Washington—have some seniority behind them but not enough to be part of the committee establishment that runs the House. Gathering in Obey's office, the regulars joke about the District of Columbia crime bill, a civil libertarian's delight from the Justice Department. Koch complains that post offices in his district are dumping his news letters and asks what the others do about that problem. Patsy Mink, just back from Hawaii, takes a good bit of ribbing about her new district, now mainly agricultural. "Boy, am I going conservative," she says.

The Hard Core is representative, I gathered as I listened to the discussion, of a certain group of younger, seniority-shy members who hold senior members in some affection but believe that the committee chairmen are too powerful and too independent. This they blame largely on the "leadership," a word spoken in Eckhardt's circles with a certain bemused disdain. Speaker McCormack, the ancient presiding officer of the House who is familiar to Americans as the old gentleman with the gaping mouth who sits behind the President during joint sessions, is agreed to be wrapped up in "the goody game." He is preoccupied, they complain, with house-keeping matters like the controversial extension of the Capitol West Front, improving the food service in the various dining rooms, and placating House employees. (If Mr. McCormack is somewhat remote from the infighting on national issues, he perks up at the slightest sign of disorder or discontent in the household. When one fairly prominent Midwest Democrat joined several others in speaking about the treatment of the dining room employees, he was startled by the Speaker's response. "After the speech, he telephoned to say that he's with us and followed it up with a meeting and other phone calls. You know why? If there were an employees' demonstration, he's the one who'd be embarrassed.") Majority Leader Carl Albert, McCormack's deputy, is suspected of secret sympathies. But as the heir-apparent to the speakership he must play conciliator. When Bob Eckhardt took me by Mr. Albert's office, I found the Majority Leader a friendly, diminutive man with twinkling eyes and a soft voice. He bristled only when I asked him the usual clichés about the House—for instance, that it has become a less responsive chamber than the Senate.

On the Wednesday before I met with the Hard Core in Obey's office, the insurgents had won a small victory in the caucus—a resolution "adopting" the 1968 Democratic platform as the basis for legislative initiative in the 91st Congress. "You can't understand the caucus problem," Eckhardt explained, "unless you understand that it's the only House forum where people who think as I do—the activists, the impatient younger members—have a potential majority." The powerful committee chairmen despise the caucus. "Do you know the difference between a caucus and a cactus?" one asked. In a cactus, the prickles are all on the outside." Knowing as they do that the insurgents want to use the caucus to bring pressure on them, the committee chairmen yearn for the old days when Speaker Sam Rayburn controlled it, fearing that it would develop into a scene of family quarrels among Democrats, especially over civil rights.

I learned still more about the recent history of the caucus, a few days later, when Eckhardt sent me to track down Representative Morris Udall of Arizona. To talk with Udall, who used to be a star athlete, you have to stay in motion. First he would lean against the marble pillars in the hallway outside the members' entrance to the House chamber (suggestive, in its tawdry ornateness, of a Byzantine seraglio). Then something would happen, Udall would dart into the chamber, where a debate was in progress over an amendment to the Wilderness Act, and after a bit he would return and we would move out on the porch overlooking the West Front. On the run, I discovered why Udall stood as a test candidate for the speakership in January 1969 against Speaker McCormack, a somewhat quixotic enterprise in which he had Eckhardt's support. Udall would say nothing to disparage the leadership, but he pointed out that his "Dear Democratic Colleague" letter of December 26, 1968, was a matter of record, having appeared in the *New York Times*. It was, in effect, Udall's platform, and it spoke for Eckhardt and others in declaring that the House "can and should be a source of innovative programs" and that "too often House Democrats have failed to extend to our newer and more marginal members the kinds of recognition . . . that would give them deserved strength in their constituencies."

Udall cupped his hands, forming a sort of canyon. "In theory," he said, "when the elections come, the House is supposed to have a heavy turnover"—he swept one hand over the other, indicating a major washout—"but it takes a real flood—a 1964—to do that, and in most years only the marginal few at the bottom of the gully, eighty or so, are exposed and washed away." It still rankles with House activists that the leadership did so little to protect the so-called "Goldwater liberals" elected in the 1964 landslide from the inevitable washing away in 1966.

In the speakership race, Udall pleaded for "constructive, rational, and responsible airing of differences in caucuses." He got a meager fifty-eight votes on the secret ballot, indicating to at least one of his staff members that "there are either a lot of secret sympathizers with the seniority system or a lot of liars." But combined with other pressures, the Udall challenge brought more alterations, one of them an upgrading of the caucus. It now meets monthly, not sporadically as under Rayburn, and it debates issues rather than merely ratifying the decrees of the elders.

The change is important to Eckhardt, for with most of the Hard Core types he believes that the Democrats' loss of the White House last year drastically changed their role. "Under Kennedy and Johnson," Eckhardt says, "the leadership was a conduit of Presidential leadership and we had a sense of motion. Nixon exerts little or no pressure, and with White House pressure off, the com-

mittee chairmen are more lackadaisical and independent."

Eckhardt was excited by what happened in the mid-September caucus, the week before I visited his office. Representative Jonathan Bingham and others, with Eckhardt playing a last-minute parliamentary role, managed to pass a resolution directing the committees to seek legislative goals in the 1968 platform. The coup displeased the elders, some of whom tried to divert the attack from the Democratic committee moguls to the White House. ("You can hear the old bulls roaring when one of us gets up in the caucus," said one of the Hard Core.)

It was the visit of Mr. Ezra Schacht of Houston one morning that introduced me to the full range of a Congressman's labors in ombudsmanship, labors Eckhardt takes very seriously. Mr. Schacht, dressed in a natty brown suit with blue pinstripes and a matching striped tie, had just delivered certain legal papers to the Supreme Court in behalf of his son, who is trying to appeal a prison sentence for antiwar activity. Danny Schacht, a young electrical engineer working at his father's plant, had acted in an antidraft skit outside the Houston draft induction center two years before. Several nights later, as Eckhardt summarized the story, FBI agents arrested Danny Schacht and charged him with violating a law prohibiting the unauthorized wearing of a military uniform. In May 1969, the sentence was upheld, even though young Schacht's lawyers argued that the antidraft theatrics were protected by the First Amendment, as well as by a law permitting an actor to portray a soldier "if the portrayal does not tend to discredit the armed forces."

This "exception to an exception," as he calls it, intrigues Eckhardt. With his aides Julius Glickman and Chris Little, both lawyers, he discusses the Constitutional issue. If the Supreme Court accepts Schacht's appeal, he decides, he may submit an *amicus curiae* brief arguing that the whole proceeding was unconstitutional if the theatrical use of an Army uniform must be confined to skits reflecting credit on the armed forces.

The Schacht case is one of hundreds that come to a Congressman's attention every year, making his office a sort of ganglion where the nerve fibers of governmental relations meet. The mails every day are heavy, and have been for three years, with military problems—mainly over the draft.

I asked Eckhardt for other examples of the ombudsman's role. From the files he brought out several worn manila folders concerning George Vincin, a Houston odd-jobs man who joined the Army in 1935—thirty-five years ago—and still seeks back pay for false imprisonment. Recently, Eckhardt wrote to the Secretary of the Army what is perhaps the hundredth letter in the case, calling Vincin's "the most shocking bureaucratic abuse that has ever come to my attention." Falsely accused of sodomy while in the guardhouse at Fort Brown, Texas, in 1938, Vincin served five years at Leavenworth, even though his key accusers admitted lying. His thirty-year effort to clear his name and collect back pay is incomplete; he has a pardon signed by President Johnson, who took a personal interest in the case, but still lacks the back pay; and unless the Army supports private legislation Eckhardt has introduced to grant Vincin his back pay, it will probably fail. Vincin, Administrative Chris Little told me, once flew from Houston to Washington to check on his case. "When I sent him down to the Army liaison office he took one look at the uniforms and fled on the next plane."

Kristina Truitt, Eckhardt's tall caseworker, handles the ombudsmanship operation, which ranges from cases as grim as Vincin's to those as comic, and as far beyond Eckhardt's miracle-working power, as that of the mother who recently wrote to complain

that the Air Force band would not accept her son as a French horn player. "I can certainly understand your keen disappointment that your son was not accepted," Eckhardt wrote in a letter of skillful Halm Ginott-like consolation. "After doing his very best to perfect his skill in the French horn, he must have been crestfallen that he was not chosen."

Some pleas for help run to the bizarre. An Army enlisted man who has been in and out of military dispensaries in the Far East wrote to ask Eckhardt's advice on a drug to restore his sexual powers to normal. As we talked about bureaucratic mix-ups one morning, a Houston lawyer telephoned to ask the Congressman's help in speeding home the body of an oil-rig operator who'd died of a heart seizure in Libya.

"His wife," Kristina Truitt explained, "asked for an autopsy, which seems to have thrown the Libyan government into an uproar. She's waived the request, but they don't embalm the dead in Libya." At the State Department, Kristina found an office wholly concerned with American deaths abroad, which for a \$10 cable fee will make inquiries. (Somewhere in the labyrinth of the diplomatic establishment, we speculated there must be a deputy assistant secretary of state for death.)

Every Congressman is to one degree or another a guardian of the Danny Schachts and the Vincins and others who run afoul of the law or bureaucracies, but I had the feeling that Eckhardt's office takes its ombudsman-ship almost as seriously as the legislative process itself. From the wall near Eckhardt's desk stares down Eckhardt's formidably bearded great-great-grandfather, Robert Kleberg, who came to Texas from Germany in the 1830s, seeking he said "unbounded personal, religious, and political liberty" and expecting to find "in Texas, above all countries, the blessed land of my most fervent hopes."

After lunch that day came the lobbyists, two gentlemen who wanted to discuss Representative John Dingell's bill pending before the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, of which Eckhardt is a member, to curtail FCC licensing of pay television.

As the staff removes the dishes and glasses, Eckhardt explains that on an average week like this one he may see perhaps a dozen lobbyists of one kind: representatives of railway unions who are quarreling among themselves over a bill to adjust the retirement fund; the pay-television people; the Quakers, who want to enlist Congressional help for the October 15 Moratorium.

"When I came to Congress," he recalls, as we wait for the pay-TV people, "my first reaction was, There's far less lobbying here than in the Texas legislature." But it's only subtler—less obtrusive, more professional. You have to make yourself available for it. But it wasn't that way in Austin. When the Texas House would adjourn for lunch and the big doors would swing open, dozens of lobbyists would swarm outside, waiting to snare you for lunch if you'd go. I believe a man could go to Austin and live off the land for the whole session. You had to hide from them. I remember I was eating one night with my family at a place in Austin. I asked for the check and found it'd been paid. I looked across the room and there was a prominent lobbyist, just smiling and nodding. He didn't even come to the table. "Is he a friend of yours, Daddy?" one of my little girls asked.

"The first time I ran for the Texas legislature—it was 1940, I was just out of law school and I got what I call my mandate from the people to practice law privately—old man Edmonds Travis, a lobbyist for several Standard Oil subsidiaries, told me, 'Bob, what you do is you attack all the venal interests except one, and that's where you get

your money. You attacked them all.' As a rule, Capitol Hill lobbyists make themselves scarce, usually hole up at the Hotel Congressional. The key point of contact is usually between a highly specialized lobbyist and the specialized staff people of a standing committee. Intimate friendships spring up there—it's the rivet point. Friendships that outlast terms. They probably have a greater influence on legislation, especially if it's technical."

Mr. Pieter van Beek, who has come to talk with Eckhardt about pay-television, turns out to be a vice president of Zenith Radio Corporation, which makes the signal-scramblers for pay-TV. An erect, Chicago Dutchman with darting eyes, a clipped moustache, and a manner of precise speaking to go with it, he looks as if, transposed to the days of the Battle of Britain, he had just stepped from the cockpit of a Spitfire. In fact, Mr. van Beek is a bit battle-shocked from the pay-television wars, and he launches into a resigned and rather doleful history of the effort of pay-TV to gain licensing by the FCC. Anticipating the point, Eckhardt breaks in: "You really want me to do nothing—right?" Nothing, that is, about the Dingell bill. As a member of the Commerce Committee, Eckhardt knows the legislation, which the local broadcasters are pushing to forestall a potential competitor. Dingell himself, as Eckhardt explained later, wants to reserve a number of the dwindling VHF frequencies for noncommercial uses, but his aims and those of the commercial broadcasters mesh. A glance at Eckhardt's mail on the subject, which was plentiful, indicated that the broadcasters are waging a fairly strenuous campaign for the Dingell bill. "We want to put you across to your constituents," the letters say, in effect, "and please drop in for a live interview next time you are in our area, but be sure you vote right on the Dingell bill." Eckhardt concludes the interview with Mr. van Beek by saying that he is "disposed" to vote against the bill, a way Congressmen have of signifying hope without airtight commitment.

Eckhardt is a do-it-yourself man when it comes to bill drafting, which is unusual in a chamber where it is admitted that too much legislation is either written or rewritten under the influence of specialized lobbies. In recent months, the House of Representatives has suddenly developed for the first time the practice of cosponsoring legislation, too, which means that there is a constant flood of bills begging for every Congressman's signature, whether he knows what's in the bill or not.

Eckhardt has a philosophy about writing legislation. "For instance," he said, "Lyndon Johnson's Great Society legislation suffered in some cases from the fact that he is what I call a legislative entrepreneur—result-oriented—not a craftsman. Too little of that legislation was governed by a firm view of what a bill is supposed to accomplish, and how."

"Look, for example, at the contrast between the Economic Opportunity Act and, say, the Wagner Act, which was modeled on a functioning New York law. Congressional acts, like the common law, ought to move carefully from precedent to precedent."

"But I'm the first to admit that it isn't easy to be a good legislative craftsman—not with twenty thousand or so bills coming into the House every year. That's why the committees are up here are so important. To survive them, a bill must gain the attention of a committee and surviving a committee means passing muster with men who've spent a lot of time mastering the details of taxation, say, or trade regulation, or judicial procedure."

("One thing you ought to say about the House," I was told by one of Eckhardt's

colleagues as we marched through the cavernous corridor that joins the office buildings to the House chamber, "is that a man's committee work is his life here, if he's serious. The real legislative craftsmen are in this house. Time is so short that when someone is allowed to speak he usually has something to say—not like the Senate, where you might hear almost any Senator talking in a half-assed way about almost any subject. You won't often hear it over here. Too little time.")

Too little time; too many members. During a week of prowling through the U.S. House of Representatives and talking with Bob Eckhardt about his job, these are the constant refrains. Because of them, the House is a pyramid resting on its apex, where legislation is usually marked pass or fail at a narrow, closely confined level. During the week I visited in Room 1741, the Commerce Committee was meeting almost every morning to complete the drafting of a complicated piece of airport legislation, and although the sessions were closed, its final action and vote would almost certainly determine the bill's fate on the House floor. "Back in Texas," Eckhardt told me, "a committee report might be overturned or not—nobody thought very much about it. Here's almost never." In the House conveyor belt for legislation, subcommittee chairmen defer to each other, committees to subcommittees, chairmen to subcommittee chairmen, and the House as a whole with very few exceptions to its committees. Often bills come to the floor under so-called "closed rules," with amendments barred. Democratic in theory, the legislative process is elitist in practice.

Bob Eckhardt, who brought an expert knowledge of federal labor law to the House, concentrates in the field but doesn't confine himself to it. I sat in late one afternoon as he and his aides, Glickman and Little, chewed over Eckhardt's "consumer-class-action" bill, a piece of legislation reflecting his passion for the fine points of federalism, combined with his interest in consumer protection.

"Today," he told me, "it costs the average consumer of, say, a defective box of breakfast cereal so much in legal fees that it would be silly to sue the company that made it. But if a number of similarly defrauded customers could pool their resources and bring a suit under the more liberal federal class-action rules, maybe some redress would be forthcoming."

"The victimized consumer ought to be able to get to court and collect when he's victimized by fraud, but a good piece of legislation will enable him to do so as elegantly as possible—without cluttering the law. You ought to be able to do it without writing a whole new federal law of deceit." (Eckhardt's federalist fastidiousness drips from every word.)

"But isn't the problem really that the courts would construe the law too narrowly, rather than too broadly?" asks Chris Little.

"Maybe," Eckhardt concedes, "but if we define deceit too broadly the bill wouldn't pass anyway. It'd be like a Nixon program—all good intention and no action."

By 6:30 p.m. the House has usually adjourned and most of the staff have left. Eckhardt, Little, and Glickman end the day by deciding that Glickman will continue to consult with Senator Tydings' office, which is also interested in the class-action legislation for consumers, seeking to pool their efforts in a definition of fraud large enough to incorporate state laws but narrow enough to oblige Eckhardt's federalist qualms. A version of the bill was introduced in May 1969, and if Eckhardt and his cosponsors are lucky either the Commerce or the Judiciary Committee or both will arrange hearings for the bill. Only

then, months after the first discussions and possibly jostled by several competing bills, would it reach the full light of legislative conflict as most Americans see it and understand it. But in the House, that would be the end, not the beginning.

SENATORS MISSTATING THE FACTS

HON. W. E. (BILL) BROCK

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. BROCK. Mr. Speaker, this past Tuesday night, five liberal Senators appeared on nationwide television to urge popular support for their attempt to cut off funds for our forces in Vietnam. They said Vietnamization is not working, that the President's action in Cambodia is an admission of failure, and that we must unilaterally and immediately pull out of the entire area.

They are misstating the facts.

First, Vietnamization has proven increasingly productive. One-hundred fifteen thousand of our troops have already come home, and the President has announced the withdrawal of 150,000 more. In addition, Secretary of Defense Laird has indicated that 1 year from now there will be no American forces in Vietnam on a combat status.

In our struggle to end this war, while leaving the Vietnamese people the means and ability to defend themselves, I believe the Vietnamization program has proven a strong step in the right direction.

On television, Senator McGovern's group also said the Cambodia action was not necessary for continued withdrawal.

They are wrong.

Can they really justify the situation which existed before this operation? For 5 years the Communists have used sanctuaries in Cambodia to rest, resupply, and retrain their troops. For 5 years they have used sanctuaries in Cambodia to fire upon our men, yet American men had no right to defend themselves. In so many words, these sanctuaries not only prolonged the war and made Vietnamization much more difficult, but they were a constant threat to the life of every American in Vietnam.

This we could not allow. The safety of our remaining forces and the people of South Vietnam depended on our actions in Cambodia—an action taken not alone, but in concert with the army of South Vietnam.

Let us look at what that action has accomplished. Preliminary reports indicate our combined forces have seized 7,540 weapons, 2,499 tons of rice, over 22,000 rockets and mortar rounds, 8,500,000 rounds of small arms ammunition, and 12 tons of medical supplies. Over 3,300 enemy bunkers have been destroyed and 178 vehicles have been captured or destroyed.

The supplies already confiscated could have equipped three enemy battalions. The food alone would have fed 6,000 Vietcong soldiers for 1 year—a year in which they could have brought death and destruction to thousands of Amer-

icans and South Vietnamese, always retreating into their privileged sanctuary in Cambodia.

Every American wants peace. But, we must achieve a peace which will last, not one simply leading to more war, either in Asia or anywhere else. I believe our temporary operations in Cambodia will bring us closer to that goal. I know that President Nixon seeks such a world of peace with every ounce of his strength. I hope he is successful—despite his critics—for all of our sakes.

THE LEGITIMATE ROLE OF CONGRESS

HON. JOHN B. ANDERSON

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Monday, May 18, 1970

Mr. ANDERSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, President Nixon's Cambodian decision has prompted a rash of congressional response, reaction, rhetoric, and resolutions, most of which have been well intentioned, yet some of which have been ill advised. What is basically at issue here is the proper constitutional role of the Congress vis-a-vis the executive on decisions affecting war and peace. Most will agree that over the years there has been an erosion in the war powers of the legislative branch and an inversely proportional growth in the powers of the executive branch. It may be argued that this trend is necessitated by the realities of our nuclear age and the need for rapid response in times of crisis. But it may also be argued that the Congress has abdicated too much of its responsibility and that the time has come to restore a proper and realistic balance between the legislative and executive branches in matters involving the commitment of American troops abroad.

We are now faced with the question of how best to restore this balance without creating a constitutional crisis and without placing unrealistic limitations and restrictions on the President. I think that most will agree that the President must be allowed some flexibility and freedom if he is to function effectively as Commander in Chief. I do not think there are many reasonable men who would seriously advocate tying the President's hands while he is attempting to extricate our troops from South Vietnam in a safe and honorable manner. At the same time, there is a growing expectation in Congress that the President should consult with us before making any future commitments of this nature. I think such an expectation is both reasonable and realistic and is in keeping with our delegated responsibilities under the Constitution.

On May 5, the Washington Post editorialized against imposing unrealistic limitations on the President's flexibility. Instead it proposed that the Congress, "adopt a national policy of withdrawal from Vietnam, leaving the timing of the exit flexible so that our forces there would encounter a minimum of danger and a vacuum would not be created overnight." The Post went on to editorialize:

If these issues are sincerely debated, we suspect that Congress will go on record in favor of a flexible withdrawal policy, as indeed, the Nixon administration did before the recent escalation fever set in. In any event, Congress ought to be shaping the national purpose. If it is going to reclaim the war power previously relinquished to the President, it has an obligation to take a substantial share of the responsibility for the course that is to be pursued.

The Post editorial concluded by posing the question:

Can it (the Congress) only kibitz and flounder, or can it assume a positive role and an honest responsibility in shaping a national policy?

Mr. Speaker, I think the point is well taken. This is no time for the Congress to simply assume a negative role by attacking the Presidency and thereby risking a constitutional crisis. Instead we should be seizing upon this opportunity to exert a positive influence and assuming our honest responsibility in shaping a national policy. This is what I am attempting to do through House Concurrent Resolutions 595 and 610 and I am proud to say that there are over 30 Members of this body who have either introduced or cosponsored this resolution. The thrust of the resolution is threefold in nature: First, it would put the Congress on record in favor of a national policy of continued American troop withdrawals from South Vietnam; second, it would put the Congress on record in favor of a national policy of avoiding a wider war in Southeast Asia; and finally, it would put the Congress on record as reaffirming its constitutional responsibility of consultation with the President on grave national decisions affecting war and peace.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this is the type of responsible and positive approach which the Congress can and should take at this time. It is in no way intended as a rebuke of the President; rather, it is Congress' way of expressing a willingness to reassert its constitutional prerogatives and to define national policy in Southeast Asia. I think the American people want and expect us to act in such a forceful, positive, and responsible manner at this time.

Last Friday, writing in the New York Times, James Reston said the following:

There are legislators, of course, who want him to get out now and some others who want to impose a deadline of a year or eighteen months for total withdrawal, but they do not have the votes. The majority is merely trying to redress the balance, leaving the President reasonable freedom of action, and guaranteeing the Congress the right of consultation and limited control.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly the intention of my resolution, and I would welcome the support of my colleagues. At this point in the RECORD I include a copy of my resolution along with the Washington Post editorial and the Reston column to which I have alluded:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION

Whereas the Constitution of the United States expressly delegates to the Congress the power "to declare War" and "to make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval forces," and expressly delegates to the President of the United States the authority to act as "Commander

in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States . . . when called into the actual service of the United States"; and

Whereas the President is pursuing a national policy designed to bring an honorable end to the war in Vietnam through the withdrawal of American troops, through a reduction in the level of hostilities, and through negotiations; and

Whereas the President has already withdrawn over 115,000 American troops from South Vietnam and has announced plans for the withdrawal of an additional 150,000 troops to be completed during the spring of 1971; and has pledged to "withdraw more than 150,000 troops over the next year" if progress is made on the negotiating front; and has reaffirmed "this Government's acceptance of eventual, total withdrawal of American troops" from South Vietnam; and

Whereas the President has reported that "progress in training and equipping South Vietnamese forces has substantially exceeded our original expectations"; and

Whereas the President has pledged to the American people that "we shall avoid a wider war" in Southeast Asia: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby declares that it is the national policy that American troop withdrawals from South Vietnam shall continue in line with the expressed intention of the President, and that the Congress fully supports all efforts by the President to achieve a negotiated settlement; and

Be it further resolved, That the Congress hereby declares that it is that national policy to avoid enlarging the present conflict into the neighboring states of Cambodia, Laos, Thailand or North Vietnam; and

Be it further resolved, That the Congress hereby reaffirms, accepts and expects to exercise its Constitutional responsibility of consultation with the President on all matters, now and henceforth, affecting grave national decisions of war and peace.

[From the Washington Post, May 5, 1970]

WHAT IS A RESPONSIBLE WAR ROLE FOR CONGRESS

The country has a right to expect that, in the present emergency, Congress will do something more than fulminate or merely spin its wheels, or just say no. Despite the deep concern that is felt on Capitol Hill over the widening of the war in Indochina, many of those who are most critical of the President's action talk nonsense when they get around to what should be done. Congress should indeed be getting into the act, not in the role of a kibitzer, or a vindictive naysayer, but in that of a responsible national policy-making body.

The course advocated by Senators McGovern, Hatfield, Goodell and Hughes is too reckless for serious consideration. Congress, they say, "must either legislate the conflict by declaring war or veto and end it." To declare war in the present situation would, in our view, be akin to madness, as these four gentlemen doubtless would agree. It would commit the nation to use of all its military, economic and moral resources in a remote part of the world where our interests are tangential and our military reach is already overextended. It would risk the possibility of involvement with both China and the Soviet Union without serving any imperative national purpose. It would imbed us in concrete when what we need is room for flexibility.

No doubt the real purpose of the McGovern-Hatfield-Goodell-Hughes foursome is to focus attention on their alternative of vetoing and ending the war. But ending a war is not accomplished by the stroke of a pen or a denial of money. With our men still fac-

ing an enemy in many different areas of South Vietnam, in Laos, and now Cambodia, no rational Congress is going to tell them to fight no more. And it would be scarcely less calamitous to declare that no funds could be spent in connection with that conflict after December 31.

Congress could, however, adopt a national policy of withdrawal from Vietnam, leaving the timing of the exit flexible so that our forces there would encounter a minimum of danger and a vacuum would not be created overnight. We should like to see Congress debate and act on such a policy. It would necessarily have to face some vital questions. How important is continental Southeast Asia to our larger international policies? Does Vietnam have any vital relation to our national security? Just what is a "just peace" and have we the capacity to induce or impose or maintain it? What right do we have to set ourselves up as the arbiter of the future of that area? At what point might it be said that we have accomplished all that could reasonably be expected of us?

If these issues are sincerely debated, we suspect that Congress will go on record in favor of a flexible withdrawal policy, as indeed, the Nixon administration did before the recent escalation fever set in. In any event, Congress ought to be shaping the national purpose. If it is going to reclaim the war power previously relinquished to the President, it has an obligation to take a substantial share of the responsibility for the course that is to be pursued.

In the face of this great need for a reshaping of national policy, leaders of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee walked into a trap of its own making by demanding an audience with Mr. Nixon and reacted in petty fashion to the President's clever counter-suggestion that the Senate committee meet him jointly with the House Foreign Affairs Committee. Foreign Relations had a right to try for a separate meeting. But no treaty is under discussion. So the President has an equal right to argue that the subject of such a session ought to be the broad national policy of liquidating the war in an orderly fashion, and that this concerns the House and the country as much as it does the Senate.

The time has come for discussion of a comprehensive policy—not for petty bickering or jurisdictional squabbles. There seems to be much awareness of the fact that the President's action has placed him on trial in the court of public opinion, and Congress is no less on trial in its own sphere. Can it only kibitz and flounder, or can it assume a positive role and an honest responsibility in shaping a national policy?

[From the New York Times, May 15, 1970]

WASHINGTON: PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS— A LIMITED BATTLE (By James Reston)

WASHINGTON, May 14.—It is clear now that there is a determined move in the Congress, and particularly in the Senate, to limit the President's warmaking powers by denying him funds to carry on the Indochina war as he pleases.

This is taking the form of legislation in the Senate to cut off money for U.S. military operations in Cambodia after June 30, to repeal the Tonkin Gulf Resolution, which the Johnson Administration used as the legal basis for its activities in Vietnam, and to set limits on the amount of military equipment the Pentagon can declare "excess" and transfer to other countries.

More than likely, President Nixon will avoid a constitutional crisis on this issue. He has already committed himself to get all U.S. troops out of Cambodia by the end of next month. He doesn't need the authority of the Tonkin Gulf Resolution to carry on the war, and he can live with limits on his au-

thority to transfer surplus arms to other nations.

Besides, he has enough trouble on other fronts without taking on a Democratic-controlled Congress whose votes he needs for his economic and social programs at home. Indeed, he is rapidly finding himself roughly in the dilemma of Pierre Mendes-France, who had to face the decision to withdraw the French army from Indochina or the prospect of not being able to govern.

Similarly, even the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, J. William Fulbright, and the other antiwar Senators know that they will lose if they try to press too hard for limitations on the President's Commander-in-Chief powers. They want the troops out of Cambodia within a few weeks and out of Vietnam on a faster schedule than presently planned, and in the present mood of the country, the Congress and the White House, they may be able to achieve both aims without a divisive constitutional battle.

REDRESSING THE BALANCE

What is happening here is another of those historic tussles to keep a fair balance between the President's power to act effectively and Congress's power to influence or control his actions. Since the invention of the atom bombs and the intercontinental ballistic missile, decisive warmaking power has swung to the President.

These devilish devices, in the hands of a nation which had proclaimed its hostility to the United States, made the Congress realize that the U.S. could be attacked and even destroyed before the Congress could ever vote, let alone debate, a declaration of war. Accordingly, it readily gave over the power to act quickly and secretly to the Chief Executives, who have been using it and adding to it.

President Truman did not seek the authority of the Congress for his intervention in the Korean War. President Johnson took the country into the Vietnam war almost by stealth. He decided when to enlarge the American expeditionary force, when to bomb and where, and when to stop the bombing—with results that increasingly convinced the Congress that it had given up too much.

In short, the swing back in Congress has been coming on for quite a while. When President Nixon challenged the Senate's right to consent to his nominations of Judges Haynsworth and Carswell to the Supreme Court, the Senate struck him down twice. And when he invaded Cambodia without consulting Congress, revolt was on.

One of the odd things about this is that the movement to cut back the President's warmaking powers is now being led, not by the conservatives, who historically have sought to limit Presidential authority, but by the liberals, who since Franklin Roosevelt's day, have approved more and more Presidential power.

LIMITED OBJECTIVE

This present controversy, however, should not be exaggerated. Most of the President's critics have a limited objective. Mr. Nixon is going to be in the White House for over two-and-a-half years at least. The aim is not to paralyze him, but to limit his power to invade countries on his personal whim, to keep him to his promise to get out of Vietnam as fast as possible, and to commit him not to go off on more military adventures without consultation.

There are legislators, of course, who want him to get out now and some others who want to impose a deadline of a year or eighteen months for total withdrawal, but they do not have the votes. The majority is merely trying to redress the balance, leaving the President reasonable freedom of action, and guaranteeing the Congress the right of consultation and limited control.