the Cannon Office Building, his passing is a special loss to me.

Bill was born in Putnam, Conn., October 9, 1914, an area that he served for life. He graduated from Tufts College in 1941, and from the University of Connecticut School of Law in 1948. During World War II, he served in North Africa and Europe.

Bill devoted his life to public service. He was a man intimately acquainted with his constituency. He served as mayor of Putnam, judge of the city court of Putnam, prosecutor of the city court of Putnam, chairman and executive director of redevelopment agency of the city of Putnam, a member of the board of education, judge of probate, and State representative.

Bill and I came to the 88th Congress together. Since that time, I developed a deep respect for his talents and legislative ability. He was reelected to the 89th, 90th, and 91st Congresses. He served ably on the Judiciary Committee and the Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee.

I am thankful that I had the privilege to know Bill. I shall deeply miss him as a colleague and friend.

A FATHER WRITES HIS SONS

HON. ED FOREMAN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. FOREMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a letter written by Mr. Rich Sims, of Las Cruces, to his two stepsons, Ray and Jerry Boles, which clearly expresses the feeling of many parents and others as we view the so-called student unrest of a highly publicized, very small, disruptive, destructive minority among some of the youth today. I include it for the review of my colleagues:

DEAR RAY AND JERRY: You have both been in my thoughts almost constantly in the past few days. This letter has been anticipated since the Kent State incident several days ago; however, the thoughts and feelings have been in my mind for years.

How proud I am to be your step-father.

Randy, you have been a good productive citizen since you got out of school and now you are serving our country in the U.S. Navy; and, Jerry, you have passed your physical and while waiting to serve your country, you're working and paying your own way.

These dissident students who are directly responsible for most of the violence and disruptions here at home are proving very emphatically that they don't have the capacity to govern a free democratic country. Thank God they are a minority of the students, although even if they were a vast majority, the group would still be a small minority of this still great and free country. Have they become so self-righteous that they think they are the chosen ones who have finally come along to take over the government of the United States through violence rather than in the voting booth?

"While they are feverishly working to undermine, destroy and then take over the country you guys are going about the business of being good Americans, just as your mother, stepmother, your dad and I have done—and our parents and their's before them. And that includes working to make this a more productive and progressive country through free enterprise and serving our country militarily to preserve our rights, your rights and your children's rights to choose, as free people, how this country should be run through the only proven way ever discovered—the ballot box, with peaceful and fair elections, where the majority not the minority, governs.

"You guys are great. You know what it means to be an American and even though you may not understand everything that is happening, your confidence in the older generation gives you the patience to wait till your generation is the majority in the polling places.

"When your dad and I were your age, we didn't fully understand all that was going on, however one thing we knew for certain was that other people, Godless people were, trying to take our great nation from us from without, and I could safely assume that over 90 per cent of the men and women in America would have gladly given their lives to protect it; tens of thousands did. Your dad fought all the way up the Western Pacific to Iowa Jima in the Marine Corps to preserve your right to be free to choose how this country would be run, and soon it will be your responsibility. We know you will do it well.

"Now a few radical dissidents are trying to take our country from us, from within through violence. They are impatient, too unjust, too unfair to try and do so as free men should, through the electorate. They are like Hitler, they want to take it period, by force or by any other way.

"The dissident is a different kind of enemy and he fights in different ways, but it is your time to protect this country, you must do whatever necessary to stop him and you must do it soon, or there will be no more freedom and no more majority rule. You and your children will live under a dictatorship of some kind.

"Your dad and I fought and worked for this country, we will do it again if we have to. I don't think you'll need our help but if you do you can count on us 100 per cent.

"We all love you; we are proud of you. We are glad you are not part of that misdirected group and we know we are in good hands—YOUR HANDS."

RICH SIMS.

SENATE—*Friday, May 22, 1970*

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon and was called to order by the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF).

The Chaplain, the Reverend Edward L. R. Elson, D.D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord our God, draw near to us as we draw near to Thee. Create in us a clean heart and renew a right spirit within us, that we may strive with fresh purpose and renewed determination for the things which pass not away, but endure as Thou endurest forever.

Impart to us the grace to stand for what is right, the grace to treat others as we would have others treat us, the grace of charity that we may refrain from hasty judgment, the grace of compassion toward the weak, the grace to use power for moral purposes, and the grace to labor in season and out, for that kingdom of truth and righteousness whose builder and maker is God. Amen.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Geisler, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session, the Acting President pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations received today, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Hackney, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had disagreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H.R. 17138) to amend the District of Columbia Police and Firemen's Salary Act of 1958 and the District of Columbia Teachers' Salary Act of 1955 to increase salaries, and for other purposes; agreed to the conference asked by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and that Mr. MCMILLAN, Mr. ABERNETHY, Mr. DOWDY, Mr. FUQUA, Mr. CABELL, Mr. NELSEN, Mr. BROYHILL of Virginia, Mr. HARSHA, and Mr. HOGAN, were appointed managers on the part of the House at the conference.

THE JOURNAL

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, May 21, 1970, be dispensed with.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION ON STATEMENTS DURING TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that statements in relation to the transaction of routine morning business be limited to 3 minutes.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS DURING SENATE SESSION

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that all committees be authorized to meet during the session of the Senate today.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL MONDAY, MAY 25, 1970

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

(Subsequently, this order was modified to provide for the Senate to adjourn to 11:30 a.m. on Monday next.)

THE CALENDAR

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, without in any way infringing upon the Pastore rule of germaneness, so that it will not be applicable, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 889, 890, and 891.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered, and the Pastore rule of germaneness, as requested by the majority leader, will not be affected by the action of the Senate.

CENTRAL AND WESTERN PACIFIC TUNA FISHERY DEVELOPMENT ACT

The bill (S. 3176) to authorize a program for the development of a tuna fishery in the Central and Western Pacific Ocean was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 3176

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That this Act may be cited as the "Central and Western Pacific Tuna Fishery Development Act".

SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized to carry out, directly or by contract, a three-year program for the development of the latent tuna resources of the Central and Western Pacific Ocean. The program shall include but not be limited to tuna exploration and tuna stock assessment, improvement of harvesting techniques, gear development, biological resource monitoring, and an economic evaluation of the potential for a tuna fishery in such area.

SEC. 3. In carrying out the purposes of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall consult and cooperate with the State of Hawaii, the governments of American Samoa and Guam, and the Office of the High Commissioner of the Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, educational institutions, and the commercial fishing industry.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of the Interior shall submit to the President and the Congress, not later than June 30, 1973, a complete report with respect to his activities pursuant to this Act, the results of such activities, and any recommendations he may have as a result of such activities.

SEC. 5. There is authorized to be appropriated for the period beginning July 1, 1970, and ending June 30, 1973, the sum of $3,000,000 to carry out the purposes of this Act. Sums appropriated pursuant to this section shall remain available until expended.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–887), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The purpose of the bill is to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to institute a 3-year program for the development of latent tuna resources of the central and western Pacific. In doing so the bill also would authorize to be appropriated for the period July 1, 1970, to June 30, 1973, the sum of $3 million to remain available until expended.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

Although research programs indicate that the central and western Pacific Ocean is a potentially rich harvesting ground for skipjack tuna, harvesting techniques have not been developed to allow proper development. In September of last year a study group of professionals prepared a report for the State of Hawaii entitled "Hawaii and the Sea," a section of which discussed the skipjack as the "last great underdeveloped tuna resource in the Pacific Ocean."

In Hawaii the inefficient pole-and-line, bait-fishing method is still being used. Although purse seine methods are being used effectively in the eastern Pacific, they have not yet been introduced in the central and western Pacific. Different environmental factors will require extensive field trials to develop techniques suitable for those areas.

Testimony before the committee indicates that most of the Pacific island groups are hardpressed economically, and a catch of only 100,000 tons of skipjack tuna at today's prices would bring fishermen almost $25 million and processors almost $62 million. At retail level this would have a value of $100 million.

The bill proposes an investment of $3 million for a 3-year research program. By one calculation, the payoff in 10 years of operation—assuming an industry yield of even a modest 30,000 tons of skipjack a year having a retail value of $30 million—would be an astounding $100 for each $1 invested in research.

COST OF THE LEGISLATION

The bill would authorize to be appropriated for the period beginning July 1, 1970, and ending June 30, 1973, the sum of $3 million to carry out the purposes of this act.

U.S. FISHING FLEET IMPROVEMENT

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H.R. 4813) to extend the provisions of the U.S. Fishing Fleet Improvement Act, as amended, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Commerce, with amendments, on page 6, line 21, after the word "years", strike out "1970 and 1971", and insert "1970, 1971, and 1972,"; on page 7, at the beginning of line 3, strike out "'1971'." and insert "'1972'."; on page 7, after line 3, strike out:

SEC. 9. The Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Maritime Administrator, other interested Federal agencies, and interested professional and industrial organizations knowledgeable about United States commercial fishing vessels and their operations, and other persons, shall conduct a study (1) on the need for, and desirability of, measures to make available at lower costs insurance for such vessels and their employees, (2) on means and measures to improve the design of United States fishing vessels and equipment to make available as much information as possible to lower the costs of constructing or remodeling such vessels, (3) on the need for, and desirability of, provision for trading in existing fishing vessels, (4) on means and measures for improving the safety and efficiency of existing fishing vessels, and (5) on the need for, and desirability of, authorizing the establishment of a construction reserve fund for fishing vessels documented under the laws of the United States for the purposes of promoting the construction, reconstruction, or acquisition of fishing vessels. The Secretary shall submit, through the President, to the Congress a report together with his recommendations not later than January 1, 1971. There is authorized to be appropriated $125,000 for fiscal year 1970 and $100,000 for fiscal year 1971 to carry out the purposes of this section.

And on page 8, at the beginning of line 3, change the section number from "10" to "9".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–888), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of H.R. 4813 is to extend and to broaden the construction assistance program under the United States Fishing Fleet Improvement Act to include reconditioning, conversion, and remodeling; increase the authorization for appropriation from $10 million to $20 million per year; provide for a class differential rather than the present individual determination, and eliminate several time-consuming provisions resulting in savings of time and administrative costs.

BACKGROUND AND NEED FOR THE LEGISLATION

Existing law prohibits the documentation of a foreign-built fishing vessel as a vessel of the United States and the landing of its catch at a U.S. port. Accordingly, a U.S. fisherman must have his vessel constructed here, even though the cost is much greater than that of his foreign competitors. As a result the average age of U.S. fishing vessels is over 20 years while most foreign vessels fishing off our coasts are newer and more modern.

The United States Fishing Fleet Improvement Act was designed to assist in upgrading the domestic fishing fleet to improve its competitive position. This is accomplished by paying a construction differential subsidy equal to the difference between the cost of construction of the vessel in the domestic shipyard submitting the low bid and the estimated cost of constructing the same vessel in a foreign yard.

Since August 30, 1964, when the act was last substantially amended, 119 applications for subsidies have been received. Contracts have been signed for the construction of 32 vessels with subsidies totaling $19,646,000. Of these, 25 have been delivered and seven are under construction. Invitations to bid have been issued on three additional vessels.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENTS

The effect of the first two committee amendments is to provide 1 additional fiscal year authorization for appropriation and to authorize the Secretary to accept applications for 1 more year. This was done in recognition of the fact that one of the 2 fiscal years, 1970, in the bill as referred to the committee is about concluded. It is in keeping with the recognized need for an adequate time period permitting the program to move forward in an orderly fashion.

The third amendment struck section 9 in its entirety and appropriately redesignated the remaining section. This section would have authorized the Secretary to make cer-

tain studies. Your committee did not feel such specific study authority was necessary or warranted by virtue of the associated costs.

WILLIAM "BILL" DANNELLY RESERVOIR

The bill (S. 528) to provide that the reservoir formed by the lock and dam referred to as the Miller's Ferry lock and dam on the Alabama River, Ala., shall hereafter be known as the William "Bill" Dannelly Reservoir was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

S. 528

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That in honor of late Probate Judge William "Bill" Dannelly of Wilcox County, Alabama, and in recognition of his long and outstanding service to his county, State, and Nation, and his leadership in the modernization of the Alabama-Coosa Waterway, the reservoir formed by the Millers Ferry lock and dam on the Alabama River, Alabama, shall hereafter be known and designated as the William "Bill" Dannelly Reservoir. Any law, regulation, map, or record of the United States in which such reservoir is referred to shall be held and considered to refer to such reservoir by the name of the William "Bill" Dannelly Reservoir.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an excerpt from the report (No. 91–889), explaining the purposes of the measure.

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

PURPOSE OF THE BILL

The purpose of this legislation is to change the name the Millers Ferry lock and dam, Alabama River, Ala., to the William "Bill" Dannelly Reservoir.

GENERAL STATEMENT

The Millers Ferry lock and dam is part of the Alabama-Coosa River system. The lock and dam is located in Wilcox County at mile 142.2 on the Alabama River. The reservoir formed by the lock and dam will be 105 miles long. The current name is taken from Millers Ferry, a little settlement near the site. Construction was initiated in April 1963 and is nearing completion.

Probate Judge William "Bill" Dannelly, a native Alabamian, was born in Camden, Wilcox County, Ala., in 1911. Judge Dannelly died in January 1969. Throughout his life, Judge Dannelly was active in the civic, religious and political life of Wilcox County. Judge Dannelly was elected judge of probate of Wilcox County in 1958 and reelected in 1964. As chairman of the board of commissioners and Wilcox County industrial committee, he was successful in locating several industries in Wilcox County. Also he was a member of the board of directors of the Coosa-Alabama River Improvement Association and served as a member of eight delegations appearing before congressional committees to expedite the comprehensive development of the Alabama-Coosa River system.

ESTIMATED COST TO THE UNITED STATES IF LEGISLATION IS ENACTED

Enactment of this legislation will not result in any cost to the United States.

VIEWS OF THE FEDERAL AGENCIES

The Department of the Army, Department of Interior and the Bureau of the Budget offer no objection to enactment of this bill.

COMMITTEE VIEWS

The committee notes the role that Judge Dannelly has played in the development of the water resources of the Alabama-Coosa River Basin and considers it desirable and fitting to designate one of the structures in the river system in his honor. Accordingly, early enactment of S. 528 is recommended.

CLIFFORD R. HOPE

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, hundreds of tributes have been paid Clifford R. Hope, Sr., who passed away last Saturday.

As has been stated by both the majority and minority leaders, Cliff Hope was an outstanding American. As has been stated by the senior Senator from Vermont (Mr. AIKEN), Cliff Hope was a leader in America in the field of agriculture.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD two editorials eulogizing Clifford Hope; one, from the Kansas City Times of May 20, 1970, entitled "Cliff Hope Knew Agriculture," and the other from the Wichita Eagle of May 19, entitled "Clifford R. Hope, Sr."

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

[From the Kansas City Times, May 20, 1970]

CLIFF HOPE KNEW AGRICULTURE

For many years the name of Clifford R. Hope was almost synonymous with agriculture in Congress. During his 30 years in the House of Representatives, from 1927 until his voluntary retirement January 3, 1957, the Kansan who died Saturday at Garden City served on the agriculture committee. He was its chairman in the 80th Congress, 1947–48, and in the 83rd Congress, 1953–54. Other years he was the ranking Republican on the committee.

Mr. Hope served in Congress in the long period when farm legislation was a major issue and when the farm programs were in the process of development. Unquestionably, he was a leader in what was known as the farm bloc. As a representative of a major wheat area (Southwest Kansas) Mr. Hope became a student of government farm programs. Never vindictive and always quietly persuasive, he became so highly respected in the agricultural field that his legislative influence was magnified many times. Urban congressmen freely admitted they followed Cliff Hope's advice. Despite all the controversies, he managed to get along with members of both political parties and it was said that he did more to make farm legislation nonpartisan than any other member of Congress.

A few years ago a member of Congress was asked what criticism he had of Clifford Hope.

"He's too much of a gentleman," was the reply.

That criticism, if it could be called such, typified the general regard for the Kansan who worked long and diligently, but quietly, to get parity income for the nation's farmers.

The esteem in which he was held perhaps could be no more practically illustrated than recalling that Clifford Hope was elected to 15 consecutive 2-year terms to Congress, serving longer than any other Kansan in the House of Representatives.

[From the Wichita (Kans.) Eagle, May 19, 1970]

CLIFFORD R. HOPE, SR.

Clifford R. Hope Sr., died Saturday night at Garden City after a life filled with accomplishment and service to others and honors.

He served this state and his nation in Congress longer than any other Kansan ever has—30 years. Had he chosen to do so he doubtless could have continued that service until the day of his death, for he was not only respected by his constituents, he was revered and loved by them.

During the dusty, drouthy 1930s Hope was ranking Republican on the House agriculture committee, and he was instrumental in conceiving and bringing to being the farm programs that helped to restore a measure of prosperity to stricken farmers. His agricultural expertise and his quiet but authoritative manner won him the admiration of his congressional colleagues, and the prestige that he enjoyed in the House has rarely been exceeded by any congressman from any state.

After his three decades in Congress, Mr. Hope returned to Garden City, and quickly helped to organize Great Plains Wheat Inc., an organization to promote use and sales of wheat over the world. He was its first president. He continued active in community and regional affairs until his disabling illness in February.

He served so long in Congress that many Kansans had forgotten his three terms in the Kansas House of Representatives, his Army duty in World War I, and his practice of law, which he gave up when he was elected to Congress.

He was powerful in the councils of the Republican party in Kansas, and at the time of his death was one of its elder statesmen.

Cliff Hope was a remarkable citizen whose presence in Kansas enriched our state, and whose wisdom in Congress enlightened its actions.

KANSAS DEPARTMENT OF THE AMERICAN LEGION RESOLUTION ON CAMBODIA

Mr. DOLE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a resolution adopted by the Kansas Department of the American Legion, in Topeka, Kans., on May 17, 1970, expressing wholehearted support for the action taken by President Nixon in Cambodia, on the basis it will shorten the war and permit the President to extricate us from South Vietnam.

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

RESOLUTION No. 14

Whereas, negotiations with the North Vietnamese and Vietcong delegations in Paris for a political settlement of the Vietnam conflict have failed to produce any results whatever; and

Whereas, the enemy has not only greatly stepped up its offensive military action in South Vietnam, but has also expanded the area of its aggressive operations into Laos and Cambodia; and

Whereas, the enemy's intensification of the conflict in the whole of Indochina seriously endangers the success of our Vietnamization program and threatens the safety of the remaining American and allied troops in South Vietnam; and

Whereas, the President of the United States has initiated a program for the elimination of enemy sanctuaries presently enjoyed and utilized to a high degree, thwarting our efforts to achieve victory in Vietnam; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, that the Kansas department of the American Legion in regular convention assembled in Topeka, Kansas, May 17, 1970, that we express the wholehearted support of the American Legion of the President's decision to eliminate Communist military sanctuaries in Cambodia and we call upon the Members of Congress and the American

people as a whole to give it the same support; and be it

Further resolved: that the American Legion urges the President to take further action, as and when he deems it essential to the safety of our troops in South Vietnam and to the successful prosecution of that conflict, to eliminate, by military action all enemy sanctuaries, installations and areas wherever situated that afford actual or potential bases for enemy action against our forces and those of our allies; and be it

Further resolved: that the necessary military action be taken for the sole purpose of hastening the cessation of fighting and inducing the acceleration of those political conversations that will secure a lasting and honorable peace.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

GAMBLE IN CAMBODIA SHOWS TREMENDOUS PROMISE

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, one of the most knowledgeable columnists we have on Southeast Asian affairs today is Joseph Alsop.

This morning's Washington Post publishes a very good article written by him entitled "Nixon's Gamble in Cambodia Shows Tremendous Promise."

I have had an opportunity to read the article and I think it sets out a great many of the facts which have been subject to dispute by many people during the past few weeks, at least.

I believe that this editorial would be valuable in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. So that everyone will have an opportunity to read it, I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

NIXON'S GAMBLE IN CAMBODIA SHOWS TREMENDOUS PROMISE

(By Joseph Alsop)

First, some facts:

Item: The South Vietnamese and U.S. troops in Cambodia have taken above 10,000 individual and crew-served weapons—or about two years of resupply for all the 101 enemy battalions in the southern half of South Vietnam.

Item: They have also taken above 11.5 million rounds of rifle and machine-gun ammunition—or about a year and a half's supply for all these enemy battalions in III and IV Corps.

Item: Of rocket, mortar and recoilless rifle rounds, they have taken well above 50,000—or enough for about 6,000 of the little attacks by fire which are customarily reported as great enemy "offensives" when they are bunched together in a "high point." By the standards of the high points of the last six months, the North Vietnamese have therefore lost the essential ingredients for over eight years of these pseudo-offensives.

Item: Some 7,000 enemy troops have also been killed, and 1,731 have been taken prisoner, against negligible U.S. losses and quite small South Vietnamese losses. In numbers, the enemy losses are nearly equivalent to the whole of one of the three North Vietnamese divisions Hanoi had stationed in the Cambodian sanctuaries.

To these remarkable totals far more could be added. But there is enough here, first of all, to prove that President Nixon's courageous gamble in Cambodia is currently being as grossly misrepresented as the enemy's desperate offensive at Tet, in 1968. One case is in fact the reverse of the other.

Tet was initially portrayed as gigantic disaster for the United States and its allies. In the outcome, it proved to be a gigantic disaster for Hanoi. As to the Cambodian gamble, although the final outcome must be awaited, it is currently being portrayed as a sad failure. Yet on the basis of the results to date, it promises to be the most brilliant feat of U.S. arms since the Inchon landing in Korea.

Almost better still it promises to be a brilliant feat of South Vietnamese arms. Here there is another irony. The same disaster-mongers who misrepresented Tet and are now misrepresenting Cambodia, used to have an easy way of spending a dull day. On such days, they would describe the cowardice and incompetence of the South Vietnamese 25th Division.

In the present offensive, this was the point division and its officers and men have fought with conspicuous courage and efficiency. But so far as one knows, none of the disaster-mongers has made a public apology to the ARVN 25th, or indeed to any of the other South Vietnamese troops who have been doing equally well. Yet the general excellence of ARVN's performance in Cambodia again ought to be news by any standard, especially in view of the President's Vietnamization program.

There are some pretty ugly things one is tempted to say about all this. But it is perhaps better to examine the reasons the Cambodian gamble now has such tremendous promise.

It will no doubt come as news to many senators, but the fact is that even the enemy's troops really cannot go on fighting without guns and ammunition. In Cambodia, we have now scooped up all the guns and ammunition and many other things that were destined to nourish the enemy's war in III and IV Corps for much more than a year.

Unless Hanoi can perform miracles of resupply, therefore, the war in the lower half of South Vietnam should now begin to wither away by stages. Genuine miracles will be needed to avert this result, moreover, because there is no doubt, any longer, that virtually all the supply for III and IV Corps has been coming by sea, through the Cambodian ports, for a very long time.

This is proved by the labels in the caches in the sanctuaries; and this lends enormous significance to another crucial fact. The President's gamble has decisively closed the Cambodian ports to the enemy, and it can be flatly predicted they will be kept closed, no matter what happens.

No increase of effort on the Laos trails can possibly compensate the enemy for the loss of Sihanoukville. This loss, in fact, should be even more upsetting to the Hanoi war-planners than their loss of far more than a year's supply for their units in III and IV Corps.

The North Vietnamese troops in Cambodia, finally, have been giving every sign of desperate disorganization, to the point of repeated disobedience of the anguished orders of the high command. Despite further misrepresentation on this head, moreover, there is no shadow of a present threat to Phnom Penh.

But the future of the Lon Nol government at Phnom Penh remains the uncertain factor. This is what makes it needful to wait and see whether the Cambodian gamble will finally fulfill all of its present promise.

REPUBLICAN VIEWS, SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING REPORT

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the Special Committee on Aging annual report, filed last week, is being released today. The entire document deserves careful review by each Member of the Congress.

It is not inappropriate that it should come in May, proclaimed by President Nixon as Senior Citizens Month.

As ranking minority member of the committee, I invite particular attention to the minority views of Senators FONG, MILLER, HANSEN, MURPHY, FANNIN, GURNEY, SAXBE, SMITH of Illinois, and myself.

I ask unanimous consent that a condensed version be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

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

(See exhibit No. 1.)

Mr. PROUTY. Mr. President, the thrust of the minority report is twofold. It calls for: First, immediate action to improve and protect incomes of older Americans, and second, initiation of a new national policy to widen choices and opportunities for older persons to participate in national and community life.

Legislation to assure that none of the elderly shall suffer from serious want deserves highest congressional priority. Creation of a new older Americans income assurance program, upgrading of social security benefits, and more equitable tax treatment of persons past 65 are all recommended in the interest of decent incomes for retirees.

Congress likewise should face up to its responsibility to bring inflation, the most universal problem confronting retirees, under control.

We believe there is need, further, for a penetrating review of policies in aging by all elements of society.

The desire and ability of older persons for extensive participation in the mainstream of American life should be given new recognition. Outmoded 19th-century concepts of aging should be abandoned and replaced by new attitudes and practices toward aging and older persons.

Multiplication of choices should be our objective.

New doors should be opened for volunteer service by retirees who want to participate in second careers.

There should be a reexamination of compulsory retirement patterns and employment practices so that older Americans who want to work, either full or part time, will not be penalized.

As former President Johnson observed:

In our Nation, there are thousands of retired teachers, lawyers, businessmen, social workers and recreation specialists, physicians, nurses, and others who possess skills which the country badly needs.

Hundreds of thousands not yet old, not yet voluntarily retired, find themselves jobless becaues of arbitrary age discrimination . . .

In economic terms, this is a serious—and senseless—loss to the Nation . . . But the

greater loss is the cruel sacrifice in happiness and well-being which joblessness imposes on these citizens and their families.

President Nixon expressed the feeling of countless older Americans when he said:

Our older citizens should have the opportunity to remain active, either in income producing occupations or in the voluntary organizations of their communities.

As Oliver Wendell Holmes said at the age of 90: "The work never is done while the power to work remains. For to live is to function—that is all there is to living."

I pledge the full resources of the Presidency toward encouraging greater opportunities for participation by the aged in all pursuits of this society.

We owe a great debt to our senior citizens for their contribution to this Nation's affluence. We should not hesitate in meeting that obligation by assuring that all are adequately cared for. Nonetheless, no group takes more seriously the late President Kennedy's admonition:

Ask not what your country can do for you—ask what you can do for your country.

Too often the chance to respond to this challenge is denied to senior citizens, who, understandably, rebel at being declared useless when they reach 65, 70, or any other arbitrary age.

Relatively few countries in the world have human resources equal to those found among millions of Americans past 65. These persons are often highly skilled, fully capable of great contributions to themselves and their Nation.

In fact, fewer than one-fourth of the world's nations have total populations equal to the number past 65 in the United States. Only two South American and three African countries have populations so large. Only eight of the 29 European countries have so many people.

The voice of older persons, as heard in many Committee on Aging hearings, cries out for opportunity to make their vast reservoir of talents available. We believe each of them should be given unlimited choices to do so.

Such a new, affirmative response, coupled with improvements in incomes, can bring real meaning to the term "golden years." This will require imagination, study and dedication by people in all walks and stations of life. We believe this effort should begin now.

At the same time, we reemphasize that many older Americans simply cannot wait. Our first order of business should be assurance of decent incomes for all older persons.

EXHIBIT 1

CONDENSATION OF MINORITY VIEWS OF MESSRS. PROUTY, FONG, MILLER, HANSEN, MURPHY, FANNIN, GURNEY, SAXBE, AND SMITH OF ILLINOIS

INTRODUCTION

Few challenges facing America in the 1970's are as important as a new policy on aging—one leading to decent living standards, independence, and meaningful retirement years for all older Americans.

Multiplications of choices open to each older person in his or her continuing pursuit of rewarding experiences is essential.

National policy should encourage older Americans to make full use of their growing potential for economic, spiritual and social involvement in family, community and national life.

Solutions to problems of senior citizens must relate to changing patterns in the aging process. Life expectancy will continue to lengthen, not shorten. Individual physical and mental abilities will grow, not decline. Reasonable needs for income to afford necessities and niceties of life will expand, not contract. Capacity and desire to take care of one's own needs, and demands for more diversified opportunities to do so, will increase, not diminish.

If society continues to ignore dynamic progress in aging, it will compound an already serious problem.

Creation of sound national approaches to aging will require many changes in attitudes. Imaginative and intelligent responses will be required by all elements of society, including senior citizens themselves.

Modification of retirement patterns and employment rules in recognition of expanding capacities and desires of many older Americans for active participation, full or part time, in the Nation's economic life should be a major ingredient.

Development of adequate community service opportunities for older persons whose retirement brings a desire for new socially oriented careers should play an important part.

Society's responses to individual needs at all ages should recognize that most people will grow old. One preventive measure deserving high priority is expansion of work opportunities for person who have not reached retirement age, but are denied jobs because of age. They are thus forced into situations which make their retirement years a prospect of social and economic deprivation.

Obviously improvements in Social Security, private pension plans and other sources of financial support designed to assure adequate retirement incomes are imperative. These should offer greater flexibility so as to increase individual options.

Achievement of a golden age in aging will take time. No one knows this better than the older American who has been misled by overly optimistic promises or suffered dashed hopes as he competes unsuccessfully with other demands on our Nation's resources.

The magnitude of the problem, however, is no excuse for delay. Certain actions should be taken now. As a minimum, therefore, we urgently recommend early action by the Congress which will look to:

1. Automatic cost-of-living increases in Social Security benefits to prevent hardships due to inflation.

2. Across-the-board increases in Social Security benefits.[1]

3. One hundred percent of primary Social Security benefits to older widows.

4. Major liberalization of the Social Security earnings test so as to prevent discrimination against those who continue to work, full or part time, especially those with relatively low Social Security benefits.

5. Upward adjustments, actuarially determined, in Social Security benefits for those who defer retirement beyond 65, so that their continuation in the work force will not be penalized.

6. An Older Americans Income Assurance Program offering income supplements to the elderly who otherwise would not be able to attain a decent standard of living or would be forced onto public assistance.

7. Medicare coverage for persons past 65 not presently covered and in need of such coverage.

8. Improvements in medicare service and financing which will reduce excessive burdens imposed by current deficiencies.

9. Updating of retirement income tax credit provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

10. Exclusion, subject to a reasonable ceiling, of medical and drug expenses from older persons income subject to Federal taxation.

11. Adequate financing for research in aging.

12. Sound governmental policies which will help bring inflation, the most universally serious problem for older Americans, under control.

NATIONAL POLICY IN AGING—A LONG VIEW

If we are to achieve the valid objectives of today's older Americans and acceptable roles for those who grow old in the future, it is necessary to develop broad new national policies in aging that recognize how outdated are 19th century stereotypes of older persons.

Implementation of humane and realistic policies will require major changes in attitudes toward aging on the part of government, business, education and all other elements of society including older persons themselves.

Recognition must be given to the expanded ability of persons at all ages to participate as fully as they desire in the Nation's economic and social life and to the growing emotional need of people in their sixties, seventies, and even their eighties for involvement in the mainstream of life.

There should be a reversal of social and economic patterns which force millions of older Americans, usually against their wills, into situations of rejection and dependence.

Rejection as first-class citizens capable of full participation in the responsibilities and rewards of active life is incompatible with the competence which most older people can bring to the challenges facing the Nation.

Dependence for many older Americans is especially abhorrent when, as is often the case, such dependence means inadequate incomes and denial of even minimal social opportunities.

In a nation where demand for skills, wisdom, and experience increases almost daily, it is totally inconsistent to erect barriers which restrict opportunities for individuals possessing such talents from making them available as fully as possible, either for hire or as volunteers.

There should be compassion toward older persons in need, but few older Americans really want compassion. They want to receive what is their's by right. First among these rights is the right to choose.

Maximization of choices open to each older person should be the objective of a new national policy on aging—choices with dignity and independence to which all senior Americans are entitled.

It is to be hoped that the 1971 White House Conference on Aging will seriously address itself to this question. It can be especially important because it is unrealistic to assume that creation of maximum choices can come overnight or without a massive, concerted effort. We cannot, however, ignore immediate consideration of present impediments to decent opportunities for older Americans. Their problems are too serious, too important.

Obviously there is no meaningful choice when millions of older Americans, through no fault of their own, are unable to pay for the barest necessities of life. Correction of this situation deserves highest congressional priority.

There is no choice when individuals are forced against their wills to leave their employment at an arbitrary age without regard for their abilities or desires. Compulsory retirement policies need careful reexamination

[1] Senator Miller notes that a 15-percent increase in benefits went into effect on Jan. 1, 1970, so that an automatice increase in benefits to keep pace with increases in the cost of living should be adequate, with exceptions to be covered by an Older Americans Income Assurance Program. (See recommendation 6.)

by every individual and organization with responsibility for employment practices.

There is little choice in retirement when policies of employers and even Federal programs, such as Social Security, prevent or discourage individual efforts to supplement income with part-time employment.

It is not uncommon for persons to enter retirement with the prospect of 20, 25, or more years remaining in their lives. Most, if not all of these years, may be accompanied by a zest for living which mitigates against nonparticipation.

Many older Americans have concluded that part-time work is essential to their own happy retirement and have accordingly maintained or resumed a modified role in the work force. Many more, particularly men, have been denied opportunities for such participation because of employer attitudes, or have passed up what they regard as desirable opportunities because of their fears as to the effect such work would have on their Social Security benefits.

We believe it is accurate to say that a high percentage of those now past 65 believe a comprehensive review of the Nation's retirement attitudes is in order. We believe that such reappraisal, looking at all factors, including economic, social, physical, emotional, spiritual and psychological, should make full use of what retirees themselves think as well as the results of research in these areas.

Countless other items of significance to the future of aging and older Americans deserve review. The time to begin reexamination and changes of attitudes is now.

The next three decades, if available evidence is even partially reliable will see further increases in length of life, in physical and mental abilities, and in social and economic appetites among older people as a result of continuing progress.

Serious students of the physiology of aging predict that by A.D. 2000 average life expectancy may be 90 or 100 years. Some researchers suggest even more dramatic shifts. In a century such as this, with serious plans developing for trips to Mars, who can ignore the optimism of science?

If an increase of 20 or 30 years in life expectancy is accompanied by probably improved levels of health and physical-mental potentials at all ages, it is obvious that present attitudes in aging, particularly regarding the proper patterns of retirement, will be completely inadequate. There is serious question as to whether many are not already out of date.

Recent years have seen emergence of a curious paradox in aging. Better health and education are raising abilities of older persons to participate in the Nation's mainstream—and their desire to do so. Simultaneously there has been a marked increase in pre-65 retirement.

If this were proof of America's success in solving the retirement income problem, there would be no grounds for complaint. Such is not the case. If, on the other hand, it represents a failure of society to meet the needs of a revolution in aging, it takes little imagination to see that additional increases in life expectancy will but compound an already serious problem.

Data reviewed by this committee shows that much of early retirement is by persons with lowest incomes—lowest incomes both before and after retirement. Decisions of many persons to "retire" have resulted from loss of jobs and inability to obtain other suitable employment. More have been encouraged to retire by suasions of various retirement programs, reinforced by social pressures to quit, even though personally reluctant to do so. Many, both underprivileged and affluent, have been forced out of their life work prematurely by rigid retirement policies.

Many older Americans have been and are resentful of the negative compulsion applied to them by society during their sixties and seventies. They rightfully feel they should have more choices as long as they live and are capable of enjoying the responsibilities and rewards of life.

Successful response to the highly varied economic, social, physical, and psychological needs of tens of millions of older Americans requires study, thought and imagination. Expansion of choices for each individual should be the objective.

Complexity of the problem, however, in no way justifies delay in congressional action on problems that are obvious and immediate.

SOCIAL SECURITY

As has always been the case, the greatest problem for older Americans is income. Large numbers of persons past 65 obviously do not have the money necessary to meet the costs of decent standards of living. Others have experienced severe losses in purchasing power because of inflation during the last 10 years. Many who retired in comfort now find themselves in or near straitened circumstances.

Our Nation's most immediate goal should be steps to assure all older Americans at least a decent minimum standard of living.

This effort calls for improvements in private pension programs, successful implementation of President Nixon's campaign to bring inflation under control, expansion of opportunities for individuals to supplement retirement income through their own efforts, and a variety of other measures.

Few congressional actions would have more widespread immediate effect, of course, than improvements in Social Security.

The recently adopted 15-percent increase in benefits is commendable, but it only represents a beginning in necessary upgrading of the Social Security system.

One improvement which minority members of the Committee on Aging and the Republican Party have long advocated is provision for an automatic cost-of-living increase in benefits to provide immediate response to rising price levels when they occur.

As when introduced first in the Senate by Senator Jack Miller of Iowa, such an automatic escalation in benefits requires no increase in the Social Security tax rates. It would obviate the game of "catch-up" which has characterized Social Security since its inception, a game in which beneficiaries have been consistent losers.

Adoption of this proposal would give assurances to younger potential beneficiaries that their benefits would be payable in amounts at least equivalent to the dollars they are paying in current taxes. This becomes important to the whole system's integrity as evidence grows of reluctance on the part of younger people to support rising costs of the Social Security program.

It is time to quit playing political football with Social Security and the needs of the aging. Too often past increases, actually amounting to no more than living-cost adjustments, have been voted by the Congress only after delay has forced many beneficiaries into inexcusable financial difficulties. Such increases could have been made automatically within the fiscal competence of the Social Security system when the aging needed them most rather than when they offered political advantage to Members of Congress. It is such immediate responses to needs of beneficiaries that is recommended through the proposal for automatic living-cost adjustments.

Precedent has been set for such a policy in other federally supported pension programs. Why should it not be extended at once to the mass of older Americans relying on Social Security?

While living-cost increases are important in modernization of Social Security, they are not a substitute for increasing the overall adequacy of the system in its design to provide income for older Americans. There is also need for across-the-board increases.[2]

The plight of widows and discrimination against them in the Social Security benefit structure likewise deserve prompt attention.

Elsewhere in this Committee on Aging report and repeatedly in those published in the past, it has been observed that no group among the elderly is subject to more severe economic handicap than aged widows. One contributing factor is failure to pay the same Social Security benefits to surviving wives as is paid to surviving husbands. Normally the latter receive 100 percent of primary Social Security benefit on the death of their spouse; the widow, however, receives only 82½ percent. There seems to be no excuse for such discrimination and we recommend its prompt correction.

Two other changes in the Social Security system are of pressing importance if we are to increase choices available to older Americans.

The first of these relates to limitations on earnings by a beneficiary.

Current limitations of $1,680 per year on the amount one can earn without penalty is totally unrealistic. The provision that a beneficiary lose only half of earned income between $1,680 and $2,880 is awkward and cumbersome.

The present limitation discourages many who would like to supplement pension payments with income from part-time work. In times of inflation this can be most important. The restriction virtually prohibits gainful full-time employment by others, often including those whose incomes are lowest and those who derive their greatest satisfaction from employment.

There is evidence the earnings limitation sometimes reduces the amount paid to those who insist on working. Without it, they would receive more money for the same work.

It should be noted, too, that while a person may receive large income from other sources without penalty, the earnings limitation applies as much to those receiving minimum Social Security benefits of $64 a month as to persons receiving maximum benefits.

In any event, this earnings limitation as now applied is seriously and properly objected to by older Americans. Its substantial liberalization would be a major step in increasing choices available to them. We recommend early consideration of such a change.

A second step which would increase choices open to Social Security beneficiaries would be through expanding the program's flexibility for those who choose to continue work after 65.

Without flexibility in the system, it is difficult for individuals to tailor it to personal situations they face in later years of life.

Some flexibility has been gained by changes which permit persons to elect receipt of benefits before age 65. Lower payments are received when such election is made.

When a person elects to defer benefits until age 66 or 68 or 70, however, he gains virtually nothing. Indeed, without increasing his benefits, he is actually required to pay additional Social Security taxes. The inequity of such a practice is obvious.

This discrimination against the person who desires to continue employment not only goes against the personal preference of many senior citizens, but also against professional opinion as to what is best for older persons.

We advocate consideration of improvement in the Social Security system which would permit realistic annual increments in benefits for persons electing to postpone retirement to ages beyond 65.

---

[2] See footnote 1.

INCOME ASSURANCE PROGRAM

Important as improvements in Social Security may be, it must be recognized that they have their limitations.

For this reason we urge that Congress give most careful consideration to development of an Older Americans Income Assurance Program, outside the welfare pattern, which will assure at least minimum income, through governmental supplements, to all the elderly who otherwise would not be able to receive a decent standard of living.

Whether such a program should be completely financed and administered by the Federal Government, or involve a combination of Federal and State funds may be subject to argument. The fact remains, however, that some such approach appears necessary if this Nation is to meet its obligation that all older persons enjoy decent standards of living.

One such proposal was offered in the 90th Congress and with modifications again in the 91st Congress by Senator Winston Prouty of Vermont. Senator Prouty's bill, S. 3554, provides that there be a Federal supplement to bring the total income of each unmarried person over 65 up to $1,800 a year and each married couple up to $2,400. The amount of subsidy would be the difference between other income of the individual or couple and the $1,800 and $2,400 respectively.

Some mechanism such as this seems to be the one way that the problem of income inadequacy can be met at a cost in keeping with the willingness of younger people to pay the bill, and this is particularly true if financing occurs out of the general fund rather than through Social Security taxes.

As an income supplement program, the cost to the taxpayer would be substantially lower than that required by any effort to raise Social Security minimum benefits to comparable levels. This is extremely important because there appears to be little disposition on the part of the Congress to raise minimums to such levels in the near future. Congressional reluctance is undoubtedly inspired by the feeling of younger people who must pay the taxes necessary for any Federal program which is financed through Social Security taxes.

Senator William B. Saxbe of Ohio has approached it in another way by offering an amendment to the Administration's proposed Family Assistance Act which would provide for supplements to a minimum of $155 monthly for persons age 72 or over.

However desirable it might be to promise older Americans that their basic economic needs can be met through raising Social Security minimum benefits now to $125 or $150 a month or more, it is grossly unfair to do so. Nothing in the 35-year history of Social Security suggests that Congress will take such dramatic action, regardless of how badly it might be needed. The obvious reason that such promises are unrealistic is the cost and destruction of the concept of Social Security as "insurance" rather than a welfare program.

Sympathetic as they may be to the importance of caring for their seniors, young workers appear unwilling to pay the increased Social Security taxes necessary to support such minimum Social Security benefits. Their attitudes are reflected in the hesitancy of the Congress to pass such proposals.

It is a fact that many young Americans, struggling to meet immediate family expenses, are paying Social Security taxes greater than their Federal income tax liability. Simultaneously, as much as 40 percent of income subject to Federal income taxes is exempt from Social Security taxation, much of it in the hands of persons most able to pay.

For the present, however, the one approach which would be responsive to the needs of the aged and do so with a price tag which could be borne by the young appears to be that offered by an income assurance plan. This could help those who need help most without creating a windfall for those now able to take care of their own financial needs.

A general income supplement program would also serve the many persons not now covered by Social Security, such as some school teachers, State and Federal government employees, and others whose employment is not or was not covered in the past by Social Security. Large numbers of these persons are among those with lowest incomes.

Efforts to provide some protection to persons not covered by Social Security began in 1965 with the Prouty amendment which authorized payments in the amount of $35 monthly (now $46) to such persons age 72 and over who had no other pensions. Even with all the limiting amendments imposed by Congress on this proposal, the problem's magnitude is indicated by the fact that over 600,000 persons qualified. For many it was the only source of cash income.

It should be noted that an income supplement program, however devised, would have an advantage as a mechanism to eliminate abject poverty among the elderly because it would avoid unearned increments to persons, some of them wealthy, who are not in need.

This is why the total net cost to the taxpayer, important to favorable consideration for any proposal, would be much lower than a comparable Social Security minimum benefit.

MEDICARE

After 3 years of operation, the Medicare program obviously is beset by numerous problems. Since these are now under examination by congressional committees with legislative responsibility in these areas, it is unnecessary here to review the numerous shortcomings which have been encountered. Even with Medicaid as a supplement, however, it appears necessary for revisions in delivery of medical care under programs supported entirely or in part by Federal funds to see that they more satisfactorily meet the most critical medical needs of the aged.

Financial and service delivery problems are making it increasingly difficult for Medicare to fulfill promises made for the program. Simultaneously there have been numerous complaints from beneficiaries because of service inadequacies. Difficult as the task may be, it is evident that attention first must be given to correction of these deficiencies as a prelude to broadening provisions of the law. Such revisions should recognize, however, that there are many serious unmet medical needs among the elderly to which careful attention should be given.

One problem of particular concern to us is provision of long-term care to older persons with varying degrees of disability and illness. We believe it imperative that Congress address itself most carefully to this problem so as to ease the heavy burdens now imposed by protracted terminal illness and highly expensive, irreversible chronic disease.

The percentage of older persons, whose disability and illness needs can efficiently be met through institutional care such as offered in homes for the aged, nursing homes and similar institutions, is small. None-the-less the cost of their care remains one of the most frightening possibilities facing older Americans and their families.

We recommend, further, that Medicare be extended to all persons over 65, regardless of Social Security status, who are in need of such coverage. Many persons not now covered have financial need as great as those who are beneficiaries. Financing of such coverage should come from the general fund of the Treasury, otherwise those who pay Social Security taxes will be paying for a program not primarily designed as "Insurance."

TAXATION

One serious problem facing many older persons, as revealed repeatedly in Committee on Aging hearings, is that created by rising taxes.

There are at least two other areas which are clearly subject to effective Federal tax relief.

We recommend updating of retirement income tax credit provisions of the Internal Revenue Code. The retirement income credit section of the code was enacted in 1954. It established for certain retirees a tax benefit similar to that others have by means of the tax-free income they receive from Social Security. The retirement income credit was computed on the maximum Social Security benefit. By the language of the tax code, however, the tax base still stands at $1,524 which was the appropriate figure 8 years ago. Since that time there have been several Social Security increases, but no comparable adjustment in the retirement income credit provision. The Congress should consider updating section 37 of the 1954 Internal Revenue Code to provide as nearly as possible equal tax treatment for all retirement income.

We urge action further to simplify that portion of tax return forms related to retirement income credit in recognition of the fact that its present complexity results in many older persons paying taxes in excess of the law's requirements.

We also recommend that medical and drug expenses of older people, including those related to dental services, be made deductible subject to a reasonable ceiling, from income subject to Federal taxation. This could be a reinstatement of deductibility for persons past 65 as applied to Federal income tax prior to 1967.

RESEARCH IN AGING

If our objectives for all older Americans are to be achieved with reasonable speed, the Nation needs facts—facts about the present and facts about what may be in the future.

We strongly recommend increased support, financial and otherwise, for immediate expansion of research in the field of aging.

Doubtless almost all basic and applied scientific research is of benefit to the old as well as the young. There needs to be more careful determination, however, of how the products of such research may be applied to the particular problems of those in middle and later years.

There is need, too, for more effective research directed specifically at the implications of age in order to develop realistic and flexible national policies and attitudes toward aging which can more satisfactorily meet the needs of people.

Obviously the Nation needs more distinguished scholarship such as the work at the University of South Florida, University of Iowa, Drake University, Duke University and the Ethel Percy Andrus Gerontology Center at the University of Southern California. That it be the sense of the Congress that such gerontological centers be encouraged has been called for in Senate Concurrent Resolution 24 introduced by Senator George Murphy of California for himself and other minority members.

Research obviously should range far beyond the physical sciences. Possibly the greatest need may be for research in the economic and social aspects of the aging phenomenon.

Practical research should also permit full expression by older Americans themselves about their problems, desires and estimates of what is needed for the future.

INFLATION

No review of today's needs of older Americans would be complete without reference to

the most serious and universal economic problem they face—inflation.

President Nixon deserves highest commendation for placing control of inflation at the top of his domestic objectives.

Any effort to preserve the value of the older American's fixed income should be applauded. We urge the Congress to give the President full support in this campaign.

Minority members of this committee have repeatedly taken the lead in recognizing that the most universal and serious sources of problems of older Americans is the massive loss of real income through inflation.

We have maintained, with wide support from economic experts, that control of inflation can only be achieved through Federal policies which are fiscally sound and by roll call votes of Members of Congress which are consistent with such policies.

We reiterate our concern for reduction in and postponement of unjustifiable or low-priority Federal expenditures. It is essential that those in control of the Congress face up to their responsibilities and put an end to rising public deficits and debt, which lay the foundation for inflation and high interest rates.

Previous minority reports of this committee have discussed how inflation injures the worker in factory, shop, office, or on the farm. The facts are too evident to require repetition here now. The truth is all citizens, save possibly the very rich, are hurt by rising living costs. None suffer more, however, than older persons.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS, MINORITY VIEWS, SENATE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The following are the *Minority Recommendations, Senate Special Committee on Aging,* as they appear in the introduction of Minority views signed by Senators Prouty, Fong, Miller, Hansen, Murphy, Fannin, Gurney, Saxbe and Smith (Ill.):

1. Automatic cost-of-living increases in Social Security benefits to prevent hardships due to inflation.

2. Across-the-board increases in Social Security benefits.[1]

3. One hundred percent of primary Social Security benefits to older widows.

4. Major liberalization of the Social Security earnings test so as to prevent discrimination against those who continue to work, full or part time, especially those with relatively low Social Security benefits.

5. Upward adjustments, actuarially determined, in Social Security benefits for those who defer retirement beyond 65, so that their continuation in the work force will not be penalized.

6. An Older Americans Income Assurance Program offering income supplements to the elderly who otherwise would not be able to attain a decent standard of living or would be forced onto public assistance.

7. Medicare coverage for persons past 65 not presently covered and in need of such coverage.

8. Improvements in medicare service and financing which will reduce excessive burdens imposed by current deficiencies.

9. Updating of retirement income tax credit provisions of the Internal Revenue Code.

10. Exclusion, subject to a reasonable ceiling, of medical and drug expenses from older persons income subject to Federal taxation.

11. Adequate financing for research in aging.

12. Sound governmental policies which will help bring inflation, the most universally serious problem for older Americans, under control.

[1] Senator Miller notes that a 15-percent increase in benefits went into effect on Jan. 1, 1970, so that an automatic increase in benefits to keep pace with increases in the cost of living should be adequate, with exceptions to be covered by an Older Americans Income Assurance Program. (See recommendation 6.)

ORDER OF BUSINESS

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

COMMUNICATIONS FROM EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS, ETC.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore (Mr. METCALF) laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

PROPOSED CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN FEDERALLY OWNED LAND TO THE CHEROKEE TRIBE OF OKLAHOMA

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to convey certain federally owned lands to the Cherokee Tribe of Oklahoma (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

PROSPECTUS FOR ALTERATIONS AT VIRGINIA HEATING, REFRIGERATION AND SEWAGE DISPOSAL PLANT, ARLINGTON, VA.

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, a prospectus for alterations at the Virginia Heating, Refrigeration and Sewage Disposal Plant in Arlington, Va. (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

PROSPECTUSES FOR PROPOSED ALTERATION OF PUBLIC BUILDINGS

A letter from the Acting Administrator, General Services Administration, transmitting, pursuant to law, prospectuses for proposed alteration of public buildings (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Public Works.

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following report of a committee was submitted:

By Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Government Operations, with an amendment to the title:

S. 2763. A bill to allow the purchase of additional systems and equipment over and above the statutory price limitation (Rept. No. 91-893).

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

As in executive session,

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. FULBRIGHT, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Sam Harry Wright, of the District of Columbia, who was confirmed by the Senate on November 26, 1969, as the representative of the United States of America on the Trusteeship Council of the United Nations, to serve on the Council with the rank of Ambassador.

BILLS AND A JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. CRANSTON:

S. 3872. A bill for the relief of Leona Lopez; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FONG:

S. 3873. A bill for the relief of Corazon Q. Quimino; and

S. 3874. A bill for the relief of Narcisa Caban Cabbab; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARSON (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. PASTORE, Mr. HARTKE, Mr. PROUTY, Mr. MOSS, Mr. CANNON, Mr. PACKWOOD, and Mr. HATFIELD):

S. 3875. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide for the rail transportation of freight for the Department of Defense in general purpose box cars owned by the United States; to the Committee on Commerce.

(The remarks of Mr. PEARSON when he introduced the bill appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

By Mr. JAVITS (for himself, Mr. JORDAN of Idaho, and Mr. MILLER):

S.J. Res. 203. Joint resolution on wage and price stability; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(The remarks of Mr. JAVITS when he introduced the joint resolution appear later in the RECORD under the appropriate heading.)

S. 3875—INTRODUCTION OF A BILL RELATING TO RAIL TRANSPORTATION OF FREIGHT FOR THE DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE IN GENERAL PURPOSE BOXCARS OWNED BY THE UNITED STATES

Mr. PEARSON. Mr. President, I am introducing today a bill for myself and cosponsored by the distinguished chairman of Commerce Committee (Mr. MAGNUSON), Mr. PASTORE, all the members of the Special Subcommitte on Freight Car Shortages, Mr. HARTKE—the chairman—Mr. PROUTY, Mr. MOSS, and Mr. CANNON, also Mr. PACKWOOD and Mr. HATFIELD, designed to meet the basic cause of the critical boxcar shortage that persists today, not only in my region, but across the Nation. The plain fact is there simply are not enough boxcars.

This bill would enlarge our Nation's overall boxcar fleet by arranging for the construction and purchase of boxcars sufficient for the needs of the Department of Defense, thereby releasing those cars presently in use by DOD. This measure is vitally needed, Mr. President, because the Department of Defense is holding cars at many shipping points across the country and paying quite substantial demurrage charges on them; while at the same time, grain is overflowing the elevators and spoiling on the ground in the midwest, while coal, perishables and other products are also waiting to be transported from points across the Nation.

Mr. President, national defense purposes undoubtedly require at times that cars be held at various shipping points. This is understandable and justifiable. Accordingly, this bill would provide adequate cars for such purposes, would ease their administrative burdens while also

saving taxpayers money. Not only would this represent a wiser expenditure of Government funds, but it could ultimately produce a net savings in the national budget.

The important thing, however, is that funds will be spent in a positive way—in an effort to alleviate the critical boxcar shortage rather than for continued payment of excessive charges in the nature of parking fines on cars which are so desperately needed, but which are sitting idle at various places throughout the Nation.

This bill, Mr. President, is not intended to prejudice any current efforts within the Congress or the Executive which are directed at other aspects of the boxcar shortage problem. There is a pressing need to establish proper rates, demurrage charges, penalties, and other regulations to increase boxcar utilization. But this proposal, which has received support from east and west, deals with the basic problem of inadequate boxcar supply.

Mr. President, within a few weeks, combines and harvest crews will be moving into the Kansas wheat fields; but as farmers and grain dealers across the Midwest are well aware, it will be a long time before this new crop reaches the market.

Unfortunately, however, this is no new problem to the people of the Midwest. The first case to be held before the Interstate Commerce Commission—docket No. 1–1887—was a petition by farmers in the Dakota territory complaining of inadequate boxcar supply.

In my State today, it has been estimated that the economic loss due to the boxcar shortage runs in the neighborhood of $100 million per year.

But Mr. President, the problem is no longer sectional; it is a national problem of awesome complexity which affects not only market price structures, but international trade as well. The problem today is no longer seasonal; it is year-round.

Mr. President, on June 24 of last year, I made a statement on the Senate floor indicating that during 1968 the Department of Defense paid out demurrage fines on the order of tens of millions of dollars, possibly even $100 million. Since that date, the figure, I am informed, has decreased. The overall supply of cars, however, has been worsening for years, as the following chart indicates:

PLAIN, UNEQUIPPED BOXCARS

Date	Ownership	Serviceable
Jan. 1, 1958	685, 276	653, 060
Jan. 1, 1960	655, 418	608, 275
Jan. 1, 1962	609, 487	559, 588
Jan. 1, 1963	578, 834	532, 469
Jan. 1, 1964	543, 898	505, 273
Jan. 1, 1965	508, 713	474, 632
Jan. 1, 1966	473, 798	444, 485
Jan. 1, 1967	454, 761	427, 404
Jan. 1, 1968	427, 206	397, 501
Jan. 1, 1969	404, 592	376, 957
Feb. 1, 1969	403, 241	376, 007
Mar. 1, 1969	401, 864	374, 459

Mr. President, given the present financial condition of most of our Nation's railroads, it is simply unrealistic to expect that the railroads will be able to build or purchase adequate numbers of boxcars sufficient for the transportation of the essential commodities of this Nation. Accordingly, I urge that the Senate redirect our Government's vital resources toward the improvement of a grave situation rather than toward the aggravation of a worsening dilemma. I urge the Senate to give the consideration to the proposal.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOK). The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 3875) to amend the Interstate Commerce Act in order to provide for the rail transportation of freight for the Department of Defense in general purpose box cars owned by the United States, introduced by Mr. PEARSON (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. 3875

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That Part I of the Interstate Commerce Act (49 U.S.C. 1, et seq.), is amended by redesignating section 26 as section 27 and by inserting before such section a new section as follows:

"NATIONAL DEFENSE FREIGHT CARS

"SEC. 26. (a) The Secretary of Defense (1) shall arrange for the construction and purchase of such number of general purpose box cars (not less than 10,000) as may be necessary to provide for the transportation of all freight tendered to railroads subject to this Part by the Department of Defense and suitable for transportation in such cars, in general purpose box cars owned by the United States or in general purpose box cars provided in exchange for such cars owned by the United States, (2) may enter into such agreements with such railroads as are necessary to provide for the maintenance and most efficient use of such cars owned by the United States, including exchange agreements, and to provide for necessary rate adjustments in order to recognize the United States' capital investment in such cars.

"(b) There is authorized to be appropriated for the purpose of section (a) (1) the sum of $120 million, such funds to remain available until expended."

ADDITIONAL STATEMENTS OF SENATORS

JOHN GRAVES

Mr. McGEE. Mr. President, all of us are saddened by news of the death of Mr. John Graves. We on the majority side of the aisle, in particular, knew and loved John, an able young man who had served us well as assistant secretary of the majority. His, of course, was a familiar face and a pleasing personality for all of us, no matter which side of the aisle we occupied. That John Graves is gone at such an early age seems most unlikely, but it is true. I will miss him, as I am sure all Senators will. And I should like to express a sense of loss at his passing, and condolences to his wife and children.

NOT EVEN A MINIMUM STANDARD OF DECENCY

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, over a month ago, Republican Senators attending our weekly policy committee luncheon heard a most moving address by the wife of one of the 1,529 Americans held prisoner by North Vietnam.

Without any formal vote or resolution, all of us vowed to help this noble woman and the other wives, parents, and families of these prisoners.

Every day since then we have called attention to the despicable refusal of the North Vietnamese to observe even a minimum standard of decency with respect to these prisoners.

Each day we have demanded that every resource of our Government and of various concerned international organizations be utilized to persuade the captor government to observe the prisoner of war conventions to which that government is a signatory.

Our topic is not new, and our prose is not original. It may be boring and repetitious to a few, but we know we speak for most Americans.

This is the very least we can do. The wives, the parents, the children of these Americans held prisoner have not given up hope. Nor can we.

SHOES SUFFER, SAYS SENATOR SYMINGTON

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, the sad plight of our American shoe workers is well known to all my fellow Senators. One man who has long recognized the problem is the senior Senator from Missouri (Mr. SYMINGTON).

Last night in St. Louis, Mo., in speaking to the United Shoe Workers of Missouri, men who have suffered just as dearly as those in my State of New Hampshire, Senator SYMINGTON called for a properly balanced policy which would protect these men and their employers from what is now certain economic downfall.

Senator SYMINGTON realizes that what is desperately needed is a policy of protection which is both fair to our own workers and fair to foreign manufacturers—a policy which would result if S. 3723, which I introduced, was to become law.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that this extremely important and timely speech by Senator SYMINGTON be printed in the RECORD.

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

THE QUIET INVASION

At the end of World War II, America emerged from four years of conflict as the most powerful trading nation in the world. Our economy was by far the strongest on earth; and our currency ruled all financial markets.

Europe and much of the rest of the developed world was in ruins; and political and economic collapse threatened many States.

It became increasingly clear that unless the United States poured massive economic aid into these countries in order to help them back on their feet, the active radical

parties, including those directly connected with the Comintern, could well take over.

Accordingly President Truman launched an unprecedented aid program, the Marshall Plan, which was designed to underwrite the recovery of Europe; and from its inception in 1948 over 16 billion American dollars were funneled to that part of the world through this program alone.

Never in the course of history has one nation given so much so freely, and asked so little in return.

To say the Marshall Plan was successful would be an understatement. With this transfusion of our dollars, Europe recovered rapidly. Stability and prosperity returned to the point where today the European Common Market has assumed the number one spot as the leading trading power in the world—a position once held by the United States.

In effect, therefore, our country, the architect of Europe's new prosperity, has bankrolled the reconstruction of Europe at very great expense.

The same story is true with respect to what we did for Japan, beneficiary since 1945 of over three billion dollars in United States economic assistance. Today this small island nation is second only to our country in Gross National Product among the nations of the free world.

From 1958 to 1968 world trade doubled; and during the past two years there has been additional record growth; but industry in this country has not benefited from this expansion as it should; in fact, our own balance of trade abroad has been, and is, deteriorating rapidly. This diminishing trade surplus results from a steady increase in imports to the point where in 1969 the United States had by far the largest balance of payments deficits in its history—6.9 billion dollars, more than double any previous year.

Of course part of the negative balance of payments situation is due to inflation here at home; but the real source of the problem goes far beyond that. It is a matter of record that Europe and other countries, particularly Japan, through the establishment of non-tariff barriers after they have made tariff agreements with us, have taken unfair advantage of the previously agreed upon trade policies; have for example created clever new impediments to the entry of our exports into their markets, which impediments enable them to circumvent said tariff agreements.

As a result, it is becoming steadily more difficult for this country to compete in various types of goods, not only on the world market, but right here at home; and the basic reason for this unfortunate condition is the soaring influx of cheap labor imports which this Government allows to come in from abroad.

As our own exports decline because of inability to meet price competition from overseas, and as our imports therefore rise, the result can only be less production here at home; and therefore fewer jobs.

In its effort to promote free trade, the United States has made every reasonable effort to reduce, if not eliminate, non-tariff barriers. Directly contrary to that "good neighbor" policy, however, the European Common Market, along with Japan and other countries, have been establishing new discriminatory arrangements which are designed primarily to cut off imports from the United States.

One is reminded of the story about the good Samaritan who came upon a man being attacked by thieves. Disregarding his own safety, he rushed to the aid of the stricken wayfarer, chased the assailants away, nursed the battered victim back to health, and then gave him fine garments to replace his tattered clothing.

When the victim had sufficiently recovered to resume his way, however, instead of thanking the good Samaritan for saving his life, clothing him, and nursing him back to health, he beat the Samaritan over the head and fled with all of the latter's possessions.

Maybe this story is not strictly applicable; but one now has the right to ask just how long can the United States of America continue to defend the free world, almost by itself, and in addition finance the free world, almost by itself; and at the same time agree to policies which allow these other countries, through the lower prices they are able to offer as the result of far lower wages, to take work out of this country; work which represents the opportunity for decent jobs for our own people?

No industry in the United States today feels the pinch of this unfair foreign competition more than does the shoe industry.

Although because of advanced technology manufacturers of American footwear still enjoy a substantial productivity edge over most of their foreign competitors, the far lower standard of living characteristic of the other countries which produce shoes automatically gives the latter a tremendous market advantage.

As illustration, labor consumes some 30 to 40 percent of the cost of shoe production in this country. But it would actually be illegal if American industry paid its shoe workers as little as they receive in all other competing countries.

Our nation today enjoys the highest standard of living in the world; and of this we should be proud indeed. The average wage of footwear workers in the United States is $2.29 per hour in mid-1969 according to the U.S. Department of Labor; and that is low as against the average industrial wage in this country.

Nevertheless Italy, our leading shoe competitor, pays its shoe workers only $1.04 per hour; and in Spain, another leading exporter of leather footwear, the hourly wage earned by their shoe workers would not buy a dozen eggs in this country. It averages 56¢ per hour.

Japan, the world's leading vinyl footwear manufacturer, is little better. Its shoe workers average 58¢ per hour.

Is it any wonder that American producers find it increasingly difficult to compete with this foreign production?

Based on the above facts, it is not hard to see why, during the ten year period from 1960 through 1969, there was no growth whatever in domestic shoe production; whereas the importing of shoes increased over 600%.

In 1969, 196 million pairs of shoes were imported into this country, an increase of 11.5 percent over the previous year. That figure represents 34 percent of estimated domestic production.

As all of us here tonight realize only too well, this rising tide of shoe production is having widespread ramifications on our shoe industry here at home; and because Missouri has always been, as it is today, one of the leading shoe producing states, this development is of special interest to our own communities.

The closing of American shoe factories more than doubled in 1969; and twenty-five percent of all such factories have shut down since 1947.

What this means we are actually doing through our trade policies, therefore, is importing shoes while we export jobs.

One result of such short-sighted policy is that many American shoe firms have set up manufacturing divisions in other countries, claiming they must do so in order to meet competition.

This policy of, in effect, exporting jobs not only affects urban and suburban areas: it has a direct effect on the prosperity of rural America; and these are the reasons why.

The shoe industry is largely made up of small and medium-sized manufacturing components. As example, more than 40 percent of all shoe production in the United States is located in towns of 25,000 or less; because as automation replaces more and more farm workers, many shoe companies have located in rural communities, where they have found available labor of the best type; and today thousands of Missourians primarily interested in agriculture work in these plants so as to supplement their farm earnings.

In 1968 there were approximately 92 shoe plants in Missouri; and a majority of these were located in rural counties. These plants accounted for over 21,000 local jobs, with a total payroll of some $20 million.

In many rural Missouri communities, a footwear factory is often either the principal or the only industry, and its closing could spell economic disaster for an entire town.

To further illustrate the negative aspect of this segment of our foreign policy, in the decade prior to 1968, the number of jobs in the production of footwear in Missouri declined 26 percent.

Today the role of the rural communities in our society has never been more important. We know only too well how overcrowded are our cities, how they suffer from grave ills which it will take careful planning and a long time to eliminate.

Continued farm-to-city migration because of lack of jobs can only aggravate these already serious problems.

By the end of this century America will be forced to accommodate an additional 100 million people. Where are we going to put them? What are they going to do? Should we not try to maintain those policies which will give them worthwhile jobs at decent wages; and spread that work around so we do not get a further concentration of the population in the large cities?

The small towns of rural America hold much of the key to the future of this nation; and therefore they, along with the rural communities which support them, should be maintained and developed.

What better incentive could there be to remain on one's land than the possibility of a good job near at hand?

It is because of the broad and basic policies which now face America that I do not understand how our present trade policy with regard to shoe imports can be justified.

Let us hope also that we can make major improvement in the quality and design of our footwear. If we look at the shoes our wives are wearing, the chances are good that some of them have been imported from Spain or Italy. As a noted professor of political economy stated recently: "While there is no quantitative proof available, I think it clear that such factors as prestige, value, style, and higher quality are becoming crucial determinants for imported goods in the affluent United States marketplace."

In addition, let us all do our best to improve even further the efficiency of American plants. Many of the European and Japanese plants often built with our aid, are very new and very modern; so we in turn should continue to modernize our own factories, thereby maintaining technological superiority.

There are some who claim also that there is a shortage of some vital skilled trades within the shoe industry, such as stitchers and cement lasters. Perhaps new training programs could re-train upward those presently employed in the industry; and also attract young men and women who will be important to the shoe production of tomorrow.

These structural adjustments will take time, however. In the interim, why should

American wage earners suffer loss of employment? Why should not all Government policies now concentrate on preserving and improving our towns and cities? Why should an entire industry suffer so heavily because of competition from foreign plants often, in effect, built with your taxes and mine?

There must of course be some "balance" to protection policies. We do not expect or desire complete restriction. Perhaps the so-called "crawling peg" quota system proposed recently by Senator McIntyre of New Hampshire would be wise. Under this system, a reasonable base number of imports is set—say the number of pairs of leather shoes imported in 1967; and in the future the amount of imports allowed into this country would increase at a constant percentage, as the level of domestic consumption increased. Imports would therefore be permitted a share of the market, but would not drive domestic producers out of business.

By leaving a small corner of the market to imports, domestic industry would be stimulated by the competition, and would be sure of maintaining the high quality and design standards which have for so long been characteristic of its work.

In summary, it is time for the United States to take a more firm and logical position with respect to its trade policies. We can no longer afford to agree to unilateral policies which not only curtail our exports to other countries, but enable those countries to take over our domestic markets.

Who will deny that it is time to get our economy moving again; and what we need now from this Administration is action, not more rhetoric.

In that way we can do more than preserve our footwear industry and the jobs that go with it. We can increase production and thereby increase the number of available jobs.

Let us never forget that our citizens being employed, on the right basis from the standpoint of wages, hours, and conditions of work, is one of the greatest of all steps towards a strong America—and a strong America is the best hope on this earth for peace and prosperity.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT NIXON'S MOVE IN CAMBODIA

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), I ask unanimous consent that a statement by him in support of President Nixon's move in Cambodia and a telegram from William G. Conomos, editor and publisher of the Orlando Sentinel, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR GURNEY

Mr. President, in the past 10 days, we have heard, I think it is fair to say, a huge outcry from the Americans who oppose our presence in Cambodia. I disagree with much of what I have heard, but I am prepared to stipulate that much of the criticism of the administration's position is sincere and rational. Some of it, however, is hysterical and irrational; I have in mind the destruction of schools, the assaults on police, and the name-calling, referring to the President as a "murderer," for instance. We have heard, as I said, from the opponents of the Cambodian decision. We are now beginning to hear from President Nixon's supporters.

The Orlando Sentinel printed a petition in its Sunday, May 10, edition. As of May 21, the petition had been signed by more than 90,000. The paper informs me that many thousands of additional signatures have come in.

ORLANDO, FLA.

Senator ED GURNEY,
Washington, D.C.:

I have sent the following telegram to President Nixon:

"The following petition was printed in Sunday's Orlando Sentinel and has been reprinted since then in the Sentinel and the Orlando Evening Star:

" 'WE PLEDGE ALLEGIANCE—A PETITION TO PRESIDENT NIXON

" 'We, members of the silent majority, object to demonstrations and desecrations to our flag promoted by professional revolutionaries.

" 'The television networks are filled with interviews of people talking about being "turned off" and alienated from their country.

" 'We, the undersigned, have been alienated, too. We are alienated by the unpatriotic rabble we see on our television screens.

" 'If you are going to listen, don't forget that we, too, are Americans.

" 'We want you to listen not only to the angry man but also to the loyal, taxpaying, concerned Americans who believe that change must come only through constitutional means—not by violence and threats of violence from a small minority who attract the television cameras.

" 'Our message to you is that we also want the war in Vietnam to end, but we think your decisions in Vietnam, Cambodia are in the best interest of America.

" 'Do not fail us now in the face of a mob brought to a frenzy by enemies of our country. (End petition)

" 'By noon today we had counted more than 25,000 signatures to the petition and thousands of others remained uncounted. We will forward these signed petitions to you in a few days.

" 'The people of central Florida—and I think the people of the entire nation—want you to know that those who shout the loudest should not cause you to waiver from your goals of seeking a just peace in the world and keeping America strong.

" 'The signers of this petition will not march on the White House, they will not rampage with rocks, they will not close down our institutions. They speak softly with confidence in our system of Government and with the knowledge that they are, indeed.

" 'The SILENT MAJORITY.' "

WILLIAM G. CONOMOS,
Editor and Publisher, Orlando Sentinel.

EARL BURTON, NEW HAMPSHIRE'S SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF THE YEAR

Mr. McINTYRE. Mr. President, on Tuesday I called to the attention of the Senate the fact that President Nixon has declared this week National Small Business Week. At that time I stated that it is the many small businesses and not the corporate giants which form the real backbone of our economy. I also said that it is only through creativity and determination that small businessmen have been able to survive the vicissitudes of our economic life.

Such creativity and determination are no better exemplified than by Earl Burton from my own State of New Hampshire, who has been chosen Granite State Small Businessman of 1970 by the New Hampshire Advisory Council of the Small Business Administration.

Mr. President, I think it is symbolic that the man accorded this honor is not engaged in the manufacture of computerware or spacecraft components or other esoteric products, but in the rather unglamorous business of rubbish disposal. However, it is an important business since the collection and proper disposal of waste is an essential ingredient in solving the environmental crisis which is causing us so much concern.

Mr. President, the Small Business Administration's announcement of the award to Mr. Burton details how he built this business on hard work and determination. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the announcement be printed in the RECORD.

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

NEW HAMPSHIRE SMALL BUSINESSMAN OF 1970, EARL BURTON, OF HUDSON, OWNER OF EARL'S RUBBISH DISPOSAL SERVICE

The New Hampshire Advisory Council of the Small Business Administration has chosen as Granite State Small Businessman of the Year 1970 Earl Burton of Hudson, owner of Earl's Rubbish Disposal Service. A special committee, headed by Donn Tibbetts of radio station WGIR, Manchester, announced its decision after reviewing several nominations submitted by members of the Advisory Council.

"This type of business is neither exciting nor glamorous," says Chairman Tibbetts, "but here is a typical small businessman who has been successful through his own determination plus a significant assist from SBA." The choice is timely, to say the least, now that the environmental crisis has spurred all conscientious citizens to demand action for a clean environment.

Earl Burton organized his business in January 1963 and registered his operation as Earl's Rubbish Disposal Service. He started with used equipment which he ran almost day and night without help.

In May 1963, Earl purchased a new truck and business increased so fast that, by July, it was necessary to hire one employee. During the first seven months of 1964, contracts exceeded total sales of 1963. Another new truck was bought in May 1964 and a second employee hired in June of that year. By contract and for a monthly income of approximately $3,000, Earl's collected and disposed scavenger from seven large industries, four important restaurants, and several homes in the Nashua-Hudson area.

Request for service kept increasing. Funds were urgently needed to acquire more equipment, especially large rubbish containers costing $225 each, to place on customers' premises for storage between collections. Earl also built a garage to store his trucks and equipment. Short-term notes in Nashua banks required high monthly payments. Earl Burton also owned a home on School Street, Hudson, where he lived with his wife and family.

In the fall of 1965, Earl's Rubbish Disposal applied for a loan from the Small Business Administration. His bank stated that it had "no interest in participating in this loan at this time." Part of the loan was to repay short-term, high-interest notes which often kill new small business. But Burton's service was increasingly needed and successful. Management was well qualified, collateral adequate, records accurate, ability to repay evident. The loan was approved on November 29, 1965.

Sales, assets and services have increased constantly since then. Earl's business seems assured as scavenger increases between four and ten per cent a year in the United States, and public officials applaud every good performance by private enterprise of scavenger collection and disposal.

TO INSURE AN ORDERLY AND SAFE WITHDRAWAL

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. President, the former Ambassador to Italy and former Member of Congress, Mrs. Clare Boothe Luce, in an article published in the Honolulu Advertiser of May 7, commented directly on the Cambodian matter.

Mrs. Luce said:

If American servicemen are to be brought safely out of Vietnam, no other course was possible.

She stated that 40,000 Communist troops "were lying in wait" in the Cambodian sanctuaries, to commence "ambushing and machine gunning our departing troops" during the continuation of the President's withdrawal plan, and to further massacre the people of South Vietnam.

This prospect, Mrs. Luce stated, made the Cambodian decision necessary "to leave the unhappy South Vietnamese even a fighting chance to survive after we pull out. It also means that we have to use every damn bit of fire power we have, including the bombing of North Vietnam, to insure an orderly and safe exodus of American forces. This is the course the President has taken: he has 'widened the war' in order to narrow it for our withdrawing troops and our left-behind allies."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article and a brief news report concerning the comments of John M. Allison, a member of the University of Hawaii faculty, be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Honolulu Advertiser, May 7, 1970]

PRO-NIXON

For good or ill, under the pressure of public opinion, the goal of military victory in Vietnam was formally abandoned by President Johnson, when the bombing of North Vietnam was stopped in 1968, and official peace negotiations with North Vietnam were undertaken in Paris. Also under the pressure of public opinion, and still hoping the policy would convince the North Vietnam negotiators of his honest intent to end the war, President Nixon made the decision to withdraw our fighting forces, over a period of time and in an orderly fashion. That withdrawal was proceeding on schedule, when, last week, President Nixon resumed the bombing of North Vietnam, and entered "neutral" Cambodia militarily.

If American servicemen are to be brought safely out of Vietnam, no other course was possible.

From the very hour when the decision was made to renounce military victory, and end as soon as possible American involvement in the war, it should have been clear to all thoughtful Americans, that there were only three ways U.S. forces could get out; they could go like shorn sheep; they could go like beaten and bloody goats; or they could go like wounded, but fighting, lions.

To leave like sheep—peaceful sheep—meant that our forces would leave as the result of the conclusion of more or less successful peace negotiations in Paris.

God knows that Kennedy tried, and Johnson tried, and Nixon has tried, to negotiate any kind of peace that would leave South Vietnam, and Southeast Asia, free from Communist annexation, and would not destroy our image and influence in the free nations of Asia.

Statesmen of other nations all over the world were urged to use their good efforts to persuade the North Vietnamese to negotiate. (They tried and failed.) The bombings in the North were halted long ago. Cease-fires were repeatedly offered, and even unilaterally initiated. And the "neutrality" of Cambodia and Laos was respected, despite the fact that North Viet forces were using those countries as military sanctuaries.

All American peace efforts have been to no avail. History records that the sole peace proposals North Vietnam has ever been willing to entertain are the virtual surrender of U.S. forces, and the virtual capitulation of the South Vietnam government. Kennedy and Johnson and Nixon have all rejected this total-victory-for-Ho formula as the basis of a viable peace. (Here we should remember that President Kennedy, who sent the first military advisers to Saigon, also, in 1962, sent 5,000 marines to Thailand to prevent a North Vietnam threat to use that country as another military base for the Communist conquest of Southeast Asia.)

Today, in the light of the history of the long-deadlocked Paris peace talks, it is hard to understand what is in the minds of those who continue to blame Nixon—as they did Johnson—for a U.S. failure to "negotiate peace." One cannot help suspecting that they either lack the political guts to call for a total U.S. surrender, and to advocate communism for all Southeast Asia, or they are really ignorant of the long history of the efforts of three presidents to end the war honorably.

When the policy of gradual withdrawal—to which Nixon had committed himself—failed to break the deadlock in the Paris negotiations, the President was faced with a bleak and tragic prospect: if he continued to weaken American forces in Vietnam, long before the last man left, the withdrawal might turn into an American Dunkirk, and we might be driven out, like beaten and bloody goats, by the forces of Ho. These forces, 40,000 strong, were lying in wait, in their Cambodian sanctuaries, only 35 miles from Saigon.

Hanoi has never renounced its goal of military victory. What if they came down, like the wolf on the fold, ambushing and machine gunning our departing troops, as they gathered at staging areas, and marched towards air fields on their way home? The bloodiest rout in all American history. And what would happen then to the loyal Vietnamese? Does anyone doubt that they would be massacred by the thousands? One only has to remember how the North Viets treated the men, women, and children of Hue when they "liberated" that unhappy city.

Nixon has refused to take this risk of an American Dunkirk.

Those who can stomach the idea, and who may even view it as a happy end to the Vietnam war, should have the guts to say so.

Only one course remained that could hope to insure the safe withdrawal of our troops—to go out like lions—wounded, but nevertheless, fighting. This meant, inescapably, cleaning out the Cambodian sanctuaries of the Vietnam enemy, lest he be tempted to seek the definitive military victory he has always demanded, by wiping out all Americans left in South Vietnam, and swarming like locusts over that unhappy country.

And no other course now can hope to leave the unhappy South Vietnamese even a fighting chance to survive after we pull out. It also means that we have to use every damn bit of fire power we have, including the bombing of North Vietnam, to insure an orderly and safe exodus of American forces. This is the course the President has taken: he has "widened the war" in order to narrow it for our withdrawing troops and our left-behind allies.

The President knows what brave and intelligent men have always known—that the only way out of a dangerous situation is to go right through it.

He also knows—he has said it himself—that his decision may cost him the presidency.

He is being supported, in this tragic hour, by former President Johnson. And no one with an iota of historical sense can doubt that Eisenhower and Kennedy, if they were alive, would also support him. And so would Lincoln and Churchill, who were also villified and ridiculed and burned in effigy by their own countrymen, for seeking to defend their nations.

I dare to hope that the majority of Mr. Nixon's countrymen will also support him, since the average American, thank God, does not have the vast conceit and arrogance it takes to insist that he knows better how to defend the nation than four presidents.

So let it be Johnson's war and now, Nixon's war. It will turn out better for us, by far, than the peace that men like Dr. Oliver Lee, of the UH, and Jerry Rubin, and their ilk, seek for our nation.

As for the Fulbrights, the Javits, the Goodells, and the Youngs, who must ride in office on the crest of the liberal left waves in their constituencies, one can only regret that they prefer to read "Profiles of Courage," rather than showing them, as President Nixon has done.

CLARE BOOTHE LUCE,
Former Ambassador to Italy and Member of Congress.

CLEVELAND'S WIRE TO NIXON IS CHALLENGED

A former diplomat, now on the faculty of the University of Hawaii, has challenged University president Harlan Cleveland's telegram to President Nixon opposing the move into Cambodia.

John M. Allison, director of the University's Overseas Career Program, sent the following telegram to Nixon:

"As a retired American ambassador to Japan and Indonesia, a former assistant secretary of state for Far Eastern affairs and a present member of the faculty of the University of Hawaii, I wish to disassociate myself completely from the telegram sent you by President Harlan Cleveland of the University.

"Having spent well over 30 years working in the field of American relations with Asia, I seriously question Mr. Cleveland's statement that 'this campus is so closely in turn with the fundamentals of American relations with Asia' and his using this alleged fact as a justification for his telegram.

"All of us are disturbed and anxious about the situation in Cambodia and all of Indochina, but I doubt that any of us at the University of Hawaii have enough knowledge about the tremendously complicated situation in that unhappy land to justify our attempting to put public pressure on our President."

INDEFENSIBLE CAMPUS VIOLENCE

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, on behalf of the distinguished Senator from Florida (Mr. GURNEY), I ask unanimous consent that a statement by him entitled "Indefensible Campus Violence" and a telegram signed by more than 750 Floridians be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT OF SENATOR GURNEY

Mr. President, in recent days, the Nation has been experiencing an almost unprecedented wave of protest about our presence

in Cambodia. Most students in colleges have behaved rationally—regardless of their views on Cambodia. But there has been another side to the protests. A sizeable bloc of students have taken to the streets and have committed criminal acts, supposedly as a form of protest. I find this criminal conduct reprehensible and indefensible: I think it is incumbent on all of us in Congress, regardless of our views on Cambodia and Viet Nam, to do what we can to halt this violence. We can begin to do that by labeling criminal acts as criminal acts. It is insanity for these youth to think that they can influence Government policy by burning down ROTC buildings or by committing felonious assaults on policemen. We cannot and should not sympathize or attempt to justify such violence in any way. We must condemn it—promptly and emphatically.

I have received a telegram signed by more than 750 Floridians which emphasizes my point: these Floridians are upset—and rightfully so—at the disruptions which the handful of revolutionaries and malcontents are visiting on our campuses today and the harm they are doing to their fellow students.

WAUCHULA, FLA.,
May 13, 1970.

EDWARD GURNEY,
U.S. Senator,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We the undersigned citizens and taxpayers of the State of Florida wish to protest the apparent dictation of a few militant students at our State universities. We firmly believe the vast majority of students at these universities would prefer to be left alone to pursue their educations and that State officials and university administrators should recognize their rights and the rights of the people who pay the bills for the universities. We respectfully request an investigation of the sources of these disturbances. Are they fueled by militant professors, professional outside agitators or out and out subversives?

Concernedly,

Joseph A. Mancini, Dewey E. Whidden, Sr., Margaret S. Wefford, Doyle E. Carlson, Jr., Ann Sasser, Willie Senterfitt, Erura P. Gilbreath, Joyce M. Sutton, Don Henry, Billy Laypot, Virgil P. Weed, William H. Perdue, Emory L. Burnett, Linda Lauhon.

O. K. Johnson, Katheryn B. McDonald, Lawrence See, Gordon L. Murphy, James R. Dudley, Ardis See, James V. See, Jack A. Carlton, Gilbert C. Rouse, John C. Ekland, M. J. Ritchey, Fern Ritchey, Dolly Murphy, Hugh Murphy.

Levinta Farnsworth, R. A. Wingate, Dot Jarvis, Leon Schrader, Patty C. Schrader, Jim Jarvis, Alonzo Whitehead, Virginia Patterson, W. P. Davis, Mrs. W. P. Davis, James Knight, Joe Cannon, Scaffest S., Tommie Albritton.

Milton Poucher, W. G. Smith, J. B. Anderson, Jr., Kenneth Willis, W. J. Kelly, George T. Trogdon, E. M. Barkdoll, Marshall Gough, Ramon Silverman, J. P. Michell, Donney Waters, Charles Dicky, W. A. Fussell, C. Barkley.

E. C. Reddick, Carolyn Reddick, Rev. Charles M. Cloud, J. G. Smith, G. D. Brummett, Betty J. Bryan, Ruth C. Harlonpe, C. Harlan, Nelda Mallory, Ann Nell Brady, Edward E. Thomas, James R. Miller, Richard Maenpaa, Doris Ann Wolfe, Irene Fussell.

Dora Milendreras, Lois Dadridge, D. R. Lambert, J. C. Richardson, O. W. McClenuthan, Lester Shmard, Sidney Brawdy, Wilbur Turner, Dean H. Richardson, Joseph Jernigar, Sharon Richardson, Dudley Rogers, Tony Garza, Jr., Gwendolyn Jerigan.

Cline Chevate, Frank Choate, Frank Lewis, Irvin La Rue, June C. Poucher, H. A. Strickland. Ronald Waters, L. W. Roberts, R. Smith, Gladys Barley, Louise C. Parker, J. L. Parker, Leland Wilins, Robert Ray Smith.

Charlie Jones, Harry S. Milbrath, R. C. Minecy, Juanita Milbrath, L. E. Reas, D. O. Wiston, Walter B. Olliff, Dexter L. Barkley, J. C. Hayman, Billy G. Ward, Frank J. Mancini, Helen W. Mancini, Roy Conerly, Irvin Lockler.

Bill Barley, Robert L. Hugh, W. Dow Durrance, Bonita Durrance, Nortris Brooks, Mary E. Brooks, Mary C. Makowski, E. A. Makowski, Jack Eason, Edgar Davis, Doloris G. Smith, Clerance A. Sterner, Mrs. Clerance A. Sterner, Jim Moye.

E. O. Roberts, H. D. Shuman, Zelma Collins, Joe B. Mosley, Harry Gause, E. A. Rumbley, Dot Campbell, Ruth M. Varn, Liz Rumbley, Alma Lee Clark, Mrs. Ann Page, C. W. Pope, Juanita Mosley, Betty Gause.

Mrs. M. B. Bonsome, Vianna Grimsley, Lawrence Ford, Wanna Ford, Johnny L. Cogburn, Billy R. Harris, Herman L. Grimsley, E. C. Harlan, Mrs. Adrian Chapman, Mrs. Louise Willis, Wayne Rickett, James L. Edwards, Roy Yarbrough, John Albritton.

Talmage Hughes, Floyd Williams, Vernon Keen, Vernon Manley, Phil Sorrell, B. J. Davis, Archie Tillman, Mrs. Lois Harris, Doris Wells, John W. Edwards, R. L. Jeter, Richard Allen, Kretta H. Rosenberger, Bettie J. Harrison, Dan Brown, Jr.

Jessie Harrison, Alice Harrison, Judy Tate, Gerald Fuller, Mike Tate, Aretha Fuller, Mary A. Howard, Nita L. Terrell, J. W. Cejka III, Loran Cognurn, Mildred Kelly, Charles B. Anderson, Wayne H. Powell, Judy Christian, James Christian, A. Bailes.

James Miller, Judy Miller, Oscar T. Miller, Mrs. Oscar Miller, Doyle Bryan, L. T. North, Louis Bryan, C. B. O'Bryan, Mrs. Marie Polk, Mrs. R. H. Lee, Mrs. Bob Fite, J. T. Mitchell, Robert G. Dick, Charles Hodges, Laura Bostick.

Cecil Martin, Doyle Powell, Anna V. Conner, Lena Thompso, Katherine Adams, J. R. Reeves, Margie Brewer, Carlos Martin, C. W. Altman, Oscar Joinor, Eva Mae White, H. C. Kinney, Lois Shackleford, R. L. Smith.

Doyle Crews, A. K. King, Willard K. Durrance, J. Y. Jirst, Mrs. W. L. Warren, Jr., Alena Chambers, Elmo Robert, Dorothy Bault, Dwight L. Prince, Dick Dewitt, Frances Louis Meadows, E. L. Meadows, Smiley B. Browning, Alice Browning.

Gail Autry, Zelma Warnock, Leo Warnock, Martin P. Roberts, Bonnie Clark, Lillian Shackleford, Dorion Shackleford, George Marrs, Morris Clavel, Junior Mullins, Hazel B. Clavel, Bertha Brantley, F. Marion Hennies, M. Wesley Shockey, R. H. Herr.

Charles E. Baggott, M. D. Himron, Eric Bennett, Hill Blackmon, Elvis Adams, M. G. Castleberry, Joel Evers, E. D. Bostick, Lemuel H. Bryan, W. D. Haney, Charles C. Heath, Mitzi B. Grice, Pete Grice, Vonnie Lee.

A. L. Lanigan, Max Hardee, W. W. Nicholson, Grady Grimes, Willis C. Beatty, Phillip Long, Perry Stanford, N. R. Polkdale, R. Bryan, J. S. Deal, T. H. Lowe, Ethel Tomlinson, Pam Bishop, Mildred Hadsel, Pearl Grice.

Ruth Anderson, Beatrice Lanigan, Amogene Magee, Cleo Horne, Pearl Smith, George W. Magee, Isabel F. Akins, Priscilla Blair, John Carneybertha Adkins, Donna Armstrong, Mrs. James Gist, James V. Gist, Tomye R. Albritton, Sammy Saro.

C. E. Adkins, Mary Kilpatrick, J. A. Kilpatrick, Anette Jones, Ruth E. Kimbrough, C. P. Blackmon, CFW Post 4349, G. F. Kimbrough (chaplain), Mrs. R. A. Blackmon, Susie M. Kimbrough, A. W. Kimbrough, Donna K. Jonguj, E. Thomas, Jacob G. Bond, Betty Hunter, Garland Van Sickle.

Cleo Depriest, James Martin, Truman Carlton, James E. Jenkin, Henry Daniels, B. E. Long, Standley Webb, C. A. Mickerson, David Stanford, Gloris J. Chapman, Ann James, Ann Stephens, Carrie Belle Daniels, R. W. O. Berry.

Howard Jones, Bobby R. Scoggins, George Wadsworth, Ferol Jones, T. H. Carlton, W. W. Johnson, F. A. Taylor, Jack See, O. K. Stringer, Sadie Brown, Rosalind Bass, Jesse Manior, Jimmy Cox, Harry Baxter, Alvin Huddleston, Nell Griffin.

Natalie Whidden, Oneita Revell, W. E. Cochrane, Zola Truitt, Avis Sasser, Arden Rawls, B. R. Cooper, E. B. Leeo, Frances Lee, Betty N. Bryant, Lina F. Ertzberger, Betty Pace, W. J. See, Mrs. Ronald Galliard.

Mrs. Sarah Albritton, Mrs. Carol Albritton, Lil G. Huss, Essie Bennett, Mary B. Bryant, Illa Jean Jernigan, Natha Lee Stannage, John Stannage, Sylvia Stannage, Charles Bryan, Jack Truitt, J. W. Eason, Mrs. J. W. Easin, Floyd M. Perkins.

A. E. Huggins, Charles L. Dixon, Mrs. Geneva Grimsley, Joseph R. Colavito, Robert Burge, Bobby R. Wooten, Hubert Grimsley, B. J. Chavis, Earl Knight, Harry Perry, R. Wayne McCorkill, Edward Schontag, C. W. Currue, Jimmy Parker.

Jerry Kyerky, Kenneth Martin, Phillip C. Roberts, E. S. Ceavel, Fred Polk, R. M. Crews, Glenus S. Slaughter, Tom Sasser, W. L. Arren, Jr., H. F. Johnson, H. W. Kay, Jr., Bert Close, John K. Cascine, Marilyn B. Cascone.

J. Lester Blackburn, Wilbur E. Blackburn, Dorothy Blackburn, Verna R. Blackburn, W. R. Boyer, Karen Boyer, Virginia Bennett, Gertrude Davis, Marjorie O. Davis, Dan A. Davis, V. V. Lee, H. O. Coker, H. D. Gilliard, F. C. Darling.

Benita K. Eklund, Jimmie Smith, James D. Batts, Helen D. Williams, Duane P. Norris, Jerry H. Melendy, Curtis Lzelle, C. Altman, L. H. Sasser, Jr., Mrs. Margie Sasser, Tom Cooper, Charles Abbot, Richard E. Abbott, Jr., Raymond F. John.

Joanne John, Jerald Carlton, Therman Boyd Hester, J. A. Stephens, J. O. Cash, Mrs. Joyce Kersey, C. W. Cooper, W. H. King, Belle Abbott, J. E. Abbott, C. R. Spicola, Jr., Mildred Cooper, Zula Cooper.

Patricia McQuaig, Vashti Abbott, Julia Faye Davis, Lucille Albritton, Charles D. Cadle, Susie Alderman, Evelyn Alderman, Oren H. Crawford David Bost, Thomas Crews, Ed Sockalosky, R. H. Brewerphilip Hines, Albert S. Lanier, Mrs. A. S. Lanier, Henry Richardson.

Amon Griffis, Aldean Davis, John Henegar, Robert Noblett, Carl J. Neal, Charles Peniel, Tommie Autry, Ralph L. Crews, J. D. Dasher, M. H. Stewart, Jewell Dean, Charles Grimsley, L. A. Roberts, I. B. Knight.

Priscilla McKnight, Stella Repetoskeu, Frank Farthing, Bobby Summerall, Gladys Coker, Mrs. W. J. Piercy, James R. Crews, Fred W. Stcncil, Roy H. Sidel, Evelyn Adams, E. F. Adams, Mrs. Raymond Lee, Mrs. Maudle Franklin.

E. E. Franklin, Patricia Depriest, Maude Josey, Mrs. Atlee Long, Bryant L. Coker, J. E. Lowe, James W. Wilson, Mabel Hanchey, Dorothy H. Chambers, Elizabeth Y. Eaton, Tom Prine, Louis T. Townsend, Don McArthur, R. D. Eaton, Winifored L. Yarbrough.

A. S. Yarbrough, Mrs. John Paris, Maude L. Blackburn, Mrs. Lucille Saywer, Mrs. Myrtle Whidden, Mrs. Harry Eures, Mrs. Tom Studstill, William H. Shiver, Paul H. More, F. W. Bryan, Louise Hopson, M. A. Gillian, G. M. Kitchings, Joseph Wyckoff.

Virginia Jones, Fred Whistlecroft, Roy Thompson, Jerry Northup, Willie Noel, Elmo Bryan, Thomas Studstill, Mrs. K. Essig, C. R. Johnson, Betty Jo Altman, Dewey Kitchings, Atra Jordon, K. E. Bryan, Ivan Hart.

Cooper Smith, W. J. Bryan, Ruth Jordan, Charlie Hancock, Mary Hancock, Karry McClellan, Florence Powell, V. E. Powell, Fayetta L. Bryan, Dan Jordan, Iona Bryant, Jim Barnett, John K. Manley, Gladys M. Manley.

Kenneth Blount, Bobby J. Belcher, John Belcher, Ella Mae Belcher, James Cook, Mrs. Elmer Northupij T. Kersey, R. C. McClellan, Vivilian McClellan, Ella Kersy, Helen Knight, Wilson Lee, Revell, Val R. Patarini, Sandra Wilson.

Ossie Horne, F. L. Revell, Jr., Maderia J. Rouse, R. C. Underwood, Andrey D. Escindudi, Beverly Weed, Catherine J. Evors, Delilah Brown, Virginia S. Edwards, Jacob Johnson, Topsy See, Hazel Gandy, Louise A. McCakeb, Deborah Martin.

James C. Gabbard, Gale Ratliff, Dewey Terrell, John H. Boyetteo, Robert E. Gregory, Joe Woodbery, Ruby Sellers, Harold F. Tew, Anne Boyette, Robert K. Stanford, Joe Barrett, Emerson Jones, Joe Cotton, Albin Ebi.

Mary Cameron, Maurice Clavel, R. B. McCade, Charles Steffins, E. K. Walker, H. A. Davis, Tommy Jackson, John Roy Gough, Roger L. Jaudon, K. D. Revell, N. E. Nielsen, Mrs. George Sasser, Mrs. K. W. Jernigan, Sheila Thornton.

Ken Nicholson, Ed Harlan, Clyde Ratliff, Jr., Virginia Lee Gough, T. G. Johnson, James K. Chancey, Dale Knight, Loren Albritton, J. P. Winchester, Carl Hanna, George Framer, Richard Martin, J. M. Goode, Marian Goode.

Merle Albritton, Grady Tomlinson, John H. Huss, Donna L. Huss, William R. Davis, Jemes Householder, David W. Lewis, Nancy Craft, J. L. Strickland, Mary Strickland, William F. Sasser, H. A. Yarborough, P. O. Lafon, Benny Albritton, Dinna Whitehead, Frankie Powell.

Louise Rucker, Coy B. Rucker, Betsy Kemp, Gene Kemp, William Ward, Jenell Ward, Harold Murphy, R. E. Stetler, Alberta Muchruch, W. J. Crawkey, Eva Crawley, Cheryl Gibson, Mrs. Geo. W. Davis.

Mrs. Al Leingartner, Donald H. Davis, William L. Gibson, Al Leingartner, Judy Albritton, Nettie Croy, Bill Croy, Terry Shackleford, Elmer Shackleford, Delora Shackleford, Kathleen Morris, Rogene Morris, W. E. Davis.

Julian Ragan, Phil Lambert, Daisy Denny, Henry Richardson, Jackie Richardson, Peggy Richardson, J. H. Brown, Mrs. J. H. Brown, A. C. Bell, James H. Morri, Sheila Lowe, Earl Carter.

Joan Terrell, Edward Terrell, Hoyt V. Terrell, Ruth Terrell, Jack Jones, Eunice Jones, Jimmy Brown, Mrs. Jimmy Brown, Clifford Welch, Clyde Welch, R. C. Weeks, Ada M. Weeks, Mrs. Jimmie Richardson.

Jimmie Richardson, Mrs. Paul Richardson, Mrs. C. R. Payne, Paul Henderson, C. R. Payne, George Osteen, Margie Osteen, B. R. Morgan, Ethel Morgan, Billy Rogers, Mrs. Billy Rogers, Mrs. Homer Smedley, Homer Smedley, Tommy Johnson.

Virginia Johnson, M. D. Whidden, W. H. Spears, Betty J. Henderson, William Moran, Barbara Wilkins, W. R. Chaote, James M. Bozeman, G. C. Mills, Amon Griffis, Jerry Ward, Coyle E. Windham.

Jacqueline J. Windham, Mrs. Jo Stanford, Joe Stanford, W. O. Stanford, W. C. Moran, James Colson, Elida F. Davis, Alvin B. Tillman, Mrs. J. M. Bozeman, Mrs. Chester Crews, Chester A. Crews, Mark Leonord.

W. S. Spear, Mary E. Klein, Mrs. Thomas Wingo, W. H. Tomlinson, F. J. Simmons, Ethlind Prescott, Iallison L. Griffin, Fred Simmons, Judy Himrod, Martha Lee Graham, Kenneth Mayberry, Ina Mae Mayberry, Raymond Grahmon, Barney Prescott.

Mrs. B. A. Osteen, Can Simmons, Leore Simon, Corinne Bond, Mrs. Jimmie Richardson, Mrs. Charlie Anderson, Charlie B. Anderson, B. A. Osteen, Luther H. Sasser, C. E. Robertson, M. M. Roberts, Ann Long.

Jessie Conerly, R. J. Hodge, Jr., Donald E. Smith, Jason Roberts, Tyron M. Chapman, Gus W. Cleve, Moses Smith, Jerell Mosley, George Jackson, J. B. Evers, William Thomas.

Wallace Keeton, Leon Sharp, Mrs. Roger Fumanti, Mrs. Walter Messick, Miss Butler, Jacque Perry, Malba Perry, Herman Grimsley, Merel Abbott, Betty Lou Miller, Myrtice Chapman, Raymond Chapman, William Paul Hunter.

Margaret Henderson, Clerance J. Bowman, Harold E. Henderson, Billy Tubbs, Jim Porter, Kenneth Watson, Walter Williams, Colemon W. Best, Adrian Chapman, George Statton, Junious Roberts, Vgeorge Ball, Jr., Larry Summers, Jessie Heeton.

Bill Taylor, Charles T. Cooper, Jane Myers Hall, Jim Frazier, Theda Wails, Mary Lou Wisbrod, Robert Traidwell, N. H. Murdock, B. Hugh Brodley, Elaine McCellan, Christine Murdock, Lamare Conley, H. F. Aohnson, J. A. Eich.

Gordon H. Goodman, Man A. Campbell, Martha Mitchell, Earl Emith, Kathryn Crosley, Mary Drake, H. L. Sanders, Jr., Mary Sue Williams, Hazel Mirchell, Pauline Hancy, Sylvia Coker, Jean Wilson, Marion Kella.

Nell Couley, Malcolm C. Smith, Mrs. Malcolm Smith, Pay Oye, S. Lamar Bostick, Ruth N. Chancey, Martha Martin, Lorne Yetter, Clarence Coleman, Donald R. Griffin, C. H. Griffin, Jr., Walter W. Napier, Charles A. McQuien, Jr., Leanora H. Shiffner.

Shafter Crawford, Bernett Shufferd, Jeff Smith, Frank Wayne Bass, Dewey W. Cowart, Gordon Stephens, Joe Baxter, Horace Graham, Charles H. Tillman, T. S. Napier, Eugene Lanier, Maurice Albritton, Billy Cathey, Joseph Smith.

Minor Bryant, V. H. Durrance, B. J. Johnson, Mrs. B. J. Johnson, Mrs. Ora Bryant, Mrs. Rhoda Durrance, Mrs. Josephine Smith, Mrs. Marcelle Aberwathy, Earl Sellers, Ray Whitt, J. W. Brown, Sr., Gerald Allison, Earl White.

Martha Blackburn, Herbert Blackburn, Mildren Scaffe, Wade Scaffe, Mrs. James Sellers, Mrs. Earl White, Billy J. Smith, Harry L. Smith, Dempsey Albritton, Ralph Adams, W. A. Polston, Alice Whidden, Margaret Johnson, Bette Hrabal.

Grace Clark, Mrs. A. L. Whidden, Melba Adams, Mrs. Eva Morgan, Donald Albritton, Norman Scaffe, John Hudson, James Nicholson, James Nichols, Doyle Parker, W. O. Shirley, Fred Cotrey, Ruth Best, W. N. Nicholson.

W. Shitley, Bob Fite, T. S. Trott, Marion E. Ratliff, Donna Jo Disharoon, Ines H. Lampkin, Theodore H. Jones, Ralph Harrison, Jerome Martin, Mrs. Opal E. Haovis, Jim Kelly, T. M. Rankl, Manuel Boyd, Lorain Moye.

A. S. Tate, Guy E. Polk, F. M. Peacock, Tommy Arant W. A. Hall, Mrs. F. M. Pearson, Edward Stephens, Jerry L. Lawhon, Raymond Chabers, Mae King, Hugh King, Lee Herbert, Sandy Hobart.

Lucile E. Adams, Iva Allen, Latimer C. Farr, Lois W. Farr, L. L. Linder, Bob Staton, Ethel McEvans, L. Q. Roberson, Tersa Howard, Elbert Waker, M. Joan Kroll, Henry McCormick, Amelia P. Lambert, Lester Lambert.

Eurice Lambert, Clayton Driskell, Harold McTeer, M. E. Bryan, Robert Collins, Myra Tylor, Emory C. Daniel, James Knight, Charles Hartfield, P. C. Daniel, Bobby G. Floyd, David Maddox, Fred Guermdt, Halcott Wilsono.

Karen Melendy, Herry H. Melendy, Jr., Sara Kay McClenithan, Carl Langer, Mitchell E. Hope, Earl Rutland, Paul D. Jones, Ronnie Driskell, Mrs. Richard Keller, Bobby English, James Merritt, J. R. Allen, L. E. Reas, W. R. Cochrane.

R. W. Millins, E. A. Rumbley, Mrs. Barbara Granger, Arthur Lee Walston, J. E. Gill, W. H. Knox, John D. Terrell, Henry E. Huff, C. P. Murdock, Lex Zirrsn, W. Reynolds Allen, E. O. Roberts, Grady Burton, Roxie Swails.

Vasco Skipper, P. A. Perrine, Bruce Perrine, Charles F. Granger, William S. Coker, Mrs. Robert Maxwell, Ivon Tilyou, Tom B. Cooper, A. A. Coestline, George Helens, Bess Stallings, James T. Stallings, Earnest H. Rawls.

Harvey Conerly, J. E. Perdue, Mindee Allen, Jimmy Hanchey, M. P. Murphy, Melvin Layport, Mabel Samuels, Mrs. J. B. Stickle, Shirley M. Thomas, Alice L. Mashuburn, Carie A. Wilkerson, William T. Mulcay, Julice Daugherty, Lillie Roddenberry.

M. E. Hendry, S. Pridgen, L. F. Gergerson, M. English, Clyde Ratliff, Mary S. Bone, Avis Claman, Alma, Fisher, Emma Crews, Ray Sencer, George Gantt, James F. Murray, Milo A. Harper, Mrs. C. A. Reif, Jr.

Mrs. David Albritton, Gayle Harper, Ben Robinson, Mrs. Robert Lewis, Mr. B. D. Farabee, Mrs. B. D. Farabee, Mary Posey, G. S. Earnest, Shirley Earnest, L. M. Huston, Jack Corley, Mrs. Jack Corley, James Parrott, Mrs. James Parrott.

Ruby Clifton, Carl Douglas, James Grimes, Jim Mitchell, Horace Staton, Charlie Spencer, C. B. Cannon, Rev. Dag Cordonvi, George Curphy, Leone Purvis, Margie Griffin, Gussie Sauls, Inez Gaylordo, Mike Barnes.

Harold Stokes, Mary L. Stokes, Leamon Stokes, R. C. Weeks, Earl Gill, Patricia Hayes, Levis Hayes, Wilson Swails, Moneda Duvall, Mrs. Archie Gose, Janet Lo Porto, Jane Leach, Rev. James B. Bailey, Mrs. James B. Bailey.

Mrs. M. G. Albritton, Elton Murphy, Jr., Larry Gillirado, Edmond S. Iong, Jewel Gilliard, Mrs. Milton Robert, L. C. Hughes, Charlene Morris, Jimmy M. Carey, J. D. Grimes, Mrs. K. Mcarey, Raymond Carnley, J. D. Grimes, Robert Grimes.

C. M. Pullen, Joe F. Chombless, Mrs. C. C. Searcy, Ruth G. Davis, H. B. Watts, Carl Satts, Pat Watts, Louis Watts, Wanda Watts, Aleene Bradshaw, B. E. Nothon, L. O. Collins, Carl A. Bradshaw, J. E. Collins.

Mrs. J. E. Collins, Vera Collins, A. G. Keisling, Nell Keisling, Sheron Collins, Faye Collins, Dale Beeles, Clara Seails, Wayne Swails, Montine Beeles, Rufus Shackleford, Norman B. Shackleford, Myra Jean Revele.

Montez May, Warren E. May, Sr., Faye D. Shackleford, G. F. Kimbrough, Billie M. Ragan, Gladys Taylor, David Flowers, Ralph Rickets, Noveta D. Deeson, Dow Durrance, Iris D. Hendry, Flen Eidson, Janet V. Welister.

Phyllis Nickerson, Mrs. John W. Himrod, J. E. Jowers, Mary Frances Tomlinson, Mrs. Jeffie Heine, Joan Harris, Mary Rogers, J. B. Williams, Annie Hart, Mrs. Lawrence See, Mrs, Charles Nicholson, Mrs. James S. Smith, Mrs. Merle Rvels, Mrs. Horace Graham.

Solon Wilson, Dr. Grant P. Carmichael, Merle Roberts, Mildred Bass, Ken Shackleford, Sammy W. Revels, Harry E. Metheny, Mrs. Harry Methney, L. T. Foskey, Dennis Roberts, Vrota Foskey, Marjorie Wiggins, Richard Wiggins, Joyce Piper.

Kenneth Piper, J. W. Crews, Jr., H. D. Wofford, Dora Johns, Pat Roberts, Linda Terrell, Sheila McClenithan, Jan Watson, Andrea Smith, Loyice Whidde, Jewel Peeples, A. G. Whidden, Katie Terrell, Kenneth Watson.

Gladys Miller, Jan C. Murray, Judy Ann Wilson, Mrs. Hugh Bradley, Mrs. L. Curry Raley, Mrs. Guy Stoner, Mrs. Lawrence Coleman, Will Mae Trimmer, Ronald Lambert, H. G. Griffin, Jr., Mathew Tomlinson, Carl Weeks.

Mrs. J. B. Williams, J. W. White, Jewel White, A. N. Bowlen, Alice Bowen, Florence Lawson, Virginia Simmons, C. C. Conley, Ellen Conley, Mrs. Annie L. Shackleford, James E. Grimsley, Donald Butler, Raymond Branning, Noah Richardson.

Ronald T. Wright, Bill Kirkland, Doyle Knight, Norman Langston, Sonny Henegar, Van Adams, David W. Lewis, Earl Tindell, Revel A. Spearman, Harold B. Bateman, John H. Klein, Harry E. Hagans, Troy Staton, Avir Cross.

Nelk Barlow, I. P. Barlow, Mrs. R. W. Branning, Mrs. Charles Roberts, D. L. Hall, E. Milton Lanier, Eugene Long, Leonard Crawley, William J. Croy, William E. Long, Flurel Leach, Charles H. Williams, Mrs. John Terrell, A. G. Wilson.

R. B. Roberts, Alma Jones, Margaret Polk, Cecil Polk, Betty Chambless, Euley Murphy, Jr., Mrs. C. A. Barker, Bert Milligan, H. L.

Limeback, Kline Platt, D. E. Hayes, Arthur Murphy Sr., Albert Murphy.

Donald R. Keen, Hugh Sapp, Esther Jones, Mrs. T. H. Jones, C. B. Harden, Homes Baker, James Greene, Myrtee Stevens, James A. Conrad, Margaret Tande, Mavis Cothran, Crystal Batton, Floyd F. Fields, Wallace Murphy.

John F. Foolsby, Jr., Abbie Turrnentine, W. C. Lerley, Robert Dickey, Calhoun Richardson, Ethel Howerton, Steve Skitka, C. H. Ballenger, Rickie Baker, Lewis Cathcart, Jack Corley, Mathew Albritton, Alton L. Lindsey, L. A. Albritton.

H. O. Buchanan, Andrew Dean, Clarence E. Reams, Frits Myer, Joe E. Stevens, Charlie Scott, Sr., G. W. Boland, Louis V. McLeod, Virgil Devore, J. W. Crews, Arthur K. Bibine, Talmadge Sharpe, Kelly Anderson.

Alton Rogers, Rev. Herman Collins, C. C. Searcy, R. T. Cook, Beulah Cook, Al Adkison, Guy A. Stiner, Maurice Henderson, Truman Boyette, Curt Truitt, B. R. Brown, Saa Lee, Walter M. Pearson, John F. Goolsby, Sr.

Imogene Goolsby, C. B. McClennand, Delores McClelland, J. W. Lessley, C. O. Shumard, Doyle Webb, Irma K. Webb, J. D. Turrentine, R. D. Albritton, V. J. R. Rainey, Milton Roberts, Reid Rainey, Shelby McIntyre.

I. J. Gaffeny, Mack Peacock, Marion R. Platt, Truman Leach, Lupe Nino, Abel Martinez, Zola R. Bennett, R. C. Bennett, Manuel T. Alvarez, Howard Bolin, Lupe Gonzalez, Daniel B. Duke, Guy Albritton, Eleanor Little.

J. W. Armstrong, Mary Albritton, Billy E. Huddleston, Charles E. Revell, Paula Revell, W. Albert Carlton, N. Smith, Mrs. J. D. Diggs, Edward Simon, Mrs. Carl W. Coker, Carl W. Coker, Ouida Roberts, Alma Ellis, Mrs. Calvin Wilson.

Mary Smith, Malcolm M. Sayre, Lois Colavito, Mrs. Cleo Prine, Mrs. Mae Brown, Mrs. Evelyn Swails, Mrs. Marvin Black, Mrs. Russell, Owe, Jet Tillis, Mary Douglas, L. Curry Rakey, Vernon Delora, Ilene Parrish.

R. W. Banks, Pete Partridge, Clarnce T. Gantt, Reson L. Holt, Claude Rainey, Lois Doke, Gene B. Doke, Mrs. Lola Shackleford, Donald Gibbs, Carla Gibbs, Mrs. H. D. Smith, Mrs. Harry Gibbs, Fay Oden, Terri Counts.

Wayne Jernigan, Leland Wilkins, Lawrence W. Roberts, C. S. Dishong, Mrs. Robert L. Gibbs, Robert L. Gibbs, Mrs. Chad McFaland, Gaynelle K. Counts, Mrs. S. G. Moskey, Ruby Foster, Linda Lee Ford, Mrs. Ralph Rickels, C. C. Duke.

Jack Himrod, Jr., Joseph D. Clark, C. W. Peavy, Loraine Peavy, C. H. Daniels, John Alxritton, Ralph Carlton, Clayton O. Evers, Viola Lanier, Mary Wale, P. E. Bumby, Horace Wilkerson, L. Knight.

Jack Cliett, Helen Lovett, Helen Lovett, Ritce Godfrey, Virgil Wilson, L. Dale Carlton, Jean B. Burton, Catherine L. Foster, Ethel G. Webb, Julian P. Davis, Leah Bonard, Benson Bolin, Louis Hughes, Calvin Wilson.

O. K. Norris, H. H. Shiver, Tom Prine, Mrs. Martin Roberts, A. C. Bolin, Charles C. Adler, Opal S. Knight, Marcella Purdom, Louise Mosele, Lynda Perry, Lois Hampton, Frank Hampton, W. Ben Hart.

Pamela Sue Rabon, J. W. Thrailkill, Mrs. S. O. Wall, Mrs. Grady Burton, Mrs. Elton Lowe, Mrs. Bartkey Sapp, Mrs. George Marrs, Mrs. Glass, Robert Donohue, Richard Klimzcak, Earl Autry, Carl Neal, Vassie Farr.

Gordon L. Murphy, Doris Murphy, Mrs. A. E. Jackson, Sr., Susue Birge, Jim Hardy, Sr., Rev. John D. Smith, James W. Chestnut, Lee Swails, Andy McIntyre, Dorothy Grimsley, Bobby Taylor, Ralph K. Taylor, Horace McCray, Jr., Frank Snelling.

Bob Hughes, Tommie Torres, Ronald Wilson, Mrs. W. H. Smithwick, Mrs. Opal Harris, V. G. Allen, Larry Martin, Brenda Martin, Betty Judah, Mary McIntyre, Mary King, Ed Brooke, Terri Bryan, Mrs. Ed Booke.

J. A. Evers, Herschel Marshall, J. F. Sellers, Wm. James Forrister, Jr., Bedford A. Prescott, Vernon Reed, James Sellara, Mrs. Jack L. Smith, W. B. Beeson, Mrs. H. H. Gantt, O. B. Stanstill, E. J. Wilson.

Emil Causey, Tommy Earl Dukens, J. W. Smith, Linda B. Carlton, Phil E. Gloruis, George Helms, Icecil Lee, Robert Weeks, Murrell Prescott, G. A. Keene, Robert Z. Olliff, L. C. Clark, J. B. Searcy.

Talmadege Jowers, Ralph Smith, Ruth Thomas, C. A. Rief, Jr., Samuel L. Osenbenger, Earle Micjerson, Audrey Gace, Faye Crawford, M. M. Carlton, Kay Blackmon, Carrie Slaughter, M. M. Moye, R. L. Mushrush, Edward Thompson.

Robert Mushrush, Joe Carlton, John D. White, Gary Mills, David Barrett, Letha Codry, Lucy J. Rhodes, Ralph H. Rhodes, Glenn S. Slaughter D. R. Harman, Mrs. Jimmy Hanchey, Mavis H. Conerly, Dayree Grimes.

J. W. Bennett, Joe Hanchey, Mrs. Jack Soles, James Watts, Mrs. Mabry Carlton, S. M. Goodwin, Hilah H. Cchrane, Mrs. Theron Royal, Mrs. S. M. Goodwin, Caudie Smith, Mrs. Catherine Garrison, Mrs. O. K. Norris, Mrs. W. R. Fewox, Jr.

Sam E. Holland, Martha Holland, Mrs. G. A. McDonald, Mrs. Dorothy Sates, Mrs. Geraldine Cogbun, W. B. Gaerett, Betty Bennett, Ethel L. Webb, Chas Perry, Irene Gramling, Jack Gramling, Mrs. Carolyn Gilliard, Maurice Gilliard, Julius Peters.

D. J. Cowart, Hill Blackmond, Mrs. Leland Wilkins, Charles H. Cannon, Judson R. Cannon, Mrs. E. S. Clavel, Mrs. J. F. Stewart, Mrs. Orin Tomlinson, Orin Tomlinson, Mrs. G. B. Sause, Wayne Jones, W. C. Ayers, O. L. Grice, Elvis Ayers.

J. H. Gibbs, W. O. Parker, H. L. Paker, Roy Burse, Billy Burse, Billy Woods, Jesse Burse, May Burse, Junior Burse, Edward Ayers, Tony Ayers.

Benito Travino, Benito Trevino, Robert E. Scott, Ed Belcher, Less L. Porter, J. A. Evers, Karen Johnson, Minnie Ayers, William Forrister, Larry W. Durrance, Thomas Wadams, W. L. Brown, D. S. Lawrence, Ervin Bodiford. Noel Rowland, Frank Wingo, Gary Armstrong, J. F. Hancock, L. F. Hudgins, James Griffis, Domingo Jaquez, Rodolph Garza.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE 24TH ANNUAL AWARDS CEREMONY—ADDRESS BY SENATOR CURTIS

Mr. HRUSKA. Mr. President, on Tuesday, May 19, my distinguished colleague from Nebraska (Mr. CURTIS) had the honor of addressing the 24th Annual Honor Awards Ceremony at the U.S. Department of Agriculture. I would like to share his remarks and the names and accomplishments of the honorees with Senators.

I invite special attention to the Senator's remarks on public service:

> One cannot serve the public interest and the highest ideals and at the same time be disloyal to his Department, to his government, or to those who carry the responsibility for the overall policies of our government.

The events of recent weeks bring the wisdom of these words clearly into view. Loyalty and patriotism are needed in our great country today as they have never been needed before. I commend my fellow Senator from Nebraska for continuing to speak forthrightly on these issues that are so dear to the hearts of all Americans.

I ask unanimous consent that Senator CURTIS' remarks and the names of the award winners be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the items were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SPEECH OF SENATOR CARL T. CURTIS

Mr. Secretary, honorees at this ceremony, ladies and gentlemen, friends all, it was with a great deal of pleasure that I accepted the invitation to speak briefly on this occasion. My State of Nebraska has a special interest in the United States Department of Agriculture. Since agriculture is Nebraska's leading industry, it is natural that we are interested in all of the programs of this Department for the betterment of rural America, but we have some sentimental reasons that add to our interest in the Department of Agriculture. One of the first Secretaries of Agriculture was a distinguished Nebraskan, J. Sterling Morton. Secretary Morton was the founder of Arbor Day. His influence has probably caused the planting of more trees than the influence of any other man in all history.

Nebraskans are proud and happy over the fact that President Nixon chose as his Secretary of Agriculture another distinguished Nebraskan, an individual who is committed and dedicated to improving the economic position of the farmers of America, The Honorable Clifford M. Hardin.

Not every gathering in Washington is like this one. We are here to honor outstanding public service. We are here to properly recognize a number of individuals who have unselfishly rendered unusual service.

The men and women whom we honor today have set an example for all of their fellowmen at a time when character values are questioned in too many places. These people who are being honored have placed the public interest ahead of their own personal desires. These honorees have refused to let the humdrum, the frustration, the problems, and the discouragements that come to all mankind day after day chart their course of action. They have done a good job not because their task was easy, but because they applied themselves and rendered a superior performance when the task was difficult.

I observe from your program that these honor awards are going to individuals who are involved in a broad scope of activities, including such fields of endeavor as program administration; group achievement; management and general administration; equal employment opportunity; science, engineering, and technology; support personnel; and heroic action.

None of us has the time, and I am not equipped, to discuss the outstanding achievements that have taken place in each of these fields. No doubt there are many characteristics of acomplishment that run throughout all of these varied activities. These individuals whom we honor today possess qualities of character and performance that have made it appropriate for them to be so honored. I would like to mention four such qualities of character. I refer to knowledge, dedication, hard work, and loyalty. I believe that all of our honorees possess those virtues.

There never was a time, much less our present day, when basic knowledge was not of supreme importance. Responsible individuals must know what they are doing. They must possess knowledge. It is easy for us to observe how a successful surgeon or an astronaut must first of all know what he is doing. Even though it might be a little more difficult to dramatize, it is equally important that every employee and officer of the United States Government has a broad and increasing knowledge concerning all aspects of the job to which he is assigned. I am confident that our honorees possess such knowledge and for that I commend them and I congratulate them.

The public servants we honor today are honored because of their sense of dedication. They are honored because they have placed all of their talents, all of their abilities, all

of their time, and all of their hopes and aspirations in an effort to achieve a job well done. Knowledge of the mind and dedication of the heart are most essential ingredients to success.

I would also like to commend our honorees today for the hard work that they have performed. Our generation has been greatly blessed with labor-saving devices. It is true that whether we work on the farm, in the factory, or in the office, man has been relieved of certain drudgery because of the technological progress that has been made and because of man's ability to utilize machines. The fact remains that nothing worthwhile can be accomplished without hard work. That was true in the years gone by—it is true now. I believe that it will be true for all time to come. It matters not whether we are called upon to work in an obscure office or a well publicized position on Cabinet level. We must choose long hours and hard work or choose failure. Laziness is man's enemy. We honor these hard workers today because they have overcome that enemy.

The great public servant must be a loyal public servant. One cannot serve the public interest and the highest ideals and at the same time be disloyal to his Department, to his government, or to those who carry the responsibility for the overall policies of our government. I do not imply that we should urge blind submission or abolish the right to disagree and dissent. I do say that without broad basic loyalty, there can be no teamwork. Without teamwork, no enterprise can serve the people of the United States. Loyalty and patriotism may not always be popular but they are virtues. The honorees today are honored because of their loyalty to the Department of Agriculture, the hard work that they have performed, their sense of dedication, and the vast knowledge that they have brought to their job. These people are living examples of what Phillips Brooks urged when he said, "Do not pray for easy lives. Pray to be stronger men. Do not pray for tasks equal to your powers. Pray for powers equal to your tasks."

In behalf of the Congress of the United States and all the people who are benefited by the Department of Agriculture, I congratulate each and every one of the recipients of these awards. You have earned this award. We are delighted that you are to receive it, and we commend you all.

DISTINGUISHED SERVICE AWARDS

IN THE FIELD OF PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Alex C. Caldwell, Administrator, CEA; Washington, D.C. For outstanding leadership and sound judgment in developing a program of Federal regulation of rapidly expanding futures trading in agricultural commodities, and administering this program with a high level of economy and efficiency.

Arthur W. Greeley, Associate Chief, FS; Washington, D.C. For eminent leadership and service to America through the development and implementation of public policies having both domestic and foreign aspects, which has assured wise management and utilization of the Nation's natural resources.

Ralph W. Phillips, Director, International Organizations Staff; Washington, D.C. For valuable contributions to international collaboration in agriculure, exceptional skill in representing the United States in international forums, and for contributing significantly to international agricultural development.

Noel P. Ralston, Associate Director, Science and Education, SEC; Washington, D.C. For exceptional leadership and effectiveness in coordinating science and education programs of the Department, in developing policy and strengthening departmental relations with the universities, particularly in regard to cooperative extension, research administration and civil rights.

IN THE FIELD OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING, AND TECHNOLOGY

Aaron M. Altschul, Director, High Protein Foods and Agribusiness Group, FEDS; Washington, D.C. For exceptional scientific ability and dynamic leadership in identifying and emphasizing the world problem of protein hunger, and initiating a wide variety of innovative programs for its solution.

Robert J. Anderson, Associate Administrators, ARS; Washington, D.C. For distinguished leadership in increasing efficiency of American agriculture and safety of the Nation's food through protecting the environment from contamination while achieving effective control of agricultural pests and diseases.

Ruth R. Benerito, Research Chemist, ARS; New Orleans, La. For notable contribution as teacher and researcher to the chemistry profession, particularly for basic research in physical chemistry and application of fundamental principles to solutions of applied research problems.

George F. Sprague, Investigations Leader, ARS; Beltsville, Md. For creative research in the theory and methodology of plant breeding and plant genetics, and for inspiring and foresighted leadership of a corn and sorghum improvement program that has won international recognition.

GROUP ACHIEVEMENT

Wurpeel Unit, ARS; Albany, Calif. For the conception, development, and extension to commercial use of a new peeling process which reduces by 75 percent the water pollution during potato processing, with concurrent operating economies.

SUPERIOR SERVICE AWARDS

IN THE FIELD OF PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION

Harold E. Andersen, FS; Sandpoint, Idaho. For exceptional vision and dynamic leadership in the administration of the Kaniksu National Forest and for unusual initiative in directing its protection and development.

David H. Askegaard, REA; Washington, D.C. For creative thinking and effective participation in efforts to save the U.S. Treasury millions of dollars by developing supplemental, private financing for rural electric systems.

Wallace Barr, Jr., ES; Columbus, Ohio. For unusual imagination, initiative, and teaching ability in developing an educational program in marketing policy, greatly benefiting not only the citizens of Ohio but also the Nation as well.

Kenneth R. Bower, FHA; Des Moines, Iowa. For sustained strong leadership and noteworthy personal example in implementing and administering sound loan programs that are effectively improving the economic and social welfare of rural people in Iowa.

Merritt D. Burdick, SCS; Phoenix, Ariz. For dynamic leadership and initiative in formulating, coordinating, and managing an effective soil and water conservation program for the State of Arizona.

James H. Burnette, C&MS; Montgomery, Ala. For exceptional skill in the administration of inspection programs in Alabama and for outstanding ability to get along with people.

Claude T. Coffman, OGC; Washington, D.C. For outstanding legal services, exemplified by consistent sound judgment, unusual proficiency, and leadership in effectuating numerous agricultural programs and in the development of important legislation relating to the agricultural economy.

Kenneth G. Fooks, SCS; Chandler, Ariz. For superior leadership in resource conservation and development and for superior management of work unit operations in Arizona to provide exceptional service to the public.

Herbert L. Forest, C&MS; Washington, D.C. For effective leadership and administrative skill in the development and operation of highly complex dairy marketing programs to the direct benefit of dairy farmers, the dairy industry, and consumers.

Claude B. Freeman, ASCS; Washington, D.C. For providing dynamic leadership in the formulation of the highly effective price support program of the Department.

L. L. Gast, C&MS; Arlington, Va. For exemplary contributions in strengthening and maintaining public confidence in Government through strong leadership, ingenuity, and resourcefulness in developing policies, programs, and procedures for insuring integrity and effectiveness of major Federal programs.

Bruce M. Graham, SRS; Washington, D.C. For exceptional initiative and creative leadership in developing and implementing a sophisticated nationwide program of data collection for the Statistical Reporting Service, emphasizing modern statistical techniques and efficient operating methods in collecting data from a changing and complex agriculture.

Herbert C. Gundell, ES; Denver, Colo. For valuable service to an urban area and for adapting Extension programs and finding new educational methods to help Denver citizens meet problems of a large population of mixed cultures.

Robert L. Heffner, SCS; Rochester, N.Y. For pioneer work in New York, focusing soil survey information on urgent suburban problems, bringing soil and water conservation districts into the field of long-range community planning.

John W. Jeakins, ES; Broadus, Mont. For conducting a comprehensive educational program which has been responsible for the development of a better community, greater teamwork among citizens, and more opportunities for young people.

Walter E. Jett, ES; Marlington, W. Va. For significant contribution as a community educator in helping to develop rural resources, camps for youth, and a million-dollar livestock industry for Pocahontas County, W. Va.

Alvan M. McDowell, C&MS; San Francisco, Calif. For unusual professional competence in planning and implementing a program for a new market news service on ornamental crops while maintaining excellence in reporting some of the Nation's most important fruit and vegetable production areas and one of the largest wholesale markets.

Donald J. Novotny, FAS; Washington, D.C. For devising improved means of providing timely and more exact information on competition faced by U.S. wheats and feed grain in world trade.

Clyde R. Payne, ASCS; Jasper, Fla. For exceptional leadership in presenting and administering agency programs in Hamilton County, Fla., which resulted in increased program participation and better understanding of ASCS programs by producers.

Wilfred L. Phillipsen, FAS; Port-of-Spain, Trinidad. For superior initiative and performance in promoting the sale of U.S. agricultural commodities in the Caribbean area.

Larry E. Rackliff, FHA; St. Albans, Vt. For energetic and effective implementation of programs, substantial contribution to the area economy, and for achieving the best loan repayment record in New England.

Carolyn C. Russell, ES; Raleigh, N.C. For outstanding leadership in coordinating resources of industry, education, and government to effectively demonstrate improved living conditions for the disadvantaged through an exemplary educational program in low-cost housing.

Glenn D. Simpson, SRS; Washington, D.C. For keen perception in identifying technical and operational needs of his agency; for the vision to anticipate agricultural and technical development, and for the application of superior leadership and administrative competence in the Statistical Reporting Service.

Harold M. Stevens, ES; Lexington, Nebr.

For exemplary leadership, innovative methods, and unusual ability to inspire and work with others, which have helped Nebraska farmers solve their pest control, soil testing, and livestock problems.

Bernice Strawn, ES; Corvallis, Oreg. For creative approach to motivation of unskilled mothers and development of a program to help them become employed, provide improved family life, and contribute to the economy.

Algot R. Swanson, SCS; Salt Lake City, Utah. For dynamic leadership and initiative in formulating, coordinating and managing an effective soil and water conservation program in Utah.

Henry F. Swanson, ES; Orlando, Fla. For imaginative and dynamic leadership in developing educational programs that achieve public understanding, economic betterment, and vital improvements for farming in one of the Nation's leading agricultural areas.

George C. Tucker, FCS; Washington, D.C. For valuable assistance to dairy farmers by enabling them to increase their marketing returns through improved organization and efficiency of dairy cooperatives.

Helen D. Turner, ES; Washington, D.C. For exemplary leadership in developing and implementing a nationwide food and nutrition educational program to help raise the nutritional level of socio-economically disadvantaged people.

Wilburn M. Williamson, ES, Sa Dec Province, South Vietnam. For unusual ability and skill in developing agricultural programs and human resources through creative Extension programs that increased agricultural production, improved living conditions, and aided pacification in Sa Dec Province, South Vietnam.

IN THE FIELD OF MANAGEMENT AND GENERAL ADMINISTRATION

Fritz A. Albert, ES; Madison, Wis. For esteemed filmmaking skills, and for production of educational films to disseminate agricultural technology, inspire citizen action on environmental protection, document socioeconomic development, and enhance classroom teaching.

Mildred H. Brown, ASCS; Washington, D.C. For unusual skill and leadership in initiating, developing, implementing, and evaluating recruitment and placement programs and for outstanding professional leadership in her specialized duties.

Audrey A. Cook, OMS; Washington, D.C. For professional competence and outstanding leadership as editor of The Farm Index magazine, greatly contributing to its effectiveness in disseminating research information.

Carl H. Dorny, SCS; Washington, D.C. For excellence in the development of budgetary and accounting systems and staff to service complex operating and scientific programs, and to maintain their financial integrity.

Daniel P. Dowling, OIG; San Francisco, Calif. For strong leadership, managerial skill, and professional competence in the creation of one regional office and the development of another while promoting and maintaining the high standards of service and excellence associated with the Office of the Inspector General.

Betty M. Elerding, FS; San Francisco, Calif. For exemplary achievement and outstanding leadership in promoting preretirement planning and retirement counseling both within and outside the Department of Agriculture.

Clarence J. Enzler, SEC; Washington, D.C. For sustained, highly superior service in the preparation of statements of unusual quality explaining agricultural policies at the highest national level for the Secretary of Agriculture and other top USDA officials.

Leonard H. Greess, OIG; Washington, D.C. For exceptional leadership and outstanding achievement in the organization and development of the Office of the Inspector General; for noteworthy innovations; and for assuming responsibilities far in excess of job requirements.

Joseph A. Hundley, FS; Albuquerque, N. Mex. For dynamic leadership and outstanding achievements in developing and promoting simplified practices of financial management, work planning, and reporting methods to meet management needs at greatly reduced cost.

Donald J. Hurst, OMS; Washington, D.C. For exceptional performance in directing the Office of Management Services' space and facilities management program, resulting in efficient handling of a number of major relocations of serviced organizations.

Glenn A. Kovar, FS; Pasadena, Calif. For enhancing the image of Forest Service through innovation in planning and executing information programs for all communication media resulting in such outstanding productions as the Lassie-Forest Ranger TV series.

Lawrence W. Modlin, ARS; Beltsville, Md. For superior production and effectiveness in the administration of the Crops Research Division's fiscal and personnel affairs.

Robert B. Rathbone, ARS; Washington, D.C. For outstanding leadership in improving communications with scientists, educators, consumers, and the general public; and for instituting new and more efficient management and personnel practices.

Bernhard A. Roth, SCS; Upper Darby, Pa. For imaginative and productive leadership in the development of public information activities designed to reach large numbers of urban people through radio, television, newspapers, and magazines.

Olin T. Seely, SCS; Alexandria, La. For meritorious staff leadership in business administration and personnel management toward a sound soil and water conservation program for Louisiana.

Audrey L. Warren, SEC; Washington, D.C. For sustained excellence and efficiency in performance of her duties as confidential secretary to two Secretaries of Agriculture.

Charles Gordon Webb, INF; Washington, D.C. For exceptional ability to organize and execute Department-wide information programs and for singular resourcefulness and creativity in working with agencies to develop maximum information support for Department policies and goals.

Rudolph A. Wendelin, FS; Washington, D.C. For his truly great artwork, dedicated to Smokey the Bear and the Forest Service in his uniquely unselfish and humble fashion.

IN THE AREA OF EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITY

Larry L. Boggs, FS; Pasadena, Calif. For exceptional initiative and unusual accomplishment in developing and conducting an equal employment opportunity program through recruitment and placement of minority group members in the Federal Service.

Carl A. Lindstrom, SCS; Washington, D.C. For creative and dynamic leadership in developing and advancing the equal employment opportunity program of the Soil Conservation Service.

Thomas C. Nelson, FS; Washington, D.C. For superior leadership and success in involving Tuskegee Institute and other southern Negro colleges in forestry programs in order to encourage more black students to enter the professions associated with forestry and wildland ecology.

Albert R. Nesuda, SRS; Washington, D.C. For outstanding achievement in providing job training, guidance, encouragement, and equal employment opportunity to a group of Washington, D.C., high school students.

IN THE FIELD OF SCIENCE, ENGINEERING, AND TECHNOLOGY

Rudolph D. Anderson, SCS; Denver, Colo. For providing exceptional technical leadership to SCS employees and guidance to group leaders that has resulted in organization structures involving all but three counties in Colorado in multicounty resource planning and development.

Michael A. Barton, FS; Ely, Minn. For extraordinary action devoted to the preservation of water quality of near wilderness areas.

Burdette D. Blakely, SCS; Washington, D.C. For eminent leadership in the development of agronomic programs for conservation of natural resources throughout the United States and in many developing countries.

George E. Bohart, ARS; Logan, Utah. For pioneering research in the field of wild bee management which has greatly improved commercial alfalfa seed production and resulted in the establishment of a new multimillion-dollar entomological industry.

Gerald J. Coutant, FS; Missoula, Mont. For dynamic leadership in developing and promoting new concepts for the management and enhancement of the scenic environment in multiple use of resources on Federal, State, and private lands.

James W. Crowley, ES; Madison, Wis. For unusual talent in translating research into useful programs and masterful application of these programs to the betterment of dairying in Wisconsin and throughout the country.

Velmar W. Davis, ERS; Washington, D.C. For valuable service to the Department and to the Nation through timely and effective research leadership and economic evaluations of present and future utilization of production resources, particularly manpower and pesticides, in U.S. agriculture.

Harlan D. Ellis, C&MS; Kansas City, Mo. For outstanding leadership and assistance in organizing and developing a comprehensive meat and poultry inspection program for the State of Missouri while assigned under the Federal-State Employee Interchange Act.

Alfred L. Everett, ARS; Wyndmoor, Pa. and Irwin H. Roberts, ARS; Albuquerque, N. Mex. For important research resulting in the discovery of the cause and prevention of the cockle defect in sheepskins, a costly problem of the tanning and associated industries.

Jerry F. Franklin, FS; Corvallis, Oreg. For unusually productive forestry research and exemplary leadership in developing cooperative relations with national and international agencies and educational institutions, which are bringing credit and distinction to the Department.

Richard G. Garner, CSRS; Washington, D.C. For superior leadership and professional competence in planning, coordinating, and implementing cooperative food science and utilization research programs between the State agricultural experiment stations and the Department.

Hoover L. Lambert, FS; Asheville, N.C. For exceptional initiative, perception and ingenuity as supervisory technician while developing new procedures for difficult surveys, training personnel, and earning recognition for his expertise from industry, State organizations, and colleges.

Vincent P. Maier, ARS; Pasadena, Calif. For unusually imaginative research in elaborating the long-sought mechanism of delayed bitterness in citrus juices and in identifying the enzyme system that prevent bitterness in the intact fruit.

Donald H. Marx, FS; Athens, Ga. For original and basic research contributions leading to a fuller understanding of the role of mycorrhizae in protecting the fine roots of forest trees against pathogenic soil fungi.

Howard B. Petty, ES; Urbana, Ill. For dynamic leadership, creative efforts, and diligent service to farmers, operators, dealers, and county agents to assure wise and safe use of pesticides.

Thomas R. Richmond, ARS; College Station, Tex. For improving knowledge of cotton genetics and breeding through personal research, effective leadership of a research

team, coordination of a regional research project, and training of scientists in genetics.

Henry T. Skinner, ARS; Washington, D.C. For extraordinary service to agriculture, particularly ornamental horticulture throughout the Nation, and for dignified scientific leadership that has brought the U.S. National Arboretum to its preeminent position of national and international influence.

J. Grady Smith, C&MS; Oklahoma City, Okla. For sustained excellence in the inspection of meat and meat processing operations contributing to the wholesomeness of the Nation's meat supply and for valuable contributions to the safety and welfare of food inspection personnel.

Russell L. Steere, ARS; Beltsville, Md. For conceiving a radically new technique for preparing biological specimens for electron microscopy, and for exceptional ingenuity in developing and perfecting sophisticated but inexpensive equipment for its use in biomedical research.

Raymon E. Webb, ARS; Beltsville, Md. For unique and effective contributions to vegetable research and for superior leadership to Federal, State, and industry groups in vegetable variety improvement and biological pest control.

Louie B. Whitaker, FS; Pineville, La. For significant contributions to research advancements in cattle range management and resource-use coordination on pine forest lands of the South.

ACHIEVEMENT BY SUPPORT PERSONNEL

Beverly J. Ayers, FS; Missoula, Mont. For dedicated, imaginative, and efficient handling of audiovisual library work with resultant savings and outstanding service to users.

Clarence W. Brooks, SEC; Washington, D.C. For continued meritorious performance of duties as chauffeur to three Under Secretaries of Agriculture.

Edward C. Cornick, FAS; Washington, D.C. For diligent, cheerful, and highly effective handling of internal and public requests for information assistance, thus setting an outstanding example to other employees and enhancing the Department's public image.

Mildred J. Griffin, SCS; Ames, Iowa. For sustained excellence of work performance contributing to the progress of the accelerated national cooperative soil survey program in Iowa.

Lillian R. Perry, C&MS; South St. Paul, Minn. For demonstrating exceptional initiative, resourcefulness, and overall proficiency in providing clerical and administrative support in the important nationwide programs affecting the marketing of livestock and the quality grading of the Nation's meat supply.

Dorothy J. Peterson, C&MS; Denver, Colo. For clerical excellence and expertise in obtaining and relaying volume and price information on grain marketing in the Denver area, and effective contribution to the market news reliability and prestige in an important market area.

Zella B. Speer, FHA; Oklahoma City, Okla. For distinctive performance of assigned duties contributing materially to the efficiency in the office which resulted in providing loan assistance to a large number of rural families in Oklahoma County.

Bernard N. Thompson, SEC; Washington, D.C. For exceptional service as executive aide to the Secretary of Agriculture in performing regular and special duties in an outstanding manner.

Ida H. Thornton, C&MS; Dallas, Tex. For exceptional resourcefulness in developing informational material to effectively reach low-income families, ethnic groups and senior citizens with facts essential to the effective use of Federal food assistance programs.

Phyllis E. Weaver, FNS; Washington, D.C. For sustained superior performance of secretarial duties, outstanding ability and initiative, and high level of work productivity.

HEROIC ACTION

Donald L. Hanson, FS; Colorado Springs, Colo. and Thomas G. Petersen, FS; Colorado Springs, Colo. For exemplary alertness, courageous action, and unhesitating response in saving the life of a panic-stricken, burning motorist and preventing extensive losses in property and resource values within the Pike National Forest.

GROUP ACHIEVEMENT

Amherst-Nelson Work Unit, SCS; Amherst, Va. For dynamic initiative and leadership to Government agencies and people in Amherst-Nelson Counties following the floods in August 1969, reflecting meritorious credit to SCS, USDA, and themselves.

Communist Areas Analysis Group, ERS; Washington, D.C. For sustained outstanding performance in the research, analysis, and interpretation of agricultural programs in the Communist countries of the world; and for the exceptional service rendered in making this information available to U.S. policymakers, farm groups, farmers, traders, and academic institutions.

Hancock County Office, FHA; Bay St. Louis, Miss. For meritorious contributions to the relief of victims among rural people of Hancock County during the aftermath of hurricane "Camille" under extremely adverse conditions.

PPBS Task Force for Market Development, FAS; Washington, D.C. For unusual initiative and effectiveness in developing, organizing, and planning a far-reaching and imaginative 5-year promotional program for expanding sales of agricultural products overseas.

WILLIAM A. JUMP MEMORIAL AWARD FOR 1970

Anthony W. Hudson, Director of Personnel, Bureau of Management Services, Personnel Division, Civil Service Commission. For outstanding contributions to the employment, training, utilization, development, and understanding of disadvantaged persons and lower level Federal employees.

Alfred M. Zuck, Director, Office of Evaluation, Manpower Administration, Department of Labor. For exceptional administrative and executive ability in the field of manpower administration including the evaluation and review of program designs, manpower policies, and legislative proposals.

The William A. Jump Memorial Award is presented annually to Federal employees under the age of 37 in recognition of outstanding service in the field of public administration. The Award is given in memory of William A. Jump who for many years was the distinguished Budget and Finance Officer of the Department of Agriculture.

The 1970 Award Committee: James E. Johnson, Vice Chairman, U.S. Civil Service Commission, Chairman; Joseph Young, Staff Writer of the "Federal Spotlight" Column for the Evening Star; Larry Jobe, Assistant Secretary for Administration, Department of Commerce; Mrs. Esther Lawton, Assistant to the Director of Personnel, Treasury Department; and Edward Hicks, Jr., Director of Personnel, Office of the Secretary, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

USDA WINNERS OF MAJOR NON-USDA AWARDS 1969–70

B. Jean Apgar, Research Chemist, Agricultural Research Service, Ithaca, N.Y. Winner of the 1970 Federal Woman's Award sponsored by the Civil Service Commission and Woodward and Lothrop to recognize women who have made outstanding contributions to the efficiency and quality of the career service of the Federal Government.

Ned D. Bayley, USDA's Director of Science and Education, Office of the Secretary. Selected by the National Civil Service League to receive the 1970 Career Service Award. This award annually honors 10 top career employees whose contributions to the public service have been significant.

Jay Justin Basch, Research Chemist, Agricultural Research Service, Wyndmoor, Pa. One of the 10 most Outstanding Handicapped Federal Employees of 1969 given honorary recognition by the Civil Service Commission for significant achievements in spite of severely limiting physical handicaps.

Carl B. Barnes, USDA's Director of Personnel. Winner of the 1969 Warner W. Stockberger Award sponsored by the Society for Personnel Administration to honor a person in public or private life who has made an outstanding contribution toward the improvement of public personnel management.

Steve A. Eberhart, Research Geneticist, Agricultural Research Service, Ames, Iowa. Selected by the Downtown Jaycees as one of the 10 outstanding young men in the Federal service to win the 1970 Arthur S. Flemming Award for meritorious work for the Federal Government.

Thomas P. Quigley, Reports Management Officer, Agricultural Research Service, Hyattsville, Md. One of six winners of the 1969 Paperwork Management Award sponsored by the Association of Records Executives and Administrators to recognize the significant accomplishments of Government managers who have successfully developed programs to reduce Federal Government paperwork costs.

WILL HARVARD HELP?

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, too much national policy has been made, for too many years, in corporation board rooms rather than by Government officials. Therefore, I commend the persons and institutions who are a part of Campaign GM. They, today, are attempting to awaken corporate management.

Corporation advertising and public relations programs will not solve the problems facing this country. Such palliatives compound the problems, because they create false illusions. Restructuring and democratization of corporate government itself is overdue.

The universities which hold large blocks of common stock are in an excellent position to provide some leadership in this matter. Some of them have not been anxious to help in Project GM. I hope that before next year's round of stockholder meetings universities with such stockholdings will lead the way toward corporate change, rather than having to be led to the issue itself by students and recent graduates.

Mr. President, as an example of what could be done, I offer Harvard and the utilities.

The general investments of Harvard College, last June 30, totaled more than $869 million. This included $379 million in common stock. The $379 million common stock portfolio included $108.7 million in electric utilities, $13.7 million in gas utilities, and $12.5 million in telephone utilities.

The largest utility holding was 544,194 shares of Middle South Utilities. This compares with Harvard's holding of 287,149 shares of General Motors stock. This does not include the holdings in Middle South of the Harvard-Yenching Institute or of State Street Investment Corp., which handles investments for

Harvard. Altogether Harvard owns about a million shares of Middle South stock. But the Harvard College holdings alone are sufficient to make the college the largest, if a minor, stockholder in Middle South, which is a New York utility holding company whose subsidiaries are Arkansas Power & Light, Louisiana Power & Light, Mississippi Power & Light, and New Orleans Public Service.

I wonder how many students and faculty members in Cambridge are aware of the extent to which Harvard has been used by Middle South Utilities, to the detriment of utility consumers in the Deep South. During the sixties, Middle South went to the Securities and Exchange Commission to seek approval of a stock option plan for its key executives. The case for the stock option plan was made to the SEC by none other than George F. Bennett, the treasurer of Harvard College, president of State Street Investment Corp., deputy director of Harvard-Yenching, and a director of Middle South as well.

Bennett argued that the president of Middle South, who at that time received a salary of $95,000 a year, would "do everything he is doing in a more extraordinary way—scan the operating expenses more carefully—sharpen his pencil a little sharper on construction programs—make his people who are negotiating with labor a little tougher," and be certain his company was enjoying a "full return"—if only SEC would approve those options.

The SEC staff opposed the stock option plan. The staff contended that it would adversely affect ordinary stockholders and utility customers and that the company was in no way suffering from its inability to issue options.

The SEC overruled its staff. The SEC approved the stock option plan desired by Harvard and Middle South. And in the pro forma stockholder proxy vote which followed SEC action, Harvard cast its votes with Middle South management, in favor of the stock option plan. The Middle South president, with his $127,033 salary and his $43,981 retirement benefits, ought to be able to keep his pencil sharp, his earnings up, and his labor negotiators tough without options for himself and other utility insiders.

The then dean of Harvard's law school, Erwin N. Griswold, who is now Solicitor General, had been one of the most articulate opponents of stock option plans, especially for utility corporations. I recall the testimony Dean Griswold gave to the House Ways and Means Committee when I was a member of that body. Those who are interested in reading his testimony on the inequity of options will find it in the Ways and Means Committee hearings for December 7, 1959. My point here is that Harvard put its influence and votes where its and Middle South's business agent said to put it, despite substantial testimony against stock options from one of its most distinguished scholars.

Mr. President, I believe that Harvard could redeem itself by using its voting power and scholarship to help make some long overdue changes in our regulatory systems. Enough things are wrong with these regulatory systems to engage and challenge hundreds of collegians. I today cite but one example, and the part which one college played.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the utility common stock holdings of Harvard College as of June 30, 1969.

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

GENERAL INVESTMENTS—COMMON STOCKS

Utilities	Shares	Market value
ELECTRIC		
American Electric Power Co., Inc	75,775	$2,519,518
Arkansas-Missouri Power Co	50,000	631,250
Boston Edison Co	34,488	1,332,099
Carolina Power & Light Co	88,338	2,981,407
Central Louisiana Electric Co. Inc	151,320	3,347,955
Cincinnati Gas & Elect Co	116,228	3,007,399
Columbus & Southern Ohio Electric Co	23,773	849,884
Commonwealth Edison Co	63,629	2,759,907
Consumers Power Co	159,609	6,045,190
Detroit Edison Co	32,400	781,650
Florida Power Corp	137,768	6,457,875
Florida Power & Light Co	105,184	6,889,552
General Public Utilities Corp	117,370	3,139,647
Houston Lighting & Power Co	40,807	1,550,666
Idaho Power Co	70,400	2,112,000
Illinois Power Co	109,262	3,824,170
Indianapolis Power & Light Co	68,189	1,815,532
Kansas Gas & Electric Co	60,065	1,486,608
Kansas Power & Light Co	100,270	2,055,535
Middle South Utilities, Inc	544,194	12,516,462
Missouri Public Service Co	5,931,929	1,312,439
New England Electric System	161,180	4,130,237
New England Gas & Electric Association	65,701	1,346,870
Niagara Mohawk Power Corp	264,266	4,921,954
Ohio Edison Co	91,300	2,328,150
Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co	118,876	2,555,834
Public Service Co. of Indiana, Inc	122,004	4,758,156
South Carolina Electric & Gas Co	118,896	3,626,328
Southern California Edison Co	127,463	4,493,070
Texas Utilities Co	18,547	978,354
Union Electric Co	260,326	5,206,520
Virginia Electric & Power Co	35,757	960,969
Wisconsin Electric Power Co	252,015	5,953,854
Total		108,677,049
GAS		
Consolidated Natural Gas Co	27,900	798,637
Equitable Gas Co	23,401	836,585
Indiana Gas Co	73,253	1,794,698
Mississippi River Corp	81,080	1,652,005
Mountain Fuel Supply Co	42,504	1,269,807
Peoples Gas Co	144,673	4,882,713
Southern Union Gas Co	28,442	867,481
Washington Gas Light Co	58,000	1,624,000
Total		13,725,928
TELEPHONE		
American Tel. & Tel. Co	220,797	11,978,237
Communications Satellite Corp	10,010	510,510
Total		12,488,747

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE ON PUBLIC SCHOOL DESEGREGATION—EMERGENCY SCHOOL AID ACT OF 1970

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I was heartened and gratified by the will for massive and affirmative action to facilitate public school desegregation demonstrated by the President in his historic message to the Congress yesterday. I believe he bespeaks the feeling of millions of Americans concerned with fulfilling the promise of the 1954 Supreme Court decision on public school desegregation.

Also I believe that the President's expressed desire for early enactment of meaningful legislation is shared by a majority of the Members of the Congress from both parties, and am therefore hopeful that legislation along the lines of the President's objectives will receive the bipartisan support needed to assure timely consideration and enactment of the measures proposed.

However, while very much sharing the President's objectives, I do have some serious reservations concerning provisions in the administration's bill itself. As ranking Republican member of the Senate committee which would consider the bill—and as a longtime and active proponent of civil rights legislation—I shall do my best to perfect the bill introduced on behalf of the administration.

My intentions are to work with colleagues from both parties to modify the administration's bill in a number of respects so as to eliminate these areas of concern, so that the objectives so eloquently stated by the President in his message might be achieved through the timely enactment of effective legislation. This timely consideration is most important, for as the President pointed out in his message:

> In the life of the desegregation process, the fall of 1970 has special significance and presents extraordinary problems, inasmuch as all of the school districts which have not yet desegregated must do so by then.

Particular points of concern to me in the administration's proposal are:

The section concerned with the transportation of pupils is subject to serious misunderstanding. The section implies that the achievement of racial balance does not, in itself, serve an educational purpose. Educational experts who have testified before Senate committees, including Dr. James Coleman, a consultant to the administration in the drafting of its bill, have taken the position that racial segregation is a prime cause for much educational inadequacy and that racial integration does itself provide educational benefits for both white and black children.

Voluntary plans for the elimination of de facto segregation almost without exception require the transportation of schoolchildren in order to achieve their objectives; this transportation is often the most costly part of an effective program. While the Congress has reiterated in a number of statutes the proposition that Federal education aid programs should not "require" or "force" transportation of schoolchildren in order to achieve racial balance, so it is equally undesirable to prohibit Federal assistance for such transportation—even including that which is ongoing now. The consequence of the provision in the administration bill could be to negate the second category of aid which the President most laudably identified in his message—"aid to districts that wish to undertake voluntary efforts to reduce or prevent de facto racial isolation."

I am also concerned about the absence of sufficient incentives for large school districts to develop desegregation plans. Districts containing either 10,000 minority group children or 50-percent minority group children can qualify for assistance for "interracial educational programs"

which falls short of achieving desegregation, without being required to demonstrate that there are no practicable desegregation plans which would qualify for assistance. The bill should more effectively encourage effort in these districts to achieve practicable desegregation.

The Congress, partially in response to administration urging, included in the comprehensive education bill signed into law by the President last month, Public Law 91–230, a number of provisions enhancing parental and public participation in decisions on education. The bill should include such a provision; for example, an earlier draft of the administration bill did include provision for an advisory committee, a proposal which, I believe, has merit.

The formula for distribution of funds to the States is inadequate to the need and requires revision in a number of respects, particularly with regard to so-called double counting.

What I have said should not be construed as disagreement with the President's objectives on public school desegregation and with his historic message. However, I feel a deep responsibility as to the means of achieving these objectives; and hope to be able to work them out with the administration and the majority in Congress.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is there further morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is concluded.

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title.

The BILL CLERK. A bill (H.R. 15628) to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from West Virginia?

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill.

Mr. DOMINICK obtained the floor.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, in view of the fact that a sufficient number of Senators are in the Chamber at the present time, I should like to ask for the yeas and nays on the pending amendment to the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ALLEN). Does the Senator from Colorado yield for that purpose?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Mr. President, will the Senator from Colorado yield?

Mr. DOMINICK. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAMS of Delaware. Is there a possibility that the amendment could be brought to a vote this afternoon? Some of us would like to go ahead and dispose of it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I am sure that we will have a response from the other side. However, I have done some checking on behalf of Senators who have spoken to me, and I would say that there is a general disposition, as I sense it, to proceed to a vote on the pending amendment to the committee amendment. Whether it would be possible to vote this afternoon, I still have no way of knowing. I would have to check further, but I think that is a possibility.

I wonder if we may have some indication from the other side of the aisle whether there is a likelihood that we may vote on the amendment to the committee this afternoon.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, speaking for the leadership on our side of the aisle, I would have to say that we would not want to reach a vote this afternoon. A large number of Senators on this side of the aisle are not here today. A good number on the able Republican whip's side of the aisle are not here. Some of our Members have been told that there was little likelihood, if any, of a vote today.

I think I would have to protect those promises, and so, on that basis, I must say I would have to do everything within the rules of parliamentary procedure to prevent a vote from taking place this afternoon.

Mr. GRIFFIN. I think that answers the question of the Senator from Delaware.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, may I ask, even if a great majority of the Members of the Senate are not willing to vote this afternoon, is it not possible to fix a time to vote on Monday, or Tuesday at the latest?

Mr. CHURCH. I see no objection to that. I would want to accommodate the desire to come to a vote. I hope we can work that out together.

Mr. GRIFFIN. We will take some further steps to see if that is a possibility.

Mr. CHURCH. I think that would be a very fair thing to do.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I share the view of the distinguished Senator from Idaho that that would be a distinct possibility, and that every effort should be made toward that end.

THE WAR AND THE CONSTITUTION

Mr. DOMINICK. Mr. President, there are a number of constitutional issues which have been raised in the course of this debate which deserve and require serious consideration. In order to put some of them in perspective, I would like briefly to address myself to a few of the more relevant points which have been raised.

First, let me say that I have been completely astonished at the fact that not one of the so-called protesters who have been sounding off in Congress and elsewhere about U.S. actions in Southeast Asia have made so much as a single outcry of protest over the 40,000 Communist troops in Cambodia threatening the capital city of that country and attacking and killing Cambodians.

Not a single individual protester that I can recall said one single word about the long-continued Communist violations of Cambodia's neutrality nor their invasions of Laos and Thailand.

They have seemed to pay not the slightest attention to President Nixon's explanation that he was taking the action he did against North Vietnamese bases in Cambodia to protect his plan to withdraw American combat troops from South Vietnam.

The President's action was not taken precipitously, as can be seen from a review of the many diplomatic moves that preceded it.

I should add here that I have not heard much comment about this from the protesters of the Cambodian action.

Here is the chronology—perhaps I should add by the State Department—of Cambodian developments in connection with diplomatic action.

In August 1969, Mr. Sihanouk installed Lon Nol as Prime Minister, with a mandate to deal with pressing economic problems.

In December 1969, Sihanouk wrote in Sangkum magazine of the danger of associating too closely with Communists: "The bird always gets swallowed." On various occasions since 1965, he had complained of the Vietcong presence in Cambodia.

And I might say in connection with that that I have firsthand knowledge of this because in May of 1967, after I had been in Vietnam and came back. I referred to the Cambodian sanctuaries which the North Vietnamese were occupying.

Mr. Sihanouk then made several unkind comments about my remarks. But he once again urged that the North Vietnamese get out of Cambodia.

On January 6, 1970, Sihanouk departed for France, leaving Cheng Heng as Acting Chief of State, after a setback in his attack on the Lon Nol Government in the National Assembly, and apparently also to avoid a scheduled visit by North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong.

In early March 1970, anti-Vietnamese Communist demonstrations in Phnom Penh lead to sacking of North Vietnamese and Vietcong Embassies by the Cambodians.

On March 13, 1970, Sihanouk left Paris for Moscow and Peking, avowedly to seek Soviet and Chinese assistance in persuading the Vietnamese Communist to leave Cambodian territory.

This is exactly what he himself announced.

On March 16, 1970, the Lon Nol Government began negotiations with the Vietnamese Communists in Phnom Penh, concerning the Vietcong presence in Cambodia.

On March 18, 1970, the Cambodian National Assembly by unanimous vote declares Prince Sihanouk no longer Chief of State. Cheng Heng, president of the Assembly, stays on as Acting Chief of State. Lon Nol continues as Prime Minister.

I think it is important to note that this was a unanimous vote.

Sihanouk arrived in Peking and de-

nounced the National Assembly action as an illegal coup de'etat.

He did this even though ostensibly this was done under their constitution and their own system of government.

On March 3, 1970, Sihanouk issued first of a series of messages calling for overthrow of the Lon Nol government.

On March 25, 1970, the Cambodian Ministry of Foreign Affairs notifies the Vietnamese Communist representatives of the Cambodian Government's desire to resume negotiations. The Communists reject the invitation and announce withdrawal of all but caretaker staffs from their embassies.

On March 31, 1970, Cambodian Government—headed by Lon Nol—informed the U.N. that it had asked the United Kingdom and the U.S.S.R. to reconvene the International Control Commission to protect Cambodian neutrality. The U.S.S.R. had refused to act. Informal Cambodian soundings at the U.N. indicated that there was little hope of getting Security Council action.

On April 3, 1970, the Vietnamese Communists began attacks against Cambodian forces in Svay Rieng Province, later expanded to other Cambodian posts in eastern Cambodia.

During March and April 1970, Sihanouk sent a series of messages to Communist regimes thanking them for their support.

April 14, 1970, the Cambodian Government issued the first of a series of appeals for foreign arms assistance.

It will be recalled that his first request was for 200,000 people to come in fully armed and equipped to help him against the Communists. Later he raised that number to 400,000, which was impossible, to equip, train, or to get into the area. The President of the United States has said that he has no intention of giving massive military support of that nature.

On April 18, 1970, the Vietnamese forces captured Saang, 18 miles south of Phnom Penh, which was later recaptured by Cambodian troops.

On April 25, 1970, Sihanouk signed a joint communique with Vietnamese Communist and Pathet Lao leaders, pledging unity and reciprocal support, and rejecting international proposals for a conference on Cambodia or Indochina.

On April 28, the Chinese Communists declared their "powerful backing" for the communique. I think we can see a lot of activity outlined here, not counting individual activities by other countries, designed to try to solve the Cambodian situation by diplomacy and agreement.

The North Vietnamese, or the Red Chinese and the Soviets blocked each of the moves and left the Cambodians to the merciless attacks of the Vietcong and North Vietnamese, at best involving the greatly expanded base areas for attacks on South Vietnamese, and at worst, the takeover of all Cambodia. When confronted with these attacks, the protesters fall back on the claim that the United States is engaged in a constitutionally unauthorized war in Vietnam because Congress has not formally declared war. Hence, the argument goes that since we are there unconstitutionally we should not be in the other areas of Southeast Asia.

Let us discuss this issue. Clearly the Constitution provides that only Congress has the power to declare war, but is a formal declaration of war by Congress the only means by which the United States can constitutionally engage in armed hostilities?

The facts surrounding our commitment of military personnel to armed combat in South Vietnam are too well known to require extended recitation. American military advisers were introduced by President Eisenhower and their number increased significantly by President Kennedy. Five years ago, President Johnson increased the commitment by dispatching division-sized units, and by the time President Nixon took office, over half a million American soldiers and marines were in Vietnam.

I am tempted to conclude that the legal principle of equitable estoppel precludes raising at this late date the question of the legality of this chain of events which extends over a nearly 20-year period, but the question is a valid and serious one, and I believe it deserves an honest and serious answer.

As we all know, the Constitution of the United States has served us faithfully for nearly two centuries because it is flexible enough to meet the changing requirements of a changing world. New problems, for example, have brought forth new views as to the role and power of Congress in meeting pressing domestic needs, the absence of explicit constitutional authorization notwithstanding. One can safely conclude that the framers of our Constitution would not recognize the commerce clause, so elastic has it become in the past 40 years. In fact, some of us today can hardly recognize it when a colleague suggests that one can find in that clause authorization for Congress to attempt to regulate the size of American families.

One hundred and eighty years ago, it was not unreasonable for the men gathered in Philadelphia to draft a new charter of government to conclude that the power to commit a nation of free men to war ought not be lodged in a single man. America was safely removed from the turmoils of Europe. At that time we did not have aircraft, submarines, or missiles. The experience of recent history suggested that wars—particularly those on the European Continent—were often fought for the personal benefit of kings at the expense of their people. We had no desire for a king, and no need for investing any man with kingly powers. Congress, it was decided, was the logical and safe repository for the power to declare war.

Wars at this time were rather formal affairs. Declarations were issued, troops were fitted out in ornate uniforms, battlefield formations were as stylized as a modern dance. One prepared for a war much as one prepared for an appearance at court.

Under such circumstances, a formal declaration of war was appropriate. But how appropriate is it today? Former President Johnson noted recently that one reason he did not ask Congress for a declaration of war against North Vietnam was that he did not know what secret treaties might have existed between Hanoi and Moscow or Peking. A formal declaration of war might very well have triggered the active belligerency of those Communist giants under the provisions of a treaty of which we were not aware. I might say that I presume this same situation still remains in effect.

Of course, there may not be any such treaties among the Communist powers and Hanoi. But, like Mr. Johnson, we do not know, and risks should be limited to what circumstances require, not enlarged to meet a constitutional formalism.

I do not suggest that the "war-declaring" power of the Congress—as opposed to the formal declaration of war—is a constitutional formalism. What I do suggest is that there are perfectly satisfactory constitutional means for Congress to exercise its war-declaring power short of the adoption of a formal declaration.

America's first war was a naval war with France which took place during the years 1798–1801. This was war in fact and in law. American warships and privateers engaged in armed hostilities on the open seas against the French Navy and merchantmen. Congress did not adopt a declaration of war against France, rather it adopted a series of enabling acts authorizing the President to take appropriate naval action against the French in reprisal for their interference with American shipping.

The Supreme Court held that this undeclared war was properly authorized under the Constitution and constituted a state of "imperfect"—or what we would call—"limited" war. Mr. Justice Washington, speaking for a unanimous Court, declared "that every contention by force between two nations, in external matters, under the authority of their respective governments, is not only war, but public war." A formal declaration was not required to clothe this limited war with constitutionality.

In 1802, Congress authorized President Jefferson to conduct limited war against the Bey of Tripoli, and in 1815, it similarly authorized President Madison to conduct limited war against the Bey of Algiers. Frequently throughout the 19th century, Congress authorized war without resorting to the formality of a declaration.

What I am suggesting is that formalities should not be allowed to obscure the substance of Congress' power to declare—that is, authorize—war. Certainly if those who served in the first sessions of Congress could recognize the desirability of adapting the means of authorizing war to the purposes for which that war was being conducted, we should not—180 years later—become so obsessed with formalisms that we cannot distinguish the substance from the form. Is the will of Congress any less clear, or its purpose any less certain, if it chooses to authorize war, not by a formal declaration, but by adopting a Tonkin Gulf Resolution, or when it debated and adopted a series of appropriations measures specifically designed to provide

funds for the conduct of the war in Vietnam.

My only point is that Congress may authorize war without a formal declaration, and a war is not unconstitutional merely because it is not waged pursuant to a formal declaration.

I might interject another point which I think had not been considered very often. We are in South Vietnam at the request of the South Vietnamese Government. Exactly whom do we declare war against? The Vietcong? The North Vietnamese? If we declare war, do we have independent action? Would we have to get out immediately if the South Vietnamese asked us to get out? I think we would—and I think, as a matter of fact, we would probably be delighted to do so. There is a grave question as to whom we would declare war against if we came to such a formal declaration.

The focus of attention in the course of this debate has been on the power of the President as Commander in Chief to commit American forces to war without the approval of Congress. This is an issue on which the Constitution suggests one answer, and the precedents of nearly two centuries of experience suggest another.

The Constitution provides that Congress shall have the power to commit this Nation to war, whether by formal declaration or other suitable means. Yet, in spite of this clear delegation of power to Congress, history records that of the eight major wars we have waged since the adoption of the Constitution, only two may truly be said to be "congressional wars," or wars in which Congress took the initiative rather than being confronted with a fait accompli. Those were, of course, the War of 1812 and the Spanish American War.

The war with Mexico was declared by President Polk when he moved troops into territory claimed by Mexico, although Congress adopted a declaration of war after the battles of Palo Alto and Resaca de la Palma had been fought. President Wilson had unilaterally adopted such a posture of hostility toward Germany that war was inevitable by the time Congress got around to declaring it, and one might say that President Roosevelt's less than neutral conduct toward Germany and Japan might very well have confronted Congress with no choice but to declare war if the Japanese had not struck Pearl Harbor first.

In that case, we were already at war when Congress finally decided that it was going to declare war.

President Truman did not make any pretense of relying upon a congressional declaration of war for authority to commit American forces to combat in Korea, and President Lincoln did not bother to wait for congressional approval before establishing a blockade and calling up the militia for the war against the Confederacy. And, of course, President Johnson did not ask for a declaration of war against North Vietnam.

What the historical record suggests is that Congress has rarely initiated war by declaration; it has mostly ratified wars underway or inevitable.

If, in fact, our major wars have been largely Presidential wars, is there any reason to wonder that there have been so many instances in which Presidents have committed forces to combat in minor engagements without the authority of Congress? The record is clear: From the undeclared Semniole War in 1816 to the pursuit of Pancho Villa in 1916, from the dispatch of 5,000 troops to quell the Boxer rebellion in 1898, to the landing of 21,000 men in the Dominican Republic in 1965, Presidents have acted to protect Americans abroad without first seeking the approval of Congress.

The authority of the President to commit troops in limited conflict is not, of course, unquestioned. There are Presidents who have doubted such authority and Congress has challenged it more than once. President Truman's commitment of troops in Korea in response to a U.N. resolution without prior approval of, or subsequent ratification by, Congress led to the Great Debate of 1951.

President Truman had relied upon his authority as Commander in Chief and upon resolutions of the U.N. Security Council declaring that armed aggression existed in Korea and calling upon U.N. members to assist in halting that aggression. He cited the history of actions by the Commander in Chief to protect American interests abroad. He characterized the U.N. Charter as the cornerstone of our foreign relations and singled out article 39 which authorizes the Security Council to recommend action to members to meet armed aggression.

The President's opponents noted that all treaties are not self-executing and that, until implemented by Congress, non-self-executing treaties confer no new authority on the President. Article 39, it was said, was not self-executing. Article 43, which provides expressly for the commitment of troops by members in accordance with their constitutional processes, had been implemented to the extent of Congress authorizing troop agreements (59 Stat. 619) but since no agreements had been entered into it was inoperative, so went the argument. Without any added treaty authorization, the President's action must be viewed solely in terms of his basic constitutional authority, it was said, and this authority does not extend to long-term commitment of troops in numbers ranging up to 250,000.

While various scholarly views were quoted on both sides of the issue—House Report No. 127, 82d Congress, first session—and the congressional debate raged from January to April, there was no legal resolution to the President's authority in light to the U.N. Charter or independent of it.

Nevertheless it is clear that Congress acquiesced in the President's action. See Rees, "The Limited War" (1964); Pusey, "The Way We Go To War" (1969).

Since judicial precedents are virtually nonexistent on this point, the question is one which must of necessity be decided by historical practice. Viewed in this light, congressional acquiescence in President Truman's action furnishes strong evidence that this use of his power as Commander in Chief was a proper one. This is particularly true because, while a treaty may override a State statute under the supremacy clause, *Missouri* v. *Holland*, 252 U.S. 416, it may not override a specific limitation on the power of the President or of Congress. *Reid* v. *Covert*, 351 U.S. 487.

There have always been those who challenged the authority of Presidents to take such actions. In recent weeks I have heard the testimony of Jefferson and Madison and Hamilton cited in condemnation of Executive usurpation. Indeed, I noted that the Foreign Relations Committee report accompanying Senate Concurrent Resolution 64 cited an annual message of James Buchanan. It is not often one hears President Buchanan quoted approvingly.

Also, these days, one does not hear too much about the Roosevelts, Theodore and Franklin, whose views on the Commander in Chief powers of the Presidency are no longer as popular as their views on social reform. And Woodrow Wilson and Harry Truman, whose strong actions in the realm of foreign affairs used to be cited with respect, are now relegated to the ranks of the usurpers. It appears that the only Presidents whose view of their powers under the Constitution are respected today are James Buchanan and Warren G. Harding, neither of which, in my opinion, were among our leading Presidents.

If history and precedent are—Buchanan and Harding excepted—relevant, it appears that there is a strong case to be made for the power of the President to commit American forces abroad without the explicit permission of Congress, although that commitment may lead to war.

I might say at this point that I personally do not like that idea, but I think the precedent is there.

This power is not unlimited, but it cannot be easily circumscribed. Just as there is a great deal more meaning in the commerce clause than a student of etymology would suspect, so too is there far more power encompassed in the Commander in Chief clause than many Members of Congress are prepared to admit.

It strikes me that it is appropriate to ask why the power of the President in the realm of foreign affairs has grown so great. Is it merely because Presidents are usurpers? Or is it because events have necessitated it?

President Wilson argued:

> When foreign affairs play a prominent part in the politics and policy of a nation, its Executive must of necessity be its guide; must utter every initial judgment, take every first step of action, supply the information upon which it is to act, suggest and in large measure control its conduct.

Is this an overstatement? Do the conditions of the world allow us safely to conduct our foreign policy on the floor of Congress? Can we safely attempt to substitute our judgment for that of the President when only he can have all the facts and only he can promptly act? Would the world be a safer place if our foreign policy were conducted by congressional committee?

Mr. President, these are questions to which we all have to search for answers. We must search in our own hearts, to

determine whether or not this is the way we want to go.

Throughout our history, and certainly in this century, our Presidents have acted decisively and, for the most part, independently in response to evolving threats to the peace and security of the United States. It would be reckless, if not dishonest, to argue that they have done so without constitutional authorization or without good reason. We can have only one Commander in Chief at a time. The Constitution says he is the President, not the Senate, not the House of Representatives, not the fourth estate. A Commander in Chief has broad powers—powers which can be abused. But history teaches us that our Presidents have, almost without exception, been wise and prudent men. But, by their actions, they can commit us to war. That is a very real risk in our present system. But we should also remember that by their actions—prompt, decisive, informed—they can keep us out of war or out of a larger war, and that is a very real strength of our system.

To interject here for a moment, I had a telephone conversation the other day with a lawyer who is a very good friend of mine, who is not a politician, and who is a Democrat. His answer was that if we were under the parliamentary system, this body would then be able to have a vote of no confidence in what the President is going to do. If we had a vote of no confidence, and that were successful, then, under the English system, there would be new elections held immediately to determine what the temper of the country was.

But that is not what we do under our system. We do not have votes of no confidence. We elect a President of the United States to serve for a period of 4 years. We elect Members of the House of Representatives to serve for 2 years, and we elect the Members of the Senate to serve for six. We try to interrelate these bodies so as to achieve first, continuity, and second, responsibility, and then be able to determine how the execution of that responsibility is rated at the end of the term, not right in the middle of it.

The Constitution provides that the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces. The courts have construed this clause to mean that once Congress has raised an army and navy, the President alone can deploy this force in the field. He, and he alone, determines movements, decides on tactics, controls strategy. The fleet sails and the army marches at his command, not at that of the Congress.

During the Civil War, Congress attempted to involve itself in the management of the war on the battlefield by means of a Joint Committee on the Conduct of the War. Lincoln refused to submit to this intrusion.

Congress cannot restrict the constitutional power of the Presidency in order to retaliate against the alleged usurpation of power by a President. The Constitution does not empower Congress to define the powers of the Presidency; it affords Congress no authority to add or detract from the powers bestowed by the Constitution on the President of the United States. If Congress believes that a President has exceeded his powers, it must employ the remedies provided by the Constitution, amongst which is Congress' right to appropriate funds with limitations on their use.

That is the role which my substitute amendment suggests—the amendment which is now lying on each Senator's desk, but which has not yet been called up. But such limitation, by its very nature, must apply to future actions. There is, of course, a political remedy. The people are the final arbiters of the propriety of official conduct, and if a President exceeds his constitutional powers or abuses his responsibility to the people, he can be defeated at the polls.

My analysis of the remedies available to Congress and to the people in the event of Presidential abuse of power is based on historical precedent. President Andrew Johnson was accused of exceeding his authority. In retaliation, Congress attempted to limit his power to remove members of the Cabinet, but the Supreme Court refused to allow Congress to restrict the constitutional prerogatives of the Presidency. Having failed before the Court, the Congress attempted impeachment. Again it failed. Finally, it was successful in the political arena. Grant, a man more amenable to the opinions of Congress, was elected to succeed Johnson.

At a time such as this, when passions are aroused and tempers are short, we should remember the constitutional lesson of the Andrew Johnson Presidency. Congress is not the final judge of the constitutional powers of the President. It cannot restrict those powers however convinced it is that they are being abused. Political passions cannot be allowed to overwhelm constitutional logic. A war is not unconstitutional because it is unpopular, and a President is not a usurper because he declines to agree with a majority of the Senate.

Although U.S. concern with the security of Southeast Asia dates from our involvement there during World War II, it was formalized in the signing and ratification of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty—so-called SEATO. The area covered by the treaty includes not only the territory of the Asian signatories but also the States designated in the protocol which was signed and ratified at the same time as the treaty. These are Cambodia, Laos, and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam. Pursuant to its treaty obligation, the United States for some years maintained military advisers in Vietnam and provided other military assistance to the Republic of Vietnam.

When U.S. naval forces in the Gulf of Tonkin were attacked in August 1964, the President took direct air action against the North Vietnamese. He also requested Congress "to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met" and asked for "a resolution expressing the support of the Congress for all necessary action to protect our Armed Forces and to assist nations covered by the SEATO treaty." (H. Doc. 333, 88th Cong., second sess., p. 3.) Note that the nations covered by the SEATO treaty under the protocol included Cambodia, Laos, and the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam.

On August 10, 1964, Congress responded with a resolution which "approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression." (Public Law 88–408, 78 Stat. 334.) It was in connection with this resolution that Congress noted that whatever the limits of the President acting alone might be, whenever Congress and the President act together, "there can be no doubt" of the constitutional authority. (H. Rept. 1708, 8th Cong., second sess., p. 4.)

In the debates in the Senate on this resolution, it is clear that the Commander in Chief was supported in taking whatever steps were necessary in his judgment to protect American forces. The floor leader, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas (Mr. FULBRIGHT), noted on August 6, 1964, that the resolution "would authorize whatever the Commander in Chief feels is necessary." He observed:

> In a broad sense, the joint resolution states that we approve of the action taken with regard to the attack on our own ships and that we also approve of our country's efforts to maintain the independence of South Vietnam.

When Senator COOPER inquired:

> In other words we are now giving the President advance authority to take whatever action he may deem necessary respecting South Vietnam and its defense, or with respect to the defense of any other country included in the treaty?

Senator FULBRIGHT replied:

> I think that is correct.

The Gulf of Tonkin resolution expresses broad support for the Commander in Chief and recognizes the need for broad latitude to respond to situations which may develop. Of particular concern to the Congress, as well as to the President, was the protection of American forces and the security of South Vietnam.

While the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was the first major congressional affirmation of the President's actions in responding to the situation in Southeast Asia, it is not the only such affirmation. When bombing of military targets in North Vietnam was undertaken in 1965, the President requested a supplemental appropriation for the military. In his message of May 4, 1965, he emphasized:

> This is not a routine appropriation. For each Member of Congress who supports this request is also voting to persist in our effort to halt Communist aggression in South Vietnam. Each is saying that the Congress and the President stand united before the world in joint determination that the independece of South Vietnam shall be preserved and Communist attack will not succeed." (H. Doc. 157, 89th Cong., 1st sess.)

The requested resolution was adopted on May 7, 1965, Public Law 89–18, 79 Stat. 109.

Since that time, Congress has repeatedly adopted legislation recognizing the situation in Southeast Asia, providing

funds to carry on U.S. commitments and providing special benefits for troops stationed there. There is long-standing congressional recognition of the U.S. commitment in Southeast Asia.

Finally, I come to the question, Is the current military operation in Cambodia a constitutionally authorized exercise of Presidential power?

Virtually everyone, I think, agrees that if American forces are constitutionally engaged in armed combat within a prescribed theater of operations pursuant to an acceptable congressional authorization, the President may employ those forces as he sees fit, and his tactical decisions are not subject to review by Congress, even though we might not like them. In considering the current operation in Cambodia, we must, then, ask two questions: First, are American troops in South Vietnam pursuant to an acceptable congressional authorization; and second, does the Cambodian sanctuary area constitute a constitutionally permissible area of operations pursuant to the original authorization?

We can dismiss the first question rather quickly: The SEATO Treaty, the Tonkin Gulf resolution, the Vietnam military appropriations bills, and the other acts and resolutions relating to the existence of hostilities in Vietnam clothe the action with constitutionality.

The real question is: Assuming the legitimacy of our presence in South Vietnam, did the President have the authority to extend the theater of operations into another country?

There are several arguments in support of such authority. The case of the steamboat *Caroline* appears on point. It is a rather interesting case, Mr. President, because it is right hand to the question with which we are dealing here.

In December of 1837, a group of British subjects and American citizens organized a raiding party in New York State for the purpose of launching an attack upon Canada, a British province. They arranged for the hire of the steamboat *Caroline*, an American vessel, to transport men and supplies from Fort Schlosser, N.Y., to the invasion site in Canada. New York authorities, fully aware of the intentions of the party, made no efforts to stop the endeavor. In fact, the authorities allowed the raiders to "steal" arms and ammunition from the State storehouses in broad daylight by the simple expedient of leaving them unguarded.

The weapons and supplies were loaded aboard the *Caroline*. On the night of December 29, a British boarding party crossed into U.S. waters where the *Caroline* was anchored, seized her, and set her afire. One American citizen was killed in the skirmish.

The United States filed a formal protest with the British Government demanding reparations and an apology for the attack. The Queen's Government refused. Lord Palmerston, the Foreign Secretary, stated the British legal position in language which is singularly appropriate to the circumstances surrounding our Cambodian operation. Wrote Lord Palmerston:

> The people of New York had begun to make war against her majesty's Canadian provinces. They had done so, apparently, with the connivance of the authorities of the State. Not only the New York territory of Scholosser had lost its neutral character, and had become enemy's land, but other portions of the territory of that State had assumed the same condition. One or other of two things must be—either the government of New York, Knowingly and intentionally, permitted the band of invaders to organize and equip themselves within the State, and to arm themselves for war, against British territory, out of the military stores of the State, or else the State government had lost its authority over the border district; and those districts were, for the moment, in open defiance of the power of the State government, as well as at war with the opposite British province.
>
> In the first case, the British authorities in Canada had a right to retaliate war for war. In the second case, they were no longer bound to respect as neutral that portion of a territory which, by shaking off its obedience to a neutral government, had ceased to be neutral, and could certainly not be entitled to the privilege of protecting persons who were actively engaged in making war upon her majesty's territory.

Secretary of State Daniel Webster accepted the British position, and the United States dropped its demand for reparations. The *Caroline* incident has since become a decisive precedent for the position at international law that a state may protect itself and its citizens from the threat of imminent attack by a preemptive military action. William Edward Hall in his "A Treatise on International Law" sets forth the rule in this language:

> If the safety of a state is gravely and immediately threatened either by occurences in another state, or aggression prepared there, which the government of the latter is unable or professes itself to be unable, to prevent, or when there is an imminent certainty that such occurrences or aggression will take place if measures are not taken to forestall them, the circumstances may fairly be considered to be such as to place the right of self-preservation above the duty of respecting a freedom of action which must have become nominal, on the supposition that the state from which the danger comes is willing, if it can, to perform its international duties.

What were the facts surrounding the threat posed by the operations of North Vietnamese and Vietcong forces in Cambodia? First, they were present in violation of the avowed neutrality of Cambodia. I might interpolate here, as I said eariler in my speech, that there were diplomatic efforts made by both Sihanouk and Lon Nol to get the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese out of Cambodian territory—all totally ineffective. Second, they were engaged in launching attacks upon the territory of South Vietnam and upon the personnel of the armed forces of South Vietnam and the United States. Third, they posed a serious threat to the integrity of South Vietnam and the safety of American and Vietnamese military personnel. Fourth, the Government of Cambodia was unable to resist their movement and prevent their attacks across the border.

As a result of these facts, it is clear that under international law South Vietnam and the United States had the right to attack those portions of Cambodia occupied by North Vietnamese and Viet Cong forces and to destroy their illegal base of operations. At international law, this right attached without regard to the attitude of the Cambodian Government. The attack would have been permissible even if the Cambodian Government had objected which it did not.

Just as the United States could not permit its territory to be used as a base of operations against British Canada, so too could Cambodia not permit its territory to be used as a base of operations against South Vietnam. And as the British had every right to enter into U.S. waters and destroy an American ship, so too did the United States and South Vietnam have every right to enter into Cambodia and destroy the Communist supply bases.

It might be argued that, although the United States had a right at international law to invade Cambodia and destroy the bases from which attacks were being launched against American forces, under our Constitution that right could be exercised only pursuant to an explicit authorization of Congress—that is, the right of retaliation at international law accrued to the United States, not to the President, and whether that right should be exercised was, under the Constitution, a question for Congress to decide.

This leads us back to further consideration of the Commander in Chief powers of the President. It would be agreed, I suspect, that the President, in the exercise of his Commander in Chief powers, would have the sole authority to decide which military operations within South Vietnam he regarded as appropriate in defense of American forces, that is, if he determined that an attack upon Communist forces in war zone C was necessary to save American lives, Congress would not presume to believe that he should seek its permission before he issued an order for the attack.

The question of the legality of the President's decision to attack Communist forces in the Cambodian sanctuaries arises because he ordered American forces across an internationally recognized frontier.

But what are the implications of that crossing? Is it a new war against a new enemy? Does it change the nature of the war, denote a new political objective, involve a new commitment? No, it does not. It is the same war against the same enemy in pursuance of the same political objectives.

American forces did not enter Cambodia either to oppose or to support the Cambodian Government. It entered to find and destroy the supply bases of the North Vietnamese—the enemy which we have been fighting for 5 years in South Vietnam. We incurred no new obligation by crossing the border. Neither the character of the war nor the identity of the enemy changed when we crossed from South Vietnam. It is the same war and the same enemy. I might add, even some of the same troops who have periodically used those bases as attack bases for incursions into South Vietnam.

What constitutional reason, Mr. President, should have prompted the President to seek from Congress permission for a tactical military operation which did not change the character of the war which we have been waging for 5 years, which did not involve new belligerents,

which did not encompass new commitments?

Mr. President, the hard constitutional fact is that the President had every power as Commander in Chief to make the decision to attack the sanctuaries in Cambodia. His action was in accordance with international law, it was in accordance with precedent going back to the earliest days of the Republic, it was in accordance with sound military judgment and prudent diplomatic risk.

I am not arguing that it is impossible to quarrel with the wisdom of the President's action. That is a question upon which men of good will can easily disagree. What I am arguing is that it is impossible to argue that his action was constitutionally unauthorized.

American forces were being attacked by an enemy which was illegally operating from sanctuaries in a purportedly neutral country. The presence of these sanctuaries presented a threat to the safety of American forces in South Vietnam, or so the President determined—and under the Constitution he is the sole judge of the military necessities of the battlefield. In accordance with the internationally recognized right of self-defense and in compliance with the authority bestowed by the Constitution upon him as Commander in Chief of our Armed Forces, he decided to reduce the threat to the safety of American personnel by attacking those sanctuaries.

There is, Mr. President, one point of constitutional law upon which all of us agree: That every citizen is constitutionally authorized to criticize the President.

The Presiding Officer (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio) has often done so. The Senator now speaking has often done so. It depends upon the circumstances. And I would hate to have anyone even imply that we could not do that. But I like to recall the wise words of Benjamin Disraeli:

> It is much easier to be critical than to be correct.

Mr. President, no man in public life deliberately chooses to do the wrong thing. All of us are committed to the cause of peace, and no man has a stronger commitment than our present President, President Nixon.

Things are, I believe, going well in Vietnam. Over 115,000 Americans have come home from the war. Another 150,000 will come home in the next year. The Vietnamization program shows every sign of progressing according to the schedule laid down by the President.

The latest military reports, quoting from the Military Update of Cambodian Operations dated May 22, 1970, the following:

In this operation there have been over 7,400 enemy killed.

There have been over 1,700 taken prisoner.

There have been 10,253 individual weapons captured.

There have been 1,566 crew-served weapons captured.

There have been 13,020 rocket rounds captured.

There have been 21,304 mortar rounds captured.

There have been over 7 million rounds of small arms ammunition captured.

There have been over 2,000 land mines captured.

There have been over 5,600 bunkers destroyed.

There have been over 250 vehicles destroyed or captured.

These were being used not only to supply reserves but also, in fact, were being used, or would have been used, to continue war on American and South Vietnamese troops in South Vietnam. They were being used, in part, by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong in attacking Cambodia.

This is very interesting. We do not hear anything about this.

Mr. President, the question of the legality of the U.S. position in Vietnam has been given searching study by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Asociation. I would like at this time to review for the record some of their findings.

By the Geneva Accords of 1954, the Commanders in Chief of the French forces of Indochina, on the one hand, and of the People's Army of Vietnam, on the other, established the 17th parallel as the military demarcation line between North and South Vietnam, with a demilitarized zone on each side of the line. They stipulated that the armed forces of each party were to respect the demilitarized zone and the territory of the other zone, and that neither zone was to be used "for the resumption of hostilities or to further an aggressive policy." The accords additionally provided for the creation of an International Commission, composed of India, chairman, Poland and Canada, to supervise the agreements.

In 1962 the International Commission reported, with approval, findings of its Legal Committee to the effect that—

> There is evidence to show that arms, armed and unarmed personnel, munitions and other supplies have been sent from the Zone in the North to the Zone in the South with the objective of supporting, organizing and carrying out hostile activities, including armed attacks, directed against the Armed Forces and Administration of the Zone in the South, and that the People's Army of Vietnam has allowed the Zone in the North to be used for inciting, encouraging, and supporting hostile activities in the Zone in the South, aimed at the overthrow of the Administration in the South.

These are findings which are in clear violation of the 1954 agreement signed by North Vietnam.

I continue to read from the House of Delegates report:

> The evidence further demonstrates that the aggression by North Vietnam against South Vietnam (the Republic of Vietnam) had been going on unabashedly since the signing of the Geneva Accords and that North Vietnam had consistently violated those accords from their inception. An official State Department report recites:
>
> While negotiating an end to the Indochina War at Geneva in 1954, the Communists were making plans to take over all former French territory in Southeast Asia. When Viet-Nam was partitioned, thousands of carefully selected party members were ordered to remain in place in the South and keep their secret apparatus intact to help promote Hanoi's cause. Arms and ammunition were stored away for future use.
>
> It is important to bear in mind that neither the Republic of (South) Vietnam nor the United States is a party to the Geneva Accords, and that while the United States participated in the discussions leading up to the accords, it did not sign the final declaration. However, during the last plenary session of the Geneva Conference on July 21, 1954, Under Secretary of State Walter Bedell Smith, head of the United States delegation, said in an official statement that his Government "would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the aforesaid agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security."

On September 8, 1954, just a few weeks after the Geneva Accords were executed, the Southeast Asia Collective Defense—SEATO—Treaty was signed. Parties to it were the United States, Great Britain, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, Pakistan, and the Philippines. The U.S. Senate ratified the treaty on February 1, 1955, by a vote of 82 to 1. It took effect on February 19, 1955.

Paragraph 1 of article IV of the SEATO Treaty provides that each party thereto "recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against any of the parties or against any State or territory which the parties, by unanimous agreement may hereafter designate, would endanger its own peace and safety, and agrees that it will in that event act to meet the common danger in accordance with its constitutional processes." By a protocol to the treaty executed on the same day, the parties "unanimously designated for the purposes of article IV the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam."

The SEATO Treaty was made by the parties in a reiteration of "their faith in the purposes and principles set forth in the Charter of the United Nations," nothing in which, according to Article 52 thereof, "precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action." Article 53 of the charter provides:

> No enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements or by regional agencies without the authorization of the Security Council.

These two articles are at the head of chapter VIII.

The preceding chapter VII deals with "Action With Respect to Threats to the Peace, Breaches of the Peace, and Acts of Aggression." The first 12 articles—39 to 50, inclusive—of that chapter prescribe the measures to be taken by the Security Council to meet "any threat to the peace, breach of the peace or act of aggression." By the last article, 51, of that chapter, it is stipulated expressly:

> Nothing in the present Charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security.

It was clearly with these provisions of articles 51 and 52 of the Charter of the United Nations in mind that, in article IV of the SEATO Treaty, each party thereto agreed that it would "act to meet the common danger" in the event of "aggression by means of armed attack anywhere in the treaty area"—Southeast Asia and Southwest Pacific. "Enforcement action" is clearly action to enforce decisions of the Security Council under articles 39 and 50 of chapter VII of the charter. Equally clearly, "enforcement action" does not include measures of "individual or collective self-defense." So that when article 53 of the charter provides that—

No enforcement action shall be taken under regional arrangements without the authorization of the Security Council.

It does not refer to such measures of "self-defense" as are contemplated under the SEATO Treaty, particularly in light of the explicit recital of article 51 of the charter that—

Nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual or collective self-defense.

The "Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference," issued on July 21, 1954, the same day on which the Geneva Accords were signed, states:

The Conference recognizes that the essential purpose of the agreement relating to Vietnam is to settle military questions with a view to ending hostilities and that the military demarcation line is provisional and should not in any way be interpreted as constituting a political or territorial boundary.

It was by no means contemplated, however, that there was to be no ultimate partition of Vietnam. On the contrary, the very next article, 7, of the final declaration provided expressly that the political problems of "independence, unity, and territorial integrity" were to be determined by free elections, internationally supervised. That article reads that—

So far as Vietnam is concerned, the settlement of political problems, effected on the basis of respect for the principles of independence, unity and territorial integrity, shall permit the Vietnamese people to enjoy the fundamental freedoms, guaranteed by democratic institutions established as a result of free general elections by secret ballot . . . under the supervision of an international commission.

It will be recalled that by the protocol to the SEATO Treaty, South Vietnam—the free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam—was promised protection as such under the treaty. Reference has since been made to South Vietnam as a "protocol state."

In addition to the reference in the contemporaneous protocol to the SEATO Treaty to—

The State of Vietnam, the Republic of (South) Vietnam has been recognized as a separate international entity by approximately 60 governments around the world. It has been admitted as a member of several of the specialized agencies of the United Nations. In 1957, the General Assembly voted to recommend South Vietnam for membership in the United Nations, and its admission was frustrated only by the veto of the Soviet Union in the Security Council.

The right of self-defense under article 51 of the Charter of the United Nations is expressed to be unimpaired "if an armed attack occurs against a Member of the United Nations," and it has been asserted by opponents of United States policy in Vietnam that this amounts to explicit denial of such a right in the event of attacks against nonmembers of the United Nations. A thesis that members of the United Nations are not permitted to participate in collective self-defense to repel aggression, on the ground that the aggrieved nation is not a member of the United Nations, can hardly be supported on its face, in reason, logic, or law. Would proponents of this doctrine suggest that members of the United Nations would have no right to assist Switzerland in self-defense against a foreign invader?

But the right of self-defense has always existed independently of the charter, and that right is recognized expressly in article 51. It is quite obvious that the charter merely confirms, as to members of the United Nations, the innate right of self-defense appertaining to both members and nonmembers. Article 51 expressly retains, unimpaired, the "inherent" right of both individual and collective self-defense, thus implicitly recognizing the independent existence of the right of members to come to the aid of nonmembers in collective self-defense against aggression, or attack "to maintain international peace and security," the very first purpose of the United Nations itself, as stated in the charter.

On August 7, 1964, the Congress adopted, by a vote of 88 to 2 in the Senate and 416 to 0 in the House, the joint Southeast Asia resolution, in which the preambular clauses recite that:

Naval units of the Communist regime in Vietnam, in violation of the principles of the Charter of the United Nations and of international law, have deliberately and repeatedly attacked United States naval vessels, lawfully present in international waters, and have thereby created a serious threat to international peace: these attacks are part of a deliberate and systematic campaign of aggression—

Against the South Vietnamese—

and the nations joined with them in the collective defense of their freedom.

The resolution then states:

The Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression; that the United States regards as vital to its national interest and to world peace and the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia; and that consonant with the Constitution of the United States and the Charter of the United Nations and in accordance with its obligations under the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty, the United States is, therefore, prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom.

Keep in mind that protocol states include the territory of South Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos, among others.

In an address delivered at Gettysburg, Pa., on April 4, 1959, President Eisenhower declared that his administration had reached "the inescapable conclusion that our own national interests demand some help from us in sustaining in Vietnam the morale and the military strength necessary to its continued existence in freedom." In a letter of December 14, 1961, to the President of the Republic of Vietnam, President Kennedy recalling that the Communist regime of North Vietnam had "violated the provisions of the Geneva Accords to which they bound themselves in 1954" and that "at that time, the United States, although not a party to the accords, declared that it 'would view any renewal of the aggression in violation of the agreements with grave concern and as seriously threatening international peace and security.'" assured him that "in accordance with that declaration, and in response to your request, we are prepared to help the Republic of Vietnam to preserve its independence."

In President Johnson's message of August 5, 1964, to Congress, reporting the Communist attacks on U.S. naval vessels in the international waters of the Gulf of Tonkin, he said:

The North Vietnamese regime has constantly sought to take over South Vietnam and Laos. This Communist regime has violated the Geneva accords for Vietnam. It has systematically conducted a campaign of subversion, which includes the direction, training, and supply of personnel and arms for the conduct of guerrilla warfare in South Vietnamese territory . . . Our military and economic assistance to South Vietnam and Laos in particular has the purpose of helping these countries to repel aggression and strengthen their independence. The threat to the free nations of southeast Asia has long been clear.

The Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam questions whether President Johnson's deployment of U.S. forces to Vietnam can "be squared with our Constitution for, contrary to widely held assumptions, the power to make and conduct foreign policy is not vested exclusively in the President, but is divided between him and Congress." In his message of August 5, 1964, to the Congress, President Johnson went on to say unequivocally:

As President of the United States I have concluded that I should now ask the Congress on its part, to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom.

And the President forthrightly requested that Congress adopt "a resolution expressing the support of the Congress for all necessary action to protect our Armed Forces and to defend freedom and preserve peace in Southeast Asia in accordance with the obligations of the United States under the Southeast Asia Treaty."

Two days later, on August 7, in response to this message from the President, Congress adopted the resolution quoted above, and on August 10 the President signed it as Public Law 88-408.

Article 51 of the Charter of the United

Nations, which provides that "nothing in the present charter shall impair the inherent right of individual and collective, self-defense," requires that "measures taken by members in the exercise of this right of self-defense shall be immediately reported to the Security Council." That the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty was made under and in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, particularly article 51, is evidenced by the provision of paragraph 1 of article IV of the treaty—by which each party agreed to participate in defending acts of aggression in the treaty area—that "measures taken under this paragraph shall be immediately reported to the Security Council of the United Nations."

On August 5, 1964, Adlai E. Stevenson, U.S. representative to the United Nations and the Security Council, advised the Council formally of two "deliberate armed attacks" by North Vietnamese torpedo boats against a naval unit of the United States on the high seas. He declared that "these wanton acts of violence and destruction" were simply part of "the sabotage of the international machinery established to keep the peace by the Geneva agreements—and the deliberate, systematic and flagrant violations of those agreements by two regimes which signed them and which by all tenets of decency, law and civilized practice are bound by their provisions," all of which, he said, "fit into the larger pattern of what has been going on in Southeast Asia for the past decade and a half."

Ambassador Stevenson assured the Security Council:

> We are in Southeast Asia to help our friends preserve their own opportunity to be free of imported terror and alien assassination, managed by the North Viet-Nam Communists based in Hanoi and backed by the Chinese Communists from Peiping. He affirmed solemnly "that the deployments of additional U.S. forces to Southeast Asia are designed solely to deter further aggression.

On February 7, 1965, Ambassador Stevenson, by a letter to the President of the Security Council, informed that body of "attacks by the Vietcong, which operates under the military orders of North Vietnamese authorities in Hanoi." He said the attacks were part of an overall plan "to make war against the legitimate government of South Vietnam" in "violation of international law and the Geneva Accords of 1954." He stated also that, as required by paragraph 2 of article IV of the Southeast Asia Treaty, the United States and Vietnamese Governments had consulted immediately and had agreed that it had become "necessary to take prompt defensive action" to resist "this continuing aggression." He reported further that the "countermeasures are a justified measure of self-defense," and that he was "reporting the measures which we have taken in accordance with our public commitment to assist the Republic of Vietnam against aggression from the north."

Of particular interest at this point is the reiterated assertion by the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam, phrased variously throughout its submission, that—

> Only the Security Council . . . is authorized to determine the existence of any . . . act of aggression and . . . the measures to be taken to maintain or restore international peace.

To the statements quoted above, which were made by Ambassador Stevenson in his letter of February 7, 1965, he added significantly:

> We deeply regret that the Hanoi regime, in its statement of August 8, 1964, which was circulated in Security Council Document S-5888, explicitly denied the right of the Security Council to examine this problem.

WHO DENIED IT? HANOI DID; NOT SOUTH VIETNAM

Less than 3 weeks later, in another letter to the President of the Security Council, Ambassador Stevenson transmitted to that body an extensive State Department report entitled "Aggression from the North: The Record of North Vietnam's Campaign To Conquer South Vietnam," the facts recited in which, Ambassador Stevenson submitted, "make it unmistakably clear that the character of that conflict is an aggressive war of conquest waged against a neighbor—and make nonsense of the cynical allegation that this is simply an indigenous insurrection."

Innumerable other reports, both formal and informal, were made to the Security Council by the representatives of the United States at the United Nations; and there was even one by President Johnson on July 28, 1965, bespeaking the continued efforts of Secretary General U Thant to find a solution of the Vietnamese problem through the United Nations. In the last of these reports available as this article is written—two letters of January 31, 1966, from Ambassador Goldberg to the President of the Security Council—it is requested "that an urgent meeting of the Council be called promptly to consider the situation in Vietnam." A draft resolution, calling "for immediate discussions without preconditions among the appropriate interested governments looking toward the application of the Geneva Accords and the establishment of a durable peace in Southeast Asia," was transmitted with the second of these letters for consideration by the council. Ambassador Goldberg said:

> We are firmly convinced that in light of its obligations under the Charter to maintain international peace and security . . . the Council should address itself urgently and positively to this situation and exert its most vigorous endeavors and its immense prestige to finding a prompt solution to it.

Despite all prior, and this formal urgent submission of the Vietnamese problem to the Security Council, it has never taken any action of any kind looking toward the restoration of international peace and security to Southeast Asia. Neither has the Council expressed the slightest criticism of any action taken by the United States in the SEATO area.

In its memorandum in opposition to the policy of the United States, the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam asserts that—

> The conduct of the United States Government in Vietnam appears plainly to violate the terms of the Geneva Accords.

While the United States is not a party to the accords, it did by contemporaneous unilateral declaration agree, in effect, to respect them. But, as demonstrated above, the Geneva accords since their inception have been violated continuously by the Hanoi regime. It is an accepted principle of international law that a material breach of a treaty by one of the parties thereto dissolves the obligations of the other parties at least to the extent of withholding compliance until the defaulting party purges its breach.

It has been suggested that because the power to declare war is vested by the Constitution in the Congress alone, the deployment of U.S. forces to Vietnam by the President, without a formal congressional declaration of war, violates the constitutinal fiat. When the phrasing of this clause of the Constitution was being considered at the convention in 1787, its original form, vesting in Congress the power to "make" war, was changed to give it the power to "declare" war, "leaving the Executive the power to repel sudden attacks"—"he should be able to repel and not to commence war" and "to 'conduct' it which was an Executive function."

The President is, under section 2 of article II of the Constitution, the "Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States." Throughout the history of the United States, he has been deemed to have authority to deploy the country's military forces to trouble spots around the world, frequently in combat. The Department of State has a record of some 125 such instances.

In the last analysis, however, the exercise of the President's power as Commander in Chief in deploying forces of the United States to Southeast Asia for the defense of the Republic of Vietnam has had the repeated sanction of the Senate, as well as of the Congress as a whole, so that, although the situation now seems unquestionably to constitute war in its techncial sense, a formal congressional verbal declaration of war as such could not conceivably be essential to clothe the President's conduct with constitutional validity. This congressional sanction has been evidence by overwhelming majorities in the Senate's approval of the SEATO Treaty, in the adoption of the joint congressional Southeast Asia resolution of August 10, 1964, and in the passage of the appropriations necessary to carry on the defensive actions undertaken by the Executive.

First, as to the treaty. In it—paragraph 1, article IV—each of the parties "recognizes that aggression by means of armed attack in the treaty area against" any of them or against the "free territory under the jurisdiction of the State of Vietnam"—protocol—"would endanger its own peace and safety."

The "treaty area," under article VIII, includes "the general area of the Southwest Pacific not north of 21 degrees 30 minutes north latitude." The United States has historically owned tremendously important and valuable strategic territorial interests in that area. Aside from its trusteeship over the Marianas—

except Guam—Marshall and Caroline Islands, the United States owns Guam, Wake, and the Samoan group. And yet the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam has asserted that "SEATO is not a regional agency within the letter or spirit of the U.N. Charter," because "articles 51 and 53 envisaged regional systems which historically and geographically developed into a regional community not contemplating a regional system which fuses Southeast Asia with a country of the North American Continent"—"separated by oceans and thousands of miles from Southeast Asia."

In the cited paragraph of the treaty, the United States agreed that in the event of aggression in the treaty area it would "act to meet the common danger." In recommending ratification of the treaty to the Senate, its Foreign Relations Committee reported that—

> The committee is not impervious to the risks which this treaty entails. It fully appreciates that the acceptance of these obligations commit the United States to a course of action over a vast expanse of the Pacific. Yet these risks are consistent with our own highest interest.

The Senate ratified the treaty on February 1, 1955, by a vote of 82 to 1.

In light of all of the foregoing, it seems difficult to find anything in the nature of an adequate foundation for the ipse dixit of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Towards Vietnam that—

> The "Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty"—connecting the United States with Southeast Asia, architectured by Secretary of State Dulles, is a legalistic artificial formulation to circumvent the fundamental limitations placed by the United Nations Charter on unilateral actions by individual members.

Undoubtedly the clearest and most unequivocal congressional sanction of the President's deployment of U.S. forces for the defense of South Vietnam is contained in the joint Southeast Asia resolution of August 10, 1964, reciting expressly "that the Congress approves and supports the determination of the President, as Commander in Chief, to take all necessary measures to repel any armed attack against the forces of the United States and to prevent further aggression," and that the United States is "prepared, as the President determines, to take all necessary steps, including the use of armed force, to assist any member or protocol state of the Southeast Asia Collective Defense Treaty requesting assistance in defense of its freedom."

The Lawyers' Committee on American Policy Towards Viet Nam quotes a passage from an article in the Washington Daily News of June 4, 1965, by Richard Starnes, read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD by Senator Ernest Gruening of Alaska, which states that the joint resolution was "passed in the fever of indignation that followed" the Gulf of Tonkin attacks, and then, again as their own ipse dixit, assert that "there is no evidence that Congress thought or understood that it was declaring war."

This statement is simply incorrect. When the President sent his message to Congress on August 5, 1964, recommending passage of "a resolution expressing the support of Congress for all necessary action to protect our Armed Forces and to assist nations covered by the SEATO treaty," he stated explicity that he "should now ask the Congress on its part, to join in affirming the national determination that all such attacks will be met, and that the United States will continue in its basic policy of assisting the free nations of the area to defend their freedom."

In the course of a colloquy on the floor of the Senate on August 6, 1964, between Senator JOHN SHERMAN COOPER of Kentucky and Senator J. WILLIAM FULBRIGHT of Arkansas, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee which recommended passage of the resolution the following discussion—excerpts—took place:

> Senator COOPER. Are we now (by this resolution) giving the President advance authority to take whatever action he may deem necessary respecting South Vietnam and its defense, or with respect to the defense of any other country included in the treaty?
>
> Senator FULBRIGHT. I think that is correct.
>
> Senator COOPER. Then, looking ahead, if the President decided that it was necessary to use such force as could lead us into war, we would give that authority by this resolution?
>
> Senator FULBRIGHT. That is the way I would interpret it.

Senator Morse himself called the resolution "a predated declaration of war," which would, somewhat enigmatically, give "to the President what I honestly and sincerely believe is an unconstitutional power to make war without a declaration of war." The enigma in this puzzling concept seems to arise from the rather simple and logical hypothesis that the function of a legislative "declaration of war" is to authorize the Executive "to make war." Since, by Senator Morse's own statement, the resolution authorizes the President "to make war," it surely has the same legal effect as a congressional "declaration of war" in haec verba would have had.

Actually, while two or three members of the Senate expressed doubt as to whether the resolution was intended to go as far as it did, there was no real question about it. Senator Morse himself made extended speeches against it, repeatedly warning his colleagues as to its dire import, in such words as that it "does go beyond the inherent authority of the President to act in the self-defense of our country and does vest in him authority to proceed to carry out a campaign that amounts in fact to the waging of war."

In the course of a recent debate on the floor of the Senate on a bill for an appropriation in support of the military forces in Vietnam, Senator RICHARD B. RUSSELL, of Georgia, chairman of the Armed Services Committee, said:

> I knew that the joint resolution conferred a vast grant of power upon the President. It is written in terms that are not capable of misinterpretation, and about which it is difficult to become confused . . . The language could not have been drawn more clearly. Personally, I would be ashamed to say that I did not realize what I was voting for when I voted for that joint resolution. It is only one page in length. It is clear. It is explicit. It contains a very great grant of power.

During the hearings on that appropriation bill before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on February 18, 1966, Senator Morse asked Secretary of State Rusk whether he thought that the vote on the Southeast Asia resolution "would have been the same if my colleagues in the Senate had contemplated that it might lead to 200,000 or 400,000 or 600,000 American troops in South Vietnam?" The Secretary replied:

> I doubt very much that the vote would be substantially different.

In response to that, Senator Morse commented that there would be "a chance next week to find out. He said:

> I intend to offer (a rescission resolution) as an amendment to the pending business in the Senate.

On March 1, Senator Morse offered his amendment to the military appropriation bill, to provide that—

> The "joint resolution to promote the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia . . . is hereby repealed.

To avoid any question as to the effect and meaning of a vote on his amendment, Senator Morse himself declared that it "would be a vote to make clear to the President that those who vote for the amendment disapprove of the continuation of the exercise of the power he has been exercising under the Tonkin Bay resolution." Senator RUSSELL said:

> The defeat of the proposal of the Senator from Oregon by the Members of the Senate . . . will leave the original joint resolution . . . unimpaired, in full strength and vigor, and with Congress, except for two Members of the Senate who voted against the 1964 resolution, solemnly and solidly behind the President in the steps that he has taken in Southeast Asia.

After full debate, Senator MANSFIELD of Montana, the distinguished majority leader, moved to table Senator Morse's amendment, and the motion was carried, 92 to 5. After some further discussion, Senator RUSSELL moved for passage of the appropriation bill, and his motion carried by a vote of 93 to 2.

One of the best means available to Congress, in my opinion, for the control of executive action is through the power of the purse—the ultimate necessity of congressional action for appropriations to provide funds to carry out executive functions. As stated by Senator Morse during the hearings on the military appropriation bill:

> A vote on this pending piece of business in the Senate really is a vote as to whether or not we are going to continue to support this program, because the only check, one of the best checks we have, is to say we are not going to finance it.

As stated, the bill was passed in the Senate by a vote of 93 to 2. The vote in the House was 392 to 4.

The legal authority of the President of the United States to conduct the present war, for "the maintenance of international peace and security in Southeast Asia," which, as Congress declared in its 1964 resolution, "the United States re-

gards as vital to its national interest and to world peace," is surely sustained amply by the composite impact of that resolution, the terms of the SEATO Treaty ratified by the Senate and the appropriations made by the Congress to support the military actions in the treaty area.

That the memorandum of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam is grounded on an emotional attitude opposed to U.S. policy, rather than on law, is not only demonstrated by a look at the facts, but is emphasized as well by the memorandum's concluding paragraph:

> Should we not, twenty years after President Roosevelt's hopeful dream—twenty years after the advent of the nuclear age with the awesome potentiality of incineration of our planet and the annihilation of our civilization and the culture of millenia—Should we not "spell the end of the system of unilateral action . . . that has been tried for centuries—and has always failed"?

Contrasted with the tone and substance of that memorandum is the temperate statement of 31 professors of international law from leading law schools throughout the United States, which recites simply that they "wish to affirm that the presence of U.S. forces in South Vietnam at the request of the government of that country is lawful under general principles of international law and the United Nations Charter. The engagement of U.S. forces in hostilities at the request of the Government of South Vietnam is a legitimate use of force in defense of South Vietnam against aggression."

Contrasted also with the tone and temper of the memorandum of the Lawyers Committee on American Policy Toward Vietnam is the simple resolution adopted unanimously on February 21, 1966, by the House of Delegates of the American Bar Association on the joint recommendation of its Standing Committee on Peace and Law Through United Nations and its Section of International and Comparative Law. The resolution is supported by a brief report, which concludes "that the position of the United States in Vietnam is legal under international law, and is in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations and the Southeast Asia Treaty."

The road to peace cannot easily be traversed by a divided people. Never was there a greater need for unity, for confidence, for hope.

Mr. President, I believe the President when he says that it was necessary to attack Cambodian sanctuaries in order to guarantee the safety of American forces in South Vietnam. I have just put in the RECORD the cumulative results of what we have already captured there. Any one of those weapons was subject to use, if they had not been captured and destroyed, to attack both our Armed Forces and the South Vietnamese. In that connection—the necessity of attacking the Cambodian sanctuaries in order to guarantee the safety of American forces—Mr. Stewart Alsop has written an excellent article and incisive analysis of the situation which appeared in the most recent issue of Newsweek, which bears the date May 25, 1970. I ask unanimous consent that the entire article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

[From the Newsweek, May 25, 1970]

MR. NIXON'S GREAT RETREAT

(By Stewart Alsop)

WASHINGTON.—In a queer sort of way, President Nixon and his bitterest critics are in collusion. Neither the President nor his enemies wants to talk about what the President is really doing in Vietnam. This exercise in mutual self-deception has wholly distorted the reality, and lent a strange never-never-land quality to the whole, bitter Vietnam debate.

What the President is really doing is to conduct a great military retreat—the greatest in American history. But for quite natural reasons he doesn't want to admit it—probably even to himself. So he wraps his retreat in thick layers of defiant, neo-Churchillian oratory.

The President's critics don't want to admit that the President is engaged in a great retreat either, because if they did they would have much less left to criticize. So they use the Nixonian rhetoric to prove that Mr. Nixon is not really retreating at all, but is instead expanding and prolonging an "outrageous" war.

This mutual self-deception accounts for the fog of unreality that has overhung so much of what has been said and written about the Cambodian operation. If you listen to the President, the Cambodian operation is the product of a great, historic Presidential decision, comparable to the great decisions of Wilson, Roosevelt, Eisenhower and Kennedy. If you listen to the President's critics, the Cambodian operation is an outrageous "invasion" of a small, neutral country (the 60,000 North Vietnamese already in Cambodia were presumably just having a big picnic) which will "sink the United States ever deeper in the Southeast Asian quagmire."

DANGEROUS

Of course, the Cambodian operation is neither of these things. It is a limited spoiling attack, designed to protect the rear guard of the American retreat. Retreat, as Napolean or Marshal Rommel could attest, is a most difficult and dangerous military maneuver. All retreats present a common problem. How do you protect your rear guard, and thus prevent your retreat from turning into a rout?

In terms of this question, the Cambodian operation makes obvious military sense. In fact, the President had little real choice—he had to end the inviolability of the Communists' Cambodian sanctuaries one way or another, unless he was willing to halt his retreat or accept the risk of military disaster to his rear guard.

That Mr. Nixon is conducting the greatest retreat in American history is obvious on the face of it. When he became President, he inherited an American force in Vietnam of 525,000 men. Within a year, he will have withdrawn at least 265,000 men, and his rear guard will consist of two divisions, maybe only one. A year later, on the current schedule, there will be about 30,000 U.S. support troops left in Vietnam.

If withdrawing half a million men is not a retreat, what in heaven's name is it? Mr. Nixon's answer is "Vietnamization," but that is a euphemism.

MEANINGLESS

It is not surprising that the President does not like to talk about his great retreat. Like all Presidents, he feels history breathing down his neck, and retreat is not a good way for a politician to get himself transmogrified into a great man. Retreating in the face of Communist power is in any case not the sort of thing a man who built his political career on a reputation as a hard-line anti-Communist likes to do.

So it is natural that Mr. Nixon—perhaps quite sincerely—should keep repeating like a metronome his promise not to be the first American President to preside over "defeat and humiliation." But the promise is meaningless. For it is silly to suppose that a division or two—much less 30,000 support troops—can provide a guarantee against defeat for our side in the war. All retreats, in the nature of things, involve the risk of defeat.

The Cambodian operation is designed to reduce the risk, and it will undoubtedly do so. As of this writing, at least, the operation is a very considerable military success. Much greater stores of weapons and supplies have been captured than in any previous operation. Those weapons and supplies cannot now be turned against our dwindling manpower in Vietnam—and after all, kids in uniform have no more desire to be shot at than kids on campuses.

But more important than the booty captured in Cambodia is the simple fact that henceforth the Communists, even if they make great effort to rebuild their bases, will know that the bases are no longer secure. Secure bases are absolutely essential to a successful guerrilla operation. To cite an example from personal experience, the French *Maquis*, in which this writer served for a couple of months in World War II, would have quickly faded into nothingness without the weapons and supplies parachuted into France by the Allied secret services.

Because of the Cambodian operation, the President may yet end up with the better of the argument with his natural enemies, the liberal Democrats. The Senate liberals are now lining up behind the amendment to deny all funds for combat in Vietnam after June 30 of next year, which is, of course, a receipe for turning the retreat into a rout. There is no doubt that most Americans ache in their bones to get out of Vietnam. But there are dangers to the Democrats in making Vietnam the central issue this year.

SIMPLE PLAN

One danger is that the Cambodian operation will go well enough so that the President can rapidly accelerate his great retreat—an idea that has certainly occurred to the President. When you strip away all the rhetoric, the President's famous "plan" for Vietnam is very simple. It is to retreat as quickly as possible, provided that the retreat does not become a rout; and provided that the people who have been fighting on our side have at least a chance to avoid defeat at the hands of the Communists when our retreat is completed.

This is not very heroic, but it is perfectly sensible, and moreover there is a chance, and maybe a pretty good one, that retreat will not mean defeat. But the President has got to risk defeat—he has no choice. The spasm of national hysteria induced by the relatively minor Cambodian operation shows how little time the President has left. He must substantially complete his retreat from Vietnam within a matter of not too many months. Otherwise, this fat and flabby country, which was not fitted by history or temperament for the great-power role thrust upon it by the second world war, seems likely to go mad. Maybe it has gone mad already.

Mr. DOMINICK. In order to emphasize some of this, I shall recite, for the benefit of my colleagues who are listening, some of the things Mr. Alsop said:

> The Cambodian operation is . . . a limited spoiling attack, designed to protect the rear guard of the American retreat. Retreat, as Napoleon or Marshal Rommel could attest, is a most difficult and dangerous military

maneuver. All retreats present a common problem. How do you protect your rear guard, and thus prevent your retreat from turning into a rout?

In terms of this question, the Cambodian operation makes obvious military sense. In fact, the President had little real choice—he had to end the inviolability of the Communists' Cambodian sanctuaries one way or another, unless he was willing to halt his retreat or accept the risk of military disaster to his rear guard.

Nothing could be more plain than that. Nothing could be more obvious that it is correct than simply watching what has already been seized and destroyed in the way of enemy ammunition.

Mr. Alsop goes on to point out:

Within a year, (the President) will have withdrawn at least 265,000 men, and his rear guard will consist of two divisions, maybe only one. A year later, on the current schedule, there will be about 30,000 U.S. support troops left in Vietnam.

He goes on to say, in part:

The Cambodian operation is designed to reduce the risk, and it will undoubtedly do so. As of this writing, at least, the operation is a very considerable military success. Much greater stores of weapons and supplies have been captured than in any previous operation. Those weapons and supplies cannot now be turned against our dwindling manpower in Vietnam—and after all, kids in uniform have no more desire to be shot at than kids on campuses.

But more important than the booty captured in Cambodia is the simple fact that henceforth the Communists, even if they make the great effort to rebuild their bases, will know that the bases are no longer secure. Secure bases are absolutely essential to a successful guerrilla operation.

I said, Mr. President, that I was not going to read the entire article, and I will not. I include it in the RECORD because I think it is a very fine analysis.

Mr. President (Mr. YOUNG of Ohio), I believe the President when he says that he will withdraw all our forces from Cambodia by July 1. I believe the President when he says that he seeks a negotiated settlement to the war. It is, Mr. President, much, much easier to be critical than it is to be correct. I believe the time has come for the Senate to be more sparing in its criticism and more generous in its support of the President, while still asserting its right in determining future policy as to future actions involving American troops. I do believe there is ample precedent in the provision adopted last year with reference to Laos and Thailand to assert the role of Congress in sharing in the determination of where U.S. ground forces may be used in the future. For that reason, I offered my substitute which will accomplish this aim in terms of the President's own expressed intentions with respect to the use of U.S. ground combat forces in Cambodia.

Mr. President, this is a simple substitute. It states as follows:

In accord with the expressed statements of the President of the United States, none of the funds authorized by this or any other Act shall be used after July 1, 1970 to finance the introduction or retention of American ground combat troops into Cambodia without the prior consent of the Congress, except to the extent that such is required, as determined by the President and reported promptly to the Congress, to protect the lives of American troops remaining within South Vietnam.

Nothing could be simpler, exercising in writing the effort to do something by way of sharing in the responsibility of determination of policy, at the same time leaving the President with a maximum of flexibility so that he can continue to use his efforts to be successful in our objectives and save the lives of as many American troops as possible.

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 11:30 A.M. ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it stand in adjournment until 11:30 a.m. on Monday next.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR JAVITS ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that immediately upon disposition of the reading of the Journal on Monday next, the distinguished Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) be recognized for not to exceed one-half hour.

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

ORDER FOR RECOGNITION OF SENATOR YOUNG OF OHIO ON MONDAY NEXT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that upon completion of the remarks of the distinguished senior Senator from New York (Mr. JAVITS) on Monday morning next, the distinguished senior Senator from Ohio (Mr. YOUNG) be recognized for not to exceed 15 minutes.

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

HANOI'S TOUGHENING STAND

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, one of America's leading experts on current events in Southeast Asia is Stanley Karnow of the Washington Post. He recently reported that Hanoi's reaction to our Cambodia operation was to stiffen its resolve to fight U.S. forces in Vietnam, Laos, and Cambodia. This toughening stand is part of the price we are paying for our venture into Cambodia. It challenges, as Karnow says:

President Nixon's contention that his Cambodian venture will shorten the war.

This report is added evidence of how urgent it is to go no further into Cambodia. It underscores the need for Congress to backstop the President, in sharing with him the responsibility for setting the limits on the Cambodian front.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the article by Mr. Karnow printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 15, 1970]

UNITED STATES SEEN CAUSING STIFFER HANOI STAND

(By Stanley Karnow)

HONG KONG, May 14.—The American and South Vietnamese intervention in Cambodia seems to have stiffened Hanoi, reducing the prospects for a negotiated settlement of the widening Indochina conflict in the foreseeable future.

This view, which challenges President Nixon's contention that his Cambodian venture will shorten the war, is held by Western and Asian diplomatic analysts here as a result of their examination of North Vietnamese, Chinese and Soviet maneuvers and statements in recent weeks.

As these analysts see it, the U.S. thrust into Cambodia appears to have thwarted Soviet attempts to persuade the Vietnamese Communists to negotiate and has pushed them closer to China, which has long advocated a tough approach to the war.

A significant indication that the Chinese have registered gains in Hanoi was evident in the treatment they gave Le Duan, the first secretary of North Vietnam's Lao Dong (Workers Party), during his three-day visit to Peking this week.

Among other things, Le Duan was accorded a joint audience with Mao Tse-tung and his designated successor, Marshal Lin Piao, which one observer here described as "The Chinese equivalent of being received by Allah and the Prophet together."

In addition to having what a Chinese communique called a "very cordial and friendly conversation" with Mao and Lin, the North Vietnamese leader talked with Premier Chou En-lai and the Chinese army chief of staff, Gen. Huang Yung-sheng.

Analysts here believe that the Chinese probably pledged to step up their military and economic aid to Hanoi and the Vietcong in anticipation of a prolonged Indochinese conflict.

The fact that former Cambodian chief of state, Norodom Sihanouk bluntly asked the Soviet Union to recognize his Peking-based government-in-exile yesterday further suggests that the Chinese and Vietnamese Communists are exerting pressure on Moscow to adopt a hard line.

Despite their protestations of support for Prince Sihanouk, the Russians have withheld official recognition of his exile government.

Analysts here believe that Sihanouk's appeal for Soviet recognition was not only encouraged by the Chinese, but also cleared with Le Duan at a meeting between the two men in Peking yesterday.

Moreover, it is thought, the question of Sihanouk's government as a symbol of Indochinese Communist resistance to the United States was raised by Le Duan in talks with Soviet party leader Brezhnev in Moscow Friday.

In contrast to the effusive description of his conversation with Mao, the Le Duan meeting with Brezhnev was perfunctorily portrayed by Hanoi as having taken place "in an atmosphere of fraternity and sincerity"—a signal in Communist jargon that the Moscow talks were a flop.

The North Vietnamese leader apparently failed to move Brezhnev to assume a harder line in response to the U.S. incursion into Cambodia. Consequently, he found sympathy in Peking.

Piecing together the complicated chain of events that prompted Le Duan to urge the Russians to stiffen their position, analysts here see the American driven into Cambodia as well as the simultaneous U.S. air strikes against North Vietnam as a turning point.

Though they were preparing for the possibility of a U.S. move into Cambodia, the North Vietnamese still displayed a good deal of diplomatic flexibility throughout April.

For one thing, they left three diplomats ensconced in the Polish embassy in Phnom Penh after evacuating the rest of their mission in case Cambodian Premier Lon Nol agreed to reach an accommodation on the Vietnamese Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia.

As Lon Nol himself disclosed this week, Hanoi also sought through Chinese Communist intermediaries to come to terms with Sihanouk's successors on the issue of the sanctuaries.

About the same time, the Soviet delegate to the United Nations, Yakov Malik, proposed that a new Geneva conference be convened to "relax tensions in the Indochina peninsula."

The fact that Le Duc Tho, Hanoi's highest-ranking official at the Paris talks, was in Moscow at the time that Malik made his statement suggests that the North Vietnamese at least supported the notion of sending the Geneva conference proposal aloft as a trial balloon.

On April 19th, Le Duan arrived in Moscow to attend the celebrations marking the centenary of Lenin's birth. His speech calling for Vietnamese, Laotian and Cambodian "unity" against "U.S. imperialism" foreshadowed the "summit conference" of Indochinese leftists then being organized.

At that conference, North Vietnamese Premier Pham Van Dong showed relative moderation. He affirmed Hanoi's respect for the 1954 Geneva agreement and asserted that North Vietnam would continue to fight on the "diplomatic" as well as military and political fronts.

On April 29, apparently convinced that nothing dramatic was in the offing, Le Duan left Moscow for Peking en route home. He may have learned of the U.S. move into Cambodia on his arrival in the Chinese capital.

Sources here submit that Le Duan's primary aim on that trip to Peking was to persuade the Chinese to concede to some kind of "united action" with the Russians on the Vietnam problem. The North Vietnamese have been unsuccessfully pursuing that objective for years.

But when he received news of the American drive into Cambodia and the air strikes above the 17th Parallel, Le Duan's mission abruptly changed. Now he had to persuade the Russians to stiffen their position along Chinese lines.

He scrambled back to Moscow, only to discover that Brezhnev had gone to Czechoslovakia. For reasons that are still not clear, Le Duan went on to Warsaw.

A clue to the extent of Hanoi's hostility to negotiations at this stage—and a hint of what Le Duan intended to tell Brezhnev—was reflected in a Hanoi Radio broadcast denouncing United Nations Secretary General U Thant's May 5 proposal for an international conference on Indochina.

The proposal, the broadcast said, "only serves to encourage the U.S. imperialists" and further "shows that the U.N. is merely an American tool."

That denunciation, sources here recall, is the first time that the North Vietnamese have condemned without qualification a recommendation for an international conference.

At the same time, the North Vietnamese and Vietcong delegates postponed the weekly session of the Paris talks and Xuan Thuy, the chief Hanoi representative, returned home.

But the Russians still stuck to the notion of negotiations, as evidenced by statement in Paris on May 6 by Polish Foreign Minister Stefan Jedrychowski saying that Poland and presumably the Kremlin favored an enlarged Geneva-type conference on Indochina.

Back in Moscow two days later, Le Duan met with Brezhnev for the second time in three weeks and probably heard a repetition of the Jedrychowski thesis. That this disappointed Le Duan was plain from a Hanoi report on the meeting.

"The two sides exchanged views on problems concerning the intensification by the U.S. imperialists of their aggression against the Indochinese peoples," the Hanoi report said, adding that they also "considered measures" for strengthening their friendship.

Le Duan took off again for Peking.

In the opinion of analysts here, the Russians cannot plausibly continue to refuse to take a tougher position without losing prestige in Hanoi and handing the Chinese an ideal propaganda weapon with which to berate the "Soviet revisionist clique."

IDAHO NEWSPAPERS SUPPORT COOPER-CHURCH AMENDMENT

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, two leading Idaho daily newspapers share my grave concern about our involvement in Cambodia. Each expresses support for the amendment of Senator COOPER of Kentucky and myself that would limit our intervention there.

The Idaho Statesman in an editorial on May 19, 1970, suggests:

President Nixon's adamant opposition to the Church-Cooper amendment tends to undermine the credibility of his pledge to do what the proposal would require—remove U.S. troops from Cambodia by June 30.

Two paragraphs later the Statesman states that—

in view of the domestic political situation the amendment might help the President more than it could hurt him.

The Lewiston Morning Tribune joins the Statesman in viewing the Cooper-Church amendment as one that should be viewed by the President as an aid, not a hindrance.

Its concluding sentence in an editorial of May 19, 1970, declares:

If the Church-Cooper amendment should force a withdrawal from Cambodia by June 30 despite strong military pressure to remain, then the President would have abided by his timetable after all. And that would help more than anything else right now to repair his credibility around the world.

I ask unanimous concent that the two editorials be printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Idaho Statesman, May 19, 1970]

AMENDMENT MIGHT HELP PRESIDENT

President Nixon's adamant opposition to the Church-Cooper amendment tends to undermine the credibility of his pledge to do what the proposal would require—remove U.S. troops from Cambodia by June 30.

Supporters of the President are saying both that there is no question that Mr. Nixon will make good on that pledge, and that the President's hands should not be tied.

In view of the domestic political situation the amendment might help the President more than it could hurt him.

First, it should soothe the feelings of people who were distressed when he made the move into Cambodia. Secondly, it would provide assurance that the United States will not be pulled into a Vietnam style adventure in Cambodia.

The President says the purpose of the move into Cambodia was to aid the Vietnamization program—to buy time. He says all U.S. troops will be out by June 30. Other sources say that if future forays into Cambodia are needed, they can be made by South Vietnamese troops.

All this is basically consistent with the Church-Cooper amendment. There would be inconsistency, of course, if the President decided he couldn't have the troops out by June 30, or would rather not.

The fact that the President has taken a rather rigid position on the amendment tends to feed the suspicions of those who believe he would take the country into a prolonged war in Cambodia.

Language prohibiting U.S. air support for Cambodian forces or military instruction for Cambodians ought to be stricken. The President should be willing to accept the Cooper-Church amendment, in some modified form.

One of the reasons that the amendment has generated so much support is the question of the war-making authority of Congress. The Constitution says Congress has the power to declare war. No such power is given to the President, although it has been exercised on six occasions.

If President Nixon doesn't want to preserve the option of sending U.S. troops back into Cambodia, then the amendment would not tie his hands.

The amendment is not a "stab in the back" for U.S. troops as the national commander of the American Legion described it. The Idaho Legion, while challenging the amendment, made clear that it did not question Senator Church's motives.

If the amendment is a "stab in the back," then the President's declaration that he will have the troops out by June 30 would have to bear a similar label.

The basic issue is the future U.S. course involving Cambodia and on this question the President and the Senate backers of the amendment seem to be in basic agreement.

Should the amendment win approval, and should the President later decide he wanted to engage U.S. troops in combat in Cambodia, he could take his case to Congress. This is the proper way under the Constitution.

[From the Lewiston (Idaho) Morning Tribune, May 19, 1970]

THE CREDIBILITY OF THE PRESIDENT

High ranking members of the Nixon administration are telling senators that the President's credibility around the world will be damaged if the Senate passes the so-called Church-Cooper amendment cutting off funds for further American operations in Cambodia after June 30.

The *Los Angeles Times* reports that three of Mr. Nixon's top advisors last week addressed a conference of Republican senators and warned them in effect that if the amendment should be approved it would be taken as a sign that the Senate does not trust the President to do as he promised and get all of the Americans out of Cambodia by that date.

The sign would be correctly read. Sen. Frank Church, one of the sponsors of the amendment, implied Sunday that the measure doesn't mean that at all, but he was merely being kind. The funds cutoff obviously never would have won the support it has if a large number of senators hadn't

thought it was needed. It is politically risky to tie the hands of a President in wartime and senators don't often take risks they don't feel are necessary.

The question is not whether the President's credibility is being damaged; it already has been. The question is whether the blame can properly be pinned on the Senate. An operation which the President sold as a quick bit of surgery that would shorten the war is threatening to widen it. The move into Cambodia was justified by the President and his staff as a purely military tactic, but some military commanders in the field now are saying that the President's timetable is militarily unrealistic.

In a report from Cambodia yesterday, the AP's Peter Arnett quoted field commanders as saying it may not be possible to clean out the border area sanctuaries by the end of June. They said only about 30 per cent of the projected area has been covered and the easiest 30 per cent at that. Further, the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong no longer are running before the American-South Vietnamese advance; they are turning and fighting back.

The prospect of being dragged deeper into Cambodia despite the President's promise that we would not be has hurt his credibility far more than anything the Senate has done. And the announcement by the vice president of South Vietnam that the Vietnamese intend to stay in Cambodia for some time despite White House assurances that they would not hasn't helped.

Mr. Nixon took this country into Cambodia on the basis of bad advice from the military and there is a deep-running fear in the Senate that more bad advice might keep us there.

If the Church-Cooper amendment should force a withdrawal from Cambodia by June 30 despite strong military pressure to remain, then the President would have abided by his timetable after all. And that would help more than anything else right now to repair his credibility around the world.

LETTERS FROM TWO CONCERNED AMERICANS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, American military intervention in Cambodia has generated an avalanche of protest mail at my office in Washington. Approximately 25,000 communications, some bearing dozens of names, have been received—the largest volume I have ever experienced on any subject since I came to the Senate nearly 14 years ago.

These letters come from professional people and blue-collar workers, farmers, and city dwellers, young and old, schoolchildren and university students. Many have a special quality about them. This afternoon, I wish to share two of these with my Senate colleagues.

The first is from a marine now in Vietnam, who writes that the Cooper-Church amendment, now the pending business before the Senate, offers "the first bit of hope" he has had since he first went to Vietnam 6 months ago:

> If the Vietnamese people are to be saved from extermination and the American people saved from civil war, "he writes," it will only be through the efforts of men such as yourself.

I shall place the full letter in the RECORD but withold the name of the marine.

The second letter is from the heartland of America, the Midwest. Steven Johnson of Madison, Ws., sent me, in his words:

> My two weeks' pay-check to be paid to the order of the Committee for the Amendment to End the War.

The Nixon administration is grievously mistaken if it believes that only a minority of voluble students is against our military policy in Indochina. My mail shows that political moderates among professional and nonprofessional adults in the United States are profoundly disturbed by our persistent war in Southeast Asia. The administration, since its Cambodian venture, will ignore this fact at its peril—and, consequently, at the peril of our beloved country.

I asked unanimous consent that the two letters I have referred to be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the two letters were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

> DEAR SIR: I just heard of the resolution you and some other Senators have introduced to cut off funds for this tragic war. I have been here in Vietnam for six months now and your resolution is the first bit of hope I've had in all that time. If the Vietnamese people are to be saved from extermination and the American people saved from civil war it will be only thru the efforts of men such as yourself. You have my humble thanks and prayers.
>
> DEAR SENATOR FRANK CHURCH: I am sending you my two weeks pay check to be paid to the order of the Committee for the amendment to end the war. I am a junior in high school who is seventeen and about to turn eighteen in August 18th. I believe we think along the same lines. Only the name, age, and time are different.
>
> Most Sincerely,
>
> STEVEN JOHNSON.

LETTER FROM INDOCHINA

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, a perceptive reporter, Robert Shaplen, has been providing the American people for many years with informative insights into the fallacies of American policy in Southeast Asia. These analyses have appeared periodically in the columns of the New Yorker magazine.

In the May 16, 1970, issue, Mr. Shaplen again dispels the illusions constantly circulated by American and Vietnamese policymakers in Saigon. The disastrous economic situation, the endemic fragility of the dictatorial Thieu regime, and the shortcomings of the decision by President Nixon to invade Cambodia are persuasively detailed by Mr. Shaplen.

At the conclusion of the article, Senator Thai Lang Nghiem, described as "an ardent anti-Communist," gives a devastating analysis of his ravaged country and its military leaders:

Senator Nghiem is quoted as declaring:

> The people's confidence is now frozen, their hope has now disappeared. Early in this Year of the Dog, we are witnessing the bankruptcy of the regime's political authority, the failure of all efforts to build up a Second Republic. Many had hoped that the beaten path of failures would have served as an example to the new leaders, but they are now advancing along the same path, following the same political ground rules that were used by the old leaders. Old and new leaders come from the same social strata—those which used to be controlled by foreigners, the scum of society that floats on the surface of the boiling social pot . . . The heart of the matter is not the offensive of the Communists but the dirty nature of our own people, our own leaders. Our minds are dirty, our hearts are dirty. It is clear that we are up to our necks in corruption. It has entered our bloodstream, our lungs, our hearts. It is no longer an individual disease. It is systematized. It has got hold of the whole regime. Corruption comes from the organization of power. To stamp out corruption means to reorganize power—in this case, political power, political institutions. Power must be put back in the hands of the people. The New Year of the Dog is the New Year of general fatigue, of a feeling of pain after being beaten up.

Surely, Mr. President, this is a sobering and stunning statement by a member of the national legislature of South Vietnam.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Shaplen's article be printed in the RECORD.

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

LETTER FROM INDOCHINA

(By Robert Shaplen)

SAIGON, May 7.—South Vietnam is now experiencing another one of the paroxysms that have shaken the country so often for so many years that one wonders how it can hold together, let alone fight a war. The latest convulsion has been brought on primarily by economic problems—soaring inflation, growing discrepancies in income, and the mounting cost of the war. All this has inevitably agitated the body politic. As many Westerners tend to forget, the Vietnamese, behind their façade of fatalism, are a highly volatile people, and the visible manifestations of the present troubles have been frequently violent emotional outbursts that have filled the streets with shouting mobs and that reached a climax this week with a bloody clash at the National Pagoda in which several people were killed. The significance of the demonstrations goes beyond recent complaints by students and by disabled veterans about repressive acts and privations imposed by the government, and even beyond the general resentment over the murder of Vietnamese citizens by Cambodians across the border or by Vietnamese Communists in this country. There is a rising undercurrent of anger over the war itself, and over both what the Americans have done and what they have not done. Even some of my most pro-American Vietnamese friends are beginning to wonder if the time has not come to stop associating with Americans and Vietnamize themselves personally. One of the popular newspapers is running a daily contest for which its readers submit details of atrocities committed by individual Americans—such as homicide, rape, or simply leaving the scene of an accident.

If the whole American venture in Vietnam can itself now be classified as a tragic accident, it is one whose scene we are not apt to be leaving soon. Widening the scope of the war, in Laos and Cambodia as well as in Vietnam, may, as President Nixon hopes, shorten the conflict, but few observers here—whether Vietnamese, Americans, or members of the foreign diplomatic community—really believe that it will. We seem to be nearing the moment of truth, and the truth is that consistent misunderstanding and mismanagement of the war from the outset have now brought us to the highly dangerous point of withdrawing our troops while broadening our commitment—a script worthy of Lewis Carroll. Years ago, the American military establishment, after warning against our becoming involved in a war on the Asian mainland, be-

gan to express resentment at being shackled and forbidden to attack Communist bases and sanctuaries outside South Vietnam. The generals were permitted to engage in limited bombing of the North, but that was stopped in order to get the Paris peace talks started. It seemed to me that there was at that time a certain logic—at least, military logic—in the pleas of the soldiers, which, in the case of Cambodia, were rejected because that country was officially neutral. We would be widening the war, it was maintained, instead of fighting a limited war, which was what President Johnson kept insisting we were doing, and we would sink lower in world opinion, which had already condemned our bombing of the North and our killing of civilians in the South. But now, at what we have been hopefully claiming is the penultimate moment, we have suddenly invaded Cambodia in an effort to destroy the vital Communist base areas, particularly the headquarters of COSVN—the Central Office for South Vietnam—from which the war in the Mekong Delta and in other parts of the South has been directed. And we have done this a month and a half after the unseating in Cambodia of Prince Sihanouk as chief of state and the takeover by the Lon Nol government, which has proved incapable of maintaining either Cambodia's territorial integrity or its neutrality. We are attacking when the situation in Cambodia is already grave and when the Communists have—as one could have predicted—dispersed most supply depots and headquarters, redeploying them, under Hanoi's orders, either deeper inside Cambodia or back into the South Vietnamese jungle. In fact, on March 18th, the very day of the coup against Sihanouk, a Communist document (it bore that date and was captured twelve days later near the Vietnamese border) said, "We must positively protect our agencies [base camps] and logistic installations in the border area by moving all of them to our territory [in the jungles of South Vietnam]." The document added, "The elements that may be selected to stay in the border area are to disperse their depots" and "be combat-ready for self-preservation and to fight back whenever the reactionary [Cambodian] troops attempt to destroy them."

If it is true that the government of Lon Nol did not know in advance about the American and South Vietnamese offensive, the attack clearly appears to be a violation—or, at best, a preemptory alteration—of the so-called "rules of engagement." Such rules, which are usually established by ranking civilian officials, up to the President, impose certain guidelines and restrictions on the military. In effect, they are a kind of top-level, top-secret martial law, and the American military men here have always professed to follow them, though there have been exceptions, justified by pleading the military necessity of "hot pursuit" or "protective reaction." These exceptions have included our bombing of, and occasional ground forays into, the Demilitarized Zone separating North from South Vietnam. Our resumption last week of the bombing of North Vietnam after our reconnaissance planes had reportedly been fired upon there was justified under the heading of "reinforced protective reaction."

President Nixon has cited the need "to go to the heart of the trouble" and "end this war rather than to have it drag on interminably" as the main justification for the attack on Cambodia, but eight weeks of such an operation—eight weeks is the period he has allotted to it, and this, of course, does not allow for its prolongation or its repetition—patently amounts to more than the President implied. No matter what the President has said about restricting the troops' area of action, what has taken place is a full-fledged invasion. If, as he said, "we will not allow American men by the thousands to be killed by an enemy from privileged sanctuary," one is left wondering why the sanctuary wasn't attacked sooner—at the height of the fighting along the Cambodian border several years ago, or at the height of Sihanouk's flirtation with the Communists—and in a more efficient manner. Wide sweep operations like the current one have failed more often than not throughout the history of the Vietnam war, and this one—so far, at least—appears, from the American military point of view, ineffective, too. The Allies may kill two or three thousand people and ultimately find some large caches of weapons and some underground installations, but it seems apparent that our potential gains are dwindling even as we get bogged down in mud. If the Allies were determined on this course of action in any case, they would surely have been far better off making swift, commando-type raids within a few days of the coup in as many different places as possible—especially in the areas east of the Mekong, where the Communists have moved quickly to gobble huge chunks of Cambodian territory. The Allied action will doubtless make things more difficult for the Communists temporarily, but Hanoi now has a better excuse and a better opportunity for retaliating as it sees fit in the course of its attempt to conquer the whole of Indo-China. Indeed, one of the first effects of our invasion seems to have been a rallying of pro-Sihanouk Cambodians to the new joint Sihanouk-Communist government-in-exile, thus creating an increased likelihood of a full-fledged Cambodian civil war. Hanoi and Peking would be the ones to pick up the pieces then.

To be sure, the difficulties that the Communists are facing all over Indo-China are not to be underestimated, as they are the first to admit. Besides the difficulty of moving supplies down the Ho Chi Minh Trail in the rainy season that is beginning this month, the North Vietnamese are fully aware of the other problems they are confronted with in prosecuting the war in South Vietnam. These problems stem partly from the gains that the Saigon government has made in its pacification program, which, with all its faults, has brought a widely increasing number of the population under government control. Though these people remain, for the most part, politically uncommitted, they can at least make a living without being drafted into the Vietcong or recruited by the Communists and taxed by both sides. The resulting manpower shortage for the Communists—particularly in the Mekong Delta, which contains about a third of South Vietnam's eighteen million people—has been exacerbated by heavy Vietcong losses, both in the main force and in the regional and local guerrilla units. Sizable elements of five North Vietnamese regiments that Hanoi has sent into the Delta have therefore been broken up into small groups to fill the shattered Vietcong ranks. These Northern replacements now make up about eighty per cent of the former Vietcong main-force units and more than half of some of the battered regional and local units as well. As strangers in the South, who know little or nothing of the terrain, the Northerners are often resented by the more independent-minded and easy-going Southerners. This has become apparent in sometimes startling ways. When I visited the Delta recently, I was told that the bodies of North Vietnamese soldiers killed in action were very often simply left lying in fields or floating in canals, whereas those of Vietcong regulars or guerrillas were always carried off, in keeping with a practice traditionally followed by the Communists, even under the most hazardous conditions, throughout the war.

Directives issued by the Central Office of South Vietnam—notably, its Resolution No. 9, which was issued late last year, and the more recent Resolution No. 14—have repeatedly stressed the theme of renewed guerrilla warfare that is likely to last for a long time. Resolution No. 14 carefully omits any references to such staples of earlier resolutions as "a decisive victory" to be gained "in the shortest possible time." Even if there should be a cease-fire, the new resolution says, "only guerrilla warfare can achieve our purpose in the complicated situation" that would follow. The Communists also acknowledge that "the people's confidence concerning the revolution became weaker" during 1969, and that this has led to "rightist tendencies" and to "a decrease in political struggles." Belatedly, the Communists say that they "failed to realize the importance of the coordination of guerrilla war with our three-pronged attack"—on the military, political, and diplomatic fronts. The truth of the matter is that the Vietcong simply haven't enough guerrillas to go around now, though we cannot assume that they will be unable to "re-guerrilla-ize" the situation once the Americans are gone. "The only way to cope with an enemy who has large numbers of troops and war facilities is to wage guerrilla warfare through the three strategic areas [the mountains, the lowlands, and the cities], to wear down and destroy the enemy on a continuing basis."

For the first time in many years, Hanoi is renewing emphasis in South Vietnam on the use of captured arms and ammunition and the manufacture of weapons—measures that hark back to the period after 1958, when the Second Indo-China War began, against the regime of the late Ngo Dinh Diem. So far, the Communists admit, "the expansion of the guerrilla-warfare movement has been slow and limited and has thus failed to meet the requirements of the general offensive and uprising campaign." For this reason, the word has gone out not to strike at a large number of objectives simultaneously but "to strike at a few objectives over a wide area." The husbanding of strength and the use of restraint instead of "going ahead with the military struggle when conditions are not ripe" is the 1970 formula set forth in the words of Le Duan, First Secretary of the Laodong (Workers') Party in North Vietnam. (Le Duan probably remains first among equals in the contest still going on over who will succeed the late Ho Chi Minh.) The Communists—despite the manifold problems they face, and despite their inability to compete with the economic inducements that the government can offer the population, thanks to American aid—retain an organizational edge. The V.C.I., or Vietcong infrastructure, composed of about fifty thousand people, including perhaps five thousand important Party leaders, has been weakened, but it remains intact. What the Communists are basically trying to do in the hamlets, villages, and cities is to create an "in-place" force that will lie low and wait for new opportunities to attack. In some localities, including Saigon, where the special police have greatly stepped up their efforts, the Communists have had some trouble doing this, but elsewhere—in other cities, in towns, and in ninety-five per cent of the hamlets that the government labels "secure," or almost so—there is no valid measure of V.C.I. strength, and surely not the American computers that rate the security of hamlets on the basis of answers to a hundred and thirty-nine questions. No computers, and no Americans, can really find out who among the Vietnamese are loyal to the government today, how many of these may be "in place" tomorrow, or which side of the flimsy fence the majority of the people are actually on.

What is probably true is that—in the words of John Paul Vann, the able and experienced head of the American-Vietnamese pacification program in the Delta—"tens of thousands of people here have made the decision that the war is over for them." They have come to feel that the pressure that the government—and especially its local militia, the Regional Forces and the Popular Forces—is putting upon them makes the risk of sup-

porting the Communists too great. This does more than anything else to account for the presence in the Delta today of only an estimated seventeen thousand guerrillas, compared to twenty-six thousand a year or so ago, and for a decline there in the guerrillas' basic manpower reserve—which used to supply not only the Delta but the area north of Saigon, too—from three hundred thousand at the time of the 1968 Tet offensive to about a hundred and thirty thousand now. For every four men the Communists lose, only three are replaced, and most of these are "fillers" from North Vietnam, about half of whom reportedly suffer from malaria after the arduous trip south. Generally speaking, Vann points out, the North Vietnamese are easier to fight than the Vietcong, "because they are tied to their logistical tail, in their bases along the Cambodian border, and they haven't got the same popular support as the V.C." Also, he says, "having to attack quickly and then withdraw quickly, they are more vulnerable to air, ground, and artillery reaction, since they can't melt back into the population as readily as the Southerners."

During two recent trips I made through the Delta, one with Vann and one with George Jacobson—the deputy chief of the country-wide pacification program and a man with ten years' experience in Vietnam—I noted a number of developments that looked encouraging for Saigon, but I also saw some things that left me wondering how stable the situation really is. The population has been moving back into areas long held by the Vietcong, using canals and roads that had been closed for years, but though incidents of terrorism have been decreasing, they still occur. Economically, many of the people are better off than they were a year ago, thanks partly to a record rice crop, but prices are rising, and the advantages of the so-called "Honda economy"—the result of the American policy of flooding the country with all sorts of consumer products to soak up local piastres—are beginning to wane. Some farmers are hoarding rice for prices to rise still further, and others are selling rice to the Vietcong, who are willing to pay very well for it. Survival is the underlying theme, so there is a general wait-and-see attitude and a continuing amount of quiet accommodation with the Communists. This means, among other things, that the gathering of intelligence information under the South Vietnamese-American Phoenix program is still extremely uncertain and that there is a widespread unwillingness to act upon it. Once the Americans stop riding herd on this effort, it could easily come apart. So far, more Communists are being killed or are surrendering than are being caught in the intelligence nets, and some of those surrendering are suspected of being plants for the future "in-place" game. This spring, elections are being held for the offices of half the village councils and a third of the hamlet chiefs elected in 1967. In the Delta—and elsewhere, too—there have been more candidates and more enthusiasm this time than last. During the elections, some candidates and incumbents have been assassinated, and some suspected Communists have been elected, but by and large the Vietcong have not interfered with the voting process as much as had been anticipated.

Village-development programs—local projects for providing such things as irrigation pumps, bridges, and pig farms—are making considerable headway, but the real test of whether the Thieu government can gain support in the rural areas will come with the attempt to carry out Thieu's recently passed land-reform act. On paper, the act is historic. For the first time in a fifteen-year history of would-be land-reform programs in South Vietnam, tenancy has been legally eliminated and the farmer is able to own the land he tills. Since eighty per cent of the nation's arable land is in the Delta, the program is essentially tailored to conditions there. If it is successfully carried out nationwide, between eight and nine hundred thousand hectares of land (a hectare is about two and a half acres) will be distributed free to about a million tenant-farmer families over the next three years. More than half the total rice land in South Vietnam will be affected, and almost half the population (reckoned on the basis of six children to a family). The government is paying the former landlords two and a half times the value of the annual crop yield of the land transferred. Twenty per cent is paid in cash and the rest in government bonds, but to avoid further inflation the Americans, who are helping to finance the program, are providing dollars to be used by the government for the importation of non-luxury items. This, in turn, will help free piastres to pay off the landlords. Ten million dollars has so far been allocated and another thirty million is being sought in our Congress this year. Ultimately, the program will cost about four hundred million.

Each farmer in the Delta will be allowed to own three hectares of land, but in central Vietnam, where the average holding is smaller, the limit is one hectare. A landlord anywhere in the country who tills his own land can keep fifteen hectares. Farmers who were given land while it was controlled by the Vietcong will be allowed to retain it. Anyone receiving land is forbidden to sell it for fifteen years—a period that the Americans regard as too long, because it will freeze the pattern of small holdings and thus hold back mechanization. While the reform measure has great political significance, potentially altering the social and economic structure in the villages, and, Thieu hopes, inspiring new loyalty to the Saigon government, there are many hurdles to overcome. A Delta farmer who is tilling twenty hectares now, for example, may want to dispose of seventeen to his friends or relatives, and may pay off land-authority officials to arrange it. The province and district chiefs and the land registrars in the villages will be the key figures in executing the law. For example, it will be up to them to see that the distribution follows prescribed priorities; that the first to receive grants, after farmers now tilling their land, will be soldiers and veterans, relatives of war dead, and prewar cultivators. The margin for maneuvering and for payoffs and favoritism is a wide one, particularly in view of the urbanization process that has taken place in Vietnam of late years, since there are likely to be contests over land titles between those who now want to return to the countryside and those who have stayed there all along. In some parts of the country—notably, the "floating-rice-field" areas of the Delta, where members of the Hoa Hao religious sect have large holdings—"struggle movements" against the law have already been started, and the Vietcong can surely be expected to incite more trouble. In principle, a farmer owning his land and harvesting more rice than ever before, owing to the use of the new miracle-rice seeds developed in the Philippines under United States auspices, and now at last able to reduce or entirely avoid the influence of middlemen in disposing of his crop, should rally to the cause of a government that has made all this possible. But things never work out quite that simply in Vietnam, and it is still uncertain if land reform will at last succeed or will once again be subverted.

With all the misery and destruction the war has caused, Vietnam remains a land of transcendent beauty, and no part of it is more beautiful than the central coastal area reaching from Phu Yen Province up to Quang Nam Province. This is traditional revolutionary country, and many of the heroes of the nation's historic anti-Chinese and anti-French struggles were born here; since the days of the Vietminh, before the Communists came to be called the Vietcong—a name, incidentally, that they never have accepted, because they regard it as a propaganda tag invented by Diem—the Communists have been determined to gain and hold this area. It may turn out that they cannot hang on in the Delta, or they may decide to wait until the Americans are gone to prosecute a new guerrilla effort there, but they will be less ready to give up either in the central coastal region or in the highlands to the west.

I recently visited Phu Yen and Binh Dinh, the province just north of it, and I came away with the odd feeling that, despite some obvious changes, the situation was in many ways what it was five years ago, when American troops kept the Communists from cutting the country in two there by moving across from the coast to the Cambodian border. And in some respects the picture was disturbingly like the one I found in 1962, when I returned to Vietnam after an absence of ten years. This was particularly true in Phu Yen, a retrograde province that a year or so ago was rated as one of those most loyal to Saigon and is now rated as one of the least so. In 1962, when the Americans only had a handful of advisers in Phu Yen, about the only places the government held securely were the capital, Tuy Hoa, on the coast, and its airstrip. During 1968 and 1969, two Korean regiments were mainly responsible for the successful work of pacifying the lush inland valley region and resettling people there, but now most of the Koreans have moved on and things have deteriorated. Since the first of the year, members of a North Vietnamese regiment have been moving down from the hills and have abducted more than six hundred peasants from the province's central valley. These people—most of them men and women over forty, with a number of teen-age boys—have been seized at night in their homes and taken into the hills, where they have been given four or five days of indoctrination, in the course of which they have been told that the Americans have lost the war and are leaving. Then most of them have been sent back to their villages to lie low and "wait." About a fifth of those abducted have not been sent back; these have been primarily boys between twelve and sixteen, who have been either kept in the hills to help the Communists or sent to North Vietnam for further indoctrination and training. Similar abductions have taken place in a number of other provinces during the last several years, and it is estimated that between five and seven thousand young men have been sent to the North. This is the strongest indication Hanoi has offered that it means what it says about beginning another guerrilla war after the Americans go home. When the First Indo-China War ended, in 1954, some eighty thousand persons voluntarily went North, and some of these formed the nucleus of the "returnees" who were the vanguard of the war against the regime of Ngo Dinh Diem, which began in 1958.

Much of the blame for the decline of government influence in Phu Yen belongs to the province chief, Colonel Nguyen Van Ba. An old-fashioned, French trained officer, Ba has held his present job for four years, but he lost interest in it some months ago when he failed to be appointed a division commander. According to the Americans, Ba has been concerned about the abductions but has done little or nothing to prevent them. He depends on the remaining Koreans and a small element of the American 173rd Brigade for protection, and allows his Regional and Popular Force elements to do pretty much as they choose; many of these territorial troops, in fact, come into Tuy Hoa at night for their own safety and to help Ba's security forces there. During a conversation I had with Ba, he told me that the abductions had ceased a month earlier, but an hour after our conversation, when I drove out in a jeep to an insecure village near the

first ridgeline of hills adjoining the valley, officials there told me that nineteen more people had been abducted only two nights before, by members of a thirteen-man band of Communists who had been visiting the several hamlets of that particular village almost nightly. Of ninety-four men, women, and children who had been abducted since January, all but twelve had returned. When I asked one of the hamlet chiefs about the current influence of the Communists—who by day, I discovered, were also collecting rice from the peasants working the fields—he replied, "The people don't believe what the Communists say, but they are intimidated and have to obey." It seemed to me that, partly because of its Vietminh history and partly because of its hilly geographical configuration, the Communists were making a test case of Phu Yen, and that they were succeeding in undermining the whole pacification process—and also demonstrating the vulnerability of the Vietnamization process when there is a failure of leadership.

The situation in Binh Dinh, though it was not as critical, was not very different from what I had found there on previous visits, and reminded me that over the last seven years I had seen the province change hands four or five times, always depending on how many Americans or Koreans were around to help the South Vietnamese and the provincial and local forces. Binh Dinh, which has a little less than a million people, is one of the most populous provinces in the country. The Koreans and most of the 173rd Brigade are there today, but they may all leave by the end of the year, and it is very doubtful whether the Vietnamese can then handle the security situation alone. Binh Dinh has always been a target for terrorism, and early in April, during the most recent flurry of Communist activity throughout the country, there were a number of assassinations, ambushes, rocket and mortar attacks, and hit-and-run ground attacks on Vietnamese bases, which together caused substantial damage and fairly heavy losses. The combined Allied forces hit back hard, costing the Communists even heavier losses, but although slightly more than half the hamlets are now considered to be completely or almost completely secure, and people are moving back into some that had been abandoned, the over-all situation is still rated as tenuous. And because of its long Vietminh history Binh Dinh, like Phu Yen, is a hard place to judge. "Whom can we trust enough to give guns to?" Tom Stephens, the American deputy province senior adviser, asked me.

Whatever happens in Laos and Cambodia, where the Communists, for the most part, are now in a position to call the tune, Hanoi remains fully aware that South Vietnam is still the main prize and the key to the control of Indo-China. It is equally aware that, except in perhaps ten or twelve of the country's forty-four provinces, the Communist forces are not now strong enough to sustain a pattern of attacks. The amount of matériel they have been sending down the Ho Chi Minh Trail—as many as a thousand trucks a day during February and March, each carrying three or four tons of arms and supplies—has demonstrated that the Communists are still thinking in terms of long-range resistance. The rate of troop infiltration over the last few months has tended to fluctuate. The reasons for this include manpower problems in the North, where Hanoi is still having trouble finding enough workers for its own agricultural and industrial development, and a desire to conserve military strength and deploy replacements more carefully in view of the extension of the battlefields into Laos as well as Cambodia.

During an upsurge of activity in South Vietnam that began on the night of March 31st, when the Communists launched about two hundred attacks throughout the country—mostly rocket and mortar assaults, with some ground fighting—they did not succeed in striking many of their chosen targets, such as the city of Can Tho, in the Delta, but they did manage to do considerable overall damage. The next night, the number of attacks dropped to sixty, and over the next ten days diminished to ten or twenty a day. A fresh "high point" can come at any moment, though some intelligence experts do not expect it until August.

The Allied assault in Cambodia obviously makes it harder for the Communists to strike and then duck back across the border, as they have been accustomed to doing, but it also offers them new opportunities to strike within South Vietnam, since they can take advantage of the wider deployment of Allied troops. This is what they have always sought to do—force the Americans and South Vietnamese to concentrate their forces in one place and then hit in another. A key to the military success of the Cambodian operation will be their response to it in Vietnam in the next month. Some observers also anticipate a lot of new action across the D.M.Z., in the vicinity of which the Communists recently stepped up their activity, leading the Americans to respond with their brief air strikes in North Vietnam.

All in all, as long as the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong can be kept on the run by aggressive tactics on the part of the Americans and the Koreans, the two or three good ARVN divisions, and the improving territorial forces, the chances of another major offensive, or even a sustained smaller one, within South Vietnam are slight. And yet there is nothing to convince one that the South Vietnamese can carry the burden of the war against a strong, persistent enemy willing to suffer high losses. The contest depends largely on time, involving, on the Communists' side, their ability to restore the strength of the Vietcong and the guerrillas and to solve the problem of blending the North Vietnamese into their forces in the South, and, on the government's side, its ability to coordinate its efforts and weld a more mobile force. In this, each component—ARVN as the strike element, the Regional Forces as the aggressive provincial troops, and the Popular Forces and volunteer self-defense units as the defenders of the villages and hamlets—must learn what it is doing and how to work smoothly in conjunction with the others. At the moment, neither the Communists nor the South Vietnamese have succeeded in their aims, but the Communists seem more imaginative and better able to respond quickly to a changed situation.

None of this will matter if the political center in Saigon fails to hold, and the Communists know this, too. The turbulent events of the past two months haven't helped; in fact, the South Vietnamese and the Americans have only themselves to blame for letting things get out of hand. There seems no excuse for the sudden severe deterioration of the economic situation, or for the development of what amounts to a "war of nerves" between Thieu's government and the Americans over how to deal with it. Nor does there seem to be any excuse for the continued neglect of the disabled South Vietnamese veterans—something that was apparent months ago but ignored until it became uncontrollable, with the result that one-legged and one-armed men have been knocked around and tear-gased by police. Nor can the treatment of the student rebellion be condoned, though the Communists and other political factions, and a new, swinging "Honda set" as well, have obviously taken advantage of it to raise as much general havoc as possible. Over many years in Vietnam, I have seldom seen so much division within the American mission. One expects that among the Vietnamese, but in terms of our institutions we have proved ourselves as inept as they are at handling the problems involved in a war as complicated as this.

On the economic front, the price of rice and everything else is skyrocketing, and, owing to corruption along the channels of distribution, the rice is not always reaching the people who need it most—the soldiers. There is constant talk of devaluing the piastre, or of establishing a new "floating," or free, market rate, as the Philippines did recently. Some such adjustment is undoubtedly necessary, but this alone won't solve the problem. The hard fact is that the Vietnamese simply cannot afford to pay for the expensive war that the Americans are now handing over to them. Saigon officials say that the country needs at least an additional two hundred million dollars this year to help defray the current deficit in the defense budget alone, and they argue that it is ridiculous for us to hold back this relatively small amount when we are already paying for Vietnamization at the rate of some two billion dollars a year. "That two billion means nothing if the man firing the new M-16 rifle you've given him hasn't enough food for his family," one Vietnamese Minister said to me. There is absolutely no doubt that the average soldier and the average civil servant cannot get along on their salaries. Senator Tran Van Don, the head of the Senate Defense Committee, who is one of the leaders of the political opposition to Thieu, has been traveling extensively around the country the past few weeks and has talked with many soldiers. "Everywhere I go, the one word I hear is *doi—doi, doi, doi, doi,*" Don says. The word means "hunger."

The Americans nod their heads and agree that things are out of joint, but they keep insisting that the Vietnamese must put their own economy in order, cut down on corruption and blackmarketeering, prevent the outward flow of capital, limit unnecessary expenditures, and do a number of other things before any more aid will be granted. In a way, this is like telling a spoiled child that he has one day in which to learn to behave himself or he will be sent to reform school. Further, the Americans say that not until all these things are done can a sensible estimate be made of how much less it will cost to support one Vietnamese soldier than it has cost to support an American G.I. out here in the manner to which he is accustomed. (One guess is that the figure will be about seventy-five per cent less, which says something about what has sometimes been called "the beer-and-PX war.") At best, the situation will remain critical for the next two years—the shortest time in which the Vietnamese can hope to establish relative security after the American withdrawal. During this period, the Vietnamese will have to raise their income in part by increasing their exports and improving their miserable trade imbalance. Their receipts from taxes are virtually nil, but to reorganize a leaky tax structure at a time like this in such a way as to make the rich as well as the poor pay up overnight is a task that even the best of bureaucracies—and Saigon is one of the worst—would find difficult. Improvements can purely be made, but not enough of them can be made quickly enough to matter much.

Our criticisms particularly annoy the Vietnamese because they claim it is we who created the inflationary economy, by allowing the market to be flooded with luxury items to soak up piastres. Life has indeed been more comfortable for the private entrepreneur—the mason, the cyclo-driver, the whore—but not for those who are doing the fighting, in the field or in drab, fly-infested, un-air-conditioned offices. The whole economic problem, of course, is deeply enmeshed in politics, and here, too, the Americans are blamed—for having foisted an impossible Western system of democracy upon an underdeveloped country that can't possibly cope with it, espcially in the midst of

a brutal war. If that criticism is justified, then the Vietnamese must also bear some of the blame.

Several months ago, President Thieu considered trying to introduce an economic-austerity bill in the National Assembly, raising taxes as much as sevenfold on some luxury items such as foreign cars. The House of Representatives refused to accept the bill, so Thieu, acting under a decree that dated back to the time of Diem, imposed the measure anyway. A senator, acting as a private citizen, brought suit against the government in the Supreme Court, charging that the decree was illegal. By then, the government realized that the measure had not been properly prepared anyway and was full of anomalies. The able but sorely tried Minister of Economics, Pham Kim Ngoc, prepared a new measure that would rectify the discrepancies and began drawing up a list of items whose importation would be completely prohibited, such as machines that the Vietnamese could make or assemble themselves, cosmetics, fruits, and whiskey. The revamped austerity bill was passed late in April by the House and is now before the Senate. Meanwhile, the Supreme Court has declared the earlier measure illegal.

The government's mishandling of the students' and veterans' problems grew steadily worse in April, during three weeks of demonstrations that were systematically broken up by police with tear gas—which they often threw into the wind and hence back into their own faces. The students were protesting initially against the reported torture of several of their number who had been arrested on charges of treason and subversive activities, and against the proposal that the accused be tried by a special military tribunal instead of by a civil court. Late in April, after Don's committee presented evidence to the Supreme Court that at least a third of the students had been beaten and tortured—or, in the case of the four girls, humiliated—that body ruled that such procedures were unconstitutional. The Court also clipped the wings of the military tribunal by ruling that its members had been illegally appointed and that its sentencing and appeal procedures were also unconstitutional. The government apparently got the message, for it admitted that some students had indeed been tortured—something that it had earlier denied vehemently. As things look now, the chances that any verdict of the military tribunal will be upheld are slight, even though the government claims to have firm evidence that at least four of the students had direct contact with the Vietcong. While the government attempted to mollify the students further by recognizing their union, their response was to take to the streets again. As of this week, the government has shut down all schools in the Saigon area.

The students have now become the spearhead of opposition to the government. The situation thus differs from that during the crises that occurred between 1964 and 1966, in which the Buddhists set the opposition course with the students following their example. Now some militant Buddhist leaders have joined the student-protest movement, while others, including Thich Tri Quang, the monk who led the 1963 campaign against Diem, are lying low. This week, students and militant Buddhists joined to forcibly occupy the National Pagoda, in the center of Saigon, in protest against the government—which, in turn, dispatched troops to oust them. On Wednesday, in a tragic echo of the Affair at Kent State, four people were killed by soldiers clearing the pagoda.

As for the veterans, what began as a legitimate protest against a lack of adequate housing and financial support for disabled ex-soldiers has become another *cause célèbre*, for government inaction resulted in other elements taking up the veterans' cause for their own purposes and helping them put shacks on government and private property. Belatedly, the government then moved to give the veterans more benefits, especially housing but, by this time they had joined with the students and other dissidents in a whole rash of demonstrations. On April 28th, at a soirée for ex-generals held by Senator Don (an ex-general himself), Duong Van Minh, the nominal leader of the anti-Diem coup in 1963, who is acting more and more like a man who wants to run against Thieu for President in 1971, expressed sympathy for both the students and the veterans. Minh warned that if the government continues its blindly oppressive policies, soldiers on active duty will soon join the fight—"a disaster that must be avoided."

A particular source of embarrassment here in recent months, for both the government and the Americans, has been the case of Tran Ngoc Chau, an able former province chief and former head of the government's pacification headquarters, who has many friends among the Americans. Chau, who left the pacification job and entered the National Assembly in 1967, subsequently had a number of contacts with a brother, Tran Ngoc Hien, a dedicated Communist who was arrested last year in a spy roundup here. Few people doubt that Chau remains a dedicated anti-Communist, but he has the misfortune of also being known as a dedicated opponent of Thieu, whose ire he has aroused by talk about a coalition government. In February, the military, under Thieu's orders, seizing the pretext of Chau's contacts with Hien and flouting his presumed immunity as an Assemblyman, dragged him from the Assembly building and before a military court that sentenced him to ten years' imprisonment. Chau maintained that he had reported his conversations with Hien to the C.I.A., and for this reason and others it was felt that our embassy should have come to his defense. The Supreme Court has, for the moment at least, rectified matters by throwing out the military verdict, but Thieu's unjust action, and our embassy's unjustified inaction, will remain on the record.

The Supreme Court has thus momentarily emerged as the conscience of the foundering Second Republic. Though it is by no means certain that the Court will be able to retain that role, what it has done so far adds up to one of the most encouraging developments since the 1967 Presidential elections. It is becoming more and more apparent that Thieu is moving in the direction of what some of his aides have politely described as "clear-sighted dictatorship." Most observers, however, doubt his ability to be either clear-sighted or, for that matter, an efficient dictator. More and more Vietnamese are blaming the Americans for having sponsored him and then nursed him to the point where he has isolated himself from almost everyone except his inner Cabinet and the few Americans who see him regularly. He speeks constantly of "national salvation," but he seldom mentions the necessity of adhering to legal principles and constitutional procedures, and so far various attempts he has made to form a political party of his own with "clear-sighted" aims have failed. The blunt truth is that Thieu is unsure of himself and mistrustful of almost all Vietnamese outside the palace, and that American efforts to build him up, give him confidence, and "bend" him to be more liberal have collapsed.

Several weeks ago, Vice-President Ky, who has been trying, partly at the suggestion of the Americans, to get Thieu to delegate some authority to him or to others, had a long talk with the President, during which they compared their situation to an automobile race. "Thieu said I wanted to go too fast," Ky later told me. "He said that I might reach the finish line first, but that there was also a chance that I would have an accident en route, while he could be sure of arriving safely. I asked him, 'What's the sense of entering the race in the first place if you don't try to win? And if you go too slow the spectators will want their money back.' " Ky told me that he had tried repeatedly to move Thieu to action, and that Thieu had often agreed but then had failed to follow through. "Some people say Thieu is a dictator," Ky said. "Actually, he is too weak to be a dictator. And he doesn't learn from his mistakes. What he most lacks is confidence in himself. As for those, like Don and Minh, who are willing to help him if he would let them, it's too late—not for them, but for Thieu."

In view of all that is happening in South Vietnam, the Cambodian adventure may well prove disastrous. I can think of no better summation than to quote from an open letter published a short time ago by Senator Thai Lang Ngheim, an ardent anti-Communist and the official spokesman for Senator Don's political group. "The people's confidence is now frozen, their hope has now disappeared," Nghiem wrote. "Early in this Year of the Dog, we are witnessing the bankruptcy of the regime's political authority, the failure of all efforts to build up a Second Republic. Many had hoped that the beaten path of failures would have served as an example to the new leaders, but they are now advancing along the same path, following the same political ground rules that were used by the old leaders. Old and new leaders come from the same social strata—those which used to be controlled by foreigners, the scum of society that floats on the surface of the boiling pot." Nghiem went on to speak of "the impotence and the blind, unjustified pride that have dominated our lives for so many years," and continued, "The heart of the matter is not the offensive of the Communists but the dirty nature of our own people, our own leaders. Our minds are dirty, our hearts are dirty. It is clear that we are up to our necks in corruption. It has entered our bloodstream, our lungs, our hearts. It is no longer an individual disease. It is systematized. It has got hold of the whole regime. Corruption comes from the organization of power. To stamp out corruption means to reorganize power—in this case, political power, political institutions. Power must be put back in the hands of the people. The New Year of the Dog is the New Year of general fatigue, of a feeling of pain after being beaten up."

ORDER OF BUSINESS—RULE OF GERMANENESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, is my understanding correct that there are no further speakers who wish to address their remarks to the unfinished business today?

In looking about the Chamber, I see no Senator who wishes to speak on the unfinished business.

I therefore ask unanimous consent that the Pastore germaneness rule be considered no longer operable at this point and that Senators may now transact routine morning business with the limitation on their speeches to be 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG). Without objection, it is so ordered.

LETTERS ON CAMBODIA

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I have received a great many letters and telegrams and petitions during the last 2 weeks. I have well over 100,000 letters, although they have not all been counted.

This morning I received at my home

two letters which I think are indicative of the point of view of many of our citizens.

One is addressed to me from a man in Georgia named Ben L. Powers.

It reads:

MAY 17, 1970.

DEAR SENATOR: The South has been lost in the past two years to the grand old Nixon party.

You have been of very little help to your liberal Democrats.

Please read the enclosed and get wise.

Yours truly,

BEN L. POWERS.

Mr. President, the letter encloses an article from an Atlanta newspaper, the Atlanta Journal-Constitution, reporting on the results of a poll with respect to the Cambodian expansion of the war.

I ask unanimous consent that that article be printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

JOURNAL-CONSTITUTION SURVEY FAVORS CAMBODIA OFFENSIVE: 83 PERCENT OF 4,552 AGREE—DISSENT HEAVIEST IN METRO AREA

President Nixon's decision to send American troops into Cambodia is approved overwhelmingly by those who responded to an Atlanta Journal-Constitution poll.

Of more than 4,500 responses, 83 per cent favored the President's action and only 17 per cent were opposed.

The questionnaire, published in last Sunday's Journal-Constitution, drew 4,552 answers from 140 of Georgia's 159 counties and from other states. Of those, 3,765 supported the President's decision and 787 were opposed.

Greatest support for Nixon's action came from those counties outside metro Atlanta, with 2,042 indicating approval, 389 disapproval. In metro Atlanta, the vote was 1,533 for and 354 against the move.

The 8th Congressional District in Southeast Georgia, voted 268–25 in favor of the Cambodian thrust.

Many of those who responded to the question wrote additional comments on the ballot or on letters attached to the ballot. Several told of sons or husbands fighting in Vietnam or Cambodia.

"I had much rather have them fight over there than in our own country," one woman wrote, adding, "My husband is over there for the third time and my son for the first time."

Another said, "My son is there, so we are vitally interested. Why isn't everyone else?" And another, also supporting the President, wrote the poignant comment: "My son is missing in action."

A young Atlanta woman, opposing the Cambodian action, wrote:

"How could I approve of it? My husband will be going to Vietnam next month. He's only 19 years old and I am 20. I have plenty of bills, I have an allergy condition that does not allow me to work and I am pregnant for the first time and we've only been married a year."

Many of those who returned the ballot took the opportunity to express strong disapproval of student demonstrations on college campuses and support of Vice President Spiro T. Agnew.

The ballot was published only in those papers delivered to regular subscribers of The Atlanta Journal-Constitution to assure that the results would accurately reflect the feeling of regular readers.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, I also received a most eloquent letter from a housewife and mother. This letter is from New Jersey.

I would like to read it. It is very brief. I read it because I think it expresses more eloquently than I can a point of view with respect to war.

The letter reads:

ELBERON, N.J.,
May 20, 1970.

DEAR MR. FULBRIGHT: I am writing you to express my opposition to the Nixon Administration's involvement in Vietnam and Cambodia. I support your views and believe you speak for the majority of the people. I can assure you that we mothers stand behind you.

As a citizen of the United States and as a mother of two children, I raise my voice in opposition to this unconstitutional war. I do not believe the U.S. should be trying in vain to help a country that will not help itself. Why should our Sons, Husbands, and Fathers die for so unjust a cause?

To ask a mother to send off to war the Son (sometimes scarcely more than a child) she has loved, guided, protected and cared for through sickness is to ask her to tear out her very heart. It is to ask her to cast aside her hopes and dreams as though ashes instead of a treasure. Is this war in Southeast Asia worth it? I do not think so.

This war is destroying us by effectively dividing our country and in the meantime all our overwhelming problems at home go uncared for. It is like a garden that isn't cared for. First one weed sprouts, and then it becomes entangled with weeds. We should make the Nixon Administration see that we are for peace and they would surely have to end it.

Then, we should get on with the overwhelming tasks of straightening up our homeland. We should help our own poor and starving people. We should make it a place where both black and white could live in peace. We should clean up our environment. We should seek to educate our young people of the dangers of drug abuse and crack down on the dope pushers. All of these problems outweigh in importance the war being fought in Southeast Asia. Yet, they all go unheeded because our tax dollars go into funding a war the majority of us neither chose or believe in.

As for purposes of security, I believe we should make it strong from within by making it a place we can believe in again. We should restore our basic American ideals.

We should let other countries help themselves and take care of just one country—ours. I believe in the policy of isolationism. Make our country strong by having all the people believing in it again and no country will want to start a war with us.

My Son is only seven and already I fear for him. In a short while, he could be called to go to war. This dear child, this cherished gift of God. If the ones who smugly declare war realized the lives that are ruined and wasted by their acts; if they were the ones who had to fight on the frontline in Vietnam and Cambodia—I daresay there would be no war. If the hand that rocked the cradle really did rule the world, there would be no war.

For the following specific reasons, I am in opposition to the war:

1. I protest the violation of the Constitution by the President, Richard M. Nixon, who undertook an act of war without formally consulting the elected representatives of the people.

2. I support those critics of the Administration who seek to bring an immediate end to the rapidly expanding war in Indo-China.

3. In memory of those who died in vain, both in the jungles of Southeast Asia and on college campuses, and because the Nixon Administration holds pride in more value than human life and democracy.

I urge you to continue your attack on this tragic war. As a mother of two very dear children and as a patriotic American, I support you and bid you Godspeed.

Respectfully yours,

Mrs. WM. C. PAULSEN, Jr.,
A Mother for Peace.

Mr. President, I think this lady, whoever she is—I do not know her—has expressed a view that I believe to be uppermost in the minds of a great many women in this country and, no doubt, a great many men as well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there further morning business?

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

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

SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 203—INTRODUCTION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION ON WAGE AND PRICE STABILITY

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, on May 19 I spoke on the floor of the Senate of my support for the income policy proposals of Dr. Arthur Burns.

A new and very alarming rise in the Consumer Price Index just announced this week makes Dr. Burns' proposal even more pressing. We see before us a 6-percent annual increase in the BLS cost of living which is very alarming for the country, and we have to consider some restraints upon unlimited wage and price increases. This country may have to go to controls. It does not like that, and I do not like that. But we must not allow ourselves to be injured as a nation by our sheer inability to control our economic situation in the face of war. We have been fighting this war without in any way recognizing economically that it is a war.

At the very least it is my belief that the recommendations made by the minority of the Joint Economic Committee in its report this spring should be put into effect.

Mr. President, it is for that purpose that I introduce a joint resolution, which I send to the desk for appropriate reference on behalf of myself, the Senator from Iowa (Mr. MILLER), and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. JORDAN).

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG). The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred.

The joint resolution (S.J. Res. 203) on wage and price stability, introduced by Mr. JAVITS (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the recommendation we made states that—

The administration * * * announce the inflationary implications of unusually significant wage and price decisions. The Council of Economic Advisers should calculate and make public how much each price increase adds to the wholesale or consumer price index, and indicate other prices which would be adversely affected by such an increase. It should publish specific arguments why a

particular industry feels it necessary to raise its prices, and suggest Government studies of situations where particular bottlenecks or unusual supply and demand conditions exist.

Similarly, on the wage front, the Council should publish the price implications of unusual collective bargaining agreements, including the timing of the wage increases under different assumptions, the productivity experience of workers in the industry, the industry's profit situation and whether industry officials feel the increases will necessitate price increases.

These activities should not be considered the foundation for more detailed intervention by the Government in individual wage and price decisions. However, we see no harm in opening up price and wage decisions which significantly affect the economy to the eyes of the public. Public scrutiny could well have a salutary effect in discouraging price and wage increases that would have inflationary consequences.

It is worth reiterating that we say these activities should not be considered the foundation for more detailed intervention by the Government in individual and wage-price decisions. However, we see no harm in opening up price and wage decisions which significantly affect the economy to the eyes of the public. Public scrutiny could well have a salutary effect in discouraging wage and price increases that would have inflationary consequences.

As the ranking minority member of the Joint Economic Committee, and as it became clear to me a few months ago that the administration's plans to deal with the economy was not bringing prices down as scheduled or stabilizing the existing price and wage structure, I wrote a letter to the chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, Dr. Paul W. McCracken on April 27, 1970, urging that the recommendations of the minority which I have read to be implemented.

I ask unanimous consent that my letter to Dr. McCracken be made a part of the RECORD.

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

APRIL 27, 1970.

Hon. PAUL W. MCCRACKEN,
Chairman, Council of Economic Advisors, Executive Office Building, Washington, D.C.

DEAR Dr. MCCRACKEN: The relentless rise in the consumer price index must be a matter of concern for all of us, coming as it does at a time when unemployment is also rising and corporations are showing a marked earnings squeeze. It is particularly disturbing to find that prices for items of great consequence to the poor and to fixed income families—housing, public transportation and medical services—have been rising significantly faster than the consumer price index as a whole. It is also disturbing to note that the index will also affect the price of government-purchased goods and services, with all that this implies for the precarious Federal budget surplus.

I am writing, therefore, to ask for your comments on the proposal—which was adopted unanimously by the Republicans of the Joint Economic Committee and reflects the input of a caucus of Senate Republicans—that the Council of Economic Advisors publish the implications of major wage and price decisions.

The proposal recommends that the Council indicate how significant price decisions, up or down, in major industries could be expected to influence overall consumer and wholesale price levels, and how they might affect other prices in related industries. The Council would also give the arguments made by particular companies or industries why price increases made by them are deemed necessary.

Similarly, the Council would indicate the implications of collective bargaining proposals in significant industries. This would include calculations of the magnitude of these increases under different timing assumptions, the productivity experience in the industry, and whether industry officials believe such increases would bring about price increases.

These activities would be limited to informing the public, and would not involve the Administration taking a stand for or against any particular wage or price behavior.

I sincerely believe that an informed public debate resulting from such information, which the Council is in a position to publish, would be a significant step in the Administration's anti-inflationary campaign. I also believe that the vast force of public opinion has not been sufficiently mobilized in this anti-inflation campaign to date.

Sincerely,

JACOB K. JAVITS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The 3 minutes of the Senator from New York have expired.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for an additional 3 minutes.

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

Mr. JAVITS. Yesterday, in a letter dated May 14, I received Dr. McCracken's reply. For the information of Senators, I ask unanimous consent that it be included in the RECORD.

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

THE CHAIRMAN OF THE
COUNCIL OF ECONOMIC ADVISERS,
Washington, May 14, 1970.

Hon. JACOB K. JAVITS,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR JAVITS: This is in reply to your letter of April 27 asking for the Council's comments on the recommendations included in the minority views of the Joint Economic Committee report on the subject of wage and price policy.

The recommendation to which you refer proposes that the Council of Economic Advisers report publicly on "the inflationary implications of unusually significant wage and price decisions." We have, of course, been aware of this proposal and have given it very careful consideration. For a number of reasons, however, we do not believe that action along these lines would be an effective way of restraining inflationary pressures.

The recommendation that the Council publicly assess the implications of important wage and price decisions is little different from the guidepost approach used until 1965 or 1966. There have been, of course, numerous efforts in the past few years to provide some form of legislative sanction for the review of important price and wage decisions. The latest of these was introduced last August and would provide for annual review of the guideposts by the Council and for the establishment of a Price-Wage Stabilization Board which would assess the consistency of important price and wage decisions with such guideposts. The Board would in turn publicize the results of its findings regarding any "price or wage behavior which does in fact threaten national economic stability" together with a recommendation for action by the President, Congress, or the parties concerned. In our testimony before the Subcommittee on Executive and Legislative Reorganization of the House Committee on Government Operations on September 23, 1969, we expressed our objections to this legislation both as regards the policy it sought to write into law and the manner in which it proposed to implement that policy. A copy of the statement is attached.

The recommendation in the Minority Report differs from the Reuss Bill in that it does not refer specifically to any formal guidepost and that it leaves the job of assessment in the hands of the Council rather than of an independent agency. The distinction is, however, one of form rather than of substance. In effect, the Council is being asked to resume monitoring private price and wage actions in much the same way as under the previous Administration, except that there would be no specific reference to guideposts as such. As a practical matter, however, there would have to be some rules by which the inflationary implications of any price or wage action is measured, whether or not it be called a guidepost.

The recommendation seeks to distinguish between "detailed intervention by the Government in individual wage and price decisions" and "opening up price and wage decisions which significantly affect the economy to the eyes of the public." It is difficult to detect any real difference in this apparent distinction. In the great majority of cases in which the previous Council and Administration intervened in price decisions, the only sanction was precisely public exposure and criticism. It is true that there were also numerous direct approaches to business executives or labor leaders preceding or accompanying the public expression of disapproval and that at times public confrontation was thereby avoided. Back of any such direct approach, however, the real threat was always that of bringing adverse public opinion to bear. The guidepost approach backed by the sanction of public disapprobation probably did have some effect at first, but this decreased rapidly as time went on and inflationary pressures became more severe. And in the crucial area of wages, in fact, virtually all efforts at intervention were abandoned after the airline mechanics' strike in 1966. The result in that case made it evident that any form of intervention by Government, including efforts to mobilize public opinion, was more likely to be counterproductive than helpful. Subsequently, there was strong public criticism of the excessive rate of increases in construction wages but this, too, proved futile.

Despite the clear inability to exert any meaningful influence on wages, and hence upon a major determinant of costs, the past Administration did continue to comment on and intervene in various price decisions. These efforts may have had some effect, decreasing as time went on, in a limited number of highly "visible" cases, such as steel, copper, aluminum and automobiles, that were seriously concerned about their public image. These industries, however, were exclusively those in which because of their structure a few leading concerns enjoyed a significant degree of discretion over their short-run price policies. Even in these, rising costs increasingly circumscribed the scope of discretionary absorption.

In the majority of American industries, however, neither direct Government intervention nor public disapprobation could be expected to exert any measurable influence over price trends either because competition was sufficiently vigorous to deny individual firms any significant discretion over short-run pricing policies, or because they were less concerned over their public image, or both. Review of the record indicates that no success was achieved, or could have been expected, in moderating price advances in such major industries as textiles, apparel, most

food products and the like. The results of this policy were, therefore, not only discriminatory and inequitable, but also sharply limited in terms of potential area of influence.

As you correctly pointed out, moreover, the prices of such items as housing, public transportation, and medical services have been rising distinctly faster than the consumer price index as a whole. Increases have also been more rapid than the average for such items as restaurant meals, mortgage interest, and property taxes and insurance. Unfortunately these are precisely the kinds of items which would be least responsive to an approach of the kind recommended. Higher costs for housing, for example, reflect in large part the exceptionally rapid advance in construction wages which, as pointed out above, have persisted and accelerated in the face of strong direct or implied criticism by both this and the previous Administration. Finance, insurance, and taxes account for about 9 percent of the weight of the consumer price index and have contributed over one-third of the overall advance in the index over the past few years. None of the components of this group—interest rates, insurance premiums or local taxes—would be affected in any significant way by public analysis of their implications. Nor is it likely that increases in public transportation, such as the recent 50 percent boost in fares in New York City, could have been averted or moderated by any analysis which the Council could conduct. There has been no dearth of public criticism of the continuing rapid advance in the cost of medical services but there is no evidence that such criticism has had any restraining effect on either physicians' fees or hospital charges. These are all areas in which impersonal market forces exert so dominant an influence on price behavior that even the strongest manifestation of public disapproval would be virtually meaningless.

Finally, I must point out that the recommendation would impose an almost impossible burden on the Council. Objective assessment of either the justification of a price or wage increase or of its inflationary implications is an extremely difficult task. Careful, objective analysis in any important case would take months and a much larger staff than is available. Anything less than such thorough-going assessment could give rise to serious inequity.

In view of these circumstances, we have reservations about the probable effectiveness of this Minority Report recommendation. And in any case this would be no substitute for proper fiscal and monetary policies.

Sincerely,

PAUL W. MCCRACKEN.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, in the reply, essentially Dr. McCracken referred to the position of the administration that it does not like "guideposts," which it characterizes as the policy which prevailed in 1965 and 1966—that is, criteria for wage and price increases. In the wage field, it will be remembered that this criterion was 3.2 percent increase per year. The letter also reiterated the fact that the administration does not like the "guideposts approach" because it thought they were not productive and that they were not likely to be complied with—the main theory being that the sanction of public disapproval would not be effective as to certain important aspects of the economy.

For example, one aspect mentioned in the letter was finance, insurance, and taxes, which account for about 9 percent of the weight of the Consumer Price Index, which contributed about one-third of the overall advance in the index over the past few years.

Also, it was pointed out that certain services like medical services, in which there had been extraordinary price increases, would not yield to this type of public scrutiny because it was divided in the hands of so many thousands upon thousands of people and institutions which charge the fees—hospitals, doctors, and other health personnel.

It gave other reasons, for example, that many of these increases, like the increase in the New York subway fare, were governmental and were subjected to very considerable scrutiny anyhow.

But what Dr. McCracken's suggestion failed to do was offer an alternative. The fact is that public disapprobation can have a restraining quality, even by the admission of his letter, on a large part of the economy, and because it will have a restraining influence on that part of the economy, it will tend to restrain other prices which it cannot affect as directly.

The main point is that we have been offered no viable alternative at the present time except to continue present policies, which have proven to be very unsatisfactory and which threaten our economy with grave danger. Hence, in order at least to try a new policy which would put a stop to the deteriorating wage and price spiral infecting the whole economy, I have offered this joint resolution, with the cosponsorship of two other members of the minority on the Joint Economic Committee, which requires the Council of Economic Advisers to publish:

One, the implications of unusually significant price decisions made or proposed in major industries during the preceding 2 weeks.

Two, the implications of unusually significant collective bargaining agreements entered into by major industries during the preceding 2 weeks.

Three, such other data on price and wage developments as the Council deems beneficial to the public interest.

I ask unanimous consent that the joint resolution be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

S.J. RES. 203

Senate Joint Resolution on Wage and Price Stability

Whereas the goals of maximum employment, production, and purchasing power set forth in the Employment Act of 1946 affirm the need for price stability;

Whereas the level of inflation presently affecting the national economy is causing severe hardship and a loss of purchasing power for many citizens; and

Whereas an informed public debate in the fight against inflation, would mark a significant advance toward our economic policy goals: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That until December 31, 1971, the Council of Economic Advisors is hereby requested to publish, every two weeks, with whatever assistance may be required from other executive branch departments and agencies:

(1) the implications of unusually significant price decisions made or proposed in major industries during the preceding two weeks;

(2) the implications of unusually significant collective bargaining agreements entered into in major industries during the preceding two weeks; and

(3) such other data on price and wage developments as the Council deems beneficial to the public interest.

SEC. 2. (a) With respect to the data referred to in paragraph (1) of the first section, each analysis should indicate how the price decisions set forth therein can be expected to influence overall consumer and wholesale price levels, how they might affect other prices in related industries, and the arguments made by particular companies or industries why such price increases are deemed necessary.

(b) With respect to the data referred to in paragraph (2) of the first section, each analysis should indicate the magnitude of wage increases, under different timing assumptions, represented by the proposals set forth therein; the productivity experience and wage experience in the industry; and whether industry officials believe such increases would bring about price increases.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the enactment of this joint resolution could serve as a constructive first step toward the implementation of Dr. Burns' "incomes policy" and could have a significant effect on the inflationary price spiral that continues to erode the purchasing power of the dollar, drive interest rates upwards, and contributes to the continuing serious deterioration in our international balance of payments.

I shall, on Monday, undertake to make an even more detailed analysis of the economic situation as it relates to the Vietnam war, but I call attention to the fact that all the people of the United States have a right to ask, when under their very noses they see such a serious deterioration of the American economic system, What are we gentlemen in Congress going to do about it? I believe also that it is an obligation of the administration. It is for that reason that I have offered this joint resolution, with my colleagues, as a first step toward doing something about it.

ORDER OF BUSINESS—UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Carolina is recognized.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. THURMOND. I yield to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, for the information of the Senate, what will be the pending question before the Senate when morning business is closed?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPONG). The question before the Senate is the amendment of the Senator from Kentucky (Mr. COOPER) and the Senator from Idaho (Mr. CHURCH) to H.R. 15628, amendment No. 653.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I thank the able Presiding Officer.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I yield.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Is that the pending

business, or a proposed amendment to the amendment?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, this is, as I understand it, a revision of an earlier amendment offered by the same Senators, and is, therefore, a revision or substitute of the prior Church-Cooper amendment. Is it not?

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, we should not use those words. It is a proposed amendment to the committee amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Michigan is correct.

Mr. GRIFFIN. It is not a substitute; it is a proposed amendment to the committee amendment—a perfecting amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is a perfecting amendment in the nature of a substitute for part of the amendment of the committee.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, if I may pose a parliamentary inquiry——

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If the proposed perfecting amendment in the nature of a substitute to part of the committee amendment were to be adopted, that would preclude proposing amendments to other portions of the Church-Cooper amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No, it would not to other portions that have not been amended.

Mr. GRIFFIN. So that there would be eight lines, which might sometimes be referred to as preamble language, that would not then be subject to further amendment. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A specific amendment relating only to those eight lines would not be in order.

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. President, if I may, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. GRIFFIN. If a broader substitute were offered later, which included that language but went beyond it, that could then make changes in the language of that proposed amendment; would that be correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Subject to review by the Chair at the time the proposal is offered, the Chair would say that it is possible to do what the Senator has stated.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, by the verbiage "subject to the review by the Chair" the Chair merely intends to be sure that such a later amendment does not amend language in the preamble that has already been amended by the pending perfecting amendment unless an additional change of substance is intended to be made at the same time in a broader area than that of the preamble itself. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Only.

Mr. SCOTT. Only.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. And subject to the review that the Chair would give to the submission of any proposal.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask that the clerk again read the amendment last pending before the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Subject to the fact that we are now, as the Senator from West Virginia knows, transacting routine morning business, the clerk will now report what was the business of the Senate prior to our going back into the morning hour, and will again become the business of the Senate when the morning hour is ended.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. The amendment by Mr. COOPER and other Senators, identified as amendment No. 653, as follows:

Beginning on page 4, line 24, strike all to and including line 6, page 5, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"SEC. 47. LIMITATIONS ON UNITED STATES INVOLVEMENT IN CAMBODIA.—In concert with the declared objectives of the President of the United States to avoid the involvement of the United States in Cambodia after July 1, 1970, and to expedite the withdrawal of American forces from Cambodia, it is hereby provided that unless specifically authorized by law hereafter enacted no funds authorized or appropriated pursuant to this Act or any other law may be expended after July 1, 1970, for the purposes of—".

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, does the language which has just been read by the clerk constitute the pending question before the Senate when morning business is concluded?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. When the unfinished business is laid before the Senate.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the additional period for the transaction of routine morning business be closed.

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

ORDER FOR ADJOURNMENT FROM MONDAY, MAY 25, UNTIL 10 A.M. ON TUESDAY, MAY 26, 1970

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business on Monday next, it stand in adjournment until 10 o'clock on Tuesday morning next.

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

AMENDMENT OF THE FOREIGN MILITARY SALES ACT

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate return to the consideration of the unfinished business.

There being no objection, the Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H.R. 15628) to amend the Foreign Military Sales Act.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the vote on the pending question occur on Tuesday next at 2 p.m.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object——

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, may I say that this has been cleared with all interested parties.

Mr. CRANSTON. I do not object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. President, may I be recognized?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SCOTT. If there is a question as to the division of time, we can take that up on Monday, or as we meet on Tuesday. I say this so there will be no assumption that we have overlooked the question of dividing time equally. It is simply left open to be determined later.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I thank the able Senator from South Carolina for yielding.

The unanimous consent agreement later reduced to writing is as follows:

Ordered, That the Senate proceed to vote at 2 p.m. on Tuesday, May 26, 1970 on the pending amendment (No. 653) by Senators COOPER, CHURCH, MANSFIELD, and AIKEN.

A LETTER FROM CAMBODIA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, there is no doubt that a large portion of our youth are behind the President. The mail from our fighting men in Vietnam and Cambodia strongly supports our Commander in Chief. I am confident our combat men are disgusted with those in our country who give aid and comfort to the enemy.

It is a pleasure for me to invite the attention of the Senate to a recent letter I received from a South Carolinian in Cambodia. This letter is from Robert E. Mimms, Jr. of Florence, S.C. He is with the 128th Assault Helicopter Company. I would like to read a portion of his letter. He states:

I would like to express my approval of President Nixon's decision concerning Cambodia. It is easy for someone in the United States to condemn the recent turn of events, but here we find the situation different. I am with an assault helicopter company, and, thus, am afforded a first-hand view of most of the situation. Overall, just being able to go into Cambodia has given a great many people a new sense of purpose over here. It seems that we are no longer sitting on our hands waiting for them to decide the moves. More so, now we are finally on the move. It helps my mind. Also, militarily, we are delivering blows which may prove disastrous for our enemy.

My only regret concerning the entire situation is the demonstrations reported taking place in the States. I feel they will, to a large degree, nullify our efforts in this drive. I think even more so, now, that the dissent will spur the communists into continuing their aggression even longer.

Mr. President, our Nation can be thankful for such dedicated and patriotic soldiers as Robert Mimms. I am proud to count him among the many others from South Carolina who support our Commander in Chief.

FIFTY TELEGRAMS ON CAMBODIA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is a pleasure to invite the attention of the Senate to the tremendous amount of mail I have received from all over the

country in support of President Nixon's action to destroy the North Vietnamese sanctuaries in Cambodia.

Before leaving my office to come to the floor, I picked up a stack of telegrams which support the President. I have here in my hand about 50 telegrams which represent hundreds of individual people and many organizations. I am proud to say that most of these are from South Carolina.

Mr. President, I would like to read one of these telegrams and place the remainder in the RECORD.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR THURMOND: Please be advised that a group of seven concerned citizens of Spartanburg Socar in a near spontaneous one day effort this date have obtained 1,387 signatures in support of the following petition in response of the end the war, television program viewed nationwide the evening of May 12, 1970, and the proposed end the war amendment we the undersigned would like to express our support for the President's Cambodian Vietnam policy. We too would like to see the war end; however our support of this policy is based on the belief that our President is motivated by the same single desire that stirs us all, that is, to bring peace to our world. Additionally, we feel that decisions of this magnitude, the decision to eliminate the enemy's sanctuaries, are best made by those having full access to all available information and those who possess the ability to weigh and evaluate it in a rational and objective manner. These issues cannot be resolved by mobs in the street over reaction caused by emotionalism can only weaken our position both at home and abroad. We support not blindly but with good reason the man elected to our highest office. Our petitions are still in circulation which we do not have the ability to recall due to the limited response time. However, we believe they too are being received favorably. We are placing in the mail tomorrow signed petitions documenting the grand total referred to above we earnestly entreat you to consider this response by your constituents.

Sincerely,

Joe G. Garrett, David G. Sherer, Charles J. Snook, James H. R. Brady, Ray C. Rogers, Jr., Milton B. Maness, Troy F. Stokes.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have these telegrams printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the telegrams were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGETOWN, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

We support the policies our President is following to clear up the situation in Vietnam. Request that you do the same.

Thank you.

Retired Air Force: Col. David F. Blackwell, Col. and Mrs. Wm. C. Warren, Maj. S. E. McFadden, Lt. Col. and Mrs. L. B. Thompson, Mr. and Mrs. Therom Hines.

Mr. and Mrs. H. G. Deer, Mrs. H. W. Hiott, Mrs. J. H. Hope, Mr. and Mrs. W. W. Doar, Mary C. Bruorton, Mrs. O. L. Bruorton, Mr. and Mrs. Linwood Altman.

Mrs. R. B. Altman, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Marlow, Mr. and Mrs. Jim Fultono, Mr. and Mrs. Leland Gantt, Mr. and Mrs. Frank Stacey, Mr. and Mrs. George Prince, Mrs. Lucinda Grate, Mrs. Barbara Reese.

Mrs. A. W. Hough, Mrs. Mary Cooler, Mr. and Mrs. A. H. Lachicotte, Mr. and Mrs. H. S. Collins, Mrs Emogene Ennis, Mr. and Mrs. Fred Packham, Mr. and Mrs. B. G. Fields.

Mr. and Mrs. J. H. Clyburn, Mrs. St. Julian Lachicotte, Harry Watson, Mrs. Wm. McCall, Mrs. Ruby Hill, Mrs. Shelor Murrell, Miss Alma Hull.

Mr. and Mrs. Jim Powell, Mr. and Mrs. Don Richarbson, Mr. and Mrs. R. C. Darsey, Mr. and Mrs. Glenn Miller, Mr. and Mrs. Charlie Zemp, Mrs. Lucine Marlow.

GREENVILLE, S.C.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

I do not approve the amendment that Goodell, Church, Hatfield, McGovern, Hughes will put before the House to curb President Nixon's plan to bring the war in Vietnam to a close as early as possible. He has the facts and interest of the U.S. uppermost in his mind and heart, and I'm sure all his decisions are arrived at from a long and prayerful search for the best for the United States and the troops without any thought of his political career. I believe in our President and will stand up for him against all others.

Mrs. HELEN J. DODDRIDGE.

SPARTANBURG, S.C.

Senator THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.

Being in Omaha Beach Invasion and father of three boys one in Thailand and another in college, I wholeheartedly approve Presidents action of late. Only problem, it should have been earlier; and news media is helping cause more uprising beginning with bias news reporting on civil rights against South for past ten years.

FRANK O. EZELL,
(*One of silent majority*).

MAY 1, 1970.

Hon. J. STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

(This telegram was sent to President Nixon.)

Mr. PRESIDENT: The undersigned being in full agreement with your action on the Cambodian situation wish to congratulate you for courage you have shown on this long overdue decision.

Vernon Smith, R. Infinger, J. Feathers, W. Parks, M. Nettles, C. Carroll, C. Mobley, H. Ray, H. Hux, D. Merritt.

R. Aderson, P. Doss, S. Wolfe, J. Johnston, J. Carroll, E. Smith, E. Harris, S. Woodson, E. Dubose, D. Hartman.

J. Muckenfuss, E. Losley, P. Hookom, R. Babson, T. Dubose, N. Stevensen, B. Blocker, E. Felkel, J. McCormick.

COLUMBIA, S.C., *May 5, 1970.*

Senator STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge your strong support of President Nixon on Viet Nam and Cambodia policy. Urge that you do all in your power to stiffle Senators Fulbright and Kennedy.

C. GUY CASTLES, Jr., M.D.

FLORENCE, S.C., *May 2, 1970.*

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Never have so few confused so many and never have so few positively accentuated the negative.

With the news media, the new left, the liberals and democrats it is rule or ruin.

I applaud your courageous support of our commander in chief. Sincerely.

JULIAN D. DUSENBURY, and family.

ROCK HILL, S.C.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please support the President in Cambodia.

CHARLES BOLLIN.

ROCK HILL, S.C., *May 18, 1970.*

Hon. STROM C. THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SENATOR THURMOND: As a commercial traveler over this State a majority of the contacts I make are back of President Nixon and his stand on Cambodia 100%. We urge that you give our position consideration. Many of us ask the question "Where were these loudmouth advisers when the preceding Presidents were in office?"

Respectfully,

C. STEVE JOHNSON.

COLUMBIA, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

In a unanimous vote we express our gratitude for your complete support of President Nixon's Cambodian policy to shorten the Vietnam war.

FLEET RESERVE ASSOCIATION UNIT No. 202.

ORANGEBURG, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We are against the amendment to limit the President's prosecutions of the war. We support the war policy of President Nixon and have confidence in the judgment of him and his advisers. We hope and think that you will actively oppose the planned move to limit his capacity to prosecute his plans in Southeast Asia.

WILLIAM GUNN and Mrs. NAOMI GUNN.

COLUMBIA, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We the ladies auxiliary of the VFW department of South Carolina support the President's policy toward the war in Vietnam

ANN THOMAS, *President.*

COLUMBIA, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

We have just viewed the telecast by the five Senators who are for the amendment to force the President to end the war. We strongly urge you to ask those five Senators what they intend to do and where they intend to relocate all of the people of South Viet Nam, Cambodia, Laos. We suggest these dislocated persons be sent to the perspective States of those Senators voting to hamstring the President's efforts to peacefully and honorably end this war in Viet Nam. We strongly urge you and beg of you to back the President of the United States in these efforts.

ACIE MERRILL,
Town and County Builders.
H. M. MIKE SMITH,
Tri County Builders.

MIAMI, FLA., *May 11, 1970.*

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

Attention all Senators. Please note the following message: Bravo for your stand in Cambodia and the campus riots. Indications here are that even the Democrats are with you. I do not believe that the U.S. can clean this mess until we follow your plan and I suggest even more harsh terms to propose to the Communist in Moscow, Peiking, Viet-

nam and last but the closest Cuba. We must be aggressive in our fight against Communism including the Communist inspired riots on campus. The penalty for violent riots must be expulsion immediately from school and then jail. A strong stand must also be taken with Castro, as he is no more than a puppet for Moscow and will infiltrate all Latin countries as we have seen.

May God be with you and give you strength and forsight in future crises against communism.

DON L. KETCHAM.

EGLIN AFB, FLA., *May 20, 1970.*

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

Thinking and concerned young people support Nixon and his Cambodian policies.

GENE and DONNA BROOKER.

CLEMSON, S.C., *May 20, 1970.*

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have my support in opposing the Church-Cooper amendment and backing President Nixon's action.

BERNARD E. DUNKLE.

COLUMBIA, S.C., *May 21, 1970.*

STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

We wish to commend you on your backing of the President's policies in Vietnam and our position in Cambodia. You have the strong support of our members both individually and as an organization.

CHARLOTTE S. DODD,
President, Ladies Auxiliary to the VFW, John W. Parker Post 8130.

COLUMBIA, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate Building,
Washington, D.C.:

I support president Nixon one hundred percent concerning his deployment of troops into Cambodia.

RUSSELL MOON.

CHARLESTON S.C., *May 5, 1970.*

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

Am completely in agreement with your support of president's decision to hasten end of war by offensive action. Although late, we feel that it will be effective and bring some peace to America.

LUTHER HAYNIE.

HUNTSVILLE, ALA.,
May 15, 1970.

Senator THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

I am behind my Commander in Chief's actions. I appreciate your support.

Sgt. IRA W. WILCHER,
U.S. Air Force, retired, South Carolinian from Charleston and an Alabamian also.

NORTH ANDOVER, MASS.

Senator THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

Cambodia campus strikes and Wall Street do not match the disarray in Senate. Church-Cooper shames the Republic and betrays the office of the President. In God's name close ranks and if you value freedom, endure the fatigue of supporting it.

HENRY G. ARMITAGE, M.D.

LYNFIELD, MASS.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

Thank you for supporting our President. We are with you all the way.

Mr. and Mrs. NELSON J. MCDERMOTT.

GREENVILLE, S.C.,
May 1, 1970.

Senator J. STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge support of President's action to remove sancturies in Cambodia, necessary to protect our troops. Political motives must now be laid aside. Action taken is in line with legion foreign policy statement at national convention 1969.

E. ROY STONE, Jr.

COLUMBIA, S.C.,
April 30, 1970.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

We don't fully agree but understand it must be done. We support the President's decision.

Mr. and Mrs. W. R. ROURK.

PELZER, S.C.,
May 4, 1970.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

My wife and I firmly support the decision of President Nixon on the Cambodia operation.

Mr. and Mrs. DOUGLAS M. COX.

AUGUSTA, GA.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

At last a man of action. Politics no, Nixon yes.

Mr. and Mrs. PAT M. TIDWELL.

CHARLESTON, S.C.,
May 1, 1970.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
Senate of the United States,
Washington, D.C.:

We support Nixon's decision tonight—hope you will.

NELL and WALTER CHASTAIN.

GREENVILLE, S.C.,
April 31, 1970.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Support Nixon.

KIRK R. CRAIG.

GREENVILLE, S.C.,
May 1, 1970.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Following copy telegram sent to President Nixon, "Your decision regarding Cambodia has our wholehearted support. It was an excellent presentation and we are with you 100 percent."

Mr. and Mrs. LEONARD M. WILSON.

AUGUSTA, GA.,
May 1, 1970.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

My wife and I as well as our friends are always your loyal supporters.

JOHN C. BEARD, Jr.

BURTON, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We are backing the President and proud of his courage.

THOROLF and JOE HANNEVIG.

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY,
Greenville, S.C., May 9, 1970.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

As a concerned American as a taxpayer and as a university professor you have my complete confidence and unqualified support.

RAY GRY.

CONWAY, S.C.

Re in regards CBS commentary

Senator STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

Here we stand in Cambodia, interview Mr. Maxwell D. Taylor and Mr. James Gavin both former generals implicated an unfavorable position with respect President Nixon decision to enter Cambodia. I support the entering of Laos in addition to Cambodia if necessary. Supply lines are vital and must be destroyed at their source. I support and encourage your support to end this conflict, further I support:

First, unrestricted bombing of north by conventional methods.

Second, the use of adequate U.S. support forces as long as necessary.

Third, cessation of useless peace negotiations in Paris.

Fourth, adequate training and use of ARVN forces.

GLENN WOODY.

CHARLESTON, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

My son and I are with you all the way. We will do anything that you want us to do.

JOE GREEN AND SON.

COLUMBIA, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

My entire family support you and President Nixon concerning Cambodia.

CHARLES W. BRIGHT,
Colonel, U.S. Army, Retired.

FLORENCE, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

100 percent behind President Nixon stand on Cambodia. Recommend strong action against rebellious college students.

Lt. Col. W. E. O'HARRA,
U.S. Army Reserve.

GEORGETOWN, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.

SIR: You are right. Stick to your guns.

JAMES D. JOHNSTON.

CHESTER, S.C.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate,
Washington, D.C.:

We back Nixon decision on Cambodia.

Mr. and Mrs. A. M. WYLIE.

CHATTANOOGA, TENN.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

Urge that you give the President your full support.

Dr. and Mrs. WILLIAM E. ROWE.

GREENVILLE, S.C., *May 16, 1970.*

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

I am against the Church-Cooper amendment. Please vote against it. Thank you.

LARRY JOE COOK.

VIENNA, VA., *May 18, 1970.*

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

As a constituent of your State, I strongly urge you to vote against the Cooper-Church resolution. I am in complete agreement with President Nixon's Southeast Asia policies.

Maj. RICHARD RASBERRY.

COLUMBIA, S.C., *May 18, 1970.*

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Columbia Chapter Reserve Officers approve the action of the President in destroying Cambodian sanctuaries, saving future American lives and urge your support.

Col. MAHLON A. SKIDMORE.

CHARLESTON, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Please don't sell U.S. aid down the river by supporting Church-Cooper bill re Nixon and Cambodia. Please support our President.

F. L. PARKER,
ELIZABETH M. B. PARKER.

SUMTER, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

We support President Nixon's war policy.

Mr. and Mrs. L. W. CANNON.

CHARLESTON, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

Senator Thurmond, urge you push war effort to fullest extent now. Please do not disclose plans or intentions. All honest students are working for their education in class rooms, not on the Ellipse.

O. E. ENGELMAN.

COLUMBIA, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

After watching NBC program asking for support for the amendment to end the war in Viet Nam, we want to make known our wishes that our country fight to victory.

Mr. and Mrs. M. O. MITCHEM.

SPARTANBURG, S.C.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

The Veterans of Foreign Wars opposes the Cooper-Church and the Hatfield-McGovern amendments, and we urge you to speak and vote against them.

L. HUBERT THOMPSON,
Commander, Post 9539.

BISHOPVILLE, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

Seven thousand American Legion Auxiliary members support President's Asian policy and troops. Urge support President Nixon.

Mrs. S. F. SHERARD, Jr.,
State President, the American Legion Auxiliary.

ORANGEBURG, S.C.

Hon. J. STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

V.F.W. Post No. 2779, Orangeburg, S.C. absolutely supports the administration in the Cambodian offensive and strongly urges that strategic points be bombed in North Viet Nam as deemed necessary. We also oppose the Hatfield-McGovern bill along with the Cooper-Church amendments now in Congress.

MELVIN DAYE,
Post Commander.

ORANGEBURG, S.C.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

DEAR SIR: The V.F.W. Posts of District No. 9, Dept. of S.C. Support our President in the Cambodian affair and strongly oppose the Hatfield-McGovern bill on troop withdrawal and the Cooper-Church amendment.

RALPH C. VOREIS.

DILLON, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
U.S. Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

Wired President Nixon today as follows: "The Republican Party and the great majority of the citizens of Dillon County wholeheartedly support your actions in Cambodia. We will also support your actions against anarchy on the campuses of this country."

GEORGE L. ROGERS,
Chairman, Dillon County Republican Party.

SUMTER, S.C.

Hon. STROM THURMOND,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D.C.:

You have been a dynamic force in South Carolina and policies governing the entire country. In these unreal critical times we are proud that you are there supporting our President.

He needs your help. After hearing on television a group of supposedly wise men of Congress urging people to vote against the President's decision on Cambodia we had to send this message urging you to work even harder in your support of his policies.

IRVIN J. and DOROTHY C. WYNN.

COLUMBIA, S.C.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Washington, D.C.:

Speaking for 10,000 members of Veterans of Foreign Wars in South Carolina, urge you vote and work against Cooper-Church-McGovern-Hatfield amendments.

LAURIE L. LANE,
State Commander, VFW.

LAWTON, OKLA.,
May 13, 1970.

Senator STROM THURMOND,
Representative, South Carolina,
Washington, D.C.:

I am a father, a veteran of World War II, Korea and Vietnam, I am a student at Oklahoma University. I am with the President. Back him.

ROBERT S. COLLINS.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in replying to these communications and the many others, I have reemphasized my support of the President. In my judgment, the President's action, which he promised to conclude June 30, will: Save American lives; reduce the possibility of a humiliating defeat; shorten the war; enhance success of the withdrawal and Vietnamization programs; and ultimately, I believe permit sustained self-determination of the South Vietnamese people. Full support to our President will insure this success.

CAMBODIA'S PLEA FOR AID FROM ASIAN NATIONS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, three important developments have taken place in recent days concerning the difficulties faced by Cambodia.

First. Cambodia has asked Asian and Pacific Ocean countries to provide arms and send troops to help her repel the North Vietnamese and Vietcong attacks on Pnompenh and elsewhere in that country.

Second, 11 governments attending an all-Asian Conference in Jakarta, Indonesia have called on all foreign forces to withdraw from Cambodia.

Third, President Nixon has endorsed the call of the Asian Conference for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Cambodia as this is in line with his earlier declaration that U.S. troops would be out of that country by July 1.

Mr. President, I would like to hear some of the supporters of the Church-Cooper amendment stand up on this floor and call for the withdrawal of Communist forces from Cambodia with the same vigor they have demonstrated in calling for the withdrawal of U.S. forces.

Mr. President, I am going to repeat this statement. I would like those who are taking the opposite side, those who are pushing the Church-Cooper amendment, to respond to the request I am now making. If they are not in the Chamber now, they will have a chance to do so when they are in the Chamber sometime next week.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THURMOND. Let me read this again, and then I will be glad to have the Senator respond, if he desires.

Mr. President, I would like to hear some of the supporters of the Church-Cooper amendment stand up on this floor and call for the withdrawal of Communist forces from Cambodia with the same vigor they have demonstrated in calling for the withdrawal of U.S. force.

I am pleased to yield to the distinguished Senator from California.

Mr. CRANSTON. Mr. President, I rise to respond to the distinguished Senator from South Carolina.

I am a sponsor of the Cooper-Church amendment. I support it. I believe it is deeply in the national interest of our country. I now repeat calls I have made in the past for the withdrawal of Communist troops from Cambodia, from South Vietnam, and from Laos. I believe that they, indeed, are the first aggressors. I call upon them to withdraw, as I call upon American troops to be withdrawn.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, we have heard a few weak words along this line, but we have not heard the determined effort, with vigor, to demand that the Communist forces withdraw from Cambodia as we have heard for the U.S. forces to withdraw.

President Nixon has made it clear that U.S. forces will be out of that country by July 1, so it seems to me we should be throwing the weight of the Senate behind demands for withdrawal of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong. Surely a concerted call for such a withdrawal could be made by all Members of the Senate, and the result would certainly enhance the chances of peace in the entire Indochina area.

Further, the Nixon administration has called for restoration of the peacekeeping machinery set up in 1954 to keep foreign forces out of Cambodia.

If necessary the Geneva Conference should be reconvened for this purpose in order to assure the integrity of the Cambodian Government and the complete withdrawal of all forces.

The Cambodian Government would certainly not need troops or arms if North Vietnam would withdraw their troops. One would think that Soviet Russia and Red China would call upon their friends in Hanoi to effect such a withdrawal if they are really interested in

peace in Indochina as they so often claim.

Mr. President, two articles in the Nation's press on May 19, 1970, contain information on the three points I have just enumerated. In the May 19, 1970, issue of the New York Times an article by Henry Kamm, entitled "Cambodia Asks Asian and Pacific Nations for Troops," and an article in the May 19, 1970, issue of the Baltimore Sun by Paul W. Ward, entitled "Nixon Backs Asian Appeal on Cambodia," are well worth the attention of the Senate.

I ask unanimous consent that these two articles be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the articles were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CAMBODIA ASKS ASIAN AND PACIFIC NATIONS FOR TROOPS

(By Henry Kamm)

PNOMPENH, CAMBODIA, May 18.—Cambodia has asked Asian and Pacific Ocean countries to send troops to help her repel the North Vietnamese and Vietcong attackers, but the initial reaction has been negative.

Highly placed Cambodian sources said today that the request for troops was sent Saturday to an 11-nation conference of Asian foreign ministers in Jakarta, Indonesia. In its closing communiqué yesterday, the conference, called to discuss the increased conflict in Cambodia, urged international diplomatic assistance for Cambodia.

The request for troops was sent over the signature of Premier Lon Nol, who acted after a meeting of the National Committee of Salvation. Although it has no official powers, the committee, headed by the First Deputy Premier, Prince Sisowath Sirik Matak, makes all vital decisions.

INDIVIDUAL ACTION POSSIBLE

High committee sources said that the lack of action by the Jakarta conference had not been regarded as a rejection of the request. They said it remained alive and a matter for the individual countries that had participated—Japan, Australia, New Zealand, South Vietnam, Thailand, South Korea, Indonesia, Malaysia, Singapore, Laos and the Philippines. Cambodia attended as a "special invitee."

The request for troops was the first made by Cambodia and a measure of the Government's view of the seriousness of the situation. Although American and South Vietnamese troops are fighting enemy forces in Cambodia, they are doing so on their own account.

The request for troops was believed to be motivated largely by the realization that the withdrawal of American air and logistics support by June 30—as decreed by President Nixon—will drastically reduce the operations of South Vietnamese troops in Cambodia and once more leave the weak Cambodian Army on its own.

HELP TERMED ESSENTIAL

The committee sources said the Cambodian Army would find it extremely difficult to assume the defense of the border regions. They said that Cambodian wanted to use the period until June 30 to prepare for that task but that help was essential.

For military manpower Cambodia looks principally now to the members of the Cambodian minority in South Vietnam who are serving as mercenaries under the American Special Forces, the Green Berets. About 2,000 of these soldiers have arrived here, followed by quantities of American equipment, and have been incorporated in special units into the Cambodian Army.

Cambodian sources said there had been an agreement in principle for the sending of more Cambodian volunteers from South Vietnam.

The sources also said that Cambodia was continuing her pleas to all countries for military equipment. An idea that is gaining favor in official circles is to ask the United States and South Vietnam to leave behind the bulk of their weapons and equipment when their forces end their offensives into enemy sanctuaries.

Cambodia, according to the sources, is planning to ask for help in training her soldiers. She would like to send units for instruction in such countries as South Vietnam, Thailand and even the United States.

LAOS OFFERS A PRECEDENT

There is precedent for such military assistance in the case of Laos. Many of her best units have been trained in Thailand with the help of American instructors.

Such training would involve American weapons, since both South Vietnam and Thailand are equipped almost exclusively by the United States. Cambodia would like to end her dependence on Chinese and Soviet arms, particularly because of the difficulties in procuring ammunition.

Officials note unhappily that the most substantial military aid received here so far has been shipments of Chinese-made automatic rifles captured by allied forces in South Vietnam. This increases Cambodia's dependence on Communist-made ammunition, they say.

If no help is forthcoming, the sources said, Cambodia is prepared to buy arms and equipment, particularly artillery and armor, anywhere, including the United States.

NIXON BACKS ASIAN APPEAL ON CAMBODIA

(By Paul W. Ward)

WASHINGTON.—The Nixon administration formally endorsed today an appeal by eleven Asian governments for withdrawal of "all foreign forces" from Cambodia and for the restoration of international machinery set up in 1954 to keep them out.

It also endorsed the group's appeal, made yesterday at the end of a two-day conference in Jakarta, Indonesia's capital, for action aimed at reconvening the Geneva conference which produced armistice agreements covering all of Indochina 16 years ago.

Meanwhile, Moscow broadcast a denunciation of the Jakarta conference's results, including what it called a "hypocritical appeal for an immediate cease-fire in Cambodia."

CALLED "UNTIMELY"

"This actually means," the broadcast said, "that the [Cambodian] military regime would be able to strengthen its power in the face of growing resistance on the part of the patriots."

It added that the Jakarta group's call for an immediate reconvening of the Geneva conference of 1954" was, and would remain "untimely as long as Cambodia is occupied by American forces."

On the other hand, it left unmentioned the group's call for the return to Cambodia of an international commission that was set up to supervise enforcement of the 1954 armistice agreement and that has been inoperative since last year. The commission is made up of Canadian, Indian and Polish delegates.

SUSPENSION ASKED

Prince Norodom Sihanouk, Cambodia's chief of state at the time, had called on the commission to suspend operations because he said, his government could no longer afford to pay its share of the commission's operating costs.

Five days after it had supplanted the Sihanouk regime on March 18, the Lon Nol government at Phnom Penh appealed for the commission's return to Cambodia. The appeal, addressed to Britain and the Soviet Union as co-chairmen of the Geneva conferees, has been endorsed by London but blocked by Moscow.

SUPPORT FOR PRESIDENT NIXON'S ACTION IN CAMBODIA

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, it is a pleasure for me to inform the Senate that I have received a great volume of mail from South Carolina in support of President Nixon's action in Cambodia. The last tabulation of this mail showed a large majority in support of our President.

A typical example of this support is a resolution passed by the "Forty and Eight Society" of Greenwood, S.C. I would like to quote a significant portion of this resolution. It states:

That it does hereby endorse and commend the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States and as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States for his decision to protect the Armed Forces of the United States in South Vietnam by directing our Forces to enter that portion of Cambodia which is and has been a sanctuary and a base of operations for the North Vietnamese in carrying on their unwarranted invasion against the people of South Vietnam, and neutralize the area.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have this resolution printed in the RECORD.

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

RESOLUTION OF VOITURE 435 LA SOCIETE DES QUARANTE HOMMES ET HUIT CHEVAUX, GREENWOOD, S.C.

Be It Resolved by Voiture 435 La Societe Des Quarante Hommes et Huit Chevaux, Greenwood, South Carolina, in meeting assembled this 6th day of May, 1970:

1. That, it does hereby endorse and commend the Honorable Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States and as Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States for his decision to protect the Armed Forces of the United States in South Vietnam by directing our Forces to enter that portion of Cambodia which is and has been a sanctuary and a base of operations for the North Vietnamese in carrying on their unwarranted invasion against the people of South Vietnam, and neutralize the area.

2. Be it further resolved, that it is believed that such action on the part of our Commander-in-Chief is in keeping with the plan for the vietnamization of the South Vietnamese and the withdrawal of the armed Forces of the United States from South Vietnam on the basis of a fair and just peace for the area.

3. Be it further resolved, that it is felt that the action of the President in this respect is in furtherance of a just peace for South Vietnam and in the world.

I, W. H. Cothran, do hereby certify that the above Resolution was duly adopted this 6th day of May, 1970.

W. H. COTHRAN,
Acting Correspondant.

REAL LEADERSHIP IN CAMBODIAN CRISIS

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in an editorial published May 11, 1970, and

titled "Real Leadership" the editors of the Augusta Chronicle newspaper in Augusta, Ga., have praised President Nixon for his clear and forthright explanation of U.S. policy regarding Cambodia.

Anyone who wanted the last detail on the motives and plans regarding U.S. efforts to destroy the Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia certainly should have been satisfied with the President's remarks.

The editors of the Augusta Chronicle chose well when they titled their editorial "Real Leadership" for that is just what the President demonstrated in handling this explosive subject.

It appears to me that some people in this country are only interested in attacking our President and if it is not Cambodia or Vietnam it will be something else.

This editorial commends the President for his clear and concise statement to the American people, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD.

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

REAL LEADERSHIP

At a moment in history when the American people suffer from division—aggravated by the emotional acts of anarchists and the subtle poison of Communist sympathizers—Friday night's press conference produce policy statements by President Nixon which should help clarify issues and correct misunderstandings.

It was a concise and statesmanlike handling of matters of concern to the American people—primarily the military operation to destroy enemy sanctuaries across the Cambodian border, the return of troops from South Vietnam and the mob violence on the Nation's campuses.

An overconcern for any isolated aspect of these varied situations might have led many a lesser official to overlook points essential to a national understanding, and to have concentrated unwisely on other points which by themselves did not reflect the entire picture. The President obviously had given much time to his preparation for this press conference, and as a result he placed the Administration's position in such sharp perspective that even his opponents must have been impressed.

Nor did the President fall into the trap of over-reacting to the shrill and automatic chorus of denunciation which has been incited among well-meaning students and liberals by those determined to destroy democracy in America. The President was conciliatory without any backing down whatsoever. His clear perception of the nature of seemingly opposed positions enabled him to extend a bridge of understanding to such critics as are open to dialogue. He pointed out, in this connection, that all his Vietnam actions since inauguration have been directed to deescalation of the Vietnamese war—from his troop withdrawal which are proceeding on schedule to the Cambodian operation which by blocking blood invasions can shorten the war and hasten reduction in military forces.

Thus he made it clear that the objectives of sincere critics are the same as his own, and that the differences are a matter of method.

Similarly, Mr. Nixon made it clear that his criticism of students was not at all a condemnation of dissenters—he upholds the right of dissent—but of criminals for whom he says his label of "bums" is too kind a word.

And, finally, Mr. Nixon swept away any misunderstanding about either "authorizing" or "muzzling" statements from officials in his Administration. This is an open administration, he reminded Americans (he had said it before) in which Cabinet members and other officers of the government are free to express their individual opinions.

To cap the entire effort to reconcile dissidents, insofar as they are open to reconciliation, Mr. Nixon's pre-dawn visit with students who were in Washington for a massive demonstration was a master stroke. In one spontaneous gesture, he removed any semblance of cause for complaining that he is oblivious to and unresponsive to the deep concerns felt by sincere demonstrators. Such a meeting must have been far more productive than a programmed confrontation in which agitators set the stage for an inflammatory approach.

The President's statements at the press conference will not change the mind of those who are irrevocably opposed to a democratic system. It may not change the minds of hardcore isolationists or pacifists, although it could cool their intemperance.

But with millions of Americans who are troubled over rumors and accusations and wondering which course is best, Mr. Nixon's words should help provide guidance in reaching rational judgments.

EDITORIAL IN THE EDGEFIELD ADVERTISER SUPPORTING PRESIDENT NIXON

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the Nation's weekly press is one of the strongest pillars in this great Republic, which some people are trying to tear down.

Time and again, the voices speaking from our weekly newspapers have proven the wisest in times of crisis. Time and again, these voices have refused to yield on the basic principles which made America great.

Such a voice was heard May 6 in the town of Edgefield, S.C., when Editor Walton W. Mims of the Edgefield Advertiser, penned an editorial titled "The President Made a Decision That Every Citizen Should Make."

I will not attempt here to elaborate on this editorial or call attention to certain of its paragraphs for the words of the editor express, far better than could I, the message all America should hear.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have the editorial printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Edgefield Advertiser, May 6, 1970]

THE PRESIDENT MADE A DECISION THAT EVERY CITIZEN SHOULD MAKE

President Nixon has stood up full height in a new resolve of patriotic leadership. Under the circumstances and with the opposition that he faces, he has exemplified a greater courage than has been shown in the White House in many years.

It was a decision from the school of Southern patriotism and whatever it might have offered, in way of a Southern strategy was unintended in the greater drama of its fatefulness and necessity. The South unquestionably is with Mr. Nixon.

Just how far-reaching is the President's challenge in the Far East? In its unpredicted timing, it presents a direct challenge to Red China and Russia beyond what they have previously faced.

But there is a more imminent challenge. It is to the American Citizen to stand up for country on every campus, in every organization, in every community and circumstance.

What the Vice President referred to here as "conditions eroding the nation's values and principles" is just now the conditions of internal weakness, that are seen in campus and organizational protests and more quietly have appeared in the absence of public care for a long time.

The President, who acknowledged that he was placing his political future at stake, cannot ultimately succeed, and there would follow a catastrophe, unless his action awakens the people individually and collectively.

It is to understand now and to care about the meaning and values of freedom!

There are those who mindlessly think they benefit by the "erosion of values and principles" about which the Vice President spoke.

They are found not only on campuses where to compensate for their illusion about life they attach themselves to spectacular causes, but are found in all areas contributing to changes that have eroded American values and principles, and therefore to the enemy's cause.

The President's courageous action hints of a new will for victory in VietNam following years of wasteful warfare that has left over 40,000 American boys dead, and up to now with but little hope! With enough support he could order victory!

Here are his words in describing what is at stake:

"We live in an age of anarchy both abroad and at home. We see mindless attacks on all the great institutions which have been created by free civilizations in the past 500 years. Here in the United States, great universities are being systematically destroyed . . .

"If when the chips are down the U.S. acts like a pitiful helpless giant, the forces of totalitarianism and anarchy will threaten free nations and free institutions throughout the world.

"It is not our power but our will and character that is being tested. The question all Americans must ask and answer tonight is: Does the richest and strongest nation in history of the world have the character to meet a direct challenge—

"Whether my party gains in November is nothing compared to the lives of 400,000 brave American men fighting for our country—

"I would rather be a one-term president than to be a two-term President at the cost of seeing America become a second-rate power and see this nation accept the first defeat in the proud 190-year history."

But, in spite of this very gerat call to victory in the Far East there were those in the Senate of the United States who called the action "unbelievable", "ghastly" and "unthinkable."

The President was speaking more for the South's kind of patriotism, and he perhaps knew that this great region would be solid with him.

Unfortunately there have been a few voices of dissent, and close to home a monopoly daily circulating in this area questions the President's logic.

When the Vice President speaking in Edgefield ten days ago said, "It is hard to straighten out a generation of problems that we have allowed to develop, but it can be done," there is little question about what he meant in the context of his speech and in the major confrontation of the Nixon Administration with the enemies at home—those who care too little about their country and those who care not at all.

It is time to intimidate the international sponsors of atheism and human slavery—a relatively few men conspiring to change the "values and principles" that have given ascendancy to America, and they would rule the world in the ancient form of barbaric darkness!

SETBACK IN HANOI TIMETABLE BECAUSE OF CAMBODIA ACTION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President (Mr. COOK), the fact that President Nixon's Cambodia action is accomplishing just what he intended finds support in an article published in the May 20, 1970, issue of the Washington Post by John Wheeler of the Associated Press.

Filed from Phnom Penh, Cambodia, the article is titled "Cambodia Invasion Reported Upsetting Hanoi's Timetable." I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

[From the Washington Post, May 30, 1970]

CAMBODIAN INVASION REPORTED UPSETTING HANOI'S TIMETABLE

(By John T. Wheeler)

PHNOM PENH, CAMBODIA, May 19.—A Communist source said today that the allied offensive in Cambodia might have upset Hanoi's timetable for Indochina.

The source, who is in frequent contact with the North Vietnamese high command, said Communist intelligence learned of the allied plans several days in advance and all major units were out of the path long before allied air and ground forces hit.

Reports from the field indicated that allied kill claims were overly optimistic but that North Vietnamese and Vietcong casualties had been serious nonetheless, according to the source. The heaviest blow was the large amount of stockpiled weapons and food captured, plus a major disruption of Communist communications in the onetime sanctuaries of eastern Cambodia.

If the North Vietnamese and Vietcong units had been conventional rather than guerrilla units, the allied thrust might have destroyed them. As it is, the source speculated, the Communists' timetable was considered to be knocked back, possibly for years, because of lost supplies and because the Communist-command troops now were fighting on more fronts.

The source claimed that the advance Communist intelligence permitted East Bloc diplomats to inform Lon Nol one day, before the invasion started. The Cambodian government was warned it was "playing with fire" if it went along with the invasion. The initial Cambodian reaction was to say any violation of its neutrality would be protested. Later the government gave tacit approval to the offensive.

The source also said that East Bloc Intelligence agents here closely investigated the March 18 coup that brought Lon Nol to power and concluded the United States played no part in it.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, the article indicates that the Cambodian action is accomplishing just what the President intended—a setback in the North Vietnamese timetable in South Vietnam. Hopefully the result of this setback will be a further strengthening of the Vietnamization program so that when American forces disengage from combat next summer the South Vietnamese will be able to preserve their liberty.

That is all the United States wishes to accomplish in South Vietnam, a condition which will permit the 18 million people of that Asian country to determine their own fate.

In his address to the American people President Nixon noted that the North Vietnamese "began to expand these sanctuaries 4 weeks ago." This came after the change of government in Phnompenh. It is true the situation changed because of a political development.

At the same time, it is true that the chief reason for this strike was the result of a military buildup which took advantage of this political development.

While critics of the administration refuse to accept this fact, as logical as it may be, perhaps they will accept the report of the new government in Cambodia. This government, noting the buildup and increased Communist activity against Cambodian military units, filed a report with the United Nations Security Council in New York and asked that this report be circulated to Council members.

The report was contained in a letter dated May 1, 1970, from the Permanent Representative of Cambodia to the United Nations, and I ask unanimous consent to have it printed in the RECORD.

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

LETTER DATED MAY 1, 1970, FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF CAMBODIA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL

On instructions from my Government and further to my letter No. 1919 of 27 April 1970 (S/9769), I have the honour to state the following for the information of the members of the Security Council:

On 24 April 1970, at about 8 a.m., the Khmer National Defence Forces attacked from the rear a force of approximately sixty Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese who were setting an ambush in the area of Kaun Sath, some ten kilometres south-east of Kampot. The Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese withdrew, leaving behind nine dead, four Chinese rifles and six grenades and taking with them some twenty dead and wounded.

The same day, at about 9 a.m., the administrative post at Sre Cheng, twenty kilometres of Chhouk, in Kampot, came under violent attack by the Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese. Overrun by the numerically superior enemy, the defenders evacuated the post. There were casualties on both sides.

The same day, at about 4 p.m., the Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese pillaged the railway station at Banley Chas. district of Samrong, twelve kilometres south-west of Chambak, in Takéo. The stationmaster was taken prisoner and was released on 25 April 1970.

During the same day, operations continued for the purpose of clearing the town of Angtassom, which had been under attack by the Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese since 23 April 1970. At about 6 p.m., paratroops of the Khmer National Defence Forces attacked the Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese, who were trying to maintain their hold on the town. Hand-to-hand fighting ensued. The enemy left behind fifteen dead and took a number of dead and wounded with them. Cambodian casualties were light.

The same day, at about 7 p.m., the Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese once again attacked the town of Kompong Trabèk, in Prey Veng. The Khmer National Defence Forces struck back vigorously, compelling the enemy to withdraw after suffering casualties.

During the night of 24–25 April 1970, the town of Mimot, in Phkar Rumchek, was subjected to two harassing attacks by the Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese. Vigorous counter-action by the Khmer National Defence Forces compelled the enemy to withdraw, leaving behind one dead, one Chinese rifle and one grenade.

During the same night, the post at Sre Chea, some ten kilometers north of the town of Kompong Trach, in Kampot, which had been attacked by the Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese at about noon on 24 April 1970, was subjected to another harassing attack by those forces, who were estimated at battalion strength, at about 2 a.m. Overrun by the numerically superior enemy, the Cambodian defenders evacuated the post. There were casualties on both sides.

On 26 April 1970, at about 9:30 a.m., the Khmer National Defence Forces fought a two-hour engagement with some sixty Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese at the village of Tuol Trabèk, two kilometers south of Prasaut, in Svay Rieng. The enemy left behind five dead, including two Viet-Namese nationals from Chiphou, as well as one rifle and two rocket-launcher projectiles and took a number of dead and wounded away with them, Cambodian casualties were light.

During the night of 26–27 April 1970, the town of Chhlong, in Kratié, was once again attacked by the Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese and the police station was set on fire. The fighting is continuing.

On 27 April 1970, at about 7 a.m., the village of Tuol Kandal, some ten kilometers south-west of Suong, in Kompong Cham, was attacked by about 100 Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese. The Cambodian defenders struck back vigorously and suffered light casualties.

The Khmer Government and people are profoundly indignant at this escalating series of overt acts of criminal aggression committed inside Cambodian territory by the Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese forces, who are thus violating the sovereignty, independence and territorial integrity of neutral, peaceful Cambodia and are trampling underfoot the 1954 Geneva Agreements and international law.

The Khmer Government and people call upon all countries devoted to peace and justice to bear witness to these facts and hold the Government of the Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the National Liberation Front of South Viet-Nam (Viet-Cong) fully responsible for any grave consequences which ensue from the present policy of aggression and expansionism.

They are entitled to take all necessary measures to ensure the defence and survival of their country, which can under no circumstances bow to the jungle law being imposed on it by the imperialist Viet-Cong and North Viet-Namese invaders.

I should be grateful if you would have this communication circulated as a Security Council document.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, some will argue that our Cambodian action was in direct response to the pressure being placed on the new Cambodian Government by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong. This report to the United Nations certainly indicates such pressure was being applied.

However, the fact that the North Vietnamese had supplies and soldiers in such numbers in Cambodia that it was able to launch attacks in two directions certainly

is strong evidence of the massive buildup they had accomplished there. The very fact they were diverted also made the U.S. and South Vietnamese attacks on these sanctuaries more timely.

Mr. President, the supporters of the Church-Cooper amendment and other critics of President Nixon have made much over the point that his action in Cambodia does not have the support of the American people.

Many of the major magazines and newspapers have since published public opinion surveys which show just the opposite. These surveys have already been placed in the RECORD so I will not duplicate them at this point.

One opinion report, however, which has not been placed in the RECORD to my knowledge comes from a group whose members have borne the hardship and heartbreak of past wars—the American Legion.

At a National Executive Committee meeting in Indianapolis, Ind., May 6 and 7, the National Security Committee of that 4 million member organization passed a resolution supporting President Nixon's orders to destroy these Communist sanctuaries.

I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the RECORD.

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

VIETNAM RESOLUTION

Whereas, Negotiations with the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong delegations in Paris for a political settlement of the Viet Nam conflict have failed to produce any results whatever; and

Whereas, The enemy has not only greatly stepped up its offensive military action in South Viet Nam, but has also expanded the area of its aggressive operations into Laos and Cambodia; and

Whereas, The enemy's intensification of the conflict in the whole of Indo-China seriously endangers the success of our Vietnamization program and threatens the safety of the remaining American and allied troops in South Viet Nam; and

Whereas, The President of the United States has initiated a program for the elimination of enemy sanctuaries presently enjoyed and utilized to a high degree, thwarting our efforts to achieve victory in Viet Nam; now, therefore, be it

Resolved, by the National Executive Committee of The American Legion in regular meeting assembled in Indianapolis, Indiana, on May 6–7, 1970, express the wholehearted support of The American Legion of the President's decision to eliminate Communist military sanctuaries in Cambodia and we call upon the members of Congress and the American people as a whole to give it the same support; and be it

Further resolved, That The American Legion urged the President to take further action, as and when he deems it essential to the safety of our troops in South Viet Nam and to the successful prosecution of that conflict, to eliminate, by military action all enemy sanctuaries, installations and areas wherever situated that afford actual or potential bases for enemy action against our forces and those of our allies; and be it

Further resolved, That the necessary military action be taken for the sole purpose of hastening the cessation of fighting and inducing the acceleration of those political conversations that will secure a lasting and honorable peace.

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, this resolution and many others like it which millions of American people have endorsed in recent weeks support President Nixon in the proper exercise of his obligations as Commander in Chief.

In so doing, he is carrying out the will of a majority of the American people. In support of this claim, I submit the words of the President who, in his television address, April 30, 1970, stated as follows:

A majority of the American people are for the withdrawal of our forces from Vietnam. The action I have taken tonight is indispensable for the continuing success of the withdrawal program.

A majority of the American people want to end this war rather than have it drag on interminably. The action I take tonight will serve that purpose.

A majority of the American people want to keep the casualties of our brave men in Vietnam at an absolute minimum. The action I take tonight is essential if we are to accomplish that goal.

Mr. President, the Commander in Chief of this great Nation has put his neck on the line for our fighting men in South Vietnam. We have a duty to support him in the difficult decisions he has had to make and in those he faces ahead. As long as he is Commander in Chief, it is folly to do otherwise.

In my view, he has acted wisely and courageously. It is also my belief a majority of the American people feel the same way.

HAVE AMERICANS LOST THEIR CAPACITY TO BE SHOCKED BY OUTRAGEOUS CONDUCT?

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, James J. Kilpatrick made a good point in the May 19 Star when he wondered whether Americans had lost their capacity to be shocked by outrageous conduct.

By way of example, he mentioned Secretary Finch's nonreaction when a rowdy group of trespassers invaded his office and occupied it for several hours. He also pointed to Dr. Larsen's donothing attitude when some profane hoodlum threw a pie in his face at a Government hearing.

Mr. President, in view of the fact that the word "discrimination" has become such an effective and emotional rallying cry in recent years, one wonders why it has not occurred to the average "man on the street" that he is being severely discriminated against. What if John Doe, the average middle American, decided to force his way uninvited into the office of a major Cabinet officer, solely because he wanted to see this important man and spend the afternoon observing the activities there. How far would he get? How long would his presence be tolerated? Or consider this situation: John attends a hearing at which some matter of interest is being investigated. Suddenly he realizes that the presiding officer is saying something he does not agree with; so he grabs the nearest bucket of water and throws it in the man's face. Do the nearby police officers simply shrug it off? Is John allowed to walk away unimpeded?

Here is a more serious situation: The local bank bounces one of John's checks, much to his distress. In a spirit of revenge, he tosses a fire bomb into the lobby that night. This is arson—one of the most serious crimes known to common law. Would not the local authorities move heaven and earth to see that John was brought to justice?

Mr. President, the answers to these hypotheticals are obvious. No one doubts that in each case John would be immediately arrested and dealt with to the fullest extent of the law. Is this not discrimination then, Mr. President? Mr. Doe is made to answer for his indiscretions while other individuals under similar circumstances are allowed wide latitude merely because they represent a "cause" and because they manage to get a mob to accompany them.

There are many among us who are forever vigilant when it comes to seeking out and exposing alleged discrimination and lack of due process, whether real or imagined. Those who are sincere in this crusade should accord publicity to this curious lack of equal protection of the laws.

ADMIRAL SMEDBERG'S LETTER TO THE RETIRED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, in the course of yesterday's debate, a question was raised concerning the briefing which the President gave to Admiral Smedberg III, president of the Retired Officers Association. I was not present at that briefing, and I do not know what transpired or what the purpose of the meeting was. However, Admiral Smedberg's account of it was most interesting to those of us who are concerned about the military capability of this Nation. Admiral Smedberg's letter to the members of the ROA was inserted in the RECORD yesterday, but no attention was drawn to the real point of the letter; namely, the precarious state of the U.S. military strength. Neither the debate on the floor nor the news accounts about the incident gave any reference to the major thrust of Admiral Smedberg's concern.

The letter was put into the RECORD but the attachments were omitted. These attachments were of extreme importance in view of the current drive to tie the hands of the President as the Commander in Chief.

Admiral Smedberg as a result of his briefing included a number of background facts related to national defense. It appears that some have been reluctant to talk about these facts and reluctant to give them the full publicity which they deserve. As Admiral Smedberg said:

The sobering, even startling, developments of the past few years relayed to us by the President, many of the details of which have been released by the Secretary of Defense, indicate that the U.S. is now very close to the point where its citizens must make a decision whether we are to continue as a first

rate world power or be willing to settle for second best.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the entire letter of Admiral Smedberg and his memo entitled, "Background Facts Related to National Defense," be printed in the RECORD.

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

RETIRED OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, D.C., May 13, 1970.

DEAR FELLOW OFFICER: Our Commander-in-Chief, the President of the United States, has made a difficult and courageous decision to attack and destroy North Vietnamese bases and war supplies along the South Vietnamese border inside Cambodia. His goals are understandable, particularly to military men; (1) to shorten the war, (2) to save American lives, (3) to enable his Vietnamization plan to carry on to a successful conclusion, (4) to permit self-determination of the South Vietnamese to continue to fruition, and (5) to minimize the prospects of a disastrous defeat as the strength of our forces in Vietnam grows less during his previously announced withdrawal program.

The order has been given, American military men are now in combat carrying out the Commander-in-Chief's orders, and some are dying in order that a larger number may live.

At home, opponents of the Administration, the "Doves", the Peace-At-Any-Price advocates, and those who have been persuaded that the United States has only to withdraw its forces from Southeast Asia in order for universal peace to exist throughout the world, are working right now to tie the hands of our President in this endeavor. Many well-meaning supporters of those policies seem to forget the additional jeopardy to which such actions will subject our troops in Vietnam.

President Nixon told me, and a few other officers of veterans and patriotic organizations, two days before his talk to the Nation, that the action he was soon to order was imperative if we were to escape the probability of total and humiliating defeat in Vietnam. Information from captured enemy documents, prisoner interrogation, aerial reconnaissance and other intelligence sources available to him had convinced him and his military advisors that our position in South Vietnam would soon be untenable, the Vietnamization program destroyed, and a humiliating defeat in Vietnam almost assured unless he ordered immediate and positive action to destroy the forces and massive supplies of arms, ammunition, food and equipment which had been stored in underground shelters in North Vietnamese "sanctuaries" on the Cambodian side of the border along the great length of South Vietnam. These stores were, he said, sufficient to supply several North Vietnamese divisions for six months.

I am convinced that the President had no alternative; to do nothing would almost certainly insure the loss of all that we have been fighting for in suport of free peoples everywhere, and the abandonment of the principles for which more than 40,000 American men have died in this war.

The voices of the organized minority are stridently raised against our President's action, giving great comfort and aid to the enemy.

I believe that, as a citizen who holds, or has held, a commission in the Armed Forces, you will want to add your support to those of us who have for too long been the "Silent Majority" by upholding our Commander-in-Chief in his resolve to bring about an honorable peace, maintain the integrity of this nation, fulfill its commitments to its allies, and honor those who have died in their efforts to preserve freedom for all peoples.

At the time of our meeting, the President gave us a detailed briefing on our general military posture. Beginning on page 3 I have briefly outlined some of his more pertinent and important points.

If you agree with the viewpoint I have expressed, I urge you as a private citizen to take immediate and positive action along the lines suggested on the following page.

Sincerely,

W. R. SMEDBERG, III,
President, Vice Admiral, USN, Retired.

BACKGROUND FACTS RELATED TO NATIONAL DEFENSE

(By W. R. Smedberg III)

On 28 April 1970 a small group of top officials of organizations which actively support an adequate national defense for the United States met with the President in the White House Cabinet room. I was honored to be one of that group.

The President talked for more than an hour of the particular problems bearing on our national security. This most unusual, if not unprecedented, talk to a group of mostly retired military and naval personnel, and the frankness with which he expressed his ideas, were positive proof of the trust and confidence our Commander-in-Chief places in those men and women who have given so many years of their lives to insure the security of this nation.

The President commented on trends which appear fashionable today, the viewing of patriotism with scorn, the downgrading of those in the military services, and the efforts to cut back on our national defense. He recognized, as do many military men, that military forces and military spending are looked upon in some quarters as inherently evil.

He recognized the high motives behind many of those who wish to take money from the defense budget in order to modernize ghettos, rebuild cities and clean our polluted air and water. The President believes that there must be major improvement in those areas, but he said that unless this country has adequate defenses, there may be no environment, at all, to worry about in the years ahead. Therefore, he feels that there must be proper balance between the required security needs of this country and the money spent in improving those areas which must be improved.

In my happy retirement I had thought that we were maintaining our deterrent capability and therefore our security. But the sobering, even startling developments of the past few years related to us by the President, many of the details of which have been released by the Secretary of Defense, indicate that the United States is now very close to the point where its citizens must make a decision whether we are to continue as a first rate world power or be willing to settle for second best.

The President laid the greatest stress on the fact that the Soviet's attitude, as expressed repeatedly, is one of expansion, whereas that of the United States is purely defensive.

Facts which I have learned and which I want to bring to your personal attention are:

1. At the time of the Cuban crisis, the United States had an overall 10 to 1 superiority in ICBMs. Now the Soviets are ahead in total numbers and greatly ahead in explosive power.

2. In the older category of multi-megaton ICBMs such as the Titan and comparable Soviet missiles, the Soviets in 1965 had a better than 4-1 advantage and they still maintain that position.

3. In 1965 the United States had 880 operational Minutemen missiles. The Soviet Union had nothing comparable. Today, the Soviets have over 800 such launchers operational and a projected force that could exceed 1,000 within the next two years.

4. In 1965, the Soviets had no operational launcher for its large SS-9 missile, which can carry a 25 megaton load. Today they have 220 operational systems and 60 or more under construction. The United States has no counterpart to this system.

5. The Soviets are continuing work on their anti-ballistic missile (ABM) deployment in the Moscow area and presently have a total of 64 launchers in place. The United States has none.

6. In the past year the Soviets installed over 120 additional ICBM sites; the U.S. none.

7. In the past year the Soviets built 8 new nuclear submarines with nuclear missile capability. We build none. We still have a superiority of almost 2½ to 1 in nuclear submarines capable of delivering nuclear warheads from the sea, but, by 1975, the Soviets will not only have equalled, but at the present rate of construction will have passed our sea-based nuclear delivery capability.

8. In 1965, neither a depressed trajectory ICBM nor a Fractional Orbital Bombardment System existed in either the Soviet or U.S. inventory. Today, the Soviets have tested both configurations and may have an operational version ready for deployment. The United States has developed nothing comparable to these systems.

9. In 1965, there was no development underway of a so-called Undersea Long-Range Missile System (ULMS) by either the United States or the Soviet Union. Today, the United States is spending relatively small sums in research and development of such a system. The Soviet Union is testing a new, long-range missile for possible Naval use.

10. In 1965, the Soviet heavy bomber force consisted of slightly over 200 aircraft. The U.S. heavy bomber force strength was about 780. Today, the Soviet heavy bomber force is slightly under 200. U.S. heavy bomber strength had declined to about 550.

These were sobering statements; in fact startling to me in both frankness and facts. Six years ago when I retired from the Navy, figures and statements such as these were "Top Secret." This new policy of the present Administration of disclosing such facts to the American people is worthy of the attention and commendation of all of our citizens. It may be possible that a potential enemy will gain some additional knowledge, but the probability is that these facts are known to his intelligence agencies already. They should, therefore, properly be known by all Americans. Only if each citizen is aware of the threats to our security can he support with confidence a defense adequate to guarantee our continuing security.

I think most of us around that Cabinet table were deeply impressed by the seriousness of the President. He had no cheerful smile after the first few minutes when he greeted us. We recognized that he felt the facts were grim and that he was doing his best to present them as they appeared to him, without camouflage or softening.

The President left no doubt but that his objective is to restore and then to maintain peace, but he understands, perhaps better than any man in America today, that one does not achieve or maintain peace from a posture of weakness.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished Senator from South

Carolina for placing these matters in the RECORD.

As in his case, I have received many wires, letters, and communications from my State indicating very strong support for the President. And I may, in the future, wish to place those letters in the RECORD. At this time, however, I want to make it rather clear for the record that it is not just in South Carolina and in Florida and in practically all of the South that this situation exists by placing in the RECORD the beginning part of an editorial from today's Chicago Tribune entitled "Strong Support for the President."

The editorial reads in part:

That was a mighty impressive display of patriotism and loyalty to President Nixon that the construction workers put on in New York Wednesday. More than 100,000 strong, they marched down Broadway and demonstrated in front of City hall to show their "love of country and love and respect for our country's flag."

They sang "The Star Spangled Banner" and "God Bless America"; they listened to fervent speeches defending Mr. Nixon's Viet Nam policy and attacking his campus critics; and they hanged one of the leading advocates of a blitz pullout from Viet Nam—New York's Mayor Lindsay—in effigy from a lamppost.

Peter J. Brennan, president of the Construction Trades council, told the crowd that "history is being made here today because we are supporting the boys in Viet Nam and President Nixon."

History was indeed being made. Here was the backbone of American labor cheering a Republican President and being showered with ticker tape in the inner sanctum, as it were, of corporate management. The rebuke to Mayor Lindsay was an eloquent testimonial to the fact that he does not speak for all Americans, even in New York—and he deserved it.

According to a Gallup poll for Newsweek magazine, 50 per cent of the American people support the Cambodian operation and 39 percent oppose it (the rest have no opinion). In Chicago, a TRIBUNE poll resulted in an 80 per cent favorable showing for Mr. Nixon.

Mr. President, I note also that the leading item in the contributors' column of the New York Times today states eloquent support of the President and the President's policy from the pen of a clergyman. And I want this to appear in the RECORD.

This letter to the editor reads in part:

TO BACK NIXON ON WAR

To the EDITOR:

As a clergyman who for fifty years in the parish ministry has been a member of most of the peace, interfaith and ecumenical agencies. I plead for understanding and support of President Nixon in his efforts to achieve peace.

This will need an understanding by all Americans of the circumstances in Indochina with which he must deal. The southern border of North Vietnam is the DMZ, the whole western border is Laos and Cambodia. In spite of encirclement, Hanoi for years has been pouring men and supplies into South Vietnam by acts of invasion of two neutral countries.

These were carried out without protest from the American peace groups, honorable and dishonorable. By their demands for the ending of American bombing of the source of that supply, these groups also gave immunity to this continual flow of thousands of soldiers, massive supplies to the aid of the Vietcong. Over a period of five years all of this produced only a stalemate and the constant attrition of human life.

PRESIDENT'S PLAN

When the President took office he said he had a plan to bring the war to a close. He began by bringing home 120,000 men during his first year, and has promised to bring home 150,000 more this coming year, with all home by the end of 1971.

* * * * *

The decision that the centers of military strength and resources North Vietnam had established in occupied Cambodia first had to be destroyed was made to protect the safety of American soldiers as they await their return home and during their embarkation. The Cambodian action will provide nine months of protection for them and for the strengthening of South Vietnam forces.

The President and the Defense Secretary have promised that all action in Cambodia will cease by the end of June. But the return of the American forces from the Far East will be determined not by slogans, or crowds, or mass confrontation of civilians in the capitals of the world; but by experience, knowledge and expertise in the logistics of moving great masses of men and material. Peace is not merely the ending of strife, but the tranquillity of order.

This is the wise pathway to the achievement of the greatest measure of peace in our time—an accomplishment which is the purpose and prayer of all Americans. The President deserves our trust and support.

The letter is signed by the Reverend Russell J. Clinchy, Princeton, N.J., May 13, 1970.

Mr. President, I simply wanted these two articles to appear in the RECORD to show that support of the President is by no means limited to that part of the Nation which is supposed to think in a little more military terms, which supplies the Commandant of the Marine Corps, from my own State, the Chief of Staff of the Army, from South Carolina, the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, from Alabama, and other great leaders of our military forces, but is also coming from such great sources of population as Chicago and New York, as stated in these eloquent articles.

RECESS SUBJECT TO THE CALL OF THE CHAIR

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate stand in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 16 minutes p.m.) the Senate took a recess subject to the call of the Chair.

The Senate reassembled at 3 o'clock and 26 minutes p.m. when called to order by the Presiding Officer (Mr. BYRD of West Virginia).

THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. President, the distinguished Senator from New Jersey (Mr. WILLIAMS) is necessarily absent today on business in his State. In his absence, he has requested that I submit remarks, which he had intended to deliver personally today, relative to the annual report of the Senate Special Committee on Aging.

The outstanding work of Senator WILLIAMS in the area of aging is well established. I have been fortunate to be associated with him and the fine work he has done in this field as chairman of the Senate Special Committee on Aging.

I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Senator from New Jersey and the material to which he refers be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COOK). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement by Senator WILLIAMS of New Jersey and the material therein referred to was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A CALL FOR ACTION ON AGING: THE ANNUAL REPORT OF THE U.S. SENATE COMMITTEE ON AGING

(Statement by Hon. HARRISON A. WILLIAMS)

Mr. President, the United States Senate Special Committee on Aging has filed its annual report, "Developments in Aging: 1969."

I am happy to comment at this time, along with our ranking Minority member—the distinguished Senator from Vermont, Senator Prouty—on the meaning and importance of this document.

For one thing, the report issues an interim discussion of the major study by the Committee during the past 1½ years. I am referring to our inquiry into the "Economics of Aging: Toward a Full Share in Abundance."

That study has, in the opinion of many experts in the field of aging and in many other fields, provided the best evidence yet that a retirement income crisis exists in this nation and that it is worsening. Today's workers—the retirees of the future—have a major stake in ending that crisis.

In addition, the report discusses many issues which should receive careful attention during the local, state, and Federal planning which will culminate in the White House Conference on Aging in November 1971. As the report makes abundantly clear, many grave issues—and many splendid opportunities for fulfillment in the later years of life—should be on the agenda for attention in the months ahead.

Finally, the report discusses emerging problems areas, such as transportation needs and cutbacks in funding levels.

Mr. President, I hope that the report will receive widespread attention. It is much too lengthy for reproduction here, but the foreword to that report and the summary of its major findings and recommendations follow this statement.

FOREWORD

Are older Americans losing the struggle to secure and maintain adequate retirement income?

That question necessarily overshadows all other issues on the pages that follow. And rightly so.

Over the past year, the Committee on Aging has issued reports and taken testimony on the "Economics of Aging: Toward a Full Share in Abundance."

Never before has such intensive congressional attention been paid to what might be called the personal economics of the elderly in this Nation.

We've paid attention, yes, to the national statistics.

But we have also heard directly from the elderly themselves, or from people who work with them every day.

We have met the widow who tries to live on less than $100, or even $60 a month.

We've heard, again and again, from elderly individuals and couples who say they must choose each day between food for the table or prescription drugs for their ailments.

We've listened to homeowners who say they can't afford to pay the property taxes that double or triple in just a few years.

Many who speak have been poor, or nearly poor, all their lives. Many did not become poor until they became old.

But, no matter what their prior history, more than one-third of all Americans past age 65 live in poverty or near poverty.

And for those whose incomes are well above such levels, retirement security is too often elusive.

Medicare covers less than 50 percent of total medical expenses of the elderly; the threat of losing the "nest egg" because of health problems is still very real.

Inflation takes a severe toll among those who try to live on fixed income.

For those ready to find a substitute for homeownership, there may be no rental units at prices they can afford.

The Committee on Aging has not yet completed its hearings on "Economics of Aging." It has not yet decided what its final recommendations will be.

But already it is clear that the committee has a major responsibility. It must alert the Nation to the fact that a retirement income crisis exists. Today, the great majority of this Nation's 20 million older Americans feel its consequence. And, unless major policy changes are made, the number will increase markedly.

Today's workers—men and women only 15 or 20 years away from retirement—thus have a major stake in the "Economics of Aging."

Vast as that subject is, however, it cannot encompass all developments in aging for 1969. Neither can this brief introduction.

Other major happenings and decisions are described on the following pages. But here, one additional issue is worthy of note. Very briefly, it is this:

There appears to be some danger that a psychology of retrenchment is taking hold in programs meant to serve the elderly. That psychology should be resisted, especially in view of the fact that a White House Conference on Aging is to be conducted in November 1971. What is needed in the months before that Conference is bold and farsighted planning and action, not a spirit of retreat or apology.

Concern about the future is caused partially by statements [1] attributed to high-ranking members of the Administration which took office in January 1969. In essence, the statements seem to suggest that the Federal commitment to the elderly be reduced in favor of a greater commitment to the youth of this Nation.

Sharp criticism [2] has been directed at such statements because the comparison of the Federal commitment has been inaccurate and misleading and because it is clear that there should be no "either-or" decisions made on behalf of one group at the expense of the other.

Fortunately, the present U.S. Commissioner on Aging has said that such reports do not accurately state the views of the present Administration.[3] In addition, the Commissioner has made other statements clearly indicating that he believes the U.S. Administration on Aging should fulfill a much more far-ranging mission than it now does.[4]

Such statements are heartening, but nevertheless there is reason for concern. Funding for the Administration on Aging suffered sharp setbacks during 1969. Housing programs for the elderly have apparently received lower priority, and may be in danger. Research on aging is underfunded. The Age Discrimination in Employment Act has not been implemented as fully as it should have been. And, despite Medicare, health care is sometimes not available—or too costly.

FOOTNOTES

[1] The Wall Street Journal of June 10, for example, gave prominent position to an article which began with these words: "The Nixon Administration is embarking on a determined but politically difficult campaign to shift the Federal welfare focus from aiding the aged to caring for kids." The same article quoted Robert Finch, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, as saying: "I'd like to see a great chunk of resources put in at the lower end of the age spectrum and hold (spending) at the top end."

Parade magazine of June 15, 1969, in an article called: "As Secretary Bob Finch Sees It: Serve the Young First," quoted Secretary Finch as saying: "There are four times as many young people as aged in the United States, but Federal benefits and services of all kinds in 1970 will average about $1,750 per aged person and only $190 per young person." The article added "In the language of the moment, he (Secretary Finch) wants to 'realine the priorities'."

The Washington Post, in an article on September 9, 1969, entitled "New Health Plan Puts Emphasis on the Young," said: "Nixon Administration planners have devised a 5-year blueprint that would expand federally financed health care for the young, rather than for elderly persons who already have the benefits of Medicare."

[2] For example, Mr. Theodor Schuchat, retirement editor of the North American Newspaper Alliance, said the following in testimony before the U.S. Senate Special Committee on Aging: "He (Secretary Finch) does not explain that 85 percent of the Federal expenditures for older people currently come from trust funds to which the elderly themselves contributed heavily during their working years * * *. He (Secretary Finch) has tried to tell the American people that the Federal Government is spending $10 for each older person and only $1 for each child. The ratio of 10 to 1 that he apparently decries falls to a ratio of only 2 to 1, however, if we exclude the trust funds expenditures and stick to expenditures from general revenues.

Delegates present on the final day of the 22d Annual University of Michigan Conference on Aging made similar criticisms in a resolution passed on June 11. The resolution called upon President Nixon "to express the philosophy and the commitment of the present Administration to the interests and problems of the more than 20 million Americans now age 65 or over and the many other millions soon to reach that age."

[3] John Martin, present Commissioner of Aging and Special Assistant to the President on Aging, on June 29 issued a statement responding to the resolution approved at the annual Michigan conference on aging. (See footnote 2.) He said: "I can assure you that Secretary Finch has no intention of downgrading the aging. This whole idea arose out of some figures used in connection with the creation of an Office of Child Development in HEW. His comments were aimed at the importance of adequate attention to the earliest years of child life and he did not intend in any way to pit the needs of older Americans against those of younger Americans."

[4] See ch. 11 for additional discussion.

CONTINUATION OF LETTER

Cost cutting in Federal programs may be necessary, of course. But the prospect of wholesale scuttling of programs—many of them just beginning to yield important social dividends after years of "tooling-in"—is something else.

The people of the United States now face a period of reevaluation in our thinking about Federal efforts on behalf of older Americans.

That period can be a healthful, stimulating interval leading to a productive and pioneering White House Conference on Aging to be held, at the request of Congress, in November 1971.

Or, that period can be one of uncertainty and lost opportunities. Gloomy as that prospect is, it is possible.

There are, however, strong arguments against it. For one thing, the field of aging has strong dynamics. It is growing as the number of older Americans grows. It grows, because our understanding of the social and personal meaning of aging is increasing. It grows because the United States wants a full and satisfying life for all its citizens, no matter how many, or how few, birthdays they have had.

For these reasons, we can be confident.

But for the next 15 months in particular, we should also be watchful.

HARRISON A. WILLIAMS, Jr.,
Chairman, Special Committee on Aging.

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

A far-reaching and deepening retirement income crisis continues to be the No. 1 problem confronting most of the Nation's 20 million older Americans.

Moreover, the evidence is abundantly clear that this retirement income gap is not a transitional problem that, given present trends, will resolve itself in the foreseeable future.

Approximately 5 million senior citizens live in poverty; yet, many did not become poor until they became old.

Recognizing the need for comprehensive and prompt action to meet these formidable problems, the Senate Special Committee on Aging will seek innovative and far-reaching solutions in the finale of its overall study of the "Economics of Aging: Toward a Full Share in Abundance" during 1970.

The committee, however, also recognizes that health care problems are intensifying other problems affecting older Americans, despite the vital protection given by Medicare.

In addition, this report describes chronic problems faced by the older worker, the emerging awareness of neglected nutritional needs among elderly Americans, the special problem of transportation for aged Americans in both rural and urban areas, the potential usefulness of the model cities program to those in later years, and the place and problems of the elderly in rural America.

These developments—and committee studies—are taking place as advance planning begins for a White House Conference on Aging in November 1971.

I. MAJOR LEGISLATIVE AND ADMINISTRATION ACTIONS

A 15-percent across-the-board increase in Social Security benefits provided a stopgap measure to prevent further erosion of retirement income because of inflation. Further improvements and reforms will be considered by the Congress during 1970.

Other major developments during 1969 include—

Enactment of the Older Americans Act Amendments of 1969 to provide new programs to meet the needs of senior citizens

and to increase substantially the authorizations for existing programs.

Reduction in appropriation levels for programs under the Older Americans Act in comparison with fiscal 1969.

Passage of a Tax Reform Act which will benefit many older persons by removing millions of elderly persons from the tax rolls through a new low-income allowance and by increasin- the personal exemption deduction in three steps for persons 65 and older from $1,200 to $1,500.

A $4.8 billion authorization for housing and urban development programs through fiscal year 1971, including an authorization of $150 million in direct loans for housing for the elderly and an increase from $100 million to $125 million for amounts authorized in fiscal 1970 and 1971 in contract authority for the section 235 low-income homeownership program and the section 236 low-income rental assistance program.

Extension of the SOS (senior opportunities and services) and Mainstream programs under the Economic Opportunity Act.

Improvements in the civil service annuity program.

Announcement for the holding of a White House Conference on Aging in November 1971.

Appointment of John B. Martin as Commissioner on Aging and Special Assistant to the President on Aging.

Investigation of profiteering and laxity in the Medicare and Medicaid programs.

Announcement of an increase in premiums under part B (medical insurance) of Medicare to be effective July 1, 1970—from $4.00 per month to $5.30.

II. COMMITTEE AND SUBCOMMITTTEE STUDIES

Members of the Senate Special Committee on Aging were involved in many of the developments listed above. In addition, the following hearings were conducted during 1969:

Economics of Aging: Toward a Full Share in Abundance:

Part 1. Washington, D.C., April 29–30, 1969.

Part 2. Ann Arbor, Mich., Consumer Aspects, June 9, 1969.

Part 3. Washington, D.C., Health Aspects, July 17–18, 1969.

Part 4. Washington, D.C., Homeownership Aspects, July 31-August 1, 1969.

Part 5. Paramus, N.J., August 14, 1969.

Part 6. Cape May, N.J., August 15, 1969.

Part 7. Washington, D.C., International Perspectives, August 25, 1969.

Part 8. Washington, D.C., National Organizations, October 29, 1969.

Part 9. Washington, D.C., Employment Aspects, December 18–19, 1969.

The Federal Role in Encouraging Pre-Retirement Counseling and New Work Lifetime Patterns: Washington, D.C., July 25, 1969.

Trends in Long-Term Care:

Part 1. Washington, D.C., July 30, 1969.

Part 2. St. Petersburg, Fla., January 9, 1970.

Part 3. Hartford, Conn., January 15, 1970.

Older Americans in Rural Areas:

Part 1. Des Moines, Iowa, September 8, 1969.

Part 2. Majestic-Freeburn, Ky., September 12, 1969.

Part 3. Flemming, Ky., September 12, 1969.

Part 4. New Albany, Ind., September 16, 1969.

Part 5. Greenwood, Miss., October 9, 1969.

Part 6. Little Rock, Ark., October 10, 1969.

Usefulness of the Model Cities Program to the Elderly:

Part 6. Boston, Mass., July 11, 1969.

Part 7. Washington, D.C., October 14–15, 1969.

Usefulness and Availability of Federal Programs and Services to Elderly Mexican Americans:

Part 4. Washington, D.C., January 14–15, 1969.

Part 5. Washington, D.C., November 20–21, 1969.

Hearings before the Special Subcommittee on Aging of the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, available from the Special Committee on Aging:

Amending the Older Americans Act of 1965—S. 268, S. 2120, and H.R. 11235, Public Law 91–69, June 19, 1969.

Hearing held by Select Committee on Nutrition and Human Needs in cooperation with the Senate Special Committee on Aging, Nutrition and the Aged, Washington, D.C., September 9–11, 1969.

III. CONCLUSIONS OR RECOMMENDATIONS

Chapter and conclusions or recommendations

I. A far-reaching and deepening income crisis remains as major policy changes are made—the elderly of the future.

I. Major reform in the Social Security system is recommended in order that older Americans today and in the future may share in the economic abundance they have created.

In thus recommending, the committee is in complete agreement with the following basic conclusions of its task on the Economics of Aging:

A reasonable definition of adequacy demands that the aged population, both now and in the future, be assured a share in the growth of the economy.

Such assurance can best be provided, or can only be provided, through governmental programs, particularly the social insurance system of OASDHI, which carry commitments for future older Americans—the workers of today—as well as for this generation of the aged.

Use of general revenues, as a more equitable basis for financing part of the costs of an improved Social Security system, should receive serious Congressional consideration.

We should now be exploring methods whereby retirement benefits can be adjusted to reflect productivity, not just rising prices.

And at a minimum and without further delay, these urgently needed changes in the Social Security system should be made:

A widow's benefit at age 65 equal to 100 percent of the husband's benefit.

An increase in minimum benefits.

A higher base for taxing and crediting earnings.

A modernization and liberalization of the retirement test.

II. Coinsurance and deductibles continue to be a major problem to users of the Medicare program. Action should be taken by the Social Security Advisory Council at the earliest possible date to review costs of reducing or eliminating these features of Medicare, beyond estimates now available. The advisory committee should also provide a thorough analysis of the costs of combining parts A and B and removing the part B premium. Included in their presentation should be some discussion of the best possible use of general revenue funding to achieve these objectives.

II. More than 3 years have passed since establishment of an HEW task force on prescription drugs under Medicare. To date, the new administration has not offered legislation to carry out recommendations of the task force or its own review committee. It is urgent, however, that legislation be introduced at the earliest possible date for thorough evaluation before appropriate congressional units. This legislation should provide, as the Committee on Aging Advisory Committee recommended, for extension of Medicare benefits to cover those drugs that are important for treatment of chronic diseases that commonly affect the elderly.

II. "Nonassignment" is causing serious problems for many Medicare patients. Those physicians who *do* accept assignment, moreover, may decide in increasing numbers that they should discontinue the practice to ease their own work pressures. Serious consideration should be given to legislation or other steps which will provide incentives for physicians to take assignment.

The HIBAC recommendations on home health services would reduce costs to the Medicare program and to individual older Americans. Utilization review mechanisms for home health agencies should be developed, and the Social Security Administration should take additional steps to provide models for the development of home health services as major resources in communitywide health service systems.

II. Recognizing that older Americans are especially hard-hit by deficiencies in the Medicaid program—and yet fully aware of the alarming rise in costs of this program, the Senate Special Committee on Aging believes that thoroughgoing reform, rather than sporadic and highly damaging cutbacks, is required. Evaluations now underway—together with pledges by the present Administration to implement reforms—hold out the hope that such action will be undertaken.

II. The Senate Committee on Aging renews its recommendation that the Medicare requirement of 3 days of hospitalization before extended care can begin be reexamined, along with other barriers to full utilization of alternatives to costly hospital care. Incentives to expansion and utilization of prepaid group health practice should also be implemented.

Chapter and Conclusions or Recommendations

II. National discussion about the need for a national health insurance program can serve a vital function if it turns public, professional, and governmental attention to actions that must be taken to remedy deficiencies which have become more apparent as more and more Federal funds have been committed to health care.

The people of this Nation now have an opportunity to transform public concern into positive action and reform. Corrective action should begin with Medicare and Medicaid, and it should aim at long-range improvement, rather than hasty retrenchment.

III. A new national nutrition survey—now underway—should be used to document and dramatize food needs and problems of the elderly. Every effort should be made by the Administration on Aging—and by other appropriate Federal agencies—to get the facts to both the old and the young.

III. Lessons learned from the AoA nutrition projects are too important to be overlooked. Additional efforts should be made by the AoA—working in conjunction with State and local government, as well as private agencies, to establish permanent arrangements for meal service programs as an important part of community service programs for the elderly.

IV. Significantly, no funds were requested by the Administration for 202 (Direct Loan Housing Program) and the Appropriations Committees of the Congress accordingly deleted even the diminutive $25 million appropriation that 202 had received in fiscal year 1969.

VI. Transportation problems among older Americans have reached the critical stage in many metropolitan and rural regions of the United States. Federal agencies have made a beginning in identifying problems, initiat-

ing research, and conducting pilot programs to test systems and concepts. The overall problem, however, is so serious that the following additional actions should be taken:

Technical assistance should be provided by appropriate Federal agencies to acquaint municipal governing bodies and private transportation managers with facts about transit barriers, special needs of the elderly and the handicapped, and new transportation concepts which would benefit, not only the elderly, but all persons who use public transportation.

The Urban Mass Transit Administration should submit to the Congress its recommendations for removing travel barriers and using existing and potential mass transit legislation to promote worthwhile social purposes, including those discussed in this chapter.

Provision should be made in planning the 1971 White House Conference on Aging for a preliminary report on transportation, to be prepared by a panel capable of giving adequate attention to sociological, technical, and psychological aspects of the subject. Every attempt should be made to show the relationship of transportation to service programs, existing or contemplated, for older Americans.

VII. Additional study will be given by the Committee on Aging to the elderly in rural areas of this Nation. Hearings thus far indicate that this subject should also receive intensive attention at the White House Conference on Aging in 1971 and in preliminary State conferences.

VIII. Additional attention will be given by this committee in the near future to the usefulness of the model cities program to the elderly. For this interim summary, it is enough to say that

(1) The new administration has taken steps which indicate an awareness of the need for the program to serve the elderly, and

(2) Additional attention must be paid, however, to unique problems and opportunities that exist among this vulnerable group.

IX. If current labor force participation trends continue, one out of every six men in the 55-to-64 age category will no longer be in the work force by the time he reaches his 64th birthday. Ten years ago this ratio was only one out of eight.

IX. Many older workers are unemployed because:

They are not equipped for the jobs in modern technology.

They lack the necessary training to move into gainful employment.

They live where jobs no longer exist.

They are seeking the employment of a bygone era.

Many of these older persons can become as productive as their younger counterparts with a flexible and comprehensive training program which is adequately funded and staffed.

Within the next 10 years, our Nation will have to train and retrain substantially more people for jobs than we do now, since industries will be changing manufacturing techniques and products more rapidly than 10 years ago. Ten years from now that pace will be even more accelerated.

IX. Although some progress has been made since the ADEA became operational, a great deal more remains to be done in order to achieve compliance with the act. A rapid increase in staff to enforce the act is urgently needed if the law is to be enforced effectively. Secondly, the study regarding the institutional and other arrangements giving rise to involuntary retirement should be undertaken as expeditiously as possible. If specific funding is necessary to undertake the study, it is incumbent upon the Department to request the needed appropriations.

IX. Although employment opportunities are limited for many disadvantaged older workers, several measures can at least help to equalize the older worker's opportunities for employment with those of others in the work force.

First, it is recommended that a Middle-Age and Older Workers Full Employment Act, similar to that introduced in the Senate (S. 4180) in 1968, be enacted and adequately implemented in order to provide a comprehensive program of employment services and opportunities for persons 45 years of age or older.

Second, there are effective ways of training and retraining older persons if we have the will to do it.

Third, additional efforts must be taken to encourage policies that will keep mature workers effectively informed about the labor market.

Fourth, the matter of pension rights needs prompt and definitive action.

Fifth, experimentation should be undertaken to provide workers 55 and over with extended unemployment benefits when they lose their jobs because of plant shutdowns, layoffs, relocations, or mergers.

IX. The 2-year period for the Senior AIDES program is drawing to an end, and limited funding may soon threaten others.

Therefore, a vital need exists for establishing the national program to continue and broaden the fine work so well demonstrated in the pioneering projects.

The committee renews its recommendations for enactment of legislation for a national Older Americans Community Service program.

XI. The cutback in the fiscal 1970 appropriations for programs for the aging represents a serious turn of events, which could possibly nullify to a substantial degree the accomplishments made under the Older Americans Act during its first 4 years. It is recommended that the funding for the AoA programs be increased substantially to fulfill the intent of the Congress as expressed in the 1969 amendments.

XI. Four years of successful operations have amply demonstrated the need for the title III programs, but significant increases in appropriations are necessary to enable many more older Americans to benefit from these successful projects.

XI. Many pilot programs have already demonstrated that older persons can make valuable contributions in a wide variety of public service type activities. However, without funds for RSVP, many older Americans will continue to be excluded from purposeful activities in their communities.

XI. The need for personnel with specialized knowledge in the field of aging is reaching emergency proportions. An immediate all-out effort on the part of Government and educational institutions is essential if the situation is to be improved. Implementation of the recommendations contained in "The Demand for Personnel and Training in the Field of Aging" should be the very minimum action taken to meet the need for trained personnel in programs serving the elderly. Omnibus legislation for this purpose should be introduced at the earliest feasible date.

XI. The variety of issues, policy questions, and research areas present cogent reasons for continuing work in the field of research and demonstration. Identification of such questions can be a significant step in continuing to expand our knowledge about the problems of the elderly and recommendations for improvement. To make this goal a reality, vitally needed funding will be necessary to meet the policy goals established in authorization legislation.

XI. At the end of 1969 only 23 months remained before the scheduled (White House) conference in November 1971. Because of the substantial number of activities to be planned, coordinated, and carried out during this time, it is essential that additional steps must be taken immediately to lay the groundwork for the conference. Additional funding and planning will be necessary to enable private organizations, individuals, and Federal, State, and local governments to plan and develop action programs to identify and make recommendations to meet the needs of older Americans.

XI. In terms of policy enunciation, the AoA commissioner has set major tasks for that agency. The role of AoA, however, remains ambiguous. Its funding levels are lower than required for healthy growth of State and community programs. It does not have the visability envisioned for it by the Congress. Serious thought should be given, before and during the White House Conference on Aging in 1971, to far-reaching proposals for constructive change that will enable the AoA to fulfill the vital missions assigned to it.

XII. It is increasingly apparent that legislation will be necessary to provide the impetus for the Federal Government to prepare older workers for their retirement years. Prompt enactment of the Federal employees Retirement Assistance Act, S. 2554, would be a major step in helping Federal employees make the crucial adjustments in preparing for their retirement.

XII. Several pilot programs conducted by the Federal Government and private nonprofit organizations have amply demonstrated the benefits to be derived from a preretirement planning program.

XII. As traditional work lifetime patterns change very rapidly and dramatically, new knowledge is essential to consider these issues in their proper perspective. It is recommended that Federal actions be taken in order to provide valuable pilot projects and research findings that will prove useful for future policy decisions in this crucial area.

TERRORISTIC ACTIVITIES

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, at 9 o'clock this morning, nine people were injured, one critically, in a bomb explosion in Ames, Iowa, which damaged the municipal building which houses the police department. On May 13, the police station in Des Moines, Iowa, was seriously damaged by a dynamite blast, with one person injured.

These terroristic activities in my own State are being repeated throughout the country, and they prompt me to call upon the Senate and House Committees on the Judiciary to act without further delay on President Nixon's proposals to strengthen the laws concerning illegal use, transportation, or possession of explosives, and the penalties for such activities.

These criminal incidents underscore the threats of self-proclaimed "revolutionaries" in our country who have no interest in our country except to destroy it.

Legislation incorporating these proposals was introduced on March 26. The sooner it is acted upon, the sooner our law enforcement officers can move more effectively to prevent or punish these crimes.

PERMISSION FOR COMMITTEES TO FILE REPORTS TOGETHER WITH MINORITY, INDIVIDUAL, AND SUPPLEMENTAL VIEWS, AND AUTHORIZATION FOR THE SECRETARY OF THE SENATE TO RECEIVE MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT AND FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment of the Senate following the completion of business today until the Senate convenes on Monday next that all committees of the Senate be permitted to file their reports together with any minority, individual and supplemental views and that the Secretary of the Senate be authorized to receive messages from the President of the United States and from the House of Representatives and that it be in order for them to be appropriately referred.

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

PROGRAM

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, Senators are reminded that there will be a vote on the pending question on Tuesday next at 2 p.m. I am authorized on the part of the majority leader to say that Senators on this side of the aisle will be notified by the majority leader's office with respect to the vote, but I think the RECORD should amply show there will be a vote at 2 o'clock on next Tuesday afternoon, and that the yeas and nays have already been ordered on the question.

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, MAY 25, 1970, AT 11:30 A.M.

Mr. BYRD of West Virginia. Mr. President, if there be no further business to come before the Senate, I move, in accordance with the previous order, that the Senate stand in adjournment until 11:30 a.m. on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.) the Senated adjourned until Monday, May 25, 1970, at 11:30 a.m.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate May 22, 1970:

U.S. MARSHALS

Edward S. King, of New York, to be U.S. marshal for the Western District of New York for the term of 4 years, Vice Alvin Grossman.

P. Ellis Almond, of North Carolina, to be U.S. marshal for the Middle District of North Carolina for the term of 4 years, vice Fred C. Sink, resigned.

IN THE AIR FORCE

The following officer to be placed on the retired list in the grade indicated under the provisions of section 8962, title 10 of the United States Code:

Gen. James Ferguson, [redacted] FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

The following-named officers to be assigned to positions of importance and responsibility designated by the President in the grade indicated, under the provisions of section 8066, title 10, United States Code:

In the grade of general

Lt. Gen. Lucius D. Clay, Jr., [redacted] FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

In the grade of lieutenant general

Maj. Gen. Richard H. Ellis, [redacted] FR (colonel, regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Sam J. Byerley, [redacted] FR, Regular Air Force.

Maj. Gen. Robert J. Dixon, [redacted] FR, Regular Air Force.

Lt. Gen. Austin J. Russell [redacted] FR (major general, Regular Air Force) U.S. Air Force, to be senior Air Force member, Military Staff Committee, United Nations, under the provisions of section 711, title 10 of the United States Code.

IN THE NAVY

Rear Adm. John P. Weinel, U.S. Navy, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of title 10, United States Code, section 5231, for appointment to the grade of vice admiral while so serving.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

In accordance with the provisions of title 10, United States Code, section 5232, Maj Gen. John R. Chaisson, U.S. Marine Corps, having been designated for commands and other duties determined by the President to be within the contemplation of said section, for appointment to the grade of lieutenant general while so serving.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TWO INTERESTING EDITORIALS RELATING TO THE WAR FRONT AND OUR CAMPUS DISORDERS

HON. ROBERT H. MICHEL

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. MICHEL. Mr. Speaker, the news media has been literally saturated in recent weeks with reports from the war front as well as the disorders on our campuses in certain sections of the country. Two editorials appearing in the May 13, 1970, edition of the Peoria Journal Star make some interesting observations relating to both items. I insert the text of the editorials in the RECORD at this point:

BATTLEFIELD NEWS BOOSTS NIXON

(By C. L. Dancey)

With the original Cambodian announcement, President Nixon's public support sagged, according to poll samples, to a record low of 51 per cent.

After a week of campus demonstrations and a blizzard of TV "specials" containing what Spiro Agnew called with a good deal of accurate word choice—"revolutionary theater"—the polls shifted to where Nixon has suddenly surged to a support of two to one.

Does this mean that the demonstration technique is an effective political tool—but chiefly effective at repelling people, not convincing them?

Does this mean that the TV skeptics who sneered at the President's explanation and forecast of events and then generally treated every radical interview and its contrived propaganda pitch as "the true word" thereby succeeded chiefly in turning a lot of stomachs?

Both such things happened obviously to some extent, but the switch goes a good bit deeper than that.

It may be that a lot of Americans decided, upon exposure, that we really might not last too long adopting a new style of democracy—one in which foreign policy is made and changed day by day depending on what "cause" produces the biggest campus combination rock festival and rally.

However, counter-reaction was not the "gut" of the matter . . . not as to the war. (It may be reflected profoundly as to public attitude to schools as time goes on, but that's another matter.)

The reality of what actually happened on the fighting front—reality of continued low casualties and the reality of the huge war center that had been sheltered in the fake "neutral" area of Cambodia—had more influence with more people than all the kinds of propaganda put together.

The evidence turned out to be all on Mr. Nixon's side.

If it hadn't, he would have been finished, and it wouldn't have required a single campus rally.

Genuine events are what "is meaningful" in this world—not artificial ones. If college doesn't teach that, it misses the boat.

COLLEGE PRESIDENTS PASSED THE BUCK

(By C. L. Dancey)

The Kent State tragedy was followed by a new record in irresponsibility and "passing the buck" when 37 college presidents tried to lay the blame for their campus problems at President Nixon's doorstep as all being caused by the Cambodian decision.

Thus these men avoid facing up to the areas of their own responsibilities and supposed competence to invade an area where they possess neither competence nor responsibility.

They are accessories to the "crime" of creating these conditions, trying to pass the buck on to a President in a troubled world.

This was not the first college riot nor the first ROTC building to be burned, and to seek out an immediate dodge in today's news for this particular one is copping out on the basic problem.

Beyond that, these folks ought to be grown up enough to realize that military strategy and foreign affairs present a task about like that of a football quarterback, with about the same percentages in terms of calling "long gainers", losses, and disappointing one and two yarders. It's a touchy business.

Hence, there is only one thing worse than an experienced professional strategist in terms of results. That is an inexperienced amateur strategist.

Sooner or later we all discover that presidents, joint chiefs of staff, the national security council, U.S. senators, and all are capable of making mistakes. This discovery is hardly the basis for assuming that half-educated students, or even college presidents are therefore supermen.

It ought to be the basis for greater humility, not greater arrogance.

It ought to make us aware of how likely WE are to make mistakes of how ignorant we are. It is hardly the basis for leaping into efforts to impose decisions made by people

incompetent in the skills involved about situations of which they are massively short of information.

To react as if the difficulties of presidential decisions elevates the college man with his practice in finding paper answers to paper questions to a position of exalted wisdom is not logic—it is psychologic, and we've had about all of it we can stand.

IMPROVED TANK CAR SAFETY

HON. VANCE HARTKE

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. HARTKE. Mr. President, we all know that there has been a great deal of discussion about ways to increase the protection provided, under accident conditions, for tank cars which transport hazardous materials over the Nation's railroads.

There have been many proposals and discussions about what the Federal Government should do in this field. I think it is noteworthy that private industry itself has taken steps to attack this problem under its own initiative and with its own funds.

A recent joint announcement by the Railway Progress Institute, the national association of the railway equipment and supply industry, and the Association of American Railroads reveals the launching of a joint research program, the goal of which is to find ways to maintain the maximum protection level for tank cars under abnormal conditions such as derailment or other accidents.

This private industry project will be funded and manned jointly by the Nation's five major tank car builders and lessors whose representatives make up the Tank Car Committee of the Railway Progress Institute and the Association of American Railroads. It is my understanding that for the first 6 months of the project already under way, the five tank car companies have allocated $100,000 and the Association of American Railroads $30,000.

In announcing the research program, AAR President Thomas M. Goodfellow pointed out that a combination of railroads and tank cars provides very safe movement of hazardous materials under normal conditions and that the purpose of the research project is to find ways to increase protection under abnormal conditions, such as derailments. RPI President Nils A. Lennartson said that the project will endeavor to find "solutions that will contribute to the public interest" by pooling of the railroads and tank car industries' resources and efforts.

In the past I have been highly critical of the lack of industry initiative in undertaking more safety research, so I am pleased now to commend this initiative on the part of the railway supply industry and the railroads in this very important field of tank car safety. I ask unanimous consent that the text of the joint announcement of the project be printed in the RECORD.

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

WASHINGTON.—A joint research program to increase protection provided, under accident conditions, by railroad tank cars used in transporting hazardous materials was announced today by the Association of American Railroads and the Railway Progress Institute.

The importance of the program was underscored by AAR President Thomas M. Goodfellow and RPI President Nils A. Lennartson, who noted that raw materials that involve some hazard in transportation are being used increasingly by industry in manufacturing essential products ranging from plastics to fertilizers.

"Railroads, operating on private rights-of-way, are without question the safest routes for moving hazardous materials, and modern railroad tank cars certainly are the safest land vehicles ever developed for their transportation," said Mr. Goodfellow, adding:

"The combination of railroads and tank cars long since has provided the safest possible movement of hazardous materials under normal conditions and will continue to do so.

"Our goal now is to find ways to retain the highest possible protective levels for tank cars under abnormal conditions such as derailments or other accidents."

Mr. Lennartson said the program will be funded and manned jointly by the nation's five major tank car builders and lessors, whose representatives comprise RPI's tank car committee, and the AAR.

The RPI president reported that the project was initiated by the tank car firms to reflect their concern with the "potential danger that might develop if a tank car loaded with a hazardous material becomes derailed in a populated area."

"Within the AAR and RPI, we have the best technical expertise available to tackle this problem head-on," he said. "By pooling our resources and effort, we hope to find solutions that will contribute to the public interest and will help the railroad industry to continue to maintain its historic high standards of public safety."

Also contributing expertise to the project, Mr. Lennartson added, will be the newly formed Tank Car Research Committee, which includes large shippers and shipper organizations, such as the American Petroleum Institute, the Chlorine Institute, Compressed Gas Association and the Manufacturers Chemists Association.

Dr. William J. Harris, Jr., vice president of the AAR's research and test department, will administer the program, which calls for a thorough study of accidents involving tank cars and an analysis of their behavior characteristics in such accidents.

Most of the work on the project will be done at the AAR's Research Center in Chicago, located on the campus of the Illinois Institute of Technology.

Special equipment is being developed at the Research Center to test types of tank cars, as well as tank car heads and safety valves. Other areas of study, Dr. Harris said, will include the designs of tank cars, the steel used in them, their insulation, heat and heat reflection resulting from fire, and the shock impact from metal objects thrown into motion during an accident.

A special project review committee will oversee the program and approve budgets as the work progresses. Chairman of this committee will be Charles E. Coyl, vice president, General American Transportation Corporation, representing RPI, with Dr. Harris serving as vice chairman.

In addition to Mr. Coyl, the major tank car builders and lessors are represented on this committee by John S. Carlson, vice president, ACF Industries Incorporated; Robert B. Oppenheimer, vice president and general manager, North American Car Corporation; Arthur L. Berry, president, Transport Leasing Division of Pullman Incorporated, and Robert D. McEvers, vice president and general manager, Union Tank Car Company.

Dr. Harris and Carl A. Love, chief mechanical officer of the Louisville & Nashville Railroad and chairman of the AAR Mechanical Division, will represent the AAR on the committee.

Named project director was Earl Phillips, who will be on leave from his post as chief engineer for Union Tank Car Co. L. L. Olson, senior research engineer of AAR, will be deputy project director. A staff of seven full-time professionals from the railroad and tank car industries already has started work on the program.

The AAR represents most of the nation's railroads; RPI represents car and locomotive builders and suppliers of railroad equipment.

AN ARTICLE WITH STRAIGHTFORWARDNESS AND OUTSPOKEN COURAGE

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, every now and then one reads an article that is noteworthy for its straightforwardness and outspoken courage. The following, written by Mr. Bob Roberts, a Honolulu radio announcer and writer, is respectfully submitted for your consideration.

I'VE HAD IT—MAY 1970 SEES A CHANGE

(By Bob Roberts)

There's something that needs to be said about this country. And since no one seems to have the gumption to say it, I guess it's up to me . . .

I have had it up to here with persons who are trying deliberately to tear my country apart . . . And it's way past time to throw at me that tired old wheeze about being a flag-waver . . . And I got the right to be one the hard way.

I have had it with pubescent punks, wallowing in self-pity, who make a display of deploring their birth into a world which—to use their sissy expressions—they didn't make.

Well, I didn' make the world I was born in either. And neither did the men I know who are worthy of respect. They just went about and made something of it.

The men I grew up with were fetched up in a logging camp. They were the immigrant sons of every cast-off race there is. And they didn't have a lot of knowledge at home to start them off, either.

But, I can write you a song about the son of a Po Valley coal miner who became a nationally renown physicist; about doctors, lawyers, teachers, forestry specialists, conservation experts and men of cloth in the Seattle-Tacoma area who came out of that logging camp. And about the son of a Danish mechanic who is one of the best friends I've got.

So don't give me your whining, whimpering, self-pity about how this country is letting you down.

I have had it with hippies, brainless intel-

lectuals, writers who can't write, painters who can't paint, teachers who can't teach, administrators who can't administrate, entertainers who fancy themselves sociologists, and Negroes who castigate us as "Uncle Toms" the very men who have done the most to demonstrate to all of us the most important quality in America . . . individual enterprise and responsibility . . . Dr. George Washington Carver, Archie Moore, Bert Williams, Booker T. Washington, Roy Wilkins, Justice Thurgood Marshall, Duke Ellington, Count Basie, Nat Cole, the Mills Brothers, and their father . . . and many more.

I've had it with those cerebral giants who think it's smart to invite drug advocates to lecture in their classrooms, and with teaching curiosities like that one in the Mercer Island School District who invited a Black Power spokesman to dispense a lecture on flag-burning.

I've had it with people who are setting about deliberately to rip up mankind's noblest experiment in decency.

And I'm going to tell you something. If you think you're going to tear down my country's flag and destroy the institutions my friends and members of my family have fought and died for, you're going to have to climb over me first.

And buddy, you'd better get up awfully early in the morning.

CLIFFORD HOPE: AN OUTSTANDING AMERICAN AND AGRICULTURAL LEADER

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, a truly great American passed away in Garden City, Kans., last weekend. His death has been deservedly noted by many Members of Congress, and I cannot let it pass without paying a heartfelt tribute to him.

When I came to Congress as a Representative in 1952, "Cliff" Hope was chairman of the House Agriculture Committee. My State had, as it still has, farm problems. My new associates on both sides of the aisle in the House told me that I could find no more knowledgeable, objective, and helpful adviser on farm problems, large or small, than Mr. Hope.

This was completely true. His knowledge of farm programs was encyclopedic. He was a partisan of the farmers of America, a gentle, but effective and obliging man who took the time to give a freshman Representative from Montana his first groundings in the workings of the farm programs, the Department of Agriculture, and the many agencies whose programs affected my district.

Clifford Hope is one of the greatest names in American agricultural history. Some of us hoped he would serve as Secretary of Agriculture, under either a Republican or a Democratic President, as he might well have done. From the vantage of hindsight, it is clear that his appraisal of that possibility was correct: he concluded he could serve agriculture best as a leader in the House Agriculture Committee. He declined the distinction of being Secretary to continue to serve in the House. His contribution from the House rivals that of any Secretary in our history.

I extend my deep sympathy to his family, for I share their feeling of personal loss. Our country, and our farm people especially, have lost a really great man.

FOOD PRICES FAR DOWN LIST

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, for more than 40 years the farmers of America have been outside the mainstream of our economic affluence.

While their profits have been shrinking during all of this time, they are generally blamed for our increasingly high cost of living.

The housewife, going to shop, is made aware daily of the higher prices of her groceries, little noting that many of the items she buys in the supermarket are not in the food line and if they are many are in the higher priced convenience category.

I was pleased to read in the Washington Star of May 8 an article by John Cunniff putting food's share of our increased cost of living in proper perspective.

Mr. Speaker, with your leave, I would like to insert Mr. Cunniff's article in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

FOOD PRICES FAR DOWN LIST IN LIVING-COST RISE

(By John Cunniff)

NEW YORK.—Everyone knows that the federal, state and local governments are firmly committed to curtailing the persistent increases in the cost of living. True or false?

Either way you answer, you will get an argument. A good many people blame government spending for the present inflation. Others are inclined to listen to governmental rhetoric, which is adamantly anti-inflation.

The facts may surprise a lot of people who firmly believe that the largest increase in the cost of living have resulted mainly from higher food prices, "and the government really can't be blamed for that," they say.

The fact is that food price increases were far down the list of contributors to the rising cost of living between 1967 and 1969. Topping the list was the personal tax bite, which rose about 28 to 31 percent.

TYPICAL BUDGETS

Recognition of this fact comes from none other than the federal government, which recently released budgets for typical urban families in 39 metropolitan areas across the country.

These budgets show that, next to taxes, the big increases were: Social Security taxes, insurance and contributions, 13 to 15 percent; medical care, 14 percent; clothing and personal care, 11 percent.

Higher food prices contributed 8 to 9 percent of the increase. Transportation costs also added 8 percent, and housing costs added 5 to 6 percent.

These budgets show that the so-called intermediate budget for an urban family of husband, wife, boy 13 and girl 8 was $10,077 in the spring of 1969, broken down this way: Food $2,288, housing $2,351, transportation $940, clothing and personal care $1,095, medical care $543, family consumption $601, personal taxes, $1,348, and Social Security, insurance and contributions $1,262.

The rapidly increasing role of taxes in the rising cost of living prompted the Chamber of Commerce of the United States to issue this reminder:

"The average American taxpayer will commence working for himself on May 9.

"Up to that date this year he will have worked just to pay his federal, state and local taxes, according to taxation experts of the Chamber.

IRONY OF TAXES

"They figure that Mr. Average works two hours and 49 minutes out of an eight-hour day to pay all of his tax bills."

What an irony that taxes are taking such a bite out of the budgets of ordinary Americans at the very time they complained about seeing too few results from their tax contributions.

The explanation isn't easy to come by, but it is generally agreed that bureaucratic waste makes a large contribution. Perhaps more so than in any other time in our history, this is the age of study, rather than the action committee.

Much of the tax money goes for purposes that are never observed directly by the ordinary American. The results of military spending, for example, are seldom observed in the average community. Despite their huge size, they have a low profile.

A good deal of tax money goes for obvious purposes, such as roads, schools, welfare, environmental protection, and so on, but it is in these very areas that many Americans are demanding that more be done.

In the view of some tax experts, the real explanation for the curious case of high taxes and poor results is that the federal government is draining off more than its share of funds.

Unable to see results in their own communities, many families conclude that the one effect of their tax money is to contribute to the rising cost of living. No wonder taxpayers are frustrated.

VIETNAM

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, May 19, 1970

Mr. O'NEILL of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I received in my office today a letter from my friend, John Kenneth Galbrath. Included in his correspondence was a copy of a telegram sent to the President of the United States expressing the views of some of our Nation's leading scholars on the subject of Vietnam. These men express very well my own sentiments. I would like to join with them saying, "that real victory for the United States lies in a speedy military disengagement from Indochina." The following is the full text of the telegram:

VIETNAM

The following telegram was sent late last night to President Richard Nixon by eleven scholars at the East Asian Research Center. A copy was sent to Senator J. W. Fulbright, Chairman, Committee on Foreign Relations, United States Senate:

"Having supported your policy of Vietnam withdrawal, we are deeply worried by the expansion of the war. We are also distressed by the assumptions, underlying your decisions, that we may become a 'second-rate power' if we do not win a military victory in Vietnam, and that American 'credibility' and the future of 'free institutions throughout the world' are at stake in Southeast Asia. On the contrary we believe the Nixon doctrine must be pursued by withdrawing from Vietnam and that real victory for the United

States lies in a speedy military disengagement from Indo-China.

"Jerome A. Cohen, Roger Dingman, Peter Duus, John K. Fairbank, Roy M. Hofheinz, Jr., Dwight Perkins, Edwin O. Reischauer, Henry Rosovsky, Benjamin I. Schwartz, Ezra Vogel, and A. B. Woodside."

ARKANSAS RIVER DEVELOPMENT PROMISES MANY BENEFITS

HON. JOHN P. HAMMERSCHMIDT

OF ARKANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. HAMMERSCHMIDT. Mr. Speaker, in the May 25 issue of U.S. News & World Report, there is an article of exceptional merit. It deals with the development of the Arkansas River for commercial navigation along a 450-mile course between the Mississippi River and Tulsa, Okla. This river transects the congressional district which I have the honor to serve. Its development affords great hope of actually improving the level of life over a vast rural area.

In the ultimate range, this public works project may indeed prepare countryside America in the vicinity of the Arkansas River as a most attractive area for industrial development and income generation. This in turn could beckon countless thousands of Americans now caught up in the frantic pace of "life under pressure" in urban America, especially the megalopolis centers.

I commend to my colleagues the articles in U.S. News, and include it at this point in the RECORD:

SEAPORTS FOR AN INLAND EMPIRE

A land with plenty of room and abundant resources is opening up here in mid-America. Its development promises relief for some of the population pressure that is threatening to overwhelm major U.S. urban areas.

Lifeline for this emerging region is the Arkansas River Navigation Project, a waterway soon to be open all the way from the Mississippi River to Tulsa. This shipping channel, 450 miles long, will give the sparsely populated Arkansas River Basin access to the sea and to 14,000 miles of navigable rivers and canals.

Commerce on U. S. inland waterways has increased fivefold since the end of World War II. The Arkansas River Basin, which includes parts of six States, is looking forward to getting a piece of this kind of action.

Tulsa, with 465,000 population in its metropolitan area, is alive with preparations for the beginning of navigation late this year or early in 1971.

"I have to keep pinching myself when I think of Tulsa becoming a port," says a banker who has been a prime mover in the project. "To think that this area was once a dust bowl and the Arkansas produced nothing but floods!"

Taming a river. The once-wild river has been tamed by upstream reservoirs that will provide an even flow of water for a channel 9 feet deep. A series of 17 locks will lift barges a total of 420 feet from the Mississippi River to the Port of Catoosa on Tulsa's doorstep.

The project's total cost of 1.2 billion dollars, financed from the U.S. Treasury, makes it the most expensive public-works project in the nation's history.

Tulsa's Port of Catoosa is just three miles east of the city's limits. Its development, at a total cost of 20 million dollars, is well under way. An industrial park of 1,500 acres will adjoin the port.

Tulsa officials say that the official estimate of 13 million tons of freight a year on the waterway, made some years ago, is on the low side. They see the Port of Catoosa alone handling 12.5 million tons by 1980. That is more freight than presently moves through any one of such busy river ports as St. Louis, Memphis and Pittsburgh.

Prospects for growth. Tulsa, as the head of navigation on the Arkansas, is seen as the funnel through which the varied products of a vast region will flow to market. At the same time, supplies for this region will come up the River. For example, steel for construction and fertilizer for grain farms are expected to be two major items handled in early days of navigation on the River.

The Arkansas River Basin stretches from the cotton lands of Arkansas through the unspoiled Ozark country, into the cattle ranges of Oklahoma and Kansas, and across the Great Plains wheat fields to the Colorado Rockies.

Cities of the Basin are young and vigorous, with plenty of room to grow. In addition to Tulsa, there is Little Rock, the capital of Arkansas with a metropolitan-area population of 323,000, Oklahoma City with 605,000, and Wichita, Kansas, with 405,000.

Resources include 65 different minerals, and one of the largest caches of energy fuels to be found in the U.S.

Coal and limestone are major resources along the waterway. This combination offers the base for steel plants and cement plants. A natural-gas field, 50 miles wide and 200 miles long, stretches along the River where it crosses the Oklahoma-Arkansas border.

Navigation was opened to Little Rock in October, 1968. It reached Fort Smith in the spring of 1970, and is expected to reach Tulsa by January, 1971.

A million tons of freight was forecast for the first year of operation to Little Rock. Actually, 2.225 million tons moved.

Expansion of industry. Little Rock's public port, with terminal and warehouse facilities, is in operation. A steel plant is going up in the industrial area that adjoins the port. A million tons of bauxite from Caribbean sources moved across private docks to nearby aluminum plants in 1969.

A few miles upstream, at Russellville, Arkansas Power & Light Company is building a nuclear power plant at a cost of 140 million dollars. When it starts producing power in 1973, this facility will increase the company's generating capacity by 20 per cent.

At Dardanelle, barges are unloading corn and other feedstuffs for the booming chicken and turkey industry of north-west Arkansas.

At Fort Smith, a community of 70,000, a subsidiary of the Kansas City Southern Lines Railway has set aside 2,000 acres for a port and industrial park. This is a furniture-manufacturing center.

At Muskogee, Okla., population 40,000, a port costing 4 million dollars is under construction.

Many of the nation's big corporations have picked sites for development along the Arkansas River.

On April 20, Kerr-McGee Corporation dedicated a 25-million-dollar uranium-processing plant near Sallisaw, Okla. This company also plans to establish a coal-mining facility costing 20 million dollars in the region.

Armco Steel, North American Rockwell, Skelly Oil, Sun Oil, and Phillips Petroleum all have plants, or will have, along the River.

Water-based recreation already is a booming industry along the waterway. More than a million visitors were counted in 1969 at 14 recreation sites around the Dardanelle reservoir.

Upstream are man-made lakes behind dams with such names as Eufaula, Tenkiller, Fort Gibson, Markham Ferry, Oologah and Keystone.

Access to markets. Water transportation brings this landblocked Basin into a network of 14,000 miles of adjoining inland waterways. Along these channels, everything from grain to iron ore moves at the cheapest rate offered by any form of transportation.

For a dollar, rivermen claim, you can move a ton of cargo 333 miles by waterway, compared with 66.7 miles by rail, and 15.4 miles by truck.

Railways and trucking companies say that water transportation enjoys an unfair advantage in the Government-built waterways. Rivermen counter that low-cost water transportation is a stimulus to rail and truck lines.

Their region, as Arkansas Basin leaders see it, has been handed the opportunity to develop without the mistakes that have led to overcrowding and pollution in other areas of the U.S. Arkansas Senator John McClellan promises:

"We don't intend to let the River become polluted. It is easier to prevent it than to remedy it."

Pollution standards have been set, and industries must promise to abide by these before their plans can be approved.

Emphasis is to be on balanced growth. A special study published May 11 by the Department of Commerce recommended that 32 port sites at small communities on the waterway be reserved now.

Over-all development is anticipated that will meet the guidelines laid down by President Nixon in calling for a national growth policy in his 1970 state-of-the-union message. Said Mr. Nixon:

"We must create a new rural environment which will not only stem the migration to urban centers, but reverse it."

This response to the President came from Jetah Taylor, lawyer in Ozard, Ark., who was one of the original boosters of navigation on the Arkansas River:

"There has been so much talk about the Government spending billions to build new cities. I think projects like this will develop our rural areas, and the people will come naturally. The people will do the building."

COPIAH-LINCOLN STUDENTS SUPPORT PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, there has been an enormous amount of publicity over the conduct and the expressions of students who oppose President Nixon's efforts to achieve peace with justice in Vietnam.

I would, therefore, like to call to the attention of the House a group of students who endorse President Nixon's action in Cambodia to protect American troops there and shorten the conflict.

There were 453 students and faculty members at Copiah-Lincoln Junior College, Wesson, Miss., who signed a petition—the text of which I shall include at the end of my remarks. These 459 students were contacted and only six indicated disapproval of our policy and refused to sign the petition. I feel this reflects the general attitude of students in my area.

The petition follows:

To the Honorable President of the United States, Hon. RICHARD M. NIXON.

We want you to know that you have our wholehearted support in your efforts to protect the lives of Americans fighting in Vietnam and to bring them home as early as possible. Your recent action is in the highest tradition of our patriotic men. You displayed the greatest of courage in trying to help bring this conflict to an end. Speaking for the student body and faculty of Copiah-Lincoln Junior College, Wesson, Mississippi, we go on record as endorsing your latest action in Cambodia. May God be with our men and women in Vietnam and may God give you the courage to always do that which is right and just for America and for the world. We'll add our prayers to yours that this conflict will soon be over.

THE SCHEUER HOUSING FOR THE ELDERLY BILL

HON. JAMES H. SCHEUER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. SCHEUER. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing the Scheuer housing for the elderly bill, landmark legislation aimed at meeting the critical housing needs of the elderly. National organizations for the elderly have studied my bill, have praised it highly, and have pledged their support.

It is a well-known fact that the elderly devote a larger portion of their income to housing than any other group in our population.

Where the elderly live in rent-controlled apartments, they find inflation jeopardizing their already barely minimal living standards. In New York City the mandate to raise rent 10.7 percent in all rent controlled apartments will leave many of our elderly homeless, and desperate.

Where the elderly have the old family home in the city they find the rising cost of upkeep prohibitive. Maintenance, repairs, and taxes have all increased dramatically within recent years. Hence, the cost of homeownership takes an increasingly larger share of retirement income.

Some 20 million people are suffering from the housing shortage and housing deterioration. These are the Americans who fought World War I, who suffered through the great depression of the thirties and who bore the children who fought World War II. They are the citizens who now find themselves confused by the rapidly changing social and economic picture in America. They have labored and suffered through the years of crisis and now face today's turbulent events forlorn, unaided, and alone.

This comprehensive legislative package for elderly housing provides:

First. Loans to help private nonprofit sponsors to build moderate cost housing units.

Second. Improved mortgage insurance terms.

Third. Loans for housing rehabilitation.

Fourth. Special funds for the beautification of housing developments.

Fifth. Training for administrators of housing developments.

Sixth. Grants for planning housing developments.

Seventh. For establishing post of an Assistant Secretary for Housing for the Elderly.

Eighth. For establishing a Presidential Commission on Housing for the Elderly.

And, as I consider the housing problems of the elderly, I am reminded of a phrase coined by a leading political figure. The phrase that comes to mind is "the silenced majority." And while the elderly may not be a majority of our people they are a sizable portion of our community. Twenty million people in the country today are over the age of 65. And by the end of the decade it is estimated there will be 24 million in the same age bracket.

Why do I say "silenced?" Because we do not hear their voices above the "whoosh" of space rockets as our space lobby burns up another billion dollars. Are their voices heard amidst the "bombs bursting in air" over Vietnam? The Defense Department packs more wallop on Capitol Hill than Housing and Urban Development.

Are their voices heard above the rumble of the bulldozer of the highway lobby? Billions are spent on highways as they drive their way through our cities, dislocating homes and making homeless those who have lived in their familiar neighborhoods for years.

Is it any wonder the senior citizen feels left out of the American dream?

Is it any wonder he feels neglected by our Government?

COMMITTEE USES NASA COMPUTER

HON. GEORGE P. MILLER

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, the Committee on Science and Astronautics, which it is my privilege to chair, is conducting a pilot project utilizing a computer console in the committee offices tied to NASA's College Park, Md., computer facility. Dr. Paine, Administrator of NASA, and I have initiated this program to evaluate the usefulness of an automatic information system between NASA and the committee. It is another means of communication between the Committee on Science and Astronautics and NASA. We believe that this will serve as a valuable addition to our more conventional means of dealing with the complex programs that the committee must review. So that the Members may be more familiar with this advanced communication system, I am including in the RECORD a press release discussing this project. The press release follows:

SCIENCE COMMITTEE USES NASA COMPUTER INFORMATION SYSTEM

Congressman George P. Miller (D–Calif.), Chairman of the House Science and Astronautics Committee, announced today installation in the Committee offices of a remote control terminal tied to a high speed computer at NASA's College Park, Maryland, computer facility. The system called RECON (the name stands for REconnaissance by remote COntrol) is part of a real-time, on-line, time-shared computer service serving 21 NASA research facilities throughout the United States.

Chairman Miller said, "To my knowledge this is the first time that an agency of the Executive Branch of the government has been tied directly by computer to a Committee of Congress. At the present time this system makes available to the Committee national and international science and technical literature within the NASA comprehensive information system. This is a pilot project which Dr. Paine, Administrator of NASA, and I have initiated to assess the value of such a system in work between the Science and Astronautics Committee and the space agency. We believe that this will be a useful adjunct to our normal means of communication between the Committee and the agency. We plan to evaluate this equipment over the next several months."

RECON helps earth-bound specialists retrieve valuable information in ways comparable to those in which other big computers have served astronauts on the Moon, and

1. Gives users thousands of miles apart equal and remarkably prompt access to the space agency's enormous central file of scientific and technical information and data.

2. Displays indexing terms and titles of documents in this big special information store in ways that help the user define precisely what he wants.

3. Guides each user via elementary logic directly to the documents that are most likely to meet whatever requirements he has specified.

4. Thereby facilitates active communication between NASA and the Science Committee researchers; reduces dependence on luck, personal acquaintance, and fallible human memories; and minimizes the possibility that anyone will needlessly duplicate a colleague's work.

RECON represents a major step toward more efficient dissemination and fuller use of accumulated information in many fields of knowledge. It enables a man at a remote console to conduct his own literature search by means of a dialogue with a computer at the NASA Scientific and Technical Information Facility in College Park, Maryland. The computer helps him pinpoint the object of his search.

A RECON user can type out questions at any one of the 21 terminals now connected to this computer. The computer flashes its replies to each user's inquiries on a cathode ray tube near his keyboard and on a teleprinter, on which a record of the findings can be kept. The replies consist of bibliographic data about the hundreds of thousands of technical documents that NASA has collected, indexed, and stored.

These documents are largely reports and journal articles that record the significant findings of Government, industrial, and academic researchers throughout the world regarding matters of interest to the aerospace community. As such literature is received, it is summarized and extensively indexed in two abstract journals: STAR (Scientific and Technical Aerospace Reports) and IAA (International Aerospace Abstracts). By merely pressing buttons, a RECON user can obtain the exact titles, dates, and other information on all documents described in those two journals that are likely to be useful to him.

STUDENT PROTESTS CONTINUE

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

To all Concerned People:

Dale (Flip) Pittman, a Vietnam veteran, who has been sitting out in Lafayette Park across from the White House, for two weeks,

in support of the Student Strike in protest of the United States invasion of Cambodia and campus killings, has further pledged himself to march until exhaustion forces him to fall and not rise again.

This marathon will begin on Friday, May 22, at 2 PM, at the site of his former demonstration. Come and walk with him and talk with him; understand the intense and sincere dedication of many of today's youthful protestors.

He needs your support!

AMERICAN PRISONERS OF WAR

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, on the first day of this month a House Foreign Affairs Subcommittee, chaired by my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. ZABLOCKI) heard testimony describing the barbaric treatment of American prisoners of war held in North Vietnam, Laos and elsewhere in Southeast Asia and the agony suffered by their families at home.

I want to commend Congressman ZABLOCKI and his committee for their efforts to alleviate the suffering of our men held by the Communists and offer the full support of the House Internal Security Committee, which I have the honor to chair.

As you know, my committee in December of last year investigated involvement of the Students for a Democratic Society in the return of some POW's. The witnesses included Lt. Robert F. Frishman and PO2c Douglas B. Hegdahl, both former prisoners of the North Vietnamese. A full transcript of these hearings is now available for study.

Interestingly enough, even though these two brave men endured many brutalities, they deplored the fact that they were returned not through prescribed military and diplomatic channels but through negotiations by private citizens, in this case private citizens who are active in the work of pro-Hanoi American "peace" groups in this country.

Let me quote Lieutenant Frishman as he testified last December before the Committee on Internal Security:

> I am a military man and there are certain prescribed military channels through which we are supposed to be released. The reason they didn't release us that way is for propaganda and we don't want them to gain propaganda out of our release.
>
> The group that we were released to were contrary to our feelings and our reasoning of being over there and we certainly didn't want to participate in any type group like that.

On May 1, the witnesses invited by Chairman ZABLOCKI's subcommittee included these two former POW's, five wives of POW's, and Texas millionaire H. Ross Perot who has been most active in trying to improve the lot of our hapless men held prisoner by the North Vietnamese and the Pathet Lao.

The wives described their frustrations in trying to deal with the North Vietnamese, explaining insuperable difficulties even in ascertaining whether their men are dead, missing or captive.

But these wives also said they did not think their own Government has displayed adequate concern about the plight of their husbands.

I would like to quote from just one of them, Mrs. F. Harold Kushner:

> I have never lost faith in my husband, but at times I wonder if my country has lost faith in him. I come before you today to tell you that I am tired. I am tired of traveling and I am tired of publicly baring my private anguish. And I am most tired of Presidential platitudes and Congressional convocations. They no longer reassure me and they have never brought any relief to the men involved.

Mr. Speaker, this gallant lady asked the Congress to publicly and forcefully pledge itself to formulate and execute a plan of action which will return the men to their homes or as she put it "to the country for which they have sacrificed so much." Mr. Speaker, I join with Mrs. Kushner in urging my colleagues to insure that our Nation does not break faith with the men we have sent into battle.

Mr. Perot had some interesting suggestions. These included setting up a display in the Capitol Rotunda that depicts the horrors the POW's have to endure, a full-scale model of the tiny, filthy cells in which they must live and replicas of the devices employed to inflict torture on them. Perot suggested that too many Americans are not aware of how the North Vietnamese treat their prisoners and that such a display would bring it home, painfully so. Perhaps he is right. Maybe the American people and those of us in Congress need some such reminder.

I would also like to commend Senator BOB DOLE of Kansas and Congressman DAN DANIEL of Virginia for their efforts in bringing together a 12-member bipartisan congressional committee that sponsored the mass rally in behalf of our POW's on May 1.

Mr. Speaker, the North Vietnamese are responsive to world public opinion. If we vigorously assert our views they eventually will accede to demands for better treatment of the men they are holding prisoner. But quiescence and wishful thinking will accomplish nothing.

I HAVE SEEN POLLUTION DONE

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, Debbie Peterson is 10 years old, is in the fifth grade in Murray, Utah, and is concerned about pollution. Unlike many of us who talk about our concern, Debbie decided to act. So, she wrote a letter to me asking for my help. I thought it was such a good letter that I am putting it in the RECORD, with the permission of Debbie and her parents. The letter follows:

MURRAY, UTAH,
May 4, 1970.

Congressman LAURENCE J. BURTON,
Longworth Building,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR SIR: This is the first time I've wrote to someone like you. But I have wrote to you so you can help me stop pollution. I have seen pollution done, because my brother does it. There were these two fish my brother caught and he left them on these rocks on purpose. I told him to throw them away, but he said we dont need them and I said pollution and then he picked them up.

Sincerely,

DEBBIE PETERSON.

ANOTHER "EARTH DAY"

HON. MARGARET M. HECKLER

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mrs. HECKLER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with my colleagues the results of an exciting archeological expedition. This fascinating dig was undertaken by Stephen Keighley, of Wrentham, Mass., in my district.

The years he spent in studying a site near Wrentham were certainly profitable—he unearthed an Indian campsite with artifacts dating back an estimated 6,500 years.

As a tribute to Stephen Keighley, I would like to insert in the RECORD a fascinating article from the Attleboro Sun describing his most interesting find.

In referring to this digging of earth, I am reminded of another very recent "Earth Day," April 22, when the Nation's attention was focused on our dire and pressing environmental problems. There is much to be found beneath the surface of the earth which is worth preserving and much above the surface of the earth which is worth preserving. I hope that we are going to be as diligent in preserving the future as Stephen Keighley is in preserving the discoveries of the past.

The text of the article follows:

INDIAN ARTIFACTS 6,500 YEARS OLD DISCOVERED IN RICH EXCAVATIONS IN WRENTHAM

(By Lola Jess)

What a thrilling experience to hold in one's hand tools that were used by people here in one's home town 6,500 years ago.

Stephen Keighley of Wrentham, had studied for years an area northeast of Lake Pearl, near the Eagle Brook Dam, because it seemed an ideal location for an Indian campsite. There were many fine springs, a good clay bed for manufacturing cooking utensils and it should have been a rich hunting ground, for it still has a goodly supply of game, including deer.

Keighley's dream was to find a place undisturbed by plows. After digging a few test holes, he discovered an Indian campsite, just below the surface, in the Fall of 1948. With dense brush and roots, excavating was very difficult, because pick and shovel could not be used. He wanted to find the artifacts in their original position, so depth below the surface could be measured accurately.

He found three potsherds 150 yards northeast of the dam, and believed this spot would reveal only an early ceramic culture (later it proved to be the ceramic-agricultural Indians of 1700 years ago).

PAINSTAKING WORK

The dirt had to be gently brushed away from each article discovered, while small roots were snipped and only a small hand trowel was used for digging—It was a slow, but methodical, one-man project but really paid off, after three years, with almost unbelievable results.

First it revealed a culture of 5,000 years ago, and then that amazing discovery of 6500 years ago that had been verified through

radio-carbon tests by the Massachusetts Archeological Society of Attleboro and the Peabody Museum of Harvard.

The lowest excavated level is the Early Archaic Culture of 6,500 years ago when the travelers arrived by dug out canoes from the north, after the glacial era, bringing certain Eskimo traits.

Though not Eskimos (who arrived at a much later date), they may have had the same Asiatic origin. A savage state prevailed; hunting was with spears, darts and harpoons; fishing was with a line and sinker. Bows and arrows were not invented and they had no cooking utensils—they cooked on stone slabs or over open fires.

Among the artifacts discovered in this level are abrasive stones, oval scraper, truncated knife, hammer stone, spears and plumblines (sinkers for fishing).

There were three fire pits. They must have lived mostly on fish and aquatic animals, as there were no trees or soil for cover and food for land animals. The summers would be livable, but short, and the glacial sheet had not entirely disappeared from the land.

Probably moss and then small bushes would be the first signs of vegetation in the white glacial sand, which was covered by the yellow sand found between that layer and the loam of our time.

The second site, unearthed by Keighley was inhabited by the Mound Builders of 5000 years ago in the Stone Bowl Era. They came from the Great Lakes region, and introduced smoking to New England.

They made three types of pipes: straight, elbow and platform. It is thought that searching for a stone from which to make these pipes may have brought them to New England's steatite (soapstone) outcrops. It was not long before they began to create eating and cooking utensils, from cups to kettles.

They also used chlorite and granite, with different kinds of stone tools. They were great inventors. Among their tools were found spears, knives, pointed, truncated eared points, semilunar knives, fluted gouges, stemmed scraper, axe head and three scapstone sherds (fragments)

Eighteen fire hearths were uncovered by Keighley in an area of 600 square feet between 1948 and 1958. He could not work when the ground was frozen, and only when the water level was very low. In all the hearths he found charcoal, bone fragments and a trace of shell.

These hearths are bowl shaped, neatly lined with stones about the size of a man's fist. Before the days of dishes and flatware, it is said the Indians pounded their small food animals almost to a pulp possibly for tenderizing, and, as they chewed their meat, they removed the pieces of bone, as one would a prune pit.

CAMPSITE FOUND

The first campsite uncovered was probably created by racial descendants of the Stone Bowl Makers. Through contacts with the West, they learned of ceramics and the cultivation of corn and beans. This gave them lighter weight cooking utensils and a more varied food supply about 1700 years ago, in the Ceramic-Agricultural period.

Clay pottery passed through four stages of development from a pointed to a round based vessel. Most of the implements found have been of dark gray felsite or slate.

Lake Pearl was formerly a marshland with Eagle Brook running through it. After the Eagle Dam was built, it became a lake.

How did the Indians pass the time in their monotonous existence? A partial list of current tasks alloted to the men and women of their tribes of Northern Canada are: for men—cutting down trees, hauling wood, shaving up kindling and lighting the fire each morning. They also erected the tents and brought home most of the food, chopped holes in the ice (for fishing and water supply), took care of weapons and other equipment, broke trail and taught the boys.

The women's tasks were to chop and carry wood, keep fires going through the day, cook, repair tents and cover the floor, carry water, wash, feed and care for the children, deliver babies, tan skins, pick berries, make and repair the clothing and teach the girls.

It is probable that such duties were assumed or added, through the ages, as the situation or necessity appeared.

In the Bronson Museum of Attleboro on the fifth floor of the Bronson Building, are four dioramas, depicting man's early days in New England, with the earliest date 9000 years ago.

Could it be possible that some other dedicated archaeologist may at some future time, start at the 6,500 year level and find proof that some more primitive tribes, the Paleo-Americans, were catching fish in our Eagle Brook thousands of years before the Early Archaic?

TESTIMONY BY LT. GOV. JOHN C. WEST BEFORE THE WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE

HON. TOM S. GETTYS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, one of our most distinguished South Carolinians, Lt. Gov. John C. West, a resident of my congressional district, recently testified before the House Ways and Means Committee on legislation introduced by Chairman MILLS and almost 200 other House Members on the subject of restricting cheap textile imports which are on the verge of destroying our domestic textile industry and thousands of American jobs. The testimony of Lieutenant Governor West on the subject is outstanding and should be noted by all Americans everywhere because it points up one of the most serious problems in our economy today. It follows:

TESTIMONY BY LT. GOV. JOHN C. WEST

It is a privilege for me to meet with you today, and to be able to express our growing concern over the difficulties now confronting our domestic textile industry.

My remarks will be directed primarily at H.R. 16920, introduced by your distinguished Chairman.

I speak today in favor of this Bill and on behalf of three parties to this problem—the textile industry in general, the people of South Carolina who depend upon textiles for their livelihood, and the State of South Carolina itself. The fact that all three of these interests can be represented today in a single voice indicates in itself the extent of our concern, and the far-reaching impact which this situation has on our entire State.

On behalf of these general interests, I wish to thank the Committee members for this opportunity to be heard on a matter which goes to the very heart of the economic future of South Carolina and any other state which depends heavily upon the textile industry.

There is an old saying around our State which applies well to the present situation; it says that when the textile industry sneezes, the State of South Carolina catches cold, and when the textile industry catches cold, the State winds up with pneumonia.

Ladies and gentlemen, I am no diagnostician, but I would say that we are somewhere between a bad cold and pneumonia at the present time.

Whereas, for several years the textile industry itself has been warning of the consequences of uncontrolled imports, I come to you today because those consequences are becoming realities. There is no longer a question of what may happen, or what will happen, it is a simple matter of what is happening. Layoffs, reduction of work weeks, plant closings, and ultimate increases in unemployment are the realities in South Carolina which we are suffering as the result of the drastic increases in textile imports.

We are not a wealthy State; that revelation should come as no surprise to any member of this Committee. For decades, South Carolina and its southeastern neighbors have occupied the lower rungs of the statistical ladders in the important economic indices. Paralleling these economic shortcomings have been general deficiencies in educational achievement, health and social services, and other vital aspects of the State's human development programs.

During the past decade, South Carolina has participated as an active leader in efforts to reduce these gaps through economic progress. It has spearheaded many significant accomplishments. The same statistics which rank us near the bottom economically also indicate that we have grown rapidly, and built up sizeable momentum to strike for the ultimate success we seek. It should be pointed out, however, that as we bring in billions of dollars in new industry, and tens of thousands of new jobs, we have retained a distinctly textile-oriented economy.

Through the great industrial boom of the 60's, many new types of industries came into South Carolina, but modern textile and fiber operations continued to develop with faith that government would not allow the textile industry to be destroyed by low-cost competition. We were two-thirds textile oriented in South Carolina ten years ago. We are two-thirds textile oriented today, even with much broader diversification of other industries.

The ability of the basic textile industry has been crucial to the development of textile-related fiber and chemical plants, which have provided the bulk of the investment in new industry in the State in recent years.

Thus, while some may say that South Carolina is moving away from its total dependence upon textiles, it is at the same time involving textiles directly in the building of a new economy. It would be my unqualified position at the present time that a healthy textile industry is the very basis of future economic growth in South Carolina.

The facts which confront us today, however, indicate that the health of the South Carolina textile industry is in jeopardy. Textile imports last year reached an all-time high of 3.6 billion equivalent square yards, 10 percent higher than the 1968 level, and more than double the volume only six years ago. This increase in imports has not been absorbed by growing markets, more than 90 percent of it has directly displaced domestic products.

In these difficult times of general economic slowdown in all aspects of our nation's economy, it can be clearly seen that a continuing increase in textile imports will have a doubly depressing effect on the domestic industry. Already, the American textile industry reports that sales in 1969 were 0.9 per cent below the 1968 level although the level of textile consumer sales has continued to rise in the United States.

Profits and earnings are generally down. Entire segments of the industry are being taken over by imports. All of this is taking place despite the fact that the textile industry in South Carolina has responded to the challenge of modernization and has fought overseas competition with the full force of its technological capability.

Please do not listen to anyone who says that American ingenuity is lacking in textiles. The truth is that the Carolinas have the most modern and productive textile industries in the world.

As the domestic industry suffers, however, the effects are being felt most directly by the individual textile worker in South Carolina. His work schedule is declining. Whereas, in 1968 he worked an average of 276 days, last year he had lost an average of seven days down to 269. Similarly, in March of 1968, the average textile work week was 42.6 hours. Two years later, it had dropped to 41.2 hours.

These reductions in work periods affect the entire industry. The most serious casualties, however, have come from the permanent layoffs. During the 13-month period ending February, 1970, a total of 2,400 textile workers lost their jobs in South Carolina, and during 1968 and 1969, eight plants went out of business altogether.

In a State which has 474 textile plants, and more than 150,000 textile employees, this type of economic erosion is a desperately serious development. Another 50,000 South Carolinians are employed in garment, man-made fiber and textile machinery plants which are located in South Carolina because the basic textile industry is located in the State. So, textiles account for over 200,000 South Carolina jobs. Left unchecked, the import crisis in textiles could directly affect the economic security of virtually every person in the State of South Carolina.

The problem, of course, is not limited to a single state or region. It is a national problem, and in wrestling with the immediate issues facing us, we must look to the future implications of these present difficulties. Under Japanese leadership, the textile industry of Southeast Asia is expanding vigorously, and is concentrating primarily on the United States market. At the present time, imports account for about 12 per cent of the U.S. textile market, and many leaders foresee a doubling—or even tripling—of this percentage within the immediate future. The textile trade deficit grew from $1.1 billion in 1968 to $1.4 billion in 1969 and the situation has worsened in 1970. Beyond the 200,000 jobs in South Carolina, we are talking about 2.3 million jobs in the United States, and we are confronted with the fact that more than 250,000 American jobs have been displaced by the current level of textile imports.

It is important to realize that we are discussing more than numbers in a statistical chart. We are discussing lives, and we are discussing some very important lives. We are discussing homes and families dependent upon textiles for generations.

We are discussing economic opportunity for many persons who may have difficulty finding employment outside the textile industry. Textiles is a business which relies heavily on semi-skilled workers, workers who do not have the type of occupational dexterity and mobility that others may have. Many of the textile workers in South Carolina are older—beyond the age they can undergo major retraining. Almost 40 per cent of them are women; 20 per cent of the textile workers in South Carolina—some 30,000 persons—are black.

As a State whose per capita income level is below $3,000, South Carolina can ill afford to suffer a further deterioration of its textile industry.

Far from denying these people jobs, our nation should set about to open new and better economic opportunities for all its people. There are more than 200,000 families in South Carolina whose income is less than $3,000 per year. Their future is dependent upon economic expansion—and not economic contraction—of our State. At a time when our State—and the nation—is seeking to solve the problems of its low-income citizens, it is distressing to observe the systematic deterioration of an industry which holds such a key to their future.

Our concern, however, goes beyond the welfare of the textile industry, and its employees. As I stated at the beginning of my remarks, I represent a third interested party to this problem—the State of South Carolina itself. The entire operation of our state government, including education, health, welfare, transportation, and all the many other facets of our concern, depends upon the continuing well-being of our textile industry.

As an example, the loss of 2,400 jobs due to increased imports has resulted in $12.2 million in lost payroll income, not counting many thousands of new textile jobs which would have opened up with textile expansion if imports had not crippled the industry.

The decline in the average work week from 42.6 hours to 41.2 hours over the past two years cost textile employees some $37 million in payrolls and resulted in heavy reduction in revenues for the State. These are tangible losses South Carolina has suffered—not just the textile industry and its people, but all those persons in South Carolina who receive services from the State. These are losses which are felt in the classroom, in the clinic, in the kindergarten. Often a teacher pay increase depends upon whether the textile business is good or bad.

Only a few weeks ago, an announcement was made in one of our coastal areas that a textile manufacturing corporation had delayed construction of a major plant because of the import problem. This plant would have provided 500 jobs in a section of our State which badly needs new employment opportunities. This one plant alone would have generated $3.6 million in new personal income, $1.7 million in new retail sales, $1.2 million in new bank deposits. This particular area of our State is part of the Coastal Plains Commission program, a three-state regional compact which has been designated by the federal government as a target area for economic development. And yet, we witness firsthand how economic expansion is being slowed directly by the problems of the textile industry.

The present administration—similar to the last—professes concern for our problems. The present administration—similar to the last—has refused, however, to take the necessary steps to do anything about our problems despite a promise, in writing, in a telegram sent to Senator Strom Thurmond in South Carolina on August 21, 1968, to provide "prompt relief". That was 21 months ago.

Administration spokesmen who have preceded me in testifying before this Committee have said nothing to indicate any real change in this do-nothing stance. Mr. Gilbert, the President's special advisor on this subject has recommended that no quotas be imposed. Secretary Stans is again asking for delay—just as in the past.

I submit, gentlemen, that the only way any results will be forthcoming is for this Congress to wield a sufficiently large legislative club to force—and I emphasize the word force—the administration to the recognition that the only alternative to acceptable administrative relief is definitive legislative relief.

The Japanese have made it abundantly clear that they will not move until they have to—and this makes sense from their point of view.

Unfortunately, our negotiators appear to need something of this same prod. This legislation offers them the most effective possible weapon if they really seek voluntary restrictions and yet all they seem to ask of the Congress is delay.

If what they need to reach agreement is only a little more time there is no real need for legislative delay. In the normal course of legislative action, Congressman Mills' Bill cannot become law for a substantial period of time—ample time for voluntary agreement—if that be possible.

As it makes its way through the legislative process, its increasing imminence will provide our negotiators with the best possible weapon they could possess—if a strong negotiating position is what they really want.

Should voluntary agreement prove impossible within the "little more time" sought by the administration, then Congressman Mills' Bill proceeding through the Congress without delay would then provide the legislative relief that is the only alternative to effective administrative action.

I respectfully urge that you act promptly and affirmatively on this Bill.

THE AMERICAN DREAM

HON. HOWARD W. POLLOCK

OF ALASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. POLLOCK. Mr. Speaker, never before in the history of our Nation has the distance between the American dream and the American reality been as great as it is today; never before have the divisions among our people been so pronounced. The reasons for this most unfortunate situation are varied and complex. Today, I would like to present for your consideration some brief observations on the present tumultuous state of our great Nation.

It seems to me that respect for law and justice is an important cornerstone of a free and orderly society. For one thing, a tradition of respect for just laws protects the collective entity of individuals called "the state" from anarchy precipitated by individual determinations of what the law should be. Of equal importance, a government of laws protects the individual from arbitrary action by the State. In a government of laws, governmental decisions are not made on the basis of whether an individual is black, white, or red, whether he is Protestant or Catholic, or whether his hair is long or short. Thus, just laws are safeguards of individual freedom, not weapons of repression.

If the citizenry loses its respect for just laws, the fabric of society will be torn asunder. In this situation, even vast numbers of police cannot maintain order. It is my belief that in the microcosmic world of the college campus, some students have lost sight of the coordinate goals of law and justice. Some students—admittedly only a few—have abandoned peaceful dissent, which is their constitutional right, in favor of violence and subversion. This is not freedom; it is anarchy. Such a situation cannot be tolerated in an orderly, democratic society, for when the dual conceptions of law and justice are abandoned, tragedy will almost certainly result. The truth of this statement is well illustrated by recent events. Lives have been lost, and property has been destroyed. Yet, we are no closer to solving the immense national issues that confront us. Instead, the divisions among our people have widened, and the relationship between

America's youth and our older citizens has become more attenuated.

In seeking solutions, we should not cast blame too readily. It is too simplistic to blame our youth. For the most part, America's young people are better educated, better informed, and more intelligent than we were at their age. Moreover, most of America's young people want very much to employ their learning in the process of evolutionary change leading to a better life for all our citizens. Likewise, the vast majority of our police—the visible agents of society's need for order—enforce the law in a fair and impartial manner. Only a very few misguided individuals breach their public trust by engaging in the same acts of violence that they were hired to prevent. Those few students and police who violate the law should be made subject to the same criminal process which is used to try and punish so-called hard core criminals, for we cannot permit the establishment of two separate standards of justice in this country. However, in the process of punishing those who would tear our traditions as under, we should not lose sight of the great foreign and domestic problems confronting this Nation. To solve these problems, we must obtain the creative input of all segments of our society, for national decisions of great magnitude should reflect the interests of all our people. However, decisions of this dimension must not be dictated by mob pressure and violence. The history of this Nation illustrates that our system is responsive to the needs of the people; thus, mob tactics can never be justified. Those who disobey the law in the name of a higher personal law must be willing to accept the consequences unless and until the American people, through their elected representatives or through the courts, declare the law unjust. Otherwise, we will retrogress into a system of individual prerogative devoid of equal justice. The burden is on those who would contravene the rules to prove their case.

Mr. Speaker, I began my remarks today with the observation that in spite of America's vast wealth and her advanced technology, the possibility of achieving the American dream is more remote now than at any other time in the history of our Nation. In making this observation, I did not mean to imply that the American dream is unattainable. As long as it remains a vision in the minds of the American people, the American dream of equality and justice for all men can be transmuted into the reality of everyday existence. For this to occur, however, we must rededicate ourselves to basic democratic principles—principles which have the concept of evolutionary change built into them—and must renew our efforts to achieve the dream which motivated the Founding Fathers. In doing so, I can think of no better place to begin than with the Declaration of Independence. Written almost 200 hundred years ago, the Declaration has as much relevance today as when it was first inscribed:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—that to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men . . .

This is a beautiful dream; it is the American dream. No nation in the history of civilization has set its goals so high or had a better chance of achieving them.

THOUGHTS OF A METHODIST MINISTER

HON. RICHARD H. ICHORD

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. ICHORD. Mr. Speaker, I have received a copy of a sermon given on Sunday, April 26, by Rev. Dr. Arthur C. Fulbright of the Wilkes Boulevard United Methodist Church in Columbia, Mo. It is entitled "I Give a Damn!!!" It deals with the course of Christendom, and expresses Reverend Fulbright's concern that a new breed of clergymen today are condoning, if not openly advocating, demonstrations, sit-downs, sit-ins, police heckling, street brawling and countless other dissident and disruptive practices.

Dr. Fulbright states that the root of the problem is spiritual. He interestingly observes:

The masses began looking upon the churches not as soul-saving, society-saving stations but as small HEW societies. People are asking the church for relief when they need redemption, for reformation when they need regeneration, for pity when they need spiritual power, for hand-outs when they need an outstretched hand!!!

I share his sentiment when he says:

Thank God Christian Ministers and laymen, both white and black are waking up, showing courage, refusing to surrender to confrontations, intimidations, manifestos and other pressures!!!

I recommend to my colleagues the reading of Dr. Fulbright's sermon which follows:

(A manuscript report of a sermon preached by the Reverend Dr. Arthur C. Fulbright, at the Wilkes Boulevard United Methodist Church, Columbia, Missouri, Sunday April 26, 1970, at 10:40 a.m.)

I GIVE A DAMN! ! !

St. John 21:15—"Jesus said . . . Do you love me . . .?"

Today, Christendom has joined the syndrome of *civil disobedience, social radicalism,* and the *secularization of the sacred,* a disease running rampant throughout our beloved nation! ! !

Ministers by the thousands, many of them in high echelons and prestigious pulpits, began denying the value of the church's major mission across the years and throwing out Christ centered traditional evangelicalism, joined the new movements, many of them Communist Front organizations, of civil disobedience, social radicalism, and the secularization of the sacred! ! ! *The pulpit moved far left of center! ! !* Draft evasion was excused! ! ! Demonstrations, sit-downs, sit-ins, police heckling, street brawling, and countless other dissident and disruptive practices—are condoned—if not openly advocated by this new breed of clergy.

We started equating the Christian mission with involvement in social issues under the devious delusion of reconciling the human race and rehabilitating society, with little or no concern for personal redemption and reconciliation with God in Christ! ! ! We said and we are saying, we must reconcile the alienated. But all we are doing is to "egg on" the alienated and alienate the reconciled! ! !

Soul saving—through the power and grace of Christ the Holy Spirit, went out! ! ! Social activism came in! ! ! Liberals in the Christian Church are now riding high! ! ! Superiors in the church echelon programs are telling the clergy to "get with this new social activism," with the threat that if we do not—we do not belong to the "new" Christian movement! ! !

So, we now have, in the new social activism program of our great beloved United Methodist Church "The Fund For Reconciliation." This movement for reconciliation funds was initiated in panic by the 1968 General Conference of the United Methodist Church. Now, some of that money has been used to fund subversive activities and violence-prone street gangs in their intention to divide, disrupt and destroy the Church I love and the American way of life in which I believe! ! ! The first $1,000 of the Missouri-East United Methodist Conference Fund for Reconciliation went to the Mid-City Community Congress, that organization whose Director, Ossie Pastard, sponsored and projected "the Black Manifesto" and the Sunday Church Confrontations in the City of St. Louis, Missouri.

Now, over in our neighboring city, Kansas City, Missouri, they set up some specialized ministries run by United Methodists who, according to *The Kansas City Star* (March 22, 1970), have now been accused of believing in "a theology of power and a sociology of violence." They are having a sickening controversy on this issue. Needless to say, thousands of "Fund for Reconciliation" dollars have been poured into that venture.

Today some of our leaders are still playing the worn out record "that" certain ethnic and racial groups are not responsible for their actions. Rather it is an oppressive society that is to blame, for which we should all wear sackcloth and ashes until the day we die. I reject such illogical and irresponsible reasoning!!!

For a long time now we have not been able to give dissident and militant elements in our midst, white or black, enough sympathy, enough "moral reparations" in special privileges and empowerment to satisfy them. Thus armed with license to break the law and infringe on the rights of others, far-left activist groups, both white and black, began mass demonstrations which evolved into riots and open reparations—all the way from an arbitrary lion's share to "whole hog" of all church funds, properties and future resources.

Just as it was inevitable that the anarchist fringe would turn against the government, school administrations, and everything else which represented authority and "establishment," these happy pagans, driven by unbelievable successes, were not going to pass up the Church. They were out to divide, disrupt and destroy anything that might interfere with "doing their thing." *We have thus been confronted by power tactics and coercion under intimidation and threat beyond credibility!!! However, Let it be Known: That enough of this so-called new theology, new morality emphasis—we want a change "now" back to the fundamentals of our evangelical Christian Faith!!! What Can We Do?!!! Plenty!!!* This is no time to decry, deplore, and depart. It is a time for self-examination and commitment—commitment to the restoration of moral and spiritual values!!!

The need in the nation was recognized by our President Richard Milhous Nixon when he declared in his inaugural address, "We have found ourselves rich in goods, but ragged in spirit." He acknowledged also that the answer needed was of the spirit, for he suggested: "To a crisis of the spirit, we need an answer for the spirit."

Here's our predicament. Here's our need. Here's our challenge, our chance. Here's our hope, society's hope, the world's hope, put together in one verse of Holy Scripture: "If my people, who are called by my name, shall humble themselves, and pray, and seek my face, and turn from their wicked ways; then will I hear from heaven, and will forgive their sin, and will heal their land." (II Chronicles 7: 14)

Until we get serious about dealing with the root of the problem, America will continue its moral and spiritual decline. *The root of the problem is spiritual,* and unless we are gripped by the desperate spiritual needs of our own lives and of the nation, and do something about it, God will surely come in judgment.

"Righteousness exalteth a nation: but sin is a reproach to any people." (Proverbs 14: 34) K.J.V.

Psychologists, psychiatrists, educators and churchmen, as such, are not going to make better people without the spiritual motivations, disciplines and resources of religion!!!

Thank God, the counter-reaction has set in!!! We churchmen now realize we went too far!!! *We give a Damn!!!* The overwhelming "silent" majority of laity are fed up and are becoming vocal where it really counts—withholding the wherewithal, the money, without which the exploiters cannot experiment and continue to damage the Church. Churches are discovering they do not have to accede to the "new" sophisticated extortion "give us this or we will see to it that your social conscience aches."

The Kansas City, Missouri Inner City Parish is in disarray after falling under critical scrutiny of "The House Committee on Internal Security" when it began exploring United Methodist aid extended the Black Panthers there!!! The Methodist Inner City Parish allegedly gave assistance to the Black Panthers by using church money for house rent and bail bonds!!!

The Reverend Dr. W. Paul Jones, associate professor of philosophy and religion at our United Methodist St. Paul's School of Theology, Kansas City, Missouri, and an activist-advisor of the Methodist Inner City Parish of Kansas City, Missouri, was quoted by *The Kansas City Star,* (March 22, 1970) as having said in a recent paper: "Our task at this moment is to work by infiltration and subversion, parallel structures and encounter, disruption and cooperation, replacement and negotiation, cooperative structures and alternative ones, so that we are irrevocably incarnated at those nameable critical points where the implications are widest for directing history."

A group of Kansas City United Methodist Ministers are now deploring these conditions and seeking to correct them. They were quoted by *The Kansas City Star* (March 22, 1970) as saying: "Money from local United Methodist Churches is being used to bring about the destruction of the Church itself. We are supporting their meetings of planning, their campaigns for support and their programs for division and destruction . . . We reject special interest groups that "use" the resources of the Church to the advantage of some at the disadvantage of others and for activities that are lowering the effectiveness of the ministry of the gospel and those who seek to proclaim it. . . ." *I salute these brethren of mine and thank God for their heroic stand!!!*

A growing crisis is developing in hundreds of local churches across Christendom. Groups of concerned laymen are organizing in protest against extreme socialistic programs that pander to Black Panthers and their like. This resistance is spreading, and our Church leadership in Christendom had better call a halt on all far-out schemes and ventures, or we are in very serious trouble!!!

Now, please don't accuse me of advocating any such rebellion locally or elsewhere. Wilkes Boulevard United Methodist Church itself meets all its financial apportionments and will continue to do so. In all my years as a Pastor, I have never had a Church default in its benevolent obligations. *I am simply saying that more of our leadership must wake up and prove their good faith!!!* However, let it be known that I am proud of the sound doctrine and spiritual dedication of my Wilkes Boulevard United Methodist people!!!

I think the worst thing today in the Church is that despite population explosion, few of our Churches are replacing their losses in membership. Why?!!! Well, we stopped renewing hearts and started redeeming social structures. *And we achieved nothing!!!* We became intent on being a "community center" rather than a "redemption center." Consequently, the masses began looking upon the Churches not as soul-saving, society-saving stations but as small H.E.W. societies. *People are asking the Church for relief when they need redemption, for reformation when they need regeneration,* for pity when they need spiritual power, for hand-outs when they need an outstretched hand!!!

Maybe you are wondering why I titled this sermon, "I Give A Damn!!!" I do so—because across the Christian Church the clergy and laity are waking up and repenting of their artificiality, their apostasy, and their apathy!!! They are becoming sincerely concerned about the Church and the glorious Gospel of Salvation through Christ our Lord and Savior!!!

Many of our leaders who went off half-cocked promoting this "new day," "new morality," "new Gospel," "new socialism" tripe are now coming back to the traditional Gospel, the age-old, Christ-given message of the Church. What the Church needs is an old-fashioned heart-warming revival of religious faith which calls men and nations back to God!!!

I am so hopeful—that by now Christendom has gotten over our "socialistic up-tightness" and our "secularistic hang-ups." I am hopeful that Christendom will now go forward to a fresh emphasis on Christian fundamentals—the love of God for all men, the saving Grace of Jesus Christ, and the present potential of the Holy Spirit in His Trinity—and reclaiming all men to a vital Christian experience, a Christian ethic, a Christian social culture, and a Christian world. I know all that sounds over-simplified, but it is the way God designed His program to work, and Christendom does make a come-back to the fundamentals of the faith, it can rectify many of its sins of the last two decades. If it does not, I will still give support and applause for those concerned laymen who "stay in the Church" and continue to work redemptively!!!

Thank God Christian ministers and laymen, both white and black, are waking up, showing courage, refusing to surrender to confrontations, intimidations, manifestos and other pressures!!! They are sick of these issues and impatient to get back to the mission that has always been ours.

I want us to help the poor, white or black, as they show initiative and seek to help themselves!!! I want us to increase our social concerns—especially in ecology, and work for a more Christian society. *But, I want us to do all this from the first established Christian premise of redeeming human personality and saving the immortal soul of man, whatever his (or her) station, race or nationality!!!*

I salute and applaud the increasing number of Christians, white and black, Bishops and Pastors, connectional men and theologians, laymen and women, young adults and youth, who have stopped looking for "New Days" in religion and started looking for "daylight"!!!

Maybe we have passed the darkest hour, and *Dawn* is almost here!!!—I pray that it may be so! ! *God's Day may be coming up over the horizon!!!* Amen!!!

ARTHUR C. FULBRIGHT,
United Methodist Minister.

PUTTING "PROTEST" IN ITS PROPER PERSPECTIVE

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following front-page editorial from the May 14, 1970, issue of the Spotlight, of Indianapolis, Ind., expresses a view which I am sure is shared by a majority of Americans:

SMALL PERCENTAGE OF COLLEGE YOUTHS PROTESTING

We, like millions of other middle-aged, law abiding, God-fearing Americans, are getting mighty sick and tired of college youths demonstrating.

We doubt if more than 10–15% of college boys and girls are honestly wanting to protest. It's more like "let's go along for the fun" sort of thing than a true conviction that our country is wrong.

Most grown-up men and women we talk to—good, home loving, conscientious citizens—feel that President Nixon is doing the very best he can to end the war in Vietnam. Most say "Give him time to prove his point." Amen.

It is indeed ironic that the greatest defenders of this most wonderful nation are the ones who have little chance of sending their children to college. And most of the kids who can't get financial aid to attend college are not in sympathy with the college Kooks.

Many folks tell us "The way to stop vandalism at colleges is for the authorities to see that the parents of any student involved in an act of destruction of property be made to pay for the damage." One loud mouth liberal can get a group started on a destructive course. When the damage has been done the ones who went along "for the fun" are really ashamed of what they have done. There must be some kind of just punishment for these non-thinking fellow travelers.

Recently at a university in Kentucky a student from the East Coast got up in the mess hall and yelled for attention. "What are we going to do about our murdered brothers and sisters at Kent State" he screamed at the top of his voice.

Whereupon an ex-Marine, who had returned from Vietnam to continue his education, walked over to the agitator, hit him with a full right to the chin completely rendering him hors de combat. Needless to say, that cooled that situation almost immediately.

We've said it before and we'll say it again—the Communist technique is to ex-

plore any and all situations that will bring embarrassment to the nation's leaders. One high-strung, explosive individual can lead hundreds of by-standers into going along with him unless he is checked at the very beginning. What is needed is more "committees of one" to stand up to revolutionary type individuals who get the dirty work started and then fade out when the confrontation begins.

President Nixon has said he has put his administration on the line by his action in Cambodia. This was an act of political courage and we feel it will prove out to be a great factor in shortening the Vietnam impasse.

GEORGE P. CAFOUROS.

GRID STAR LAUDED FOR DEFENSE OF FLAG

HON. BOB WILSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. BOB WILSON. Mr. Speaker—

I was born under that flag, I fought for that flag and I'm going to college today because of what it represents.

These are the words of a dedicated patriotic young man who had the personal courage to stand up for his beliefs in the face of overwhelming odds.

All of us in San Diego are deeply proud of Bill Pierson, a senior at San Diego State College, father, Navy veteran, and football hero. Bill's friends characterize him as a quiet, hard-working student who is fed up with the small minority of violent radicals who have completely disrupted normal campus life. Last week, after several successive raisings and lowerings of the State College flag by Bill and a group of radicals, he raised Old Glory for a final time and stood guard over the flagpole for 3½ hours single-handedly defying a menacing group of dissidents determined to again lower the flag. Praise has poured in from all quarters since this incident, but during the moments which really counted, Bill Pierson had the personal fortitude—call it "guts"—to stand alone and defy a taunting mob with no regard for his own personal safety.

I know I speak for millions of Americans when I say, thank you, Bill for standing up for America when it really counted.

I am pleased to share with my House colleagues some of the recent news clippings which give more details on this incident and this remarkable young man:

[From the San Diego Union, Thursday, May 14, 1970]

GRID STAR LAUDED: DEFENSE OF FLAG WINS SUPPORTERS

San Diego State football star Bill Pierson continued to receive congratulations and honors yesterday from people throughout the area after making a lone, three-hour stand Monday against student militants to protect the campus flag.

Telephone calls, telegrams, and requests for proper addressing for letters and personal messages poured in throughout the day, yesterday.

The Exchange Club of Mission Valley-San Diego voted unanimously a resolution to honor Pierson next Tuesday at a breakfast meeting.

RALLYING POINT

American Legion Post 26 will honor the Aztec first string center tonight.

The Heartland Youth for Decency organization unanimously voted Pierson an honorary member.

San Diego State students phoned congratulations. One sophomore said. "At last the students have someone in the ranks they can identify with. We're hoping he hangs in there."

People offered money to help finance cost of a proposed injunction that Pierson and a group of San Diego State students are considering seeking against campus militants to prevent their further disrupting the campus or keeping students from classes.

PARENTS OFFER AID

Several parents with sons or daughters attending the University of California in Santa Barbara asked to help finance the legal costs of getting the injunction.

One mother said her son had just discovered he may not receive his diploma next month because of required class work lost on the UCSB campus.

A father called saying, "The country has been waiting for someone like this on an American college campus for too long.

"My friends and I would like to let him know we're behind him with money for that injunction, or with numbers if he needs help against harassment on the campus."

ONE MAN'S STAND

On campuses all over the nation bands of students have assaulted flag-poles with little opposition as they sought to dishonor the American Flag to satisfy their thirst for attention.

Not so last Monday at San Diego State. Standing between the flag and students who wanted to lower it was the imposing figure of Aztec football center Bill Pierson.

"I was born under that flag, I fought for that flag and I'm going to college today because of what it represents," he explained.

Pierson stood his ground for three hours. The flag waved on.

How sad it is that principles which mean so much to so many are defended by so few. Surely students who share Bob Pierson's convictions will not let him stand alone.

ARTICLE BY BOB ORTMAN

Bill Pierson, a Navy veteran of 26, is married and has a 3-year-old daughter, Dawn Christen. A B-average student, he is a month away from receiving a degree in marketing at San Diego State, where he was first-string center on the football team. The 250-pound native of Arlington, Tex., keeps busy.

"He has been so wrapped up in his studies," reported his wife, Barbara, "he was not aware of all that was going on."

Bill realized dissidents were stirring up strife on other campuses—"He had disgust for people who were demonstrating" remarked Barbara—but had not noticed that the pot was starting to boil on Montezuma Mesa.

Then a couple of months ago, Pierson had occasion to visit the administration building, and he discovered that student protestors had taken over the first floor of the structure.

"He's so emotional," said Barbara, lovingly. "He couldn't understand why someone just didn't go in and take them out. Conditions were filthy, appalling."

BILL MAKES SURE FLAG RAISED HIGH

His eyes opened by this incident, Bill started noticing that sometimes the flag wasn't flying the way it should. "He hadn't talked about it," said Mrs. Pierson, "but on several occasions, when he walked by the flagpole, the flag was at half mast, and he raised it.

"When the students were shot at Kent State, he felt it was a tragedy," she recalled, "but they shouldn't have been involved in the demonstration or riot."

With graduation so near, Pierson was distressed when Gov. Reagan closed all California state colleges and universities last week in an attempt to cool off antiwar fever and halt demonstrations protesting the Kent State shootings.

"Bill is not the type who stands on a bandwagon," said his wife. "He doesn't talk much about things. But to me and to our close friends, he had been very disturbed about the governor closing the schools. He finally decided, though, that the governor probably did the right thing."

JEERS, TAUNTS OF MOB HIT DEAF EARS

School reopened Monday, and it seemed like any other Monday, especially when Barbara, a department secretary on campus, was chased out of her building for the second time in two weeks by a bomb scare. When she returned an hour later, she learned that Bill was conducting a one-man stand-in at the base of the campus flagpole to prevent the flag from being lowered.

She found out later that "coming on campus, just from the parking lot to his class, the flag was raised and lowered about four times. He just went over and did it. It was not premeditated."

For 3½ hours Pierson stood guard and turned his other ear to the violent and obscene jeers and taunts of the mob.

"I just burst into tears, I was so proud of him," Barbara disclosed. "I received several phone calls from people telling me about it. I can't understand it—they were willing to call and to go by and see him and smile, but they wouldn't stand up with him."

After the fact, many people are standing up with him, although most of the students "are not that vocal," according to Barbara.

POOR RALLY ATTENDANCE CHEERS MRS. PIERSON

"They seem afraid," she said. "But one thing gives me a clue the students are not with the radicals. Only 300 or 400 attended a rally Wednesday, but at the same time the cafeteria and classrooms were packed. The students were just not interested.

"We have received hundreds of telegrams and letters. The PE department is complaining that they can hardly get any work done because of phone calls. I had to leave work a half dozen times yesterday to get away from the phone.

"Most of the letters and telegrams just say thanks or congratulations or we're proud of you," she added. "One was from a grandmother who wished there was some way she could help. Several were from people who have sons in Vietnam or sons who died in Vietnam. They're so proud he stood up for what their sons believed.

"Bill thinks it's astounding that one little thing, so unpremeditated, could create such a commotion."

"I consider myself an average citizen," said Bill.

[From The San Diego Union, San Diego, Calif., May 13, 1970]

GRID STAR GUARDS FLAG AT S.D. STATE

Bill Pierson, senior and football player at San Diego State, stood at the base of the campus flagpole for three hours yesterday during student demonstrations to protect the flag from being lowered or desecrated.

"I was born under that flag, I fought for that flag and I'm going to college today because of what it represents," he said.

"No one is going to desecrate it anywhere as long as I can defend and protect it."

The first-string center, who has been drafted by the New York Jets, commented on a vote by the Associated Student Council yesterday to bring the campus flag down to half-staff until the Asian war is ended:

"There are more than 20,000 students at San Diego State and if the flag is lowered for any reason to half-mast for any length of time, then I think all students should have a chance to have a voice in the issue through a popular vote."

He said there "weren't more than 150 students" who tried to lower the flag yesterday and "not more than 800 or 900" who will go along with the protesters.

AT SAN DIEGO STATE: STUDENTS MAY ASK COURT TO HALT MILITANT DISORDER

(By Vi Murphy)

A group of San Diego State students will go to court to obtain an injunction against student militants if they persist in disrupting the college campus or obstruct classes, Bill Pierson, football star, said last night.

"There are a lot of us on campus who are fed up with this whole silly business of an administration letting a small group of radicals push around a campus of more than 23,000 students," Pierson said.

He estimated fewer than 100 militants had occupied the first floor of the business administration building and that fewer than 800 students on the campus support the disruptive forces.

Pierson said that because of campus disruptions and blocking of classrooms, some seniors may not get their college degrees at San Diego State next month.

"We have waited and waited for permissive college officials to get up enough courage to stand up to this handful of militants who may have already cost some of us our college degrees," Pierson said.

He added, "We have been told by some professors that continual disruptions by these radicals, who keep students from attending classes, will likely lose credits for some of us because we cannot get in the required number of hours or course work.

"I have worked for five years to get my degree in business administration and was due to graduate in June.

"Now because the radicals have the administration of San Diego State bluffed, more than 23,000 students are taking an academic whipping by a handful of people a lot of us have absolutely no use for."

Pierson said, "The strength is growing behind a student move to control student radicals through orderly court procedure by getting an injunction against their disrupting classes or the campus, then insisting the injunction be enforced and kept enforced."

"We have to do something while we still have college degrees we can salvage."

San Diego State officials verified Pierson's remarks about the growing student body backlash against the militants and noted tension is growing on the campus among students who do not wish to be kept from classes or harassed by the protestors.

GOING TO CLASS

Pierson said about 15 or 20 students rocked his car yesterday when he tried to enter the campus for classes "but stopped when I kept driving."

He said some harassment was not personal, "a lot of people got that kind of stuff when they tried to go to class."

Officials in the college's athletic department said Pierson is "normally a very matter-of-fact, unemotional person but he is fed up with this as are many students."

Officials in both the athletic department and in the administration said Pierson's lone stand at the base of the campus flagpole Monday to protect the flag had resulted in numerous telephone calls and telegrams praising the football star.

HELD OFF MILITANTS

Pierson, who has been drafted by the New York Jets, held off 150 militants for three hours, who were trying to lower the flag to half mast after he had run it back up to its original position.

"They yelled and cursed at me and threatened me if I didn't let them bring it down."

Pierson, a center on the football team, stands 6 foot 3 and weighs 250 pounds.

He said militants who occupied the first floor of the campus building have denied students access to classrooms on that floor.

SERVED IN NAVY

"They threatened to use high pressure fire hoses or shoot chemicals from hand fire extinguishers in the faces of anyone defying their ultimatum," he said.

"They may call that nonviolent but I've got another name for it," Pierson noted.

He said he served in the U.S. Navy from 1962 to 1965 on the U.S.S. Bon Homme Richard and has a brother in the Marines in Viet Nam, "who has already served two hitches in Viet Nam."

Don Doryell, head football coach at San Diego State, and Al Baldock, head offensive line coach, both praised Pierson's Monday action as "a fine example of the courage he possesses."

Said Pierson, "Everyone refers to SDSC students as apathetic. It's time the silent majority makes itself heard."

FREE TRADE PRINCIPLE UNDER CHALLENGE

HON. PAUL FINDLEY

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. FINDLEY. Mr. Speaker, respected editorial columns in Illinois recently voiced concern about trade protectionism that seems to be taking form in the Congress. The Chicago Tribune in an editorial May 15 noted the advantage which flows from the discipline of competition from foreign sources, while the Illinois State Journal of Springfield, Ill., on the same day stated that competitive challenge works ultimately to the benefit of the buying public.

These messages are timely and deserve the attention of all Members of this body. The texts of the editorials appear below:

THE QUOTA QUANDARY

At the request of Secretary of Commerce Stans, the House ways and means committee has put off action on a bill to clamp a quota on textile imports. It has thus given the administration another month in which to do what it hasn't been able to do in more than a year; namely to persuade Japan and other textile producers to accept a voluntary limit on their exports to the United States.

The voluntary quota is Mr. Nixon's only visible means of escape from a dilemma into which he has talked himself. He has generally supported free trade and, on taking office, said he took "a dim view of the tendency to move toward quotas and other methods that may become permanent." Yet during the 1968 campaign he promised southern textile states that he would "rectify" the Johnson administration's "unfair" failure to protect them from foreign competition.

When Mr. Nixon appointed free trader Carl J. Gilbert, a year ago, as his representative for trade negotiations, it looked like a victory for free trade. But since then the free trade issue has become entangled in the inflation issue. Mr. Nixon's campaign against inflation has slowed down business and squeezed profits in many industries, including the textile industry. The clamor for protection has grown, along with pointed references to Mr. Nixon's campaign promise.

If textiles alone were at issue, then perhaps Mr. Nixon could accept legislation protecting the textile industry without abandoning his general commitment to free trade. But this isn't the case. The textile industry is supported, in its quest for statutory quotas, by other industries which also want protection—steel, plywood, oil, and beef, to name a few.

When all of the congressmen representing areas dependent on these industries are squeezed into one lobby, you have quite a crowd—and congressional courtesy requires that they stick by each other until they all have their quotas.

The breadth of this support, therefore, is the reason to be wary of it. For, if quotas are to be imposed on textiles, they will very likely lead to quotas on steel and so on; and, in the end, protectionism will triumph and the consumers (including those in the protected industries) will have to pay the bill in the form of higher prices.

Sen. Hollings of South Carolina, a backer of textile quotas, once complained that letting Mr. Gilbert handle trade talks "is like delivering lettuce by way of a rabbit." What Mr. Hollings seems to have overlooked is that as former chairman of the Gillette Razor company Mr. Gilbert himself faced a devastating challenge in the form of stainless steel razor blades from England. His company not only survived the challenge but moved ahead with new products of its own.

Not every threatened industry may be able to do as well as this, but surely most should. Import barriers not only deprive industry (and labor, not so incidentally) of the incentive to put out the best product in the most efficient manner possible, and therefore burden the consumer with unnecessarily high prices. They also invite the favoritism and scandal which so often go with arbitrary federal controls.

So the present dilemma is not just Mr. Nixon's personal one; it is also the country's. We hope members of Congress will remember this, even tho some of them might otherwise relish the White House's embarrassment.

FREE-TRADE PRINCIPLE: UNDER SERIOUS CHALLENGE

For 35 years the United States of America has based its trade policies on the theory that the free exchange of commodities and manufactured goods on the world market is the surest route to a healthy economy in our own country and for our friends abroad.

The doctrine is sound. The postwar growth of the economies in the industrial nations of the free world is evidence of what can be accomplished when trade barriers are kept low.

That very success is now bringing the free-trade principle under serious challenge. Aggressive producers in some nations—notably Japan and the Common Market countries of Europe—are succeeding so well in marketing their goods in the United States that our own industries are complaining.

To let this problem carry us back into the era of protectionism would be a grave mistake. Yet that is the direction in which the House of Representatives is moving with legislation that would establish import quotas to protect two of the U.S. industries which are hurting most from foreign competition—textiles and shoes.

Import quotas have a certain attraction for those looking for immediate, dramatic treatment for a painful ailment. In this case, however, the cure could have worse consequences than the disease. A move by our country to restrict imports is certain to invite corresponding restrictions by other countries of the goods we offer for export.

The administration has proposed that U.S. manufacturers be offered tax incentives to encourage the overseas marketing of their products. Such a program to bolster our export trade would be defeated if we move with the other hand to restrict imports.

Rep. Wilbur Mills, the House Ways and Means Committee chairman, who is leading the fight for import quotas, would limit them at this time to the hard-pressed textile and footwear industries. It would be impossible to guarantee, however, that other industries would not demand the same consideration in the future once the protectionist policy were embraced.

Support for import quotas is coming from unexpected quarters. Even labor organizations are veering away from their traditional devotion to free-trade policies. This is ironic, since labor contracts driving wages up at a rate faster than increases in productivity have helped put U.S. goods at a price disadvantage in competition with imported products.

Congress should heed the administration's urging that import legislation be held back while efforts are continued to negotiate voluntary agreements that would help redress the problems afflicting our textile and shoe manufacturers. Voluntary agreements reducing imports would be far more preferable than the imposition of quotas, which would have a psychological effect to our detriment in the world marketplace.

Foreign goods find a ready market when they are of a quality equal to home-produced goods but cost less. This is the kind of competitive challenge to our industry that works ultimately to the benefit of the buying public. In the long run it is the shopper who suffers when restrictions are placed on the free flow of goods in the marketplace.

ST. REGIS WORKS TO PROTECT OUR NATION'S ENVIRONMENT

HON. CHARLES E. BENNETT

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. BENNETT. Mr. Speaker, the problems of pollution and protecting our environment have leaped into national prominence like no other issue in recent years. A Gallup Poll of May 13, 1970, reported that next to reducing crime, eliminating air and water pollution was the country's most important priority in 1970 and 1971. A similar poll conducted 5 years ago showed that pollution was not of major concern to Americans, and in fact was listed ninth among 10 problem areas. Congress in that past period was giving more attention to the pollution problems than was then being given by the public.

All of us are concerned about protecting our environment and I have been glad to work for all of the major measures Congress has enacted in this field. I am particularly pleased that one of the largest industrial plants in Florida, located in Jacksonville in the Third Congressional District which I represent, is really doing something constructive about its pollution and that it is doing this with a genuine feeling of concern for the general public.

The St. Regis Paper Co., a civic-minded participant in Jacksonville economic, social, and cultural activities for almost two decades, has a program to recognize its responsibility to the over 500,000 citizens of the community. The company's policy includes developing its assets to serve the public, utilizing the technological ability and facilities of its employees and plant, increasing the scientific and mechanical advances to protect the air and water at its mill and plant locations and cooperating and consulting with various governmental bodies for a clean environment.

St. Regis in Jacksonville has developed a $6 million water quality program and new air pollution devices in its antipollution program, which will help insure a better place to live for north Florida residents, and at the same time provide for great economic growth for our area.

I am pleased to bring this good news about our environment to the U.S. Congress and to the American people. I congratulate plant manager Denholm Smith and all of the Jacksonville St. Regis employees for their cooperative and constructive activities for a cleaner America. Articles explaining what this industry leader is doing in the antipollution field follow:

[From the Florida Times-Union, Jacksonville, Apr. 9, 1970]

ST. REGIS OFFERS ANTIPOLLUTION PLAN

(By Tom Longhurst)

St. Regis Paper Co., rated the No. 1 polluter of the St. John River by the Jacksonville Pollution Control Department, is awaiting state approval on a $6-million water quality program aimed at meeting federal standards.

Plant Manager Denholm Smith told The Florida Times-Union Wednesday that the proposed program, which has been before state officials since Feb. 2, will remove 90 percent of the oxygen-robbing pollutants in the process waste water used by the mill.

An earlier proposal by the company which envisioned the construction first of primary treatment facilities, then after study, the completion of secondary treatment in time for the Jan. 1, 1973, federal deadline, was rejected by the state.

"The state insisted on seeing the total treatment plan now before they would consider approval," Smith explained. "This is what we are seeking approval on now."

Smith said that St. Regis is not waiting for approval from Tallahassee before acting, however.

"We are going ahead with the preparation of engineering drawings and specifications," he said. "We can't afford to delay any longer on this and hope to make the deadline for having these facilities in operation."

St. Regis discharges approximately 80-million gallons of effluent into the river each day. Some 60-million gallons consist of water withdrawn from the Broward River and used for cooling purposes. The remaining 20-million gallons contain the pollutants, which include wood fibers and other solids.

The plant will consist of a clarifier which will remove the solids, Smith said, and then the effluent will be pumped to two large aeration basins which will reduce the biochemical oxygen demand (BOD) before discharging it into the river.

He said the program is designed to be completed by July 1, 1972, a full six months before the federal deadline, and demonstrates the company's recognition of its obligations to the community and the environmental problems of the city.

The Mill effluent receives no treatment now, Smith said, but pointed out that until recently, none was required by the state until public concern over the deteriorating quality of the river stiffened old standards and regulations.

[From the Chronicle, Jacksonville, Fla., May 14, 1970]

POLLUTION BAR AT ST. REGIS

Installation of a new air pollution control device was announced by Denholm Smith, resident manager of the St. Regis Paper Company's local kraft mill.

The equipment is a venturi-type scrubber designed to remove particulate matter from the exhaust of lime kilns. Lime kilns are designed to recover lime used in the paper-making process, and the new "scrubbers" are designed to remove the particulate matter from the gases given off in the burning process. The new scrubber replaces a similar but older type of pollution control device.

This is the second of the three lime kilns at the mill to have the new venturi-type scrubber installed. Pollution control equipment for the third lime kiln has been ordered and will be installed as soon as it is delivered. Each of the units costs approximately $125,000.

This installation is another milestone toward upgrading air quality at St. Regis based on a program approved by local and state pollution control agencies.

[From the St. Regis News, southern edition]

JACKSONVILLE MAINTAINS HIGH AIR QUALITY STANDARDS

JACKSONVILLE. — St. Regis' Jacksonville Mill, since original construction in 1952, always has maintained high standards of air pollution control. However, with recent changes in air standards, improvements are necessary.

Concerned over the growing air pollution problems of Jacksonville and environs, St. Regis initiated the establishment in 1964 of the Air Improvement Committee composed of manufacturers, the City of Jacksonville and the County of Duval.

The committee financed a study of air pollution problems, and as a result of this study the Duval Air Improvement Authority (DAIA), an enforcement agency, was established.

The Authority has approved plans for more efficient air pollution equipment for the St. Regis Jacksonville Mill. Installation is ahead of schedule and should be completed in early 1972.

The City of Jacksonville consolidated government replaced the DAIA with the Air Pollution Board, which is now the local enforcement agency for the entire county.

Air pollution sources at the Jacksonville Mill include power boilers, which use oil as fuel; bark boilers; recovery boilers, which is the first step in reclaiming chemicals used in pulp-making; and lime kilns. Smoke stack density meters have been installed on all this equipment for 24-hour monitoring of the efficiency of their operation.

Air/fuel ratio controllers have been installed on the power boilers to ensure proper combustion. Both bark boilers have been recently upgraded at a cost of $350,000 for installing new bark-feeding equipment, new fans and draft controls, and flyash arresting equipment. The recovery boilers have been recently rebuilt, the electrostatic precipitators, that remove tiny particles and other wastes, have been overhauled and the capacity of the two larger units was increased by 50 per cent.

Two venturi-type scrubbers have been installed on two lime kilns replacing relatively inefficient collectors. A third scrubber has been budgeted for installation on the other kiln.

The Air Pollution Board restricts the use of oil for power boilers to a content of 1½ per cent sulphur. In September, 1970, this restriction will be reduced to one per cent sulphur. This restriction limits the amount of sulphur dioxide released to the atmosphere by all power boilers in the area.

However, this low sulphur content oil will not pour at normal temperature. Therefore, it is necessary that heating equipment and insulation be installed on all of the oil pipes at a cost of $100,000. This more expensive fuel oil will cost an additional $300,000 per year.

WATER TREATMENT

St. Regis has submitted a water pollution control program to the state Air and Water Pollution Control Commission and the company's Board of Directors for approval. This installation will be completed by mid-1972 and will cost almost $6 million.

A 300-foot-diameter clarifier will be installed to remove solid matter from the 20 million gallons of process water the mill uses daily. Solids will be compressed, dried and burned. Four aeration basins will be installed to pump oxygen back into the waste water before it flows into the St. Johns River. The approximately 50-million gallons of water that is pumped from the Broward River daily is used for cooling condensers in the power boilers, and therefore does not come into contact with pulp or paper processes.

Resident Manager Denholm Smith said, "Standards for both air and water quality appear to be changing almost daily—and always higher—making our job of correcting our pollution problems doubly difficult. It has been our recent experience that no sooner than we spend a large amount of investor's money for pollution control equipment, the rules change and we are in violation of new standards."

CURIOSITY PLAYED A PART IN THE KENT TRAGEDY

HON. FLOYD V. HICKS

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, one of the best-read columnists in the State of Washington is the Bremerton Sun's Adele Ferguson. Recently she discussed the Kent State tragedy in terms of the human trait of curiosity. I believe it is worth reading, and commend it to the attention of my colleagues:

THE TRAGEDY OF KENT

(By Adele Ferguson)

It doesn't take any Warren Commission-type investigation to look into the whys of the Kent University tragedy in Ohio.

What happened there was inevitable.

If it hadn't happened in Ohio, it would have happened someplace else.

When anyone commits an act of violence or goes where the action is to see someone else do it, there is a risk involved, no doubt about it.

Put uniformed men in as opposition to that violence, and the risk becomes greater, whether they are carrying loaded rifles or billy clubs.

What happened at Kent is somewhat like what happened at the Democratic Presidential convention in Chicago, except that no one was killed in Chicago. There wasn't even a shot fired.

But the police there were seasoned men, trained to deal with disorder. There was some indiscriminate clubbing of troublemakers and onlookers alike, but it's hard to tell the difference in a crowd through a storm of thrown rocks and bottles.

National guardsmen are not for the most part, trained riot troops. They are simply young men who probably couldn't afford to go to college or didn't care to, and are part-time soldiers, while holding down jobs.

Whether a rock in the face is sufficient reason to believe your life is in danger is a question the Guard must answer.

But the students at Kent wouldn't have been killed if they had been tending to their business, at their studies or in some place other than where the action was.

They suffered from that old human trait, curiosity. They had to see what was going on.

It happens all the time to people of all ages.

When auto accidents occur on the highways, state troopers are almost frantically busy keeping traffic moving and chasing away curious onlookers who are in hopes of seeing some blood.

Remember the time that jetliner was coming in to New York Airport with its landing gear locked and when word got out via radio, the roads to the airport were so jammed with curiosity seekers driving there in hopes of seeing a crash that emergency vehicles couldn't get through?

Whether it's an auto wreck, a house fire, a drowning or just two dogs fighting, the curious crowd will gather.

It has been said time and again that when several thousand students gather for a demonstration someplace and violence breaks out, that only a small percentage of them are doing it—the overwhelming majority are just onlookers.

Being onlookers at violent acts at Kent cost some students their lives, needlessly.

What the college must come to is expulsion of those who commit the violent acts.

It may not stop the violence, but it will move it off campus, to some other location, where other curious crowds will gather and inevitably find that when you go where the action is, you're bound to get some of it on you.

QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. GEORGE E. BROWN, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. BROWN of California. Mr. Speaker, I recently sent poll results and other information related to my activities in Congress dealing with environmental problems to persons who responded to my poll. The newsletter follows:

Over a half-million Californians responded to my recent questionnaire on a broad range of environmental issues, and the overall indication is that tougher, more positive government action should be forthcoming.

The top two issues on what the national priorities for 1970 should be were Vietnam and pollution. Here are the final statewide breakdown of answers.

Do you favor proposals to ban the internal combustion gasoline engine until it meets stringent exhaust emission standards?

Yes: 80 percent. No: 20 percent.

Do you feel the oil companies and automobile manufacturers should be required to act more quickly to solve the problems of air pollution?

Yes: 96 percent. No: 4 percent.

Do you favor a Federal Regulatory Commission on Environmental Quality?

Yes: 77 percent. No: 23 percent.

Do you favor stronger government efforts to regulate shoreline use to increase the amount of beach property available for public use?

Yes: 83 percent. No: 17 percent.

Would you support stronger government efforts to regulate use of undeveloped open spaces, including advanced acquisition of land for public use?

Yes: 82 percent. No: 18 percent.

Would you support a complete ban on all federal offshore oil drilling except in national emergency?

Yes: 77 percent. No: 23 percent.

Do you favor stronger governmental efforts to educate the public on the problems of over population?

Yes: 87 percent. No: 13 percent.

SCIENCE COMMITTEE HOLDS ENVIRONMENTAL HEARINGS UNDER CHAIRMANSHIP OF GEORGE BROWN

Questionnaire results aided recent hearings conducted in Los Angeles and San Francisco by the Science, Research and Development subcommittee of the House Science and Astronautics Committee.

George Brown acted as hearing chairman in the two days in San Francisco, and during the four days we heard from over 50 witnesses, who gave their views on the topic, "Technology Assessment and Environmental Problems."

Certainly it became amply evident in the hearings that we need to develop an "ecological point of view" as well as new institutions to enable us to see more clearly the full range of factors involved in environmental planning.

The hearings also highlighted what appears to be increasing skepticism with the traditional and conventional beliefs that progress and economic growth are, in themselves per se, good.

It is clear that if we in California—and in this nation—are to achieve the kind of life to which we aspire, we may have to make some fundamental changes in our own life styles; in our views toward resource utilization, the application of our technologies, and the increasing growth of our population.

PROPOSALS INTRODUCED BY GEORGE BROWN DURING THE 91ST CONGRESS

Anti-smog bills to:

(1) set up programs to develop smogless vehicles;

(2) remove lead from fuel;

(3) establish standards for used cars;

(4) toughen existing laws for both stationary and motor vehicle emissions;

(5) allow states to adopt stricter standards than those of federal government;

(6) utilize an excise tax to finance development of smogless cars and a massive urban transit system;

(7) allow states to use federal highway funds to purchase low emission cars.

A cleaner ocean from bills to:

(1) insure local hearings on offshore leases;

(2) halt all offshore drilling until stringent standards and platform codes are adopted.

Adequate power from bills to:

(1) certify future electric power needs be met without damaging environment;

(2) create a Commission on Nuclear Safety.

Stabilize population by bills to:

(1) set up a Commission on Population;

(2) create a National Institute for Population Research;

(3) establish a nationwide series of Population Research Centers;

(4) limit personal tax exemptions to first two children in a family.

Protect national park lands and our shoreline:

(1) establish National Commission on Coastline Development;

(2) acquire Point Reyes, the Santa Barbara Channel Islands, and other marine sanctuaries;

(3) protect natural value of Mineral King, San Joaquin Wilderness, Garner Valley;

(4) retain Golden Eagle Park entrance fees.

Strengthen government policies on environment by bill which:

(1) declare the public right to environmental quality;

(2) establish a permanent Commission on Environmental Quality;

(3) withhold gov't contracts from polluters;

(4) call for international conference on environmental problems.

Other environmental bills to:

(1) formulate a comprehensive federal-state policy for optimal land use;

(2) protect wilderness areas from ecological damage caused by adjacent development;

(3) create an office of noise control in the Public Health Service;

(4) ban the SST until proven not a health hazard;

(5) establish a sonic boom damage fund;

(6) call for a major pesticides study, ban DDT and other chlorinated hydro-carbon pesticides for five years;

(7) create nationwide education program on environmental problems;

(8) protect wildlife, such as Calif. tule elks and the Alaska seals.

CONGRESSMAN GEORGE BROWN'S STATEMENT ON CAMBODIA

I have actively and publicly opposed the U.S. policy in Vietnam for the past 5 years. I am especially appalled at the action of the administration in "broadening the war in order to hasten the withdrawal of our troops." This irrational logic simply escapes me. In an immoral and futile war that the American people desperately want to bring to an end, the administration is playing the deadliest of "war games" in which no one can win and everyone will lose. This action in Cambodia, in my view, will merely prolong the war and cause much unnecessary suffering. It is obvious that the administration's program of "Vietnamization" is failing. It is equally obvious that the real answer is to withdraw American troops from the entire SE Asia area as rapidly as possible.

CONGRESSMAN GEORGE BROWN'S 5 YEARS OF VOTING NO ON THE WAR

	Vote	
	Yes	No
May 5, 1965—$700,000,000 Vietnam supplemental appropriation	408	7
June 14, 1966—$17,900,000,000 fiscal 1967 Defense authorization	356	2
July 20, 1966—$58,100,000,000 fiscal 1967 Defense appropriation	393	1
Mar. 8, 1967—$4,500,000,000 fiscal 1967 supplemental authorization	364	13
Mar. 16, 1967—$12,200,000,000 fiscal 1967 supplemental appropriation for Vietnam	385	11
May 9, 1967—$21,500,000,000 fiscal 1968 Defense authorization	401	3
June 13, 1967—$70 300,000,000 fiscal 1968 Defense appropriation	407	1
Sept. 12, 1967—Defense appropriation conference report	365	4
Oct. 3, 1967—Military construction conference report	377	33
June 11, 1968—$4,000,000,000 Vietnam supplemental appropriation	324	33
July 11, 1968—$72,200,000,000 fiscal 1969 Defense authorization	363	15
July 29, 1968—$1,800,000,000 military construction appropriation	350	32
Mar. 27, 1969—$62,000,000 procurement of Army aircraft	341	21
Aug. 5, 1969—$1,550,000,000 fiscal 1970 military construction	375	30

NAVIGATOR DIES IN VIETNAM

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, Lt. Robert W. Smith, a fine young man from Maryland, was killed recently in Vietnam. I would like to commend his courage and honor his memory by including the following article in the RECORD:

NAVIGATOR DIES IN AIR CRASH

First Lt. Robert W. Smith, 25, of Annapolis, died in the crash of his F-4 Phantom jet in Binh Dinh province.

Lieutenant Smith, a navigator, leaves a three-month old daughter, Lowry, whom he never saw.

"I don't think he really enjoyed his job, but he felt it was his duty as an American," said his wife, Mrs. Nancy Sayer Smith.

"He loved to fly but he didn't like the killing aspect," she said.

A career officer, Lieutenant Smith had flown more than 150 missions since he arrived in Vietnam 6 months ago. He was stationed with 480th Tactical Fighter Squadron, of the Seventh Air Force.

Lieutenant Smith, a 1967 education graduate of the University of Maryland, had been the student commander of the college Air Force ROTC unit. He was commissioned upon graduation.

As a boy he had one ambition—to become a fighter pilot. He still continued his boyhood hobby of building model airplanes. More than 40 models decorate his Annapolis apartment, his wife said.

Born in Washington, he grew up in Oxon Hill and graduated from Oxon Hill Senior High School.

ON EXTRA DUTY

Besides his wife and daughter, he leaves a son, Robert Sayer Smith, 2; his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Wilbur G. Smith, of Oxon Hill, and two sisters, Mrs. Jean Underwood, of Cherry Point, N.C., and Miss Nancy Smith, of Oxon Hill.

TENTH ANNUAL KANSAS FOURTH DISTRICT OPINION POLL

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, I include the following questionnaire which is being mailed to my constituents in the Kansas Fourth Congressional District this week. This is the 10th annual opinion poll which I have conducted since coming to Congress. It is very helpful to me to have the thinking of the people on the serious issues facing our country.

I am grateful, too, for the assistance of hundreds of volunteers throughout the fourth district who took the time to help address envelopes to be used for mailing the questionnaire.

The material follows:

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

DEAR FRIEND: As your elected representative in Washington, I need your opinions on matters that affect you as a citizen of Kansas and of the United States.

I personally visit the people I serve as often as it is possible. Congress, however, is staying in session longer, sometimes until November or December, thereby, reducing the time available for going home for this purpose. Accordingly, I have utilized this annual Opinion Poll as one method of helping me find out your thinking on problems facing our country.

I invite you to take a few minutes to express your opinions through this questionnaire. It may be difficult to respond to many of the questions with a simple "Yes" or "No," but that is how each Member of Congress must decide when legislation comes up for a vote. Separate letters on these or any other issues are alway welcomed by me.

The time spent telling me how you feel on the matters contained in this questionnaire will provide guidance for months to come, and assist me in serving you and our country. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely,

GARNER E. SHRIVER,
Member of Congress.

1. Do you favor establishment of an all-volunteer army as recommended by the President's Commission?

2. Should college deferments be eliminated from the Selective Service law?

3. Do you favor lowering the voting age?

4. The Safeguard Anti-Ballistic Missile system (ABM) is currently planned to protect two of our missiles sites. Should we expand the system to other sites in order to safeguard our nuclear deterrent?

5. What should we do about Vietnam:

a. Carry on limited military action and pursue peace talks in Paris?

b. Follow the Nixon policy of gradually phasing out U.S. troops and replacing them with South Vietnamese?

c. Withdraw immediately?

d. Do you support the President's decision to conduct a military operation in Cambodia against North Vietnamese and Viet Cong sanctuaries?

6. Would you be willing to pay higher taxes, if necessary, to finance an all-out Federal attack on pollution of our environment?

7. Do you favor federal subsidies for railroad passenger service?

8. Do you favor wage and price controls as anti-inflation weapon?

9. Do you favor busing school children to achieve a better racial balance?

10. Should we elect the President by direct popular vote?

11. Should penalties for the use or possession of marijuana be reduced, and penalties for selling it be increased?

12. Do you feel economic equality for Kansas farmers can best be established by:

a. Maintaining present price support policies?

b. Returning to free market operations?

c. Providing increased bargaining power?

d. Long-term retirement of crop acres?

13. Do you favor legislation which would limit daylight savings time to the three summer months only?

14. In your opinion, what is the Nation's No. 1 need today?

Your signature is *not* required on this questionnaire.

Do you now receive Congressman Shriver's periodical newsletter?

FATHER HESBURGH ISSUES STATEMENT CONCERNING VIETNAM AND CAMBODIA

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, Father Theodore Hesburgh, president of Notre Dame University, is a man whose views and opinions on any given subject are received with respect and interest by many Americans.

On May 4, 1970, Father Hesburgh issued a statement concerning the military situation in Vietnam and Cambodia. I include the text of his statement in the RECORD and invite the attention of my colleagues to it:

STATEMENT TEXT

(By T. M. Hesburgh)

As Americans, proud of our national traditions and committed to the best ideals of our country, we declare that we see these traditions and ideals best realized by not continuing our military operations in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos.

1. We favor the withdrawal of our military forces at the earliest moment and the designation by the Congress of an ultimate date for complete withdrawal.

2. We favor the most serious efforts to repatriate our American prisoners of war at whatever cost. The nation should recognize its deep debt to them and their families for their continued suffering.

3. We favor the use of our persons and our financial resources to rebuild a new and hopeful society in Vietnam and all of Indo-China that has known nothing but wars for so many years.

4. We suggest that the people of this whole area must ultimately make their own effort to achieve the kind of society that they want; that whatever the good will of our past and future efforts, it is the Vietnamese, Cambodians, and Laotians themselves who will create the conditions for peace and a better society, something that no force of arms or military imperialism from North or South, East or West, has yet created.

5. Most fundamentally, may we state our deep convictions that our national priorities today are not military, but human. Our nation is unnecessarily and bitterly divided on issues at home and abroad. If the war abroad can be quickly and effectively diffused, then we can be united at home in our dedication to justice, to equality of opportunity, and to renewing the quality of American life—a task that will require our best personal efforts and even more of our financial resources than those squandered by us in recent years on a largely frustrating and fruitless venture.

6. Lastly, we realize that the above points would sound like empty rhetoric if we did not stand ready—as we do—to commit our persons, our talents, our honor, and our futures to help work for a better America and a better world in a peaceful and nonviolent manner.

FINANCIAL AID FROM BUFFALO HELPS MILWAUKEE GET TEAM

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the sports pages were filled earlier this year with stories about the plight of the Seattle major league baseball team.

The decision was made to shift the franchise to Milwaukee.

Since the decision was made, it has come to light that one of the prime factors that made the shift possible for the Milwaukee backers was a $3 million assist from a Buffalo-based corporation, Sportservice.

This company has played an active role in connection with professional baseball for many years as a concessionaire. It also has catering and parking concessions at many airports as well as many other enterprises, now extending worldwide.

The company has nearly 1,000 employees in Buffalo among its 67,000 full- and part-time employees in its worldwide operations.

Mr. Speaker, as part of my remarks I include a recent article by Larry Felser in the Buffalo, N.Y., Evening News which tells of the company's role in the Milwaukee franchise:

$3 MILLION "ADVANCE" FROM BUFFALO HELPED MILWAUKEE GET THE BREWERS

(By Larry Felser)

Major League baseball returned to Milwaukee this season after a 4-year absence, but the void might not have been filled in the city except for a financial boost by Sportservice, the Buffalo-based concessions firm.

Sportservice advanced the Brewers about $3 million in operating funds.

This was dislosed in a recent interview with Jerry Jacobs, the youthful head of Sportservice.

"We felt that Milwaukee was, and still is, an excellent baseball city," said Jacobs. "There was an intolerable situation in Seattle and the ball club couldn't afford the trouble it had there."

Sportservice also had about $2 million in the Seattle club, but Jacobs emphasized that his corporations had no role in shifting the American League franchise to the midwest after one season in the Northwest's largest city.

LONG-TIME PRACTICE

The firm's financial aid to the clubs took the form of an advance on concession contracts. It is a long-time practice of the company, reaching back to the days when the financially-strapped Connie Mack was struggling to maintain the Athletics' franchise in Philadelphia.

There is a bit of old baseball lore that says Sportservice once subsidized all the teams in the old Texas League.

"It could be true," says Jacobs, who assumed command of the vast business after the death of his father, Louis M., Aug. 6, 1968.

Jacobs said his firm "guaranteed $12 million" in rent as an assurance Busch Stadium would be built in St. Louis several years ago. The entire cost of the stadium was about $40 million.

"I remember my father saying after that deal 'I wouldn't want too many more of those' ", says Jacobs.

ON GETTING INVOLVED

Why does Sportservice get involved in what financiers refer to as "high-risk investments?" Almost all capital used in sports operations come under this category.

"Good business," says Jacobs. "When we satisfy ourselves that the people we are dealing with are good businessmen and that the operation in which they are involved is sound, we go ahead with our investment.

"It has nothing to do with philanthropy. We are opportunists of longevity."

Jacobs said that in the Busch Stadium deal his father was "convinced that St. Louis was a fabulous sports town." The elder Jacobs satisfied himself that good tenants were guaranteed before he negotiated the contract. It was, by far, the most spectacular of baseball contracts at that time.

"August Busch and my father had done business for years," says the younger Jacobs. "It had been good business. That's what sports have succeeded on all these years.

40 YEARS WITHOUT CONTRACT

"Arthur Wirtz, who owns the Chicago Stadium, and my father operated together for 40 years without a contract. I thing Arthur's son, Billy, and I will be the same way for another 40."

Wirtz is just one sports figure for whom a close association with the Jacobs family has been beneficial to both sides. Another is Bill Veeck, who rose from a shoestring operator of a minor-league baseball franchise in Milwaukee to one of the most successful figures in the major leagues. L. M. Jacobs, in effect, was his sponsor.

"We have invested in a lot of franchises through the years in baseball," says Jerry Jacobs, "but it's always been the policy of the corporation never to interfere with the operations of the club.

"Judge Landis, the late commissioner of baseball, once said that he never worried about the interests Sportservice had in so many baseball teams because he could trust that they wouldn't get involved in the actual baseball business."

EMPLOY ABOUT 67,000

Sportservice now employs about 67,000 people, full and part-time, throughout the world. There are between 900 and 1000 employes in the Buffalo area. The corporation's interests range from catering and parking concessions at major airports to the prestige account of the food concession at Great Britain's famed Ascot Race Track.

Jerry Jacobs is the owner of the Cincinnati Royals in the National Basketball League, a franchise operated by his brother, Max, 33, executive vice president of Sportservice, but he remains an unabashed baseball fan.

"It's a tremendous sport and I still think it has appeal for every age group," he says. "I disagree with these people who claim baseball is on its way out. I think it's going to improve and grow.

"For anyone who doubts that, I'd like to take them to Montreal to watch a game in Jarry Park. It's like no other event you've ever seen."

Jerry Jacobs, despite his international business interests, continues to live in Buffalo year round with his wife and five children. Jerry just turned 30.

THE DEADLY HUMOR OF THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, the newspapers occasionally contain very significant information that might otherwise be lost amongst the accounts of campus demonstrations and protesting protesters unless special attention is given to it.

The Evening Bulletin of Philadelphia recently carried a story to which my attention was drawn by the caption: "Assistant DA Quits in Frustration: 'Criminals Laugh at System.' " Indeed, it might be humorous, as sick as it would be, if the results were not so tragic. As reported, Assistant District Attorney Robert G. Ginsburg of Philadelphia is leaving his position in frustration because of the mockery of justice perpetuated by none other than the judges themselves in their administration of the criminal justice system.

I think Mr. Ginsburg's first-hand observations as to the operation and effects of the system are particularly worthy of more than passing mention. He says that the system "is being taken advantage of by the criminal element"; that "the system is working totally against the decent people."

He goes on to say:

A large percentage of judges are misinformed as to a person's responsibility for his acts and a lot of judges believe social conditions are the reasons people do what they do.

This, in my estimation, is the real crux of the problem for we have a goodly portion of judges who have the notion that they are society's social reformers and that the courts are the proper forum for carrying out social revolution rather than the policy-making legislative bodies. Says Mr. Ginsburg:

Crime is a matter of choice, a criminal knows exactly what he is doing. If the judges would quit looking to excuse them (criminal defendants), then they would become a little more severe.

And, I might add, society would not have to continue to be victimized by known criminals who are the beneficiaries of parole or lenient sentences by permissive judges while the alleged "guilty social conditions" are being treated by the legislative branch.

It is no wonder why the law-abiding citizen also feels victimized by the Government whose paramount responsibility it is to protect its citizens' lives and property. The District of Columbia is a prime example where even in the most sophisticated of neighborhoods, persons fear for their safety if they walk on the streets at high noon. Observes Mr. Ginsburg:

It is totally unnerving to prosecute a burglar, for instance, with five, six or eight prior convictions only to see him walk out of court the same day on bail to await sentencing or on a sentence of probation.

These repeat criminals walk freely among the public, with hardly a moment's hesitation to mug or rob an unsuspecting victim, and with nothing more than a slight slap on the wrist for prior infractions of the law and other people's rights for which the blame is laid to "social conditions."

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that so long as ill-defined "social conditions" are held to be the guilty party rather than the purposeful and deliberate criminal who ends up in the sanctuary of the criminal justice system, you and I and the rest of John Que Public will have little hope of being able to walk the streets of the District of Columbia or any other city in America without the pervasive fear for our personal safety.

ROTC: THE UNIVERSITIES' STAKE IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

HON. LOWELL P. WEICKER, JR.

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. WEICKER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to read the following statement made by John W. Bitner, chairman, Princeton University Joint Army-Navy-Air Force ROTC Advisory Council. Mr. Bitner raises some valid points which deserve the serious consideration of all Americans. The statement follows:

ROTC: THE UNIVERSITIES' STAKE IN NATIONAL DEFENSE

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

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

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

Since national security requires a well-trained officer corps, the nation is better off by far if much of that corps is composed of men with the sound academic training, disciplined individual thinking and the understanding social outlook that our foremost colleges and universities can contribute.

The truth of this was significantly underlined by a recent special committee of civilian educators and military officers, commissioned by the Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird to study problems of the ROTC program. The committee and its advisory panel included not only two generals and an admiral, but also nine university presidents or chancellors and other men of considerable academic and administrative stature representing leading universities in all sections of the country. The members of this committee advised Secretary Laird a few months ago: "most American colleges and universities do have a responsibility to share in the defense of the free society of which they are a part. It is in their institutional self interest to contribute to the leadership of the armed forces." The committee also unanimously agreed that "If ROTC were to be removed from the nation's campuses there would be grave danger of isolating the services from the intellectual centers of the public which they serve and defend."

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

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

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

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

To the extent that a school rejects ROTC, the school shrugs off the challenge of that unique function. Even more disturbing: it abandons a significant area of academic freedom: the right of a student to choose whether or not he will train for a military career at the same time he proceeds with his liberal academic education.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Certainly there is ample room for re-examination of campus-ROTC relationships by men of good will representing both points of view. Let us then have new in-depth discussions between the colleges and universities where there has been a deterioration or cessa-

tion of ROTC on the one hand, and appropriate military department officials on the other: discussions which, with the best overall interests of our nation in mind, should be aimed at re-evaluation of how the academic world and our armed services can best relate in meeting the Nation's defense training problems of our armed services. And let's have these discussions before more damage—possibly irreversible damage—is done.

PHYSICIANS HONORED ON STAMPS

HON. HAROLD R. COLLIER

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. COLLIER. Mr. Speaker, in his remarks of May 7, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CONYERS) stated that "only two stamps commemorating the efforts of medical men have ever been issued" by the U.S. Post Office. He mentioned the stamp issued in 1947 with the painting "The Doctor" and one issued in 1964 in honor of Drs. Charles and William Mayo.

As I am confident that my colleague from Michigan would not want the record to be incomplete, I invite his attention to three other physicians who have been commemorated by means of postage stamps.

In 1959, Ephraim McDowell, who performed the first ovariotomy in 1809, appeared on a stamp.

Two stamps that honored physicians appeared in 1940. One bore the likeness of Crawford Williamson Long who, in 1842, first used ether as an anesthetic in surgery. The other memorialized Walter Reed, the famous Army medical officer whose efforts four decades earlier led to the practical elimination of yellow and typhoid fevers.

I wish the gentleman from Michigan success in his efforts to secure recognition for Daniel Hale Williams, who was the first surgeon to perform open heart surgery. Certainly the pioneers, who are all too often forgotten, deserve more than a footnote in history.

DR. RODGER BELL AND DR. RONALD JARVIS OF THE INSTITUTE OF APPLIED PSYCHOTHERAPY RECEIVE THE ELOY ALFARO GRAND CROSS

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, I am including in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the formal presentation address of Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American Provost, the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama; the investiture speech of Dr. L. Lester Beacher, Deputy American Provost and Chancellor of Philathea College, London, Ontario, Canada; the presentation and translation of the diplomas by Mr. Walter T. Mandel, director of public relations, Institute of Applied Psychotherapy; and the acceptances of Dr. Rodger Bell and Dr. Ronald Jarvis, when both of them received the highest honor of this foundation. The dual decoration ceremony took place in my congressional district on Wednesday, the 15th day of April 1970, at the headquarters of the Institute of Applied Psychotherapy, Inc., 251 West 92d Street, New York, N.Y., in the presence of more than 50 associates and guests.

The Institute of Applied Psychotherapy is a nonresidential therapeutic community that guides young men and women towards a pattern of constructive living through emotional education. Utilizing insights into their own personalities, achieved with the help of individual sessions, group workshops, and work therapy, the members gain a better understanding of themselves and others.

The workshops have a dual purpose: the first builds new levels of communication between parents and their children; the second deals with the emotional dynamics of drug prevention. Thus in addition to its other functions, the institute is a drug prevention center. Prevention is the most effective manner in which to eliminate the need for cure and rehabilitation.

After the invocation delivered by Dr. L. Lester Beacher, Dr. Herman A. Bayern delivered the formal presentation address which follows:

DR. BAYERN'S PRESENTATION ADDRESS

Dr. Bell and Dr. Jarvis, we are assembled here this morning, to honor both of you in a dual decoration ceremony, with the highest honor of this Foundation . . . the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma.

We are here this morning to honor you in testimony; firstly, in our faith in the ideals of American Democracy; secondly, in our devotion to the cause of universal education as the bulwark of these ideals; and thirdly, because of our confidence in the cooperation of all peoples of the Western Hemisphere in the preservation of human freedom and peace of all the peoples of the world.

Such was the pattern of life of our standard bearer, the immortal Eloy Alfaro, the great Democrat of Ecuador. As President of Ecuador at the turn of the century, he expanded and furthered educational institutions of his own country.

He appealed to the Spanish Monarch to establish peace, and to grant to the people of Cuba the freedom for which they yearned and bled. Now, those people of Cuba, pray once more that somehow, perhaps by Divine Guidance, they will again see their freedom restored—freedom which Dr. Castro and the Soviet Union wrested from them in direct violation of the Monroe Doctrine.

The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation of the Republic of Panama, gathers and encourages the permanent political and moral values of the Americas. Eloy Alfaro was the most outstanding Ecuadorian in the Western Hemisphere. The action and thought which he placed at the service of his country, were instrument and agency of the highest aspiration of half the globe. He worked for a broad land; he strove to raise the social level of the Indians; to spread education among his countrymen; to banish exploitation of man by man; to act for the defence of liberty, regardless of frontiers; to American public laws; and to free the flesh and the spirits from their chains.

The Eloy Alfaro International Foundation has neither political nor financial purposes. The finality is to pay tribute to the memory of Eloy Alfaro, and make available all knowledge of his life and works as a statesman and liberator. What Eloy Alfaro undertook and accomplished in half a century, constitutes the essential transformation of normal people.

Eloy Alfaro was a citizen not only of his native Ecuador, but of all the Americas. The personal integrity, the unwavering defense of the principles of truth, justice, and friendship among nations; the self sacrifice that marked about one-quarter of a century of unflagging service to his fellow man, extended way beyond the confines of his own country, Ecuador.

He was a rebel and a conspirator, but his rebellion and conspiracy were directed against hatred, injustice, discord and tyranny. He was the leader of a generation fired with the hope and desire that responsible political action would enhance the prosperity of their country and the welfare of their people.

Whenever there was a threat to the peace in the Western Hemisphere, Eloy Alfaro was the dynamic leader who brought about a peaceful settlement of such disputes.

General Alfaro sowed the seeds to Pan American cooperation and understanding. In 1907, he called a peace conference in Mexico City in which the United States participated, for welding all the Americas together, and to preserve for the Western Hemisphere, the Pan-American unity of freedom-loving people that would be the perpetual harbinger against the attempt of any form of despotism to plant the tyrant's heel on even the tiniest portion of the soil of our Pan-American nations.

Were General Alfaro alive today, he would be a zealous supporter of the United Nations. This great Ecuadorean statesman and dedicated leader would have left no stone unturned to assure all the peoples of the world hope, peace, and good will. That is our common heritage from our common Creator.

The public and private activities of both Dr. Bell and Dr. Jarvis, come within the framework of this kind of service to humanity, to education, and to country, and to the aims and purposes of this Foundation.

In recognition of this, the ruling body of this Foundation grants both Dr. Rodger Bell and Dr. Ronald Jarvis, its highest honor—the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross and Diploma. This was voted for both of you because of your immeasurable service to international goodwill, your outstanding contributions to world culture, and "in recognition of their outstanding service to their country and to mankind, in the fields of education and psychotherapy, and their outstanding activities in behalf of humanitarian causes, in keeping with the aims, ideals, principles, and purposes of this Foundation."

Both of these distinguished citizens, join a very select and elite group of Americans who have been honored similarly in the past. They include former Presidents John F. Kennedy, Franklin D. Roosevelt, Harry S Truman, President Richard M. Nixon, Vice President Spiro Agnew, former President Lyndon B. Johnson, former Vice President Hubert H. Humphrey, former General of the Armies Douglas MacArthur, F.B.I. Director J. Edgar Hoover, Senators Mansfield, Scott and Javits, Congressmen Emanuel Celler and William F. Ryan, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller, Hon. John V. Lindsay, Dr. Marie L. Fetch, Dr. Hattie Grossman, the Hon. Stanley Fuld, Chief Justice of the Court of Appeals of New York

State, and the Hon. James E. Allen, U.S. Commissioner of Education, who typify the calibre of individuals who hold this high honor.

It now gives me personal pleasure, and it is an honor and a privilege for me to call on Dr. L. Lester Beacher, Deputy American Provost and Chancellor of Philathea College, who has been honored by many nations and colleges, an outstanding opthalmologist who did the original research and development on the contact lense and who has written many books and articles on this subject.

INVESTITURE SPEECH OF DR. L. LESTER BEACHER

I am aware of the achievements of both Dr. Bell and Dr. Jarvis in their work with young people. Due to my long involvement in the field, I can appreciate the dedication and perseverance necessary to sit hour after hour in session, listening to people's troubles, in order to guide them to happier, fuller, lives.

In this world, very few people take time out to care for one another. These two young men have given unselfishly of themselves in the service of their fellow man. I am reminded of an incident on the New York subways during the rush hour period. A woman, looking very tired, was holding on to one of the straps and was being jostled about. A young man sitting in front of her got up and offered her his seat. The woman fainted. When she had composed herself, she thanked him. Then he fainted.

It now gives me great pleasure and happiness, as the Deputy American Provost of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, to carry out the determination of the Board of Dignitaries, to present you Dr. Bell, and to you Dr. Jarvis, the Eloy Alfaro Grand Cross.

THE PRESENTATION AND TRANSLATION OF THE DIPLOMAS FROM SPANISH TO ENGLISH BY MR. WALTER T. MANDEL

It is hard to believe that only one year ago the Institute of Applied Psychotherapy began with six people in Dr. Bell's living room. It was then decided that the purpose of the Institute would be to help young people to lead creative, responsible lives.

The Institute has grown this past year to over fifty people, all of whom help each other in finding and pursuing their goals. Without the guidance of both Dr. Bell and Dr. Jarvis, none of this would be possible. I am sure that all the members of the Institute of Applied Psychotherapy, join me in saying thank you, Dr. Bell and Dr. Jarvis, for giving us the opportunity to create better and fuller lives.

At this time it gives me great pleasure to translate and present the Diplomas to both Dr. Bell and Dr. Jarvis.

"Thus one goes to the stars—Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, recognizing the special value of the services rendered by Dr. Rodger Bell and Dr. Ronald Jarvis, in support of the objectives of this institution, they have been awarded the Cross of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation. In witness whereof, this diploma, with the seal of the foundation, is presented in the City of Panama, Republic of Panama, on the 25th day of June, 1969."

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF DR. RODGER BELL, FOUNDER AND DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF APPLIED PSYCHOTHERAPY, INC.

I want to express my sincere gratitude to the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, Dr. Herman A. Bayern, American Provost, and Dr. L. Lester Beacher, Deputy American Provost, for the great honor conferred on me this morning.

I appreciate the unusual honor and privilege of having the Chancellor of Canada's Philathea College, Dr. L. Lester Beacher for being here today in order to make the investiture. I wish I could express the feelings inside of me now. It is a mixture of humility and pride. The names of all those who have helped me to turn a dream into a reality pass through my mind as I stand before you today.

At a time when the populace of the world is condemning the breakdown of family, religion and major institutions for young people, the Institute of Applied Psychotherapy is doing something about it.

The Institute is a non-residential therapeutic community staffed by young educators and psychotherapists who are dedicated to the prevention of drug addiction through emotional education. The Institute's uniqueness lies in the fact that it does not deal with the drug addict but rather with so-called normal young adults.

Through individual counseling, work projects, and group seminars, our members are taught a constructive, creative and exciting way of life.

One institute of fifty people is not enough. The urgency of problems facing young people today screams now. More emotional education is needed before America loses its youth to the pitfalls created by alienation.

I accept this award on behalf of all those who have lent me their talents and concern and who have given freely of their trust to allow me to be a catalyst in the forming of a pioneering and needed social institution. This award brings new inspiration and encouragement as I strive to attain these goals.

I wish to convey my best wishes to the Board of Dignitaries of the Eloy Alfaro International Foundation, who so generously selected me to join such a distinguished company of outstanding personalities, who have heretofore been honored by the Foundation.

I shall regard it as an impetus to accelerate my efforts to carry out the aims, purposes, principles, and high ideals of the Foundation.

ACCEPTANCE SPEECH OF DR. RONALD JARVIS, CO-FOUNDER AND ASSISTANT DIRECTOR OF THE INSTITUTE OF APPLIED PSYCHOTHERAPY, INC.

I did not write a speech. I am not here today for a debate or lecture so I don't need facts and figures. I am here to express my feelings.

When I first learned that I was to receive this honor, I thought it strange. I was getting an award for doing that which I love most. I am doing something that has meaning and purpose to me and I would do anything for it. But then I started thinking about some of the great men who have also received this award and realized that they too were dedicated to a cause or a purpose that had great meaning to them. In thinking of this I realized that no man is born happy, secure or fulfilled. It comes from how you live your life and what you do. It is true that some of us are born into more favorable circumstances than others, and yet some of the greatest and happiest people have come from the deepest of life's pits. I truly believe that if we make something more important than ourselves, we free ourselves from petty fears and needs, enough so that they no longer have the power to stop us from growing and realizing our potential.

Although I feel privileged to be the youngest person ever to receive this honor, I cannot accept it for myself. I owe it all to Dr. Bell and all the people of the Institute. Without them, there would have been no purpose, and without Dr. Bell's help and support, it could not have been done. On their behalf I gratefully accept this award.

I want to say more, but I am a little overwhelmed. I'm afraid my attempt to do so would result in incoherent babbling. I want to thank Dr. Bayern, Dr. and Mrs. Beacher, Mr. Mandel, and the rest of our honored guests for being here. Thank you.

THE SILENT MAJORITY

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, recently, Dr. Eric Walker, president of Pennsylvania State University, addressing a graduating class, made the following comments in describing the silent majority:

These 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 workday by a third have more than doubled per capita output.

These are the people who have given you a healthier world than they found. You no longer have to fear the epidemics of flu, typhus, diphtheria, smallpox, scarlet fever, measles or mumps that they knew in their youth.

These remarkable people lived through history's greatest depression. Many know what it is to be poor, hungry, and cold. Because of this, they determined that it would not happen to you, that you would have a better life—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 and earn more.

These are also the people—your parents and grandparents—who fought man's grisliest war. They are the people who defeated the tyranny of Hitler, and who, when it was 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 U.N.

Representatives of these two generations, through the highest court of the land, fought racial discrimination 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 instead of the dream of only a wealthy few.

And they made a start 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. But these generations—the Establishment—made more progress by the sweat of their brows than any preceding 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.

STAND TOGETHER

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, an article entitled "We Must Stand Together" appeared in the May 8, 1970, issue of the Florida Alligator, the student publication at the University of Florida in Gainesville.

Written by Bruce Alper, a junior at the university, it points out the viewpoint of what I feel is the vast majority of our young people today.

This is one of the most excellent articles on dissent and the problem on our college campuses today that I have seen. I commend it to the Congress for their information:

WE MUST STAND TOGETHER

(By Bruce Alper)

Those who march today on the campus and in the streets and employ violence and mob action are the real enemies of the freedom to dissent. Those who threaten and attack others who support the president, who believe in America and in peaceful change are not really dissenting from the Vietnam or Cambodian policies or from social injustice.

Those who claim their right to dissent is threatened and under attack by Vice-President Agnew, the police and others, are outright liars. The tables are now turned and the wheel has come full circle and now all—all, should be capable of seeing the truth starkly glaring down upon them.

I was informed on Tuesday, May 5, in Matherly Hall at 2:50 p.m. by a group using Hitlerite tactics of terror and mob action that I, indeed, no man, can support the president or attend classes or do anything not approved by such extremists.

One leader of the mob decreed, "we are ordering this classroom emptied and closed." Hitler too, emptied and closed the stores of the Jewish people for they too faced violent intimidation and mob action.

Each extremist of the left has the makings of another Hitler, of another Stalin, of another murderer. Each man who cherishes his freedom and liberty is a target of the extremists of the left, for they cannot allow us to disagree nor to go about our business as we may choose. Thus they declare our right—your right and mine—to dissent from violence and views of a treacherous group of hooligans is now ended. They demand unwavering devotion to their decree of the truth and personal subordination to their terrorist leadership.

We must realize that dissent is threatened but not the dissent of those against the Vietnam war or the recent action on Cambodia, but the dissent of those who support the president and who refuse to condemn America for they know it is a nation of justice, virtue, and honor.

We must stand together and oppose the left and its fascist tactics. When men march screaming "burn it down, shut it down" we are threatened with more than a conflagration of buildings. We are threatened with an inquisition against those who have faith in their country, who still trust our president and who will not be the willing tools of our enemies abroad.

A smaller inner core of experienced anarchists are playing upon the fears, the discontent, the unhappiness of others and using such persons for their own ends.

Those who truly and deeply disagree with American involvement in Asia on moral grounds are doing themselves a disservice by associating and participating in violent demonstrations. By using violence they negate their own personal abhorrence of violence and thus violence becomes glorified as good and just if it achieves their aims. But all along it is the inner core of anarchists and traitors who are wielding their unsuspecting followers to achieve their own selfish dreams and illusions of greatness.

Make no mistake about it the right to dissent of those who disagree with American policy is not threatened. It is the right of those who dissent from violence and who dissent from an unreasoning condemnation of this nation whose rights are threatened and being called into question.

Those men who use violence and burn ROTC buildings, thus interfering with the rights of others to serve their country as they wish—it is they who are traitors and criminals. They are traitors for they reject the nation and criminals because they want only and maliciously to destroy the property and rights of others.

To refuse to accept the views of the left and of others who disagree with the direction America is moving in is just as sacred and inalienable a right as is that to be a member of the left. But this freedom is scorned by the violent left.

The violent, the extremists and the anarchists are on notice that students will not be forced from a classroom if they desire to pursue their education. The violent can attempt to intimidate us, to frighten and threaten but we must never kow-tow to them. Not cowardice nor compliance is called for. What we who love this nation and abhor violence must do is to stand our ground and condemn the extremists.

Should it come to a clash of physical violence when we whose rights are being attacked have not only the legal right of self defense but the duty to fight this aggression against our freedom as Americans.

Only one person out of my entire class elected to leave and perhaps, join the mob on Tuesday. Those who remained, perhaps unaware of it at that moment, took a stand for freedom, for the right to dissent for justice and for America. As long as men will be steadfast in their dedication to uphold our liberty then our nation need not fear.

The enemies of freedom are now on notice that those Americans who cherish their liberty will not be intimidated or bullied by fascist mobs and extremists of the left. Rather, freedom will be preserved. The nation will not be forsaken by true patriots.

SMALL BUSINESS—VITAL TO OUR NATIONAL ECONOMY

HON. HAROLD T. JOHNSON

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. JOHNSON of California. Mr. Speaker, once again the Nation is celebrating "National Small Business Week." In his proclamation designating May 17 through 23 as "Small Business Week, 1970," President Nixon succinctly pointed out the importance of small business to the American way of life:

The imagination, courage and hard work of small businessmen have, since our country's founding, been a great source of national vitality and inventiveness.

Small business is not and never has been a small matter in our national life. Operating or working in small business has not only been a good way to make a living—it has been a good way to help make a country strong and free and prosperous.

The principal Federal agency coordinating activities for "National Small Business Week" is the Small Business Administration, which has made remarkable progress in increasing the flow of assistance to small firms.

Of special significance is the development and progress of SBA's new program known as "Operation Business Mainstream." This program brings all SBA programs and services together in a coordinated effort to give maximum thrust to helping provide sound business opportunities for all minority individuals.

Because of the splendid record SBA has made in the State of California during fiscal year 1969, I want to take this opportunity during "National Small Business Week" to offer a special salute to SBA Administrator Hilary Sandoval, Jr., and his staff here in Washington and also to our very fine area administrator serving the Pacific coast States, Donald McLarnan, and his people in the State of California who are working so cooperatively with small business in seeking to enhance this vital segment of our business economy.

In the area of financial assistance alone, SBA made 754 loans totaling nearly $33.4 million to small companies in California during fiscal 1969. The Agency also greatly increased the amount and number of Government contracts going to small firms in California during the past fiscal year.

Greater emphasis was also placed on providing small firms in California with management and technical assistance to help them operate successfully and profitably.

California is a State with a large number of small firms. The work the Small Business Administration is doing, the zeal with which they are carrying out their important mission, deserves our support and commendation.

FIGHTING MEN IN VIETNAM AGREE WITH NIXON ON CAMBODIAN DECISION

HON. JOHN WOLD

OF WYOMING

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. WOLD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to share with my colleagues the letter I have received from a young Wyomingite serving in Vietnam. The straightforward thoughts of Jeff Jones, specialist, fourth class, speak for themselves on the wisdom of the President's decision to destroy enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia:

Dear Mr. and Mrs. Wold: Sorry for the long delay but things have been pretty busy around here since so many Marines left.

I'll be home in September but I think I'm going to come back here for six months.

Almost all of us here feel the same way. The move into Cambodia was great. It will save a lot more lives than you can imagine and the work here will progress twice as fast.

We all want to go home, naturally, but all of us would rather stay here than go home to the crazy people marching up and down the streets trying to destroy the things we are fighting for. Don't they realize every time they riot, the NVA produce another pamphlet and their will to fight against a divided nation increases?

Tell your colleagues who are dissatisfied with Mr. Nixon's Cambodia decision that there are more than 400,000 Americans here who are glad and damn thankful he had the guts to do it.

The best of luck and write when you can. See you in Sept.

JEFF.

ROCHESTER'S LILAC TIME SETS HIGHLAND PARK ABLAZE WITH COLOR

HON. FRANK HORTON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. HORTON. Mr. Speaker, in my home district springtime and lilac time are synonymous. The Monroe County Parks Department is the home of the world's finest lilac collection.

This weekend will be the opening of the lilac season, and I would sincerely hope that all my colleagues could have the opportunity to visit this world famous collection at Highland Park in Rochester, N.Y.

More than a half million persons visit the park each year to see the gentle slopes of Highland Park ablaze with the colors ranging from white and the most delicate shades of lilac to the deepest purple. The collection includes lilac varieties which date back to colonial days.

Since 1890 Highland Park has been pioneering new varieties of lilacs. As many of my colleagues may recall, a new lilac named in memory of the late Dwight David Eisenhower was presented to Mrs. Nixon for the White House gardens last spring.

Rochester is famed as the lilac capital of the world and once again I would like to extend an invitation for all of you to visit our community and the Highland Park gardens. I would also like to share with my colleagues an article on lilac time by Judy Adams, a reporter for the Rochester, N.Y., Times Union which appeared May 16, 1970.

A SCOTSMAN AND LILACS

(By Judy Adams)

It began one balmy Sunday in May, 1898.

The quiet laughter of people and the squeaking of carriage wheels signaled the movement of small groups toward the slopes of Highland Park.

It was a beautiful day. The sun was bright and warm and the smell of lilacs was in the light breeze.

No one knew it then, but that was Rochester's first Lilac Sunday.

The lilacs in the park were only a few years old. The first collection had been planted by a Scotsman named John Dunbar and two local nurseries had just added more bushes on the south slope. Now the lilacs were in bloom and the people of Rochester were taking a Sunday stroll or ride to view them.

There were 3,000 who came that day.

Many more thousands were expected to stream through Highland Park next weekend, 72 years later, during Rochester's 61st Lilac Sunday. (It didn't occur to city officials to dub it that until 1909.)

There are now about 1,600 bushes with about 550 varieties in the park. It's the largest and most famous collection in the world.

Weather has always played a role in the selection of the weekend when the blossoms would be at their best. Occasionally it has played the villain. So this year planners have cautiously scheduled the activities for Saturday, May 23, leaving Sunday open for a switch of dates in case the weatherman fails to cooperate.

Last year the turnout—which has been as high as 100,000—was kept to about 6,000 because of the cold, wet weather.

This year's activities start at noon Saturday with a luncheon at the Flagship Rochester for city, county and festival officials.

At 1:45 p.m., the Harvest Queens and officials will leave the Flagship by motorcade escorted the last part of the way to the park by the Bishop Kearney Marching Band.

The official program begins at 2:30 p.m. It will include introduction of the Harvest Queens and presentation of awards. At 3 p.m., there will be a "Music in Motion" performance by the Kearney Band, including highlights of their recent performance in Ireland.

The Monroe County Parks Band will play from 12:30 until 2:30 p.m. and from 3:30 until 5:50 p.m. on Saturday and from 2 until 4 p.m. on Sunday.

The lilacs will be floodlighted from dusk until 11 p.m. starting Saturday and continuing through the end of the week.

CHESAPEAKE AND OHIO CANAL: INDUSTRIAL PARK OR RECREATIONAL PARK

HON. GILBERT GUDE

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. GUDE. Mr. Speaker, in light of the important emphasis on the environment in public policy considerations today, I thought the following excerpt from a constituent's letter I received in my office this week provided an excellent commentary on a serious environmental problem of our National Capital area. I include here one citizen's questioning of our care and concern for the preservation of the capital area's rich beauties.

"The Washington Post" and "The Evening Star" said that the stretch-jets continued to be used at WNA. A "promise" had been made that they would be allowed "only for the duration of the controllers' strike."

We followed with interest your efforts with regard to environmental improvements along the Potomac and the Old Canal. Last night we hiked in the area of lock house . . . where the canal barge turns, near Brookmont. There were more than 30 too low flying jets over this so-called recreational park and towpath during *one hour!* Altitude regulations have ben disregarded there (as well as here in Cabin John) without any inhibition. Violations are the rule rather than an exception.

No music was allowed in the Amusements Park of Glen Echo. Are noise and pollution by aircraft directly over hikers and anglers allowed? City dwellers seeking fresh air and recreation have to swallow 30 times during one single hour the pollutants coming down in thick black streams. . . . The jets are *not* (or only seldom) flying over the river, as FAA callously continues to state.

This same appalling condition exists at the unique (and expensive) Turkey Run Park, on the other side from Glen Echo. The planes come from there directly to the Old Canal. Walkways and towpaths might as well be located in an "industrial park", instead of a "recreational park". The criteria for industry zoning are pollution and noise. These criteria prevail in this public property area.

There is *no precedent* in any big city, where the public's finest assets for recreation, study in history and nature, are allowed to be invaded by heavy industry. "Flying or mobile industry" are common knowledge now. The abuse here is unique.

SOME COMMONSENSE ON CURRENT PROBLEMS FROM FRANKLIN, IND., DAILY JOURNAL

HON. WILLIAM G. BRAY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Speaker, the following appeared in the Franklin, Ind., Daily Journal on May 18, 1970. I insert it to call attention to the remarkably good commonsense of the editorial, and also the editor's followup remarks in "County Chatter," as follows:

A MOCKERY

"Plain, outright murder," was how a respected Cleveland television commentator labeled the shootings at Kent State University.

The violence was a direct result of Governor Rhodes' sending in the Ohio National Guard "for the main purpose of suppressing student expression of protest and dissent," a local director of the Committee for a Sane Nuclear Policy wrote in a letter-to-the-editor.

"All people now see that the government is not only willing to kill Vietnamese and blacks, but its own students," charged a Boston College professor of political science.

At a time when Americans desperately need words of reconciliation and healing, such statements and others like them are worse than asinine. Whether made in the heat of emotion or out of cold calculation, they can only serve to further confuse and divide and inflame us.

There are enough people on both sides willing to capitalize on the unfortunate deaths of four kids who were at Kent only to get an education and who took no part in the riots—to use them in death as they would not be used in life. Responsible leaders and molders of opinion must not join the chorus of unreason.

The word "unfortunate," meaning an unlucky chance, is the proper word. What happened at Kent was an accident or aberration, unplanned and unexpected—but one that was made inevitable by the current general disregard for the standards of civilized behavior without which a free nation cannot remain free.

This is still America. We do not have a government which dispatches troops to fire

on those who dissent with its policies. But it has never been, and must never become, a country where the right of free speech and petition of grievances extends to the destruction of property, the stoning of legally constituted authorities and the infringement on the rights and safety of others.

Those who claim that the government of the United States is at war with its own citizens make a mockery of the deaths of four innocent people and, wittingly or unwittingly, only lay the ground for more tragedy to come.

COUNTY CHATTER

(By Scott Alexander)

We're quick to judge the young generation these days and more often than not our judgments reflect harsh criticism rather than plaudits.

We forget, or perhaps tend to overlook many of the good things our young people do and often judge the many by the antics of a few.

Take right here on the "home front" for instance:

. . . Didja know that throughout the past several young college students (yep, even some of the so-called 'hippies') have been working voluntarily with children at the Gateway Learning Center . . .

. . . Didja know that as recently as last Thursday four young Greenwood lads—David and Steve Hagan, Larry Corrie and Danny Rehfeldt—voluntarily and without her knowledge mowed and trimmed the lawn of Mrs. Judy Baker whose husband Dennis drowned April 25 while canoeing in Putnam county . . . ?

. . . Or didja know that after members of the Indianapolis symphony orchestra and those attending a concert at the college gym were forced to invade Cline-Hoover halls due to the electrical storm, a group of college boys braved the storm to hustle chairs from the gym to the dormitory so that everyone could at least be comfortable?

. . . Didja know that several schools, scout troops and other young groups throughout the country are currently involved in a voluntary clean-up campaign in hopes of doing their bit for ecology?

. . . Didja know that over 90 per cent of our young people under 18 years of age DID NOT drop out of school and have high hopes of graduating this year or someday?

. . . Didja know that several Franklin College students are currently trying their best to open up communication lines with citizens of the Johnson county community by offering to provide programs for organizations when asked?

. . . And didja know that several youth groups, both at the college and in our churches and public schools have volunteered countless hours at the hospital, retirement homes, and to service-church organizations, staging programs, offering help and in general—simply involving themselves in community affairs during the past year?

We could go on and on—reciting the many contributions made by our young people to the community-at-large during the past year.

We could mention such things as choral programs, band concerts, sports activities, fund drives, etc. etc., but the list would be virtually endless.

Suffice it to say that the young people of our community—the great majority of them—are involved and interested in making a contribution.

Ask yourself—can you challenge their record?

How involved are you?

Or do you care?

When was the last time you gave of yourself in terms of time, talent and energy for the betterment of the community in which we all—young and old—have chosen to live?

An unfair question?

Perhaps, but we seriously doubt if the young people of our community would think so.

TESTIMONY OF MR. FRANKLIN D. SCHURZ BEFORE THE HOUSE POST OFFICE SUBCOMMITTEE

HON. J. GLENN BEALL, JR.

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. BEALL of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, recently a House Post Office Subcommittee took testimony on proposed rate changes for second-class mail.

Among those testifying was Mr. Franklin D. Schurz, Jr., publisher of the Hagerstown Herald-Mail. Mr. Schurz is an active and public-spirited citizen of Washington County, Md., which is in my congressional district. He testified as vice chairman of the postal committee of the American Newspaper Publishers Association and I include his testimony in the RECORD, so that the Members of the House may have the benefit of his thinking on this important matter:

TESTIMONY OF FRANKLIN D. SCHURZ

My name is Franklin D. Schurz, Jr., publisher of the Hagerstown (Md.) Herald and Mail. I appear before your Committee on behalf of the Postal Committee of the American Newspaper Publishers Association. I am taking the place of our Committee chairman who was, unfortunately, detained by imperative business. I am accompanied by the ANPA General Manager Stanford Smith.

The ANPA is a national trade association of daily newspapers. Its membership includes 1,054 daily newspapers in all 50 states, with total circulation in excess of 90 per cent of total U.S. daily newspapers circulation. One-half of the members of our Association have circulations of less than 25,000 daily and about three-fourths have circulations of less than 50,000 daily. Among all second class mail users, these smaller daily newspapers are most adversely affected by the proposal now before you.

ANPA appeared before this Committee on Dec. 10, 1969, during hearings on another postal rate increase bill, H.R. 10877. At that time we did not object to the *amount* of the second-class rate increase; we objected to the *principle* of the surcharge on a per-piece basis. Now we object strenuously to both the *amount and the principle* before you.

At the December hearing we recognized the Post Office Department's need for additional revenue, but we objected to Bill H.R. 10877 for its departure from the long-standing policy of the Congress in enacting second-class postal rate increases in approximately equal percentages across the board to all users.

On that occasion, the legislation before your Committee called for a 3/10 of one cent per copy surcharge on second-class mail outside the county of publication. Now we have a whole new situation. The surcharge per piece proposal as enunciated by Pres. Nixon in his April 16 message to Congress calls for an astounding 1.2 cents per piece surcharge—0.6 cents 45 days after enactment of this legislation and another 0.6 cents to take effect on Jan. 1.

As we did in December, we now oppose the introduction of the surcharge as a new element in postal rate-making. Our main contentions remain that the brunt of surcharges now proposed would be most onerous for small city daily newspapers—those newspapers which are almost entirely dependent on adequate mail service; those newspapers least able to pay; and those newspapers least able to change to alternative methods of distribution.

It is the rural population which is hurt by drastic increases in second-class postage rates. Publishers are forced to raise mail subscription prices when rates go up and some readers cannot afford the higher prices. Therefore, a less informed rural public results and people who live in remote areas are penalized as compared to city dwellers who receive their daily newspaper by carrier delivery and are not affected by a second-class mail increase.

We wish to point out again that the ANPA is not opposed to reasonable postal rate increases applied to newspapers. We have had nine increases in the past twelve years, the last of which took effect on Jan. 1, 1970. Additionally, the last postal rate increase enacted in 1967, although extremely costly to those of our members using the mails, received the support of ANPA.

However, postal service today seems to be worse than ever. Publishers are reporting examples of slower service to their subscribers. Aggravated by curtailed train schedules, manpower shortages, delays in adoption of improved mail-handling procedures, threats of nation-wide walkouts of postal workers, and improperly announced holidays, newspaper publishers have to rely on their own trucks to transport newspapers to outlying post offices while still paying full postage.

Again we recognize that, although service does not justify it, rate increases are necessary. However, the use of a surcharge on second-class mail is not. Our view is exactly the same as that expressed by the Chairman of this Subcommittee, Congressman Olsen, when you testified at the April 17, 1962 hearings before the Senate Post Office Committee. At that time, Mr. Chairman, you stated: "The one cent surcharge per piece is a totally new concept in postal rate-making which, I am completely convinced, is inequitable, unreasonable, and unrealistic. If permitted to become law, it would have a staggering economic impact on our already overburdened publishing industry. It could sound the death knell for many of our small town daily and weekly newspapers." At that time, Mr. Chairman, you also said this provision "should never be enacted into law."

Fortunately, the bill was enacted without the surcharge proposal.

Now the surcharge is before us again. The time is different, but the situation is exactly the same.

We have the additional point now that some form of postal reform is imminent and one of its goals is to modernize the unduly complex rate structure. To further complicate the existing rate structure now is unwise, particularly since it is also unfair to the small city daily newspapers.

A tabulation of the effect of this surcharge proposal on a large sample of ANPA members is attached to this statement. This shows that the proposed increase, while averaging 50% on second-class mail users as a whole, amounts to as much as 89% in the case of individual newspapers.

The situation for these small city dailies is pointed out in a letter from Mr. Kenneth B. Way, publisher of the Watertown (S.D.) Public Opinion to the Congressmen and Senators of South Dakota, as follows:

"If President Nixon's request to Congress to raise second-class postage rates by one-half is approved by Congress, it will be almost impossible financially to operate a daily newspaper in South Dakota, unless distribution to farmers was eliminated."

Another witness today is Mr. Otto B.

Schoepfle, representing the Inland Daily Press Association. He will cite a number of other specific examples of the unfairness and extreme hardship the surcharge would bring about. We commend your attention to his statement.

No publication circulated to subscribers by mail could reasonably be expected to absorb rate increases in the magnitude now being discussed in one step or in two steps so close together. It simply takes time to adjust prices. The Congress has always recognized this fact by staging second class rate increases, usually over three years.

The ANPA would not object to such a phased second-class postal rate increase equitably applied to all mail users without imposition of the inequitable surcharge and therefore without penalty or preferment to any group within the second class mail category.

A clear line should be drawn between second-class mail and other classes. Second-class mail is solicited mail—requested and paid for by the subscriber, as contrasted with unsolicited mail.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

NEARSIGHTED STUDENTS

HON. EARL B. RUTH

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. RUTH. Mr. Speaker, Members of Congress, in the past weeks have been hearing and in most cases have been listening to the voice of the campus. But how many of us have recently heard the voice of a veteran of Vietnam?

The author of the following letter raises questions that are being ignored, or even forgotten, today as this country turns its attention more and more away from the problem and toward the dissenters.

The author is among a minority in this country that has both served in Vietnam and is now a student. In addition, his views are well stated and I share them with my colleagues.

The following letter was printed by Mr. J. H. Moore, editor of the Laurinburg, N.C., Exchange:

NEARSIGHTED STUDENTS

TO THE EDITOR: In the wake of the recent "uprisings" on our college campuses and elsewhere throughout our troubled nation, I believe that the time has come for some deep thinking on the part of both young and old. The youth of today, and I say "young" in a collective sense of the word, for I fear that this minority of trouble-makers is no longer the minority we were speaking of a year ago, but a rapidly growing movement which, if not curtailed, will result in a series of Administration compromises which can only end in the destruction of a nation "so conceived, and so dedicated that it might long endure."

It might well pay these young people to consider that the government which they are fighting so hard to take over is the same government that fought like hell to preserve these young people's freedom to behave in the very way in which they now are behaving. Under no other form of government would these factions exist. Under no other form of government would these "non-violent" demonstrations be met with the "minimum" force necessary to preserve peace. We can well remember the Hungarian revolt of the 1950's—or can we? Surely these students have taken time out from their protests to read their history books! Here was an instance where the United States had promised to help Hungary in its quest for political freedom, and then did "nothing" to help her. And what happened? Our country was publicly scorned for backing out on our commitment! And scorned by the very critics who are now scorning our involvement in Southeast Asia. But did the Communists use Guardsmen and tear gas to quell this disurbance in Hungary? No! They resorted to tanks and machine guns and slaughtered countless Hungarians in a successful effort to tell them to "cool it."

In a well publicized speech in the early 1960's, Nikita Khrushchev exclaimed, "we will bury you," with a finger pointed at the United States of America, Mr. Khrushchev seems to have been a fairly good prognosticator. There is no doubt in my mind that the Communists are cheering every demonstration, every protest, every picket line. In fact, I am confident that they have their cheerleaders on our college campuses raising the blood of our student leaders to a boiling point, and then quietly slipping into the crowd to watch the ball game as spectators.

Why can't our students realize that they are playing into the hands of the Communist World? They are being used as surely and as effectively as if they were Communist agents being given a free hand in our country.

To you students, where do you think all of this will get you? You say you are for world peace! Do you seriously and sincerely believe that if you are successful in assuming the reins of our government that your Communist neighbors are going to sit back peacefully and that it will mean the end to all war, tragedy, and heartache? Hell, no! Because you will have to "fight" to keep your country! The Communists may not attack you with infantrymen, tanks, and hydrogen bombs, but they will surely integrate with you, undermine you, and overtake you unless you do something to prevent it. Remember, their goal is not Vietnam, Indo-China, or the whole of Southeast Asia. Their goal is the entire world! You are fighting, and unfortunately now dying for what you believe, and if you succeed, "you" will become the "establishment", and you will continue fighting, and you will continue dying for what you believe. This is the pattern of our world, and this has been the pattern of our nation and every other nation. Since the first shot of the Revolutionary war almost two hundred years ago, hundreds of thousands of brave Americans has died in defense of our flag and "what she stands for!"

Our Administration has been trying to avoid the tragic sequence of events which led Europe, and then America into the bloodiest and most devastating war in the history of the world. Compromises with Nazis and Communists can lead only to more compromises, and finally the times when we have to put down our foot and say "no more!" No one in his right mind wants war. Everyone should strive for peace. But there are always advocates of change, and madmen such as Hitler, Mussolini, and Lenin, who "force" changes and new ideas on people who wish to leave well enough alone. Thank God there are free people with enough power to stop them.

The war in Vietnam "should" end. It is a cruel war, and it has brought strife at home as well. But it is necessary! Our present administration has vowed to bring our boys back home, and they are doing it. The loud-mouthed politicians who cry for an end—and immediate end—are only doing so because they know it's what we want to hear, and we are the ones who keep them in office. An immediate withdrawal of American troops without adequate "Vietnamization" would only prolong an agonizing situation which would surely confront us later.

Think!! American students, think of how you are dividing our great nation; and think of the inevitable outcome of your efforts!

E. F. GILL, Jr.

(NOTE.—A native of Laurinburg, Mr. Gill is a young gradute of Wake Forest University and a recent veteran of military service in Vietnam. He now makes his home in Fayetteville).

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRADUATION

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, our entire country can be proud of the Clemson University graduation exercises this year. While more than 400 universities across the Nation were closed or closing, Clemson graduated 664 students without any incident to mar this great occasion. Earlier on that day, 137 students were commissioned in the U.S. Army and the U.S. Air Force. The distinguished commanding general of the 3d Army, General Connors, addressed this group of outstanding young men.

I am personally proud of the distinguished president, faculty, and student body of Clemson. Dr. Robert C. Edwards, Clemson's president, delivered to the graduating class an outstanding and timely address which I commend to the attention of the Congress and to the American people, particularly those associated with the academic community:

CLEMSON UNIVERSITY GRADUATION

It is my privilege and satisfaction to welcome this class of graduates into the larger body of Clemson Alumni—an ever increasing group of distinguished ladies and gentlemen. This Alumni Family extends to you fraternal greetings and wishes you well!

As alumni and graduates of this institution, you now represent to the world the ideals and aspirations of Clemson University. As our representative, each of you is herewith charged to do your full part toward fulfilling the dream of Thomas Green Clemson—a dream that would have you encourage the love of truth and justice and would have you stand steadfastly against their detractors; a dream that would commit you to use wisely and well your knowledge and skill in service to all humanity.

For its part, your Alma Mater pledges to you that it will protect in every academic and ethical way the full measure of respect and acceptability which your diploma does now and must always carry.

On this particular day, there is a basic right which should be especially appealing to this audience. It is the right to learn—the right to acquire knowledge and to pursue truth without hindrance or interference from any source. It is a right that imposes no limitation except the obligation to act wisely and justly upon that knowledge and truth as it is acquired. This is a precept to which your University is unequivocally dedicated, and from which it shall not recede.

I particularly invite the Graduating Class to look around and see those who have gathered as spectators to honor you on this day. These people, and particularly your parents and grandparents, are remarkable people indeed.

These are the people who within just five decades have increased life expectancy by approximately 50 per cent—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, small pox, scarlet fever, measles or mumps. And the dreaded polio is no longer a medical factor, while TB is almost unheard of.

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

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.

They built thousands of high schools, trained and hired tens of thousands of better teachers, and at the same time made higher education a real possibility for millions of young ladies and gentlemen—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 made more progress by the sweat of their brows than in any previous era . . . *and don't 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 earth's remaining ills.

A problem remaining which is of paramount importance to our survival constitutes a challenge to you to rise to the stature of your predecessors in accomplishment.

Man is the only species which has achieved the power to destroy himself and all other life, and is steadily engaged in doing it. Rarely is any part of this destruction his deliberate objective, but rarely does he deliberately guard against it. His impact on natural environment on this little planet, which he shares with so many forms of life, has already been tremendous. He is now altering that environment however, at a rate the acceleration of which is almost staggering. No matter what aspect of the natural environment one considers, one finds that man is destroying or degrading it—land, rivers, forests, wildlife, and even the oceans and the atmosphere.

Man does possess the intelligence and the means to solve every one of these environmental problems. If he had put half the resources of brainpower, determination and money into mitigating the evil effects of his technology that he has put into the development and short-term application of that technology, we would already have a far better environment and a far better chance to survive. As it is, only an arounsed public, willing not only to accept but even to demand some very hard decisions, seems likely to produce the movement, the momentum, necessary to turn us around, or at least slow us up, in our precipitous rush to destroy this earth. Frankly, I would like to enlist in the conservation cause a large proportion of our finest minds, and you here today include many such.

Twenty-five years from now you can expect to be called on to account for what you have done, and what you have failed to do. It won't be I, or others of my generation, who question your performance. The questions will be asked by your own children.

All of us are asking more of life, both for ourselves and for others. The price is what it has always been, to give more of yourself to what you believe.

By staying alive all your lives, by being dedicated to an ever greenness of the mind and spirit, you will have learned to live, and you will be prepared to render your own accounting.

May strength, wisdom, and courage go with you!

VIRTUES OF CAPITAL

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago-South Suburban News, a publication orientated to the black communities in the metropolitan area, is known for the diversity of its views and its spirited editorial page. In its Saturday, May 9, edition a letter to the editor prominently emphasizes the virtues of capital which I insert into the RECORD at this point:

DEAR EDITOR: On Sunday April 19th Stokely Carmichael spoke to an audience on the west side of Chicago. He told his audience that, "According to Marx, a capitalist is someone who owns and controls the means of production . . . Marx says there is no hope for the capitalist. We must destroy him. Marx is absolutely correct."

When I studied fundamental economics, I learned that the only thing added to land to produce wealth is labor. And the part of wealth which man uses to help him produce more wealth is capital. The tools of production are capital. Labor is much more productive using capital than he is using his bare hands.

The land yields wealth only to labor. Capital cannot use itself. Labor must apply capital to land and natural resources to produce wealth. If only labor can produce capital, producers should own capital. If only labor can produce other forms of wealth, the producers should own the wealth.

The only reason non-producers can own wealth is because our system of taxation permits non-producing land title holders to charge other people to use their land. Therefore they are able to become the owners of wealth and capital without contributing any mental or physical labor to aid in the production of it. This is exploitation.

This ability to make an unearned income from land makes men greedy and many of them hold valuable land out of use or in underdeveloped use until the scarcity of available land inflates land prices and makes it increasingly expensive to live and do business.

Unearned incomes and inflated land prices can be eliminated if the community government will collect the full annual rental value of all land sites (whether in use or not) as public revenue and remove the taxes on buildings, products and incomes.

The presence of the people of the community and their commercial, industrial and recreational activity make some locations more productive than others and therefore more valuable. Economic justice calls for the community government to collect this community created location value of land as public revenue and allow the producers of capital to own the capital without being subject to confiscation by taxation, and compel all land title holders to become producers before they can acquire ownership of any of the means of production (capital). We must preserve capital; but we must destroy unearned incomes and put an end to confiscation of capital by taxation.

—*Marvin Saillard.*

COWGER TO RETURN TO VIETNAM

HON. WILLIAM O. COWGER

OF KENTUCKY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. COWGER. Mr. Speaker, within the next month, I will, at the request of President Nixon, return to Southeast Asia on another factfinding inspection tour. I will be joining with Congressman FRED SCHWENGEL of Iowa and a team of experts who have had experience in Indochina. We originally went to Vietnam in November of 1967 and upon our return made a report to Congress and to President Lyndon B. Johnson.

I would also like to take this opportunity to present my views on the situation in Southeast Asia as expressed in two speeches I recently gave in Louisville: One at the Jewish Community Center, and the other before the Kentucky State Council of Machinists.

Mr. Speaker, we must first trace some recent history. In January 1961, when President Eisenhower turned over the reins of Government to President John F. Kennedy, we had 759 U.S. military observers in South Vietnam. At the time of the assassination of President Kennedy in 1963, our forces had been increased to 7,000. During the 1964 political campaign, President Johnson said, "I will not send American boys to do the fighting for Asian boys." Upon his election, President Johnson immediately started his escalation of the war to the point where we had a total of almost 550,000 Americans in Vietnam. Then came the election of 1968, and President Nixon pledged to disengage this country from that war. To date, 115,000 troops have been returned and an additional 150,000 are scheduled to leave Asia within the next year. Then recently came President Nixon's decision to destroy the North Vietnamese sanctuaries in Cambodia. Please remember that all major and minor Vietcong and North Vietnamese offensives have initiated from these off-limit bases in Cambodia and Laos.

By any standard, the Cambodian operation has been, to date, a tremendous military success, which will insure the orderly withdrawal of our troops scheduled for the next year. I am sure that the President, in making this decision, reckoned with the corresponding price of division in our country, not only among students, but among other groups across the country. I would hope that President Nixon will now pause, long enough, to request United Nations intervention in the widening Indochina conflict. The new Cambodian Government has requested intervention by the U.N. and Secretary General U Thant has called for an international conference on all of Indochina. The United States has for years poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the U.N. based on the premise that this organization will promote world peace. Now is the time for our Government to officially and formally request that a fact-finding team be sent to the Far East to advise this Nation and its allies the proper course of action toward

peace. On Thursday, May 14, I joined with two of my colleagues in submitting a resolution in the Congress calling upon the President, acting through the U.S. Ambassador to the United Nations, to bring before the Security Council, the question of assuring the neutrality and territorial integrity of Cambodia.

I was not in the Congress when President Truman involved us in the Korean conflict that was finally terminated by President Eisenhower. Nor was I in the Congress when the Gulf of Tonkin resolution was adopted, endorsing President Johnson's escalation of the Vietnam war. I will never support any President who involves us in another undeclared war that we are then unwilling to win. Our country was attacked by Japan on Sunday, December 7, 1941. The very next day, Monday, December 8, Congress declared war, bringing to bear the full force and will of our country to defeat the enemy. I will not ask our young men to make a full commitment, even death, without asking the whole country to make that same commitment. Under a declared war, our Nation could use every means to bring that conflict to an early end, including embargoes, blockades and the full force of laws affecting treason and sedition. The Rap Browns, Jerry Rubins and Bobby Seales would find themselves immediately behind prison bars.

Mr. Speaker, these are my views, based on years of study, service in World War II, personal inspection of Vietnam, privileged information as a Member of Congress, and confidential interviews with worldwide political leaders. During this past week, I have had the opportunity to receive briefings from Secretary of State William P. Rogers, Assistant Secretary of State for Near Eastern Affairs, Joseph J. Sisco, Assistant Secretary of State for Far Eastern Affairs, Alexis Johnson, and Ambassador to the Republic of South Vietnam, Ellsworth Bunker. Based upon information I receive and opinions that I respect, I try to make a judgment. I am not always 100 percent right, but I make a 100-percent effort to be right.

POSITION OF THE STUDENT CALIFORNIA TEACHERS ASSOCIATION

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, the Student California Teachers Association is headquartered in my district in Burlingame, Calif. They have asked me to insert in the RECORD the officially adopted position of their executive council, as follows:

The SCTA wishes to go on record as strongly "opposing the expansion of American military involvement in Southeast Asia." We feel that the decision to commit American troops to Cambodia grossly violated the powers given to the President of the United States and, further, that it was not in keeping with his "promise" of withdrawal. Such action is nothing more than escalation and can result in nothing but continued American involvement in Southeast Asia.

LETTER FROM A CONSTITUENT

HON. EDWIN D. ESHLEMAN

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. ESHLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, following is a letter from one of my valued constituents, that I feel is well worth sharing with my colleagues in the House and other readers of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

AN ANSWER TO YOUTH

(Editor, New Era: Following is a copy of a letter I sent to the editor of one of our leading national magazines in response to an address made last week. I feel it relates to the root causes of incidents like that which took place at Kent State and the polarization which has been building.)

You quoted from a letter written by your son in which he raised many questions about the future of the Republic. At the time I wondered how you would answer him.

It's really none of my business. I suppose I was thinking of you in your position as editor, answering all of our sons. I was thinking how we enlightened adults have so often ducked our responsibility to provide them with straight answers. We have become so impressed with how bright the now generation is—how zealously it pursues idealism—that we look in awe and bow our heads with humility when it speaks. In so doing, we equate brightness with wisdom. We confuse idealism and good judgment because we also confuse "relevance" and reality.

I would suggest, as one adult to another, that some of the idealism is really self serving; that it provides a beautiful escape hatch from the harsher realities of this world; that there is a great unwillingness to cope with things as they are, and a desire to deal with them on some other terms. Politics is the art of the possible—but some of this generation have rejected politics as we know them and substituted tyranny of the minority through politics of the street.

There is also good reason to fear that a part of this bright generation has developed a sneering attitude toward middle class values—a snobbery that is providing the building blocks for an intellectual establishment of limited membership.

Having said that, I would also suggest that as adults we should listen and that we should recognize genuine concern as it is expressed by those who will inherit this planet.

But we owe them a response that will restore some of the respect in you and in me that they so badly want and need. They know the world is in a mess. They don't expect us to lie face down before them and confess that we put it there and ask them how to bail us out. They're kids! They need some understanding of how we got there so that they might someday do better.

So, will you tell your son that the story of Vietnam didn't begin in 1954—the date at which most young people begin their chronology. Will you tell him that it had its roots in Yalta and Potsdam and the takeover of all Eastern Europe with menacing movements toward the Middle East. Will you remind him of the fall of China, and of the United States unilateral disarmanent after World War Two, which led to the invasion of Korea. With that background, he might better understand how four American Presidents (bright and idealistic, too) formulated a policy for Southeast Asia.

Will you tell him how we came to be the policeman of the world? That as a conquering nation with the world in our grasp, we chose instead to pour 100 billion plus dollars into Europe and Asia to restore peaceful economies; forbade the rearming of Japan, took the responsibility for maintaining the peace, pulling out of all occupied countries as rapidly as possible.

And please—will you point out that war is not a profitable enterprise for the American economy. Tell him not to be confused by catch phrases like "Military-Industrial Complex." We have no Krupp Munitions complex operating within cartels. Most industrialists do not see great rewards in government contracts. They do far better, operating in peace time, dealing in the private sector of the economy. The war in Vietnam is suppressing, not supporting the economy.

And will you tell him that Americans are a compassionate people—that his generation does not have a corner on the market.

Your son's letter undoubtedly reflects the convictions of many of our more thoughtful young people. Then let's have more adults who will be equally thoughtful; and in expressing their deep convictions, will add perspective and depth before formative thinking becomes hardened opinion.

DONALD G. GOLDSTROM.

WHY THERE IS A SO-CALLED TIGHT MONEY MARKET

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the following article concerning the Federal National Mortgage Association will give some indication as to why there is a so-called tight money market:

FANNIE MAE'S PUNY PROFITS SURE TO STIR STOCKHOLDERS

(By Robert J. Samuelson)

Unless events take a perverse and unpredictable turn, this week's annual meeting of the Federal National Mortgage Association is going to be an interesting affair. They always are when profits run downhill like an alpine skier. And FNMA's last quarter profits almost disappeared; they shrunk to a puny $18,000 from $48 million a year earlier.

Although not many people—aside from worried stockholders—probably noticed or cared, FNMA's eroding profit directly influences many things that excite people a great deal: housing, the availability of mortgage money, and mortgage interest rates.

Last year, FNMA (known in the housing vernacular as "Fannie Mae") supplied about 51 per cent of the commitments on mortgages backed by either the Federal Housing Administration or the Veterans Administration.

There is a good reason why FNMA sounds like a government agency; it once was. But in 1968, Congress decided to convert the mortgage lender, which relied on Treasury borrowings and was tied to appropriations, into a private company.

Though that shift freed FNMA from the limitations of budgetary restrictions, the government didn't relinquish all its control. The President still appoints five members of FNMA's 15-man board of directors, and the law binds it to support the mortgage market when it needs credit.

Which it does now. As interest rates rose last year, many traditional mortgage lenders—such as insurance companies—abandoned housing loans for more lucrative investments. The same withdrawal occurred during the "credit crunch" of 1966, and FHA-VA new home starts dropped 21 per cent. In 1969, with FNMA support, FHA-VA starts actually rose slightly (2 per cent).

Homeowners never deal directly with FNMA. Instead mortgage originators (mostly mortgage bankers, but also savings and loan

associations and banks) make the loans and then resell them to FNMA. Each week, FNMA holds an auction, specifying an amount of mortgages it will buy, and then taking the mortgages offered at the lowest prices.

Thus, FNMA purchases the mortgages with the highest effective interest yields. All mortgages carry the same nominal interest rate—now 8.5 per cent, the FHA-VA rate, on every $100 of the loan. More mortgages, however, are customarily offered to FNMA than it wants to buy. To make the real yields higher, mortgage originators compete to sell their loans at a discount. FNMA will buy a mortgage at, say, $92 before purchasing at $95.

DISCOUNT PASSED ON

The mortgage originators, naturally, don't finance this discount. It is almost always passed on to either the buyer or seller of a home in "points," lump sum payments equal to one per cent of the face value of the loan. In effect, one "point" equals one dollar (per $100 at par) in FNMA discount.

Playing this sort of game, it is hard to see how FNMA can lose.

There are, however, crucial qualifications. Precisely stated, FNMA can never escape two risks:

First, to lend the vast quantities of money (last year's total loans amounted to $4.2 billion) it must raise funds in the nation's capital markets. Here, it must pay its own interest rates.

Second, mortgages customarily are written for 20 to 30 years (though many are terminated before the final maturity date), and FNMA is vulnerable to the traditional interest rate squeeze—lending long term at low rates and refinancing its maturing debts at increasingly high rates.

WHAT HAPPENED

In fact, this is precisely what has occurred.

Consider the situation in March:

The yield on FNMA's outstanding mortgage portfolio stood at 6.68 per cent after deduction of about one-half per cent to cover local service charges (the fees which the local mortgage originator receives for making the loan, then collecting the monthly installments, and forwarding them to FNMA).

By contrast, FNMA's outstanding borrowing costs stood at 7.67 per cent. The difference: more than a full percentage point. The mortgages FNMA is currently buying fetch yields around 9 per cent and, in time, they will narrow—and probably eliminate—the gap.

If interest income represented FNMA's only business, the company would now show a loss, not the small profit it does. The actual earnings resulted from fees that FNMA charges mortgage originators for granting commitments—a guarantee that FNMA will buy the mortgage at some specific time in the future.

With the commitment, the mortgage originator is free to look for more favorable lending conditions; he would rather sell to someone else at $97—or $100—than to FNMA at $95 and, given enough time, he may be able to do so. But FNMA exacts a price for being a credit source of last resort. A 90-day commitment costs ½ per cent of the loan's face value; a six-month commitment—where most are bunched—costs ¾ percent of the loan's face value.

Last year these fees accounted for FNMA's profit. They totaled $44.8 million absorbing some of the higher interest costs and leaving $34.2 million in net before-taxes earnings.

EMBARRASSING QUERIES

When FNMA's stockholders meet this Thursday in L'Enfant Theatre, there will undoubtedly be some embarrassing questions. After all, interest rates weren't always 8.40, the level of FNMA's last major borrowing.

The man who will try to deflect many of these queries is William Ross, former deputy under secretary of the Department of Housing and Urban Development who became FNMA's executive vice president earlier this month.

Sitting in his office, Ross gestures towards the low end of an interest rate chart when borrowing costs hovered between 5 and 6 percent.

"If we were so damned smart, we would have taken all we could get then," he says. "But like everyone else, we didn't believe what was happening." While the disbelievers watched, interest rates climbed inexorably.

SACRIFICE SHORT-TERM PROFITS

As a Congressionally-created hybrid between a federal agency and a private corporation, FNMA is supposed to sacrifice short-term profits for stability in the mortgage market. "There are times when our profits will be negligible, and others when they'll be substantial—with a balancing out," says Oakley Hunter, FNMA's president.

Just where "balance" occurs no one says. Nevertheless, the high-yielding mortgages FNMA buys today are the buds of future earnings. A decline in interest levels will enable FNMA to refinance many of its short, costly borrowing at lower, long-term rates. If so, today negative spread between borrowing and lending costs could become positive—and highly profitable.

HIGH INTEREST RATES

HON. SPEEDY O. LONG

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. LONG of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following:

HIGH INTEREST RATES

Whereas: Interest rates are the highest they have been in over one hundred years; and

Whereas: Skyrocketing interest rates are raising costs all along the line to the consumer—adding considerably to upward price pressures under the guise of fighting inflation and thereby building up high costs and prices for years to come; and

Whereas: The recent rise in the interest rate ceiling on FHA and VA mortgages from 7½% to 8½% is merely one example of how the consumer is being saddled for the future; and

Whereas: At the above rate on a 30 year, $20,000 mortgage, the rise in mortgage rate increases monthly payments on principal and interest by about 10%, thereby costing the home owner a total of $55,362.00 before he can call his home his own; and

Whereas: As interest rates soar, homebuilders postpone construction; state, parish and municipal governments put off building hospitals, roads and public buildings thereby causing increased unemployment; now therefore be it

Resolved: That the Louisiana AFL–CIO in its Fifteenth Annual Convention does hereby oppose the present administration's use of high interest rates as a guise to curb inflation and call upon the President of the United States to use the powers available to his office to order a reduction in these unnecessary high interest rates; and be it further

Resolved: That if such action is not taken to reduce these high interest rates by the President of the United States that the Congress of the United States take action immediately to force a reduction in the interest rates to a reasonable level in the interest of the people of the United States.

Respectfully submitted by the Executive Board, Louisiana AFL–CIO.

CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, May 22 marks the 50th anniversary of the Civil Service Retirement Act and of the system it created.

As a member of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee who is familiar with the fine programs carried out through the civil service retirement system, I would like to salute that system, those who work with it and especially those who are served by it.

Last October, I was most fortunate to see the President sign into a law a measure I cosponsored that assures the future of the civil service retirement fund. Today, I want to pledge that as a Member of Congress I shall continue to work toward maintenance and betterment of the retirement system.

In light of the golden anniversary of the system, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues and associate myself with an article appearing in the April–June 1970 Civil Service Journal.

That article follows:

SALUTE TO PROGRESS: CIVIL SERVICE RETIREMENT SYSTEM, 1920–70

(By Andrew E. Ruddock)

In 1920, following years of struggle and controversy, Congress passed the Civil Service Retirement Act. President Wilson signed the measure on May 22 as union representatives, Government officials, and employees congratulated themselves and each other on the hard-won victory. Today, 50 years later, congratulations are again in order—this time for past as well as expected future performance.

Established, in the words of Fiorello H. LaGuardia, then a Member of Congress, as "a matter of justice to the employees and as a matter of efficiency to the Government," the civil service retirement system has pioneered in the pension field and importantly influenced development of other pension plans throughout the Nation.

Predating the social security and railroad retirement systems as well as all except three of our State systems, it is today vital, vigorous, and responsive to the changing temper of the times. Every Congress introduces scores of bills dealing with retirement and every Congress since the 66th, which created the system, has modified it. Almost without exception, the modifications have been to make it more liberal for the employee.

THEN AND NOW

Extremely flexible in terms of the options it makes available to employees, comprehensive in terms of the kinds of benefits it provides, and generous in terms of the level of benefits it assures those who work a full career in Government, the system now bears only slight resemblance to the original.

The 1920 model provided only for mandatory and disability retirement of employees who had completed at least 15 years of Federal service. It offered no survivor benefits at all, and paid a maximum annuity of $60 a month to employees with 30 years of service (a minimum of $15 was assured those with 15 years of service).

The 1970 model provides, in addition to old age (mandatory retirement) and disability benefits, immediate "discontinued service" benefits which can go to people not yet out of their forties. It also provides a deferred

annuity right to those who complete as little as 5 years of service and leave before they reach retirement age, and optional retirement benefits for others who, as early as age 55, simply choose not to continue working for the Government.

Although not coordinated with social security, today's model provides survivor benefits—beginning after only 18 months of service—to help meet some but not all of the broad social objectives that social security serves for most of the Nation's non-Federal work force.

In contrast to the 1920 statutory maximum of $60 a month, some (a very few) of today's annuities exceed $2,000 a month and there is no statutory dollar maximum. The 1920 retiree was paid the same amount month after month until 1926, when Congress authorized a modest increase. In 1969 alone, annuitants received two separate cost-of-living increases, raising annuities by 9.1 percent—and we appear well on the way to another increase this summer.

The 1920 law required employee contributions at 2½ percent of basic salary and authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to invest these funds at interest and to accept donations or other moneys "which may be contributed by private individuals or corporations or organizations for the benefit of civil service employees generally or any special class of employees." Without requiring any Government contributions or making any appropriations other than for administrative expenses, it directed the Secretary of the Interior (whose department administered the law through the Commissioner of Pensions) to submit annual estimates of the appropriations required to continue the law in effect. Annuities were actually paid entirely from employee contributions for the first 8 years, with Government making its first contribution through an appropriation for the fiscal year 1929.

Today, employees contribute 7 percent of their basic pay (Congressional employees contribute 7½ percent and Members of Congress 8 percent), appreciably more than employees in most other contributory systems, and their agencies contribute matching amounts on a current basis. Government is responsible for providing, under a complex formula established by 1969 amendments to the retirement law, any remaining funds required to maintain financial stability of the system.

The 1920 retirement system covered about 330,000 employees in the classified civil service, 58 percent of Government's civilian work force. Today's model covers 2.7 million active employees, about 9 out of 10 of all civilians in the executive, legislative, and judicial branches.

On August 20, 1920, the day that retirement first became possible, 4,000 employees retired. Before the fiscal year ended, the number totaled 6,767. Many of them were in their eighties and some in their nineties. Their average annuity benefit was $568 a year.

Between 50,000 and 55,000 employees retire each year now. Their average age is around 60, and their annuity exceeds $3,600 a year. The average annuity of the person who retires today with 30 or more years of service exceeds $6,600.

More than 1.5 million people, over a fourth of them survivors, have received annuity benefits from the system through the years, and we are now servicing an active roll of more than 925,000 annuitants. Annuity disbursements total $2.6 billion a year—with significant impact on the national economy as well as the economic well-being of the individual recipients.

HOW IT HAPPENED

A retirement system of this kind and scope did not "just happen," nor did it come about simply because employees thought that it might be nice to have a pension plan.

Passage of the Retirement Act was a direct and inevitable, though delayed, result of the passage of the Civil Service Act some 35 years earlier. Once a system of competitive appointment with tenure was established and the spoils system brought under control, the civil service began to age peacefully.

Despite the Civil Service Commission's early protestations that the merit system provided for dismissal for inefficiency and was not responsible for the problem of "superannuation," the superannuated were not dismissed because Government could not simply dump them into the streets with no resources. Born too soon for social security, lacking any kind of staff retirement plan, and unable to save enough to provide for their old age, employees clung to their jobs until separated by death.

Departments did the only thing they could do: They retired employees on the job, usually with full pay, "out of pure humanity and against all reason." The quotes are those of Secretary of War Newton D. Baker who told the Senate Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment that this "leads to the clogging up of the service; it discourages and dispirits those already in the service."

The Secretary of the Interior reported that 10 percent of all employees in one of his Bureaus were veterans of the Civil War—which had ended 55 years earlier—and that the general situation was "pitiful."

The Secretary of Labor minced no words: ". . . it would seem to be high time to recognize the fact that the executive departments have a pension roll whether they like it or not, and that it is the most expensive, cumbersome, and in many ways inhuman sort of a pension system. What I refer to here is the water-logged payroll, which in all essentials produces a pension system without the retirement."

The Civil Service Commission, which as early as 1889 recommended some kind of retirement plan, testified that "A retirement law is urgently needed in the interests of efficient public service."

They were testifying on the Sterling-Lehlbach bills, companion measures introduced in the spring of 1919 by Congressman Frederick H. Lehlbach of New Jersey and Senator Thomas Sterling of South Dakota, who saw the measure become law 1 year later.

The argument that a sound retirement plan would promote efficiency in Government finally tipped the scales for a retirement system specifically designed to remove from the active work force, in a socially acceptable way, employees who because of age or disability could no longer produce. Though it was created primarily to meet this management need and only secondarily to meet the employees' need for continuing income in the later years of life, its objective was nevertheless a mutually shared one and drew strong support from employees and their organizations, Government executives, and outside groups concerned with good government.

Advocates included the United States Civil Service Retirement Association, which was organized to promote establishment of a pension plan, the National Civil Service Reform League, the American Federation of Labor, the National Federation of Federal Employees, the National Rural Letter Carriers Association, the National Federation of Postal Clerks, the Railway Mail Association, and others.

The issue of how costs were to be met was debated long and hotly, and was eventually compromised.

The first seriously proposed retirement bill, introduced by Representative Brosius of Pennsylvania in 1889, had provided that all costs would be met through employee contributions via a "tontine" plan, a last-man-take-all kind of arrangement named after an Italian banker, Count Tonti. Employee organizations in 1905 were expressing willingness to pay all costs, while in 1908 a special committee on personnel of a Presidential Commission appointed to study application of "business methods" in the executive branch proposed a plan based on monthly deductions from the salary of each employee to provide a fund for the purchase of annuity upon his retirement.

By the end of World War I, however, employees and the organizations representing them had come to believe, as did a number of other groups which studied the problem, that Government should pay either part or all of the costs.

Representative LaGuardia, who said he didn't believe in "panhandling arrangements," advocated a Government-pay-all plan. Many executive branch officials shared his view. The Chief Clerk of the Department of Commerce informed the Senate Committee that "I do not believe in the halfway plan of the Government pretending to give something to the employee and then making the employee pay for it. . . . I do not believe that the civil employee, any more than the Army or Navy man, should have to pay for his annuity." The Secretary of War agreed: "I do not think that the employees ought to make any contribution to the fund at all . . . The Government has to pay it in either case, and you will have to add it to the wages of the employees and then take it away from them, and that always creates trouble."

On the other hand, many in Congress felt strongly that Government should pay no part of any pension or retirement benefit for Federal employees. Some objected on the basis of cost and worried aloud about the high cost of Government, its huge (565,000) post-World War I work force, the crushing national debt ($24 billion), and the urgent need to "retrench." Others objected on the basis of principle. One of these was Represenative Sam Rayburn who vowed, "I never will, as long as I live, vote to tax the people, all the people of his country, to pay civil pensions for a special class."

The joint contributory plan was clearly a legislative compromise between these schools of thought. One 1920 Congressional leader reported frankly that "We took the middle [joint contributory] course because . . . that was the only course that would enable us to get legislation through Congress." But another—Representative MacCrate of New York—argued for the principle of joint contributions in words that might have been delivered on the floor, or in the Committee rooms, of Congress yesterday.

"It is beside the question to talk of some part of the people supporting another part of the people under the terms of this legislation. . . . The Government is an employer dealing with employees who must be recompensed and dealt with as employees and not only as citizens of the Republic. When you suggest, therefore, that the employee shall pay the full amount of whatever he shall get at the end of his service, you are giving him nothing except a compulsory savings system, and you take from him the right to say how much he shall or shall not save. . . . [On the other hand] For the good of employees of this Government, I trust no one will ever suggest in their behalf that they make no contribution to the retirement fund. We hear now on every occasion when increased pay is justly due them that they get 30 days' sick leave and 30 days' vacation, and should they contribute nothing to the retirement fund, we would hear added 'and they get a pension.' It is difficult enough now to get fair pay for efficient service rendered to the Government, and in the future it will be well if employees can continue to say that 'We are contributing to this fund.'"

Accommodation to conflicting views still characterizes the system, as is clearly illustrated in the legislative history of the Oc-

tober 1969 amendments to the retirement law. The Civil Service Commission and the Budget Bureau, as spokesmen for both the Johnson and the Nixon Administrations, urged enactment of measures, including increases in employee contributions, to strengthen the financial position of the retirement fund but advocated postponement of all benefit improvements. Employees and their organizations quite predictably opposed such action and Congress, equally predictably, sought a middle course. The Daniels-McGee Act (named for Representative Dominick V. Daniels of New Jersey and Senator Gale W. McGee of Wyoming), which eventually passed Congress and was approved by President Nixon, was a masterful and bipartisan accommodation to the divergent pressures for strengthened financing, improved benefits, and a more responsible approach to future changes.

AN EVALUATION

How shall we evaluate the retirement system today?

Sound evaluation must necessarily be done in terms of objectives, so we can look first at the limited but still fundamental objective of the 1920 system: To remove the aged and the disabled from Government's active work force, and to do this in a socially acceptable way.

The old and the disabled *are* effectively removed, either by their own choice or by operation of the mandatory and disability retirement provisions of the system.

Superannuation is no longer a significant problem. Far from working into their eighties and nineties as in 1920, employees leave at early ages—even earlier than is general in industry. Most who retire from Government are under 65; only 8 percent of all retirees stayed until their 70th birthday. We are, in fact, a much younger service than in 1920.

Neither is the service any longer loaded down with employees who are too ill to work. The physically and mentally disabled are retiring at the rate of 15,000 to 20,000 a year—under a far less stringent definition of disability than is generally applicable in the private sector.

The 50,000 to 55,000 retirements that now occur each year undeniably help open up both appointment and promotion opportunities, "unclog the service," and relieve the "discouragement and dispiriting" of those already in the service. To this extent, the original management objective is being met.

Though low by today's standards, the 1920 annuity made removal of the superannuated and the disabled a "humane" and quite acceptable procedure, and the liberalizations that have occurred since that time have maintained an even higher standard of social responsibility. Today the retirement system makes the Federal employee these six promises:

(1) *A choice of times to retire.* It promises him that he may retire at his own option between ages 55 and 70, depending on length of service (age 55 with 30 years of service, age 60 with 20 years, age 62 with 5 years). Few other systems allow the employee so wide a range of personal choice. In addition, if he should lose his job for reasons other than misconduct, he is eligible for immediate monthly benefits, regardless of his age, provided he has 25 years of service or is 50 and has 20 years of service.

(2) *Generous career benefits.* It promises that if he works a full career with Government, his annuity will be adequate, even generous. A retirement system is generally considered adequate if it produces retirement income equaling one-half of pay after 30 to 35 years of service. Our system meets that test after 27 years of service by providing annuity equal to 50 percent of average pay during the 3 years of highest earnings, 35 years produces two-thirds of pay, and 41 years and 11 months produces 80 percent of pay.

(3) *Early vesting of benefits.* If he leaves Government after completing 5 years of service but before he reaches retirement age, he is promised a vested right to an annuity (payable at age 62) for that portion of his working years spent in Federal service. That annuity will provide a fair and proportionate part of his total retirement income. (If he chooses not to take advantage of this right, he may have refunded to him all the money he contributed to the retirement fund.) If all employer-sponsored retirement systems had such early vesting provisions, desirable interchanges of employees between Government and industry, and among employers, would be greatly facilitated.

(4) *Protection for his survivors.* The system promises the employee that if he should die in service after completing as little as 18 months of service, his widow and children will receive monthly benefits. The widow of a younger employee will receive 22 percent of his average pay, and the benefit in all cases will be at least 55 percent of the annuity to which the employee would be entitled if retired. If he should die after retiring, the benefit for his widow will generally be 55 percent of his annuity. All widow's benefits, unlike social security, are payable whether or not there are children. Each child's benefit is now $79 a month unless there are more than three children, in which case the maximum children's benefit is about $235 a month.

(5) *Benefit increases after retirement.* The system promises the employee that he will not be forgotten after he quits work. There have been numerous increases through the years for those who have already retired. Today every annuitant is assured prompt and automatic increases, related directly to rises in the cost of living, to preserve the basic purchasing power of his annuity. Moreover, since October 1969, an extra 1 percent is added to each such increase to help improve his standard of living.

(6) *Assurance of timely and complete payment.* Finally, the system promises the employee that there will always be enough money in the retirement fund to assure that the benefits due him can be paid in full and on time. Though civil service retirement benefits have never been repudiated, reduced, or delayed for lack of funds, we now have—in addition to the "full faith and credit" backing of the Government and a substantial and growing balance in the fund—the first effective, built-in provisions for maintaining the fund at a completely safe level. The system, thanks to the October 1969 retirement law amendments, is now soundly financed for the first time in its 50-year history—an anniversary event well worth noting.

Though it serves both employer and employee well, the system is, of course, not perfect. Nevertheless, it has gradually but consistently, for 50 years, changed to meet the needs of changing times and it has succeeded in fairly and equitably balancing divergent interests and needs. Although so different from the original as to be almost unrecognizable, the system still operates on the original fundamental premise that both employees and Government will contribute to a program designed for their mutual benefit, that employees will be able to retire in dignity and comfort at the end of a reasonable career, and that Government will be able to fill their places with younger and more vigorous workers.

I believe that the next 50 years will see the same pattern of dynamic, yet evolutionary, adaptation of the civil service retirement system to meet Government's changing manpower needs and policies and our Nation's changing concepts of social responsibility—but at a pace much faster than that anticipated in 1920 or actually experienced through 1970.

THE SST: HOW MUCH CAN WE STAND?

HON. SPARK M. MATSUNAGA

OF HAWAII

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. MATSUNAGA. Mr. Speaker, in spite of growing evidence that the supersonic transport would cause major degradation of the environment, the plane's backers are giving the same old answers, apparently hoping that Congress will overlook the facts and appropriate another $290 million.

A central element of the SST backers' strategy seems to be a concentration on the sonic boom problem, which they claim to have solved by promising that SST's will not fly at supersonic speeds over land. This strategy was evident in the regulation recently proposed by the Federal Aviation Administration, purporting to ban overland sonic booms. Whether this regulation, published in the Federal Register for April 16, 1970—page 6189—actually would ban the boom is moot, since the language of the regulation permits any flights "necessary for aircraft development."

But while the Department of Transportation tries to divert our attention to the sonic boom, a number of other problems are being swept under the runway. One of these—airport noise—is of particular concern to my constituents, since SST's are supposed to be used for transoceanic flights, presumably to places like Hawaii.

Airport noise is already bad enough at our heavily used airports, yet the SST would make more sideline noise than any existing commercial jet. As physicist Richard L. Garwin told the National Journal:

> It would be like 50 subsonic jets taking off simultaneously.

This is a kind of pollution nobody needs or wants, and nobody should have to pay for it through Federal appropriations. If we are serious about protecting the environment, we can start by rejecting the budget request for $290 million for the SST.

"How Much Can We Stand?" is the way the Honolulu Star-Bulletin summed up the SST issue. In an editorial on February 5, 1970, the Star-Bulletin cited growing international opposition to the SST for environmental reasons, and posed the question: Just what is the SST going to be good for?

Because this editorial admirably represents the opposition to the SST among Hawaiians, I include it in the RECORD at this point:

HOW MUCH CAN WE STAND?

If a supersonic transport isn't allowed to fly over populated areas—and it's pretty evident it won't be allowed to—just what is it going to be good for?

Ocean travel, some of the experts will answer, or maybe over and under the Poles. Never mind the people on ships, the Eskimos and the relatively few scientists and explorers (how about the oil drillers on the North Slope of Alaska?). They can take it.

But let's say a New Yorker wants to come to Hawaii. When he can fly nonstop in a

DC-8 from the Big City to Honolulu, why get off in San Francisco and lose all the time on the ground that he would save on a San Francisco-Honolulu SST flight?

Because the United States has already announced that no SST's will fly over our populated areas. Now five European nations—Sweden, Switzerland, West Germany, The Netherlands and Norway—say they will have none of it. The Swedes don't like the idea of even having it fly by over water.

The British and French also attended the Paris meeting of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, a group primarily concerned with protecting the environment. As partners, the British and French are building the supersonic Concorde. Naturally they tried to allay the fears of the others.

The Concorde—and the U.S. model, if it is ever built—at 10 miles high will generate a sonic boom of two pounds per square foot of pressure over a trail 50 miles wide. This is about what you would get, in noise, from an Air Force C-135 tanker flying 100 feet overhead.

The State and the air lines, in discussing noise levels at Honolulu International Airport, might look into what the people of Kalihi and Palama will be up against when one of the 1,800 m.p.h. monsters rises off the runway over their roofs.

PART-TIME WORKING STUDENTS—NO TIME TO DEMONSTRATE

HON. JOHN E. HUNT

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. HUNT. Mr. Speaker, we are all aware that the local colleges and universities, as well as many in our home States, are or should be in the midst of examinations.

As far as the local colleges are concerned, it is apparent from the newspapers that a variety of unique arrangements have been made for those taking exams, including the repugnant extreme of canceling all exams in favor of giving students a "pass" for courses in which exams would otherwise have been given. At one local university, it has been brought to my attention that in addition to legitimate, commonsense reasons for being able to defer an examination, such as physical incapacity or death in one's immediate family, there has been added another category: "Conscience." Whether it is one's "conscience" as to the purported reasons for recent demonstrations or "guilty conscience" for not having pursued studies diligently would not seem to make a difference.

Despite the substantial number of students who have fallen victim to the "cop-out" syndrome, there is another class of students to which little attention has been paid but which makes a significant contrast to those who have been appearing in the news media. These are the part-time evening students, especially those going beyond undergraduate studies, for whom it is the rule rather than the exception to pay for their education out of pocket from earnings received from full-time jobs. Many have families and all have to sacrifice luxuries and other personal interests in order simply to take advantage of educational opportunities which many others, in less strained circumstances, take for granted. These students have another thing in common; they have the determination and ambition to advance their education by choice and are not looking for an out from other responsibilities.

I am informed of a recent instance where the part-time students at a local law school had options to take a final examination at the scheduled time, complete the exam at home over a period of several days, or defer the examination until a later date when, supposedly, one's conscience is less of an interference. Not surprisingly, the overwhelming majority of the students elected to take the exam at the time scheduled.

There is, I believe, a significant point to be made out of all this. It seems that there is a substantial correlation, on the one hand, between having to work for a living while availing one's self of higher education as an opportunity; and on the other hand, merely attending an institution of higher education—frequently as a matter of course and at someone else's expense—and participating in whatever protest is at hand.

Those who have "copped-out" of any productive role in society may find the going easier for a while within the sanctuaries provided by many institutions of higher education. But it is only temporary. Unfortunately, the standards for all are lowered in the meantime. It will continue to be true, nonetheless, that the serious students will get out of an educational opportunity what they put into it.

It is my opinion that the majority of our students are fine examples of American youth, but unfortunately are victims of distorted versions of academic freedoms.

SPECIAL IMPACT PROGRAM

HON. WILLIAM A. STEIGER

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. STEIGER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, for the past several months I have been concerned about the payment of contingent fees by special impact program contractors in Los Angeles, Calif. It has come to my attention that several brokerage firms in Los Angeles have received significant commissions for rendering services of questionable value. I have therefore asked the General Accounting Office to make a formal determination of the legality of these payments.

The letter I have sent to Mr. Staats follows:

MAY 21, 1970.

Mr. ELMER B. STAATS,
Comptroller General of the U.S. General Accounting Office, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. STAATS: I am in receipt of your letter of April 17, 1970, on the question of the legality of the payment of contingent fees by Special Impact Program contractors in Los Angeles, California. In your letter you declined to make an official determination on the issue as I requested in my letter to you of January 23, 1970. I am not satisfied with your response.

I am again asking GAO to make a formal determination of the legality of the payment of contingent fees by Special Impact Program contractors in Los Angeles to Dempsey-Tegeler, Inc. GAO has completed a field review of this situation for its report on the Special Impact Program in Los Angeles, and has the investigative capacity in Los Angeles to get any further information that it might need to make this determination, and most importantly, has an independence and expertise in the issue at hand.

I would appreciate your response at your earliest convenience. The matter of contingent fees in the Special Impact Program has troubled me since I first became aware of it.

With kindest regards,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM A. STEIGER,
Member of Congress.

HON. JOSEPH T. MEEK

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, a constitutional convention is being held in the State of Illinois to produce a new document for that great State. One of the 116 delegates to the convention is Joseph T. Meek of Western Springs, Ill.

Prior to his serving as a delegate to the constitutional convention, Joe Meek was one of the great business and civic leaders of our State and he was very properly commended by a resolution adopted at the constitutional convention, which I am pleased to insert into the RECORD to pay tribute to one of my most respected constituents:

HON. JOSEPH T. MEEK

Whereas, Joseph T. Meek recently retired from the Illinois Retail Merchants Association after serving as its President and as President of its predecessor organization from the turbulent years of the 1930's until the fall of 1969; and

Whereas, His excellent leadership and devotion to the retail industry has deservedly earned for him the title "Mr. Retail of Illinois"; and

Whereas, He served some thirty-five years as Legislative Agent before the Congress of the United States and the General Assembly of Illinois, and in this capacity, through honesty, devotion and untiring effort, Joe Meek did more than anyone in the State of Illinois to prove the value of the work of a true Legislative Agent in contributing to better government at the Federal, State and local levels; and

Whereas, He was honored at a banquet reception in Chicago on April 15, 1970, during the Annual Meeting of the Illinois Retail Merchants Association, with a "Salute to Joe Meek" for his outstanding service to retailing; and

Whereas, Joe Meek is a colleague of ours, serving at this Sixth Illinois Constitutional Convention as a prominent delegate from the Ninth Senatorial District; therefore, be it

Resolved, by this Sixth Illinois Constitutional Convention, that we today honor our colleague, Joseph T. Meek, by adopting this resolution wherein we, too, salute him for his many long and faithful years of service to the retailing industry, that we express our thanks to him for all that he has done to promote a better life for each of us through his many civic, religious and charitable activities, that we wish him the best of health, happiness and prosperity, and that we pray

for him and for us that every day will be "Joe Meek Day".

Unanimously adopted this sixteenth day of April, 1970, by the delegates to the Sixth Illinois Constitutional Convention.

SAMUEL W. WITWER,
President.

IN THE NATION: FOR WHITE READERS ONLY

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, recent news articles with datelines Augusta, Jackson, and Chicago describe shocking violence perpetuated by police against blacks. Six blacks are dead in Augusta, shot in the back. Two black youths are dead at Jackson State, victims of a fusillade of 140 bullets shot into a crowd of unarmed black college students. Two are dead in Chicago, victims of a shootout which appears really to have been a shoot-in.

Obviously, these incidents point out a dangerous tendency on the part of the police to shoot at blacks without provocation. And in this turn of events, the Nixon administration has helped create an atmosphere conducive to such incidents. Inflammatory statements by high administration officials, and the administration's retrogressive civil rights policy, have given encouragement to prejudice and repression, which themselves breed violence.

Tom Wicker in his column in the May 19, 1970, New York Times, describes the situation confronting black citizens in our Nation.

Mr. Wicker's column is both timely and necessary reading for all citizens concerned about the fate of our democratic society. It follows:

[From the New York Times, May 19, 1970]

IN THE NATION: FOR WHITE READERS ONLY

(By Tom Wicker)

WASHINGTON, May 18.—Suppose you were black. What would you think if you had read these items in your newspaper in the last ten days?

From Augusta, Ga.: Six black men are dead, all shot in the back by police rifles or shotguns. At least four may have been no more than bystanders at rioting last week that followed the death of a black youth in a jail where conditions are known to be so terrible for blacks that community protests have been regularly made for years. One of these protests was a letter to Attorney General John Mitchell. He never answered.

From Jackson, Miss.: At Jackson State College, two black students are dead and nine are wounded, including several girls. All fell before a thirty-second barrage of gunfire from state highway police who for unexplained reasons took over the task of quelling a student disturbance, although town police and National Guardsmen also were at hand. The highway police justified the shooting by contending that they were receiving sniper fire from a dormitory roof. No evidence or witnesses have been found to substantiate the sniper story, although there are dozens who refute it, and there is no explanation at all of why trained police officers, upon receiving what they thought was sniper fire from a rooftop, fired more than 140 bullets into a crowd of unarmed students standing on the ground in front of a girls' dormitory. At the moment, no national protest rally is being planned for the Ellipse in Washington.

THE CHICAGO SHOOT-OUT

From Chicago: Months after Fred Hampton, a Black Panther leader, was killed by Chicago police in what they described as a blazing gun battle with a band of armed Panthers, a grand jury has discovered that only one bullet was fired at the police raiders. It was the police who poured a massive fire into the apartment where Fred Hampton and others had been sleeping; it was the Federal Bureau of Investigation that provided the preliminary information, and it was police and city officials who later covered up the truth and concocted the story of the "shoot-out." Some Chicago newspapers as well helped carry out the distortion.

From Washington: The Justice Department has filed a brief in support of the proposition that Southern parents should get a tax deduction for making contributions to private academies set up as an alternative to desegregated public schools. As recently as January, Robert Finch, the Secretary of H.E.W., pledged to fight any such move, because he knows well that these academies can survive only through tax-exempt status; and that if they receive it, they will spring up throughout the South, thus effectively reestablishing a tax-supported dual school system.

SOMEONE TO TURN TO

Well, since I am white, I don't know for sure what I would think if I were black and read those news stories. But even the effort to put oneself in the other fellow's skin, under these circumstances, is frightening. It is bad enough to be, say, the victim of a crime, or to be in fear of crime and disorder, when you have recourse only to an ineffective police force and to a court system heavily overburdened. But at the least, in that case the law is on your side, or you believe it to be; there is someone to whom you can turn.

But suppose you feel that the armed policeman is not there to protect your life and rights but to do away with them? Suppose even the Federal Government is no longer trying to assert your rights in court and its highest law enforcement arm seems more interested in helping the police exterminate black militants than in impartially observing and enforcing the law? Suppose that, by all evidence available to you, the law does not even seem to be on your side—is at best indifferent and at worst hostile?

No wonder Dr. Aaron Shirley, up to now a moderate black leader in Jackson, said the other day that "if black folks have to die, they ought not to die so peacefuly." White men who read that as a threat instead of a desperate plea for rudimentary justice and humanity can make no answer that will not ultimately echo the Mississippi patrolman who said after the Jackson slaughter: "You better send some ambulances, we killed some niggers."

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

NEEDED: A BALANCED TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM

HON. WILLIAM F. RYAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Speaker, the House Public Works Committee is holding hearings on legislation which would extend the highway trust fund. Instead of continuing to build highways, the Federal Government should have a balanced transportation policy. The disparity between Federal money spent on mass transit and highways is glaring.

To date, $795 million has been spent on mass transit; while $34.2 billion in completed highway projects and $13.9 in incompleted highway projects or those projects under authority has been spent.

Since Congress has in no way illustrated its commitment to mass transit programs by appropriating adequate levels of funds, I have been introducing legislation for many years which would allow a State to elect to use its highway construction allocation for mass transit. In this Congress it is H.R. 48.

As I said in testifying before the Subcommittee on Roads of the House Public Works Committee on April 20, 1970:

> Either we do something about making adequate transportation available to all Americans, or one day the time will come when our present chaotic transportation scheme will really prove to be our Achilles heel and pitch us into national disaster.

Yesterday's New York Times had a cogent editorial on this subject. It follows:

[From the New York Times, May 20, 1970]

KING AUTO

Hearings now being held by the House Public Works Committee provide a perfect opportunity to reopen the question why at this point in history the American people should be paying sixteen times as much for highways each year as they do for mass transportation. The disparity would be great even if the population were ideally dispersed throughout this vast country. With close to 80 per cent of the people jammed into urban areas, it is wildly irrational.

The Highway Trust Fund, which makes possible an almost cancerous spread of concrete, rest on the thesis that the money it receives from automobile users in the form of gasoline taxes should be spent on facilitating their chosen mode of travel. This argument is the most obvious kind of special pleading. Revenues from cigarettes are not used to finance medical research that might lengthen the lives of smokers, and drinkers do not get bigger and better bars out of the taxes they pay on their whiskey. Why should gasoline taxes be reserved for highways?

Except for a newly passed scheme to finance airport improvements, the Highway Trust Fund is, in fact, unique—and with due respect to the contribution of the automobile, it has not been so unmixed a blessing as to merit the exceptional treatment. It has its virtues of privacy and convenience, but the automobile also accounts for some 60 per cent of air pollution. The superhigh-

ways laid out to accommodate it are all too frequently destructive of the countryside, bulldozed across the land without regard for any other factor than brute efficiency—and all too often lacking even that. Not least, automobile-worship and the federally supported proliferation of roads to serve it have completely undermined passenger rail carriers, which could be twenty times as efficient as highways and no threat whatever to the environment.

Congress has the option of abolishing the discriminatory Highway Trust Fund or making it serve the financial needs of other forms of transportation as well. The highway lobby—including organized labor as well as the automobile and construction industry—is far too powerful to encourage the hope that gasoline taxes will suddenly be diverted to the Treasury, to be parceled out, like other revenues, on the basis of nationally determined priorities. But until that is done, the least Congress can do is to enlarge the scope of the Fund to provide that "balanced transportation system" to which President and Congress alike are so fond of paying verbal tribute.

A RESPONSIBLE MESSAGE BY DR. FORREST J. ROBINSON, SENIOR MINISTER, FIRST UNITED METHODIST CHURCH OF WICHITA, KANS.

HON. GARNER E. SHRIVER

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. SHRIVER. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Forrest J. Robinson, senior minister of the First United Methodist Church of Wichita, Kans., last Sunday made a statement concerning the Cambodian situation which is deserving of attention of many concerned Americans throughout the country today.

Dr. Robinson spoke of the President's decision, the right to dissent, and the "growing tendency to short circuit democratic process with the substitution of violence."

I take this opportunity to commend Dr. Robinson for his leadership in bringing a responsible message to his congregation which should be heeded by others throughout America.

Under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the statement made by Dr. Robinson on May 10, 1970:

STATEMENT BY DR. ROBINSON

The rapid developments of events of recent days precipitated by our president's painful and momentous decision concerning Cambodia, have added volatile fuel to an already raging fire.

The tragedy at Kent State University, the campus protests, the ranges of reaction from all across the country, are but evidence of ever deepening crisis.

As with many I have had many personal doubts concerning this new military action. With many, I totally deplore the Viet Nam war in the first place. Yet along with the vast majority, I must realize my ignorance concerning the many factors to which I do not have access and which influenced our president's immeasurably difficult decision.

Although I have been somewhat skeptical, I believe our president acted courageously and responsibly in the discharge of his duty, according to the dictates of his conscience.

We are in Cambodia. No amount of violence here at home today can alter that fact. Our president has assured us we will be out by July 1. In his honest judgment, this action will help to improve the safety of American troops remaining in South Vietnam during the withdrawal phase, will make possible the return of American troops at least on schedule and will ultimately shorten the war.

Our president, in what was surely one of the greatest personal political risks ever undertaken is acutely aware of the disagreement with the rationale for his action. However, I believe he has displayed mature and creative leadership by encouraging peaceful demonstration against his action. I believe it to be an affront to the intelligence to have it said that his decision came as a bowing to those with powerful, vested interest in the prolongation of this war.

Our freedom to dissent is priceless (Charles Sulzberger in the "Wichita Eagle" wrote graphically about the Russian people's despair over the lack of this freedom). We must not endanger it by an ever growing tendency to short-circuit democratic process with the substitution of violence. Let's pledge ourselves to act in Christian character, with responsibility and charity.

Only in this way will our democracy be preserved and ever strengthened. Let's prayerfully and responsibly support our president and our elected representatives in congress in the critical days ahead.

NEWBERRY, S.C., SUPPORTS PRESIDENT NIXON

HON. WM. JENNINGS BRYAN DORN

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, the mayor and city council of Newberry, S.C., unanimously adopted a resolution supporting President Nixon's courageous action in Cambodia. Mr. Speaker, this splendid resolution is typical of the patriotic, dedicated Americans in my congressional district. I recommend this timely and great resolution to the attention of my colleagues:

RESOLUTION

Whereas, Richard M. Nixon, Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States of America has thoughtfully and painstakingly made the decision to send American troops into Cambodia to clean out major North Vietnamese and Viet Cong occupied sanctuaries which serve as bases for attacks on both American and South Vietnamese forces in South Vietnam, and

Whereas, The President of the United States of America has all the facts and is aware of the possible consequences if the enemy activity in these Cambodian sanctuaries is not halted, and

Whereas, we, the City Council of the City of Newberry, South Carolina, are of the unanimous opinion that the President of the United States of America is taking the necessary action to bring this war to a just conclusion.

Now, therefore, be it resolved, by the City Council of the city of Newberry, South Carolina, that President Richard M. Nixon, in his choice of action in Cambodia, has the wholehearted and unanimous support of the City Council of the City of Newberry, South Carolina, and we strongly urge all citizens to honor the President's request for support of our brave men who are fighting for the peace and freedom of all citizens of these United States and the free world.

Be it further resolved, that this resolution be forwarded to The President, with copies to the Senators of South Carolina and the Representative of the Third Congressional District of South Carolina.

Done this 15th day of May, 1970.

CLARENCE A. SHEALY, Jr., *Mayor.*

PRESTON MCALHANEY,
CLAUDE PARTAIN,
C. D. COLEMAN,
CARMAN BOUKNIGHT,
L. D. GARDNER,
CECIL E. KINARD,
Councilmen.

PREPARED REMARKS OF THOMAS GRIFFITTS ELLISON DELIVERED BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, I have just returned from hearing the testimony of Thomas Griffitts Ellison, a student at the University of Virginia, who served 2 years with the Marine Corps, including a 13-month tour of duty in the I Corps area of Vietnam between September 1966–October 1967. I commend Mr. Ellison's remarks to my colleagues:

REMARKS OF THOMAS GRIFFITTS ELLISON, USMC

Good afternoon, gentlemen: My name is Thomas Griffitts Ellison. I am chairman of Virginia Veterans for Peace and a fourth year student in the McIntire School of Commerce at the University of Virginia. I have not come here today primarily as an official spokesman of our organization, rather I wish to speak first as a concerned citizen, second as a concerned veteran who served in Vietnam in the Third Division of the United States Marine Corps, and third as a concerned student at a university where misunderstanding, not violence, brought violence. I neither purport to be an expert on constitutional law nor an experienced and well-versed student of diplomatic history. What I would like to speak about is the undeniably brutal effect our Nation's commitment to Indochina is having upon the Nation's youth, in particular, those who have fought in this undeclared war.

To illustrate this, I would like to relate the course of my own metamorphosis from the son of a Naval military officer to a combat marine in Vietnam to my present position as a veteran for peace. I was brought up in what ex-commandant of the Marine Corps General David M. Shoup terms a militaristic society. Our society is indeed militaristic: 20% of the adult population of this country are veterans of military service; in fact, over half of this Congress hold positions in the various services' reserves or in the national guard. General Shoup has analyzed our environment well. If I may quote: "Whole generations have been brought up on war news and wartime propaganda. The few years of peace since 1939, have seen a steady stream of war novels, war movies, comic strips, and television programs with war or military settings. To many Americans, military training, expeditionary service, and war are merely extensions of the entertainment and games of childhood." General Shoup's observation is further substantiated by Noam Chomsky in his book, No More Vietnams: "America has institutionalized even its genocide . . . the fact that the extermination of Indians has

become the object of public entertainment and children's games."

In January 1966, I enlisted in the Marine Corps for two years. My motives were clear: I was incensed at the atrocities of the North Vietnamese against our captured pilots, and I felt a chauvinistic and patriotic urge to do something about this. Parris Island and subsequent infantry training at Camp Geiger had somewhat of a bewildering effect upon me and my comrades in arms. I gained a false sense of security from the corps. I became a trained killer, and unaware to myself, I became more of a racist than the most bigoted member of the Ku Klux Klan. But at that time I was not disillusioned. Indoctrination was effective. The world's problems could be solved through military reactions, and I would follow any orders given to me by a superior. In fact, had I been a National Guard member at the time of Kent State, I would have fired unhesitantly into the crowd when the order was given. In retrospect, the person I had become was frightening and dangerous. Any idealism or concern for humanity I once had was replaced by the role of a hard marine I then played.

An extension of psychological reconstruction was further enacted at the Marine Corps staging area. I was completely familiarized with the concept: "The only good gook is a dead gook." Very little differentiation was made between the South Vietnamese populace and Viet Cong or NVA troops. I almost swallowed this postulate completely. But I was fortunate enough to attend the naval Vietnamese language course. We were not only taught the basics of the language but also the culture. I then began to respect the Vietnamese as a people, contrary to the opinions that were institutionalized by superior non-commissioned and line officers who did not have the desire or did not have the opportunity to learn the truth about the Vietnamese.

What happened to me and the other men in my outfit in I–Corps, has established itself well in my memory. I doubt I will ever forget the good and the bad times. The joy of a warm can of beer or "Winstons" in our C-rats while on operational status still brings a smile to my face. But I am not here to speak about smiles. Last week, 168 American lives were ended because of your inaction to end the war! Five-times-decorated Master Sgt. Donald Duncan states the case well. "Those people protesting the war in Vietnam are not against the boys in Viet Nam. On the contrary, what they are against is our boys being in Viet Nam. They are not unpatriotic. Again the opposite is true. They are opposed to people, our own and others, dying for a lie, thereby corrupting the very word, democracy."

The first K.I.A. I saw was death of a friend of mine in our very first fire fight. It was in the very same area Bernard Fall so appropriately named, "the street without joy." My friend died from a mis-aimed shot from within our own company perimeter. Subsequently, a very large logistical camp was named for him after we secured the area. I can assure you that he would trade whatever honor there is in that for his life.

Obviously, though contrary to the beliefs of many of our more powerful veterans' organization, there is nothing romantic about this war. "Wings of gold upon his chest," "duty, honor, and country" rallies, and other misguided, supposedly patriotic attempts to gain a lasting peace through waging an eternal war have not rallied the country to a new God-endowed manifest destiny.

However, I specifically came here today to speak about the dehumanization, resulting from militaristic conditioning and actual experiences in the combat zone of Viet Nam. The psychological imbalances and violent reactions of the Mike Sharps, the Charlie Whitmans, the Captain Medinas, and countless others are a result of many stimuli. I can empathize with these men. Of the over eighty active members of Veterans for Peace in Charlottesville, over half—including myself—carry the memories of their own personal My Lai-4's. Gentlemen, I can assure you, it makes it difficult to sleep at night.

I am not a psychologist. What makes me qualified to expound on the subject? Experience! Experience not gained from flying in by helicopter for a day or two, but experience gained from being an exhausted and frustrated combat marine for extended periods in the field.

Personally, I felt three areas in which stimuli acted in such a way that I believe I or any other Grunt (as we infantrymen proudly called ourselves) would be forced to the point where any one of us was perfectly capable of committing wholesale murder on innocent civilians in Viet Nam.

First, in the combat environment of Vietnam, no greater frustration can be experienced than not knowing who the enemy is. As one recent returnee stated, it is utterly impossible for a G.I., especially a scared G.I. in the dark, to make any differentiation between a V.C. and a civilian." The general policy of "shooting anything that moves" conditions one to fire at will, even if women and children are the targets. This problem is further illustrated by our unrealistic and inadequate attempts at pacification and Vietnamization. I worked in a civic action program for two and a half months.

I can say with some authority that relocation in Northern I—corps does not work. Why? "Our government faces a somewhat dual and contradictory problem in pacification. One day it is necessary to napalm a Vietnamese village to liberate it from V.C. infiltrators. The next day we begin to pacify the burned and embittered survivors. They must surely wonder if we are liberating them to death. But liberate them we will. And those who are too ignorant to realize they must be liberated must be pacified, so they will not interfere with the liberation of their more enlightened brethren whose enthusiasm for liberation has been greatly enhanced by their participation in the profits of the economic boom the United States has brought to their hapless land."

In addition, the people of Vietnam are not pacified. They are merely tired and apathetic.

Thus, we are asking one hell of a lot from our troops in demanding they fight for a populace which only wants an end to the hostilities, regardless of who the victor may be.

I know all to well the fear of not knowing whether or not a village was friendly. I also remember a desire to shoot to kill and ask questions later.

Secondly, many of us saw our buddies maimed, killed, and mutilated. Many of these deaths were the result of an absence of danger landmarks and poor leadership, specifically on Hamburger Hill, Hill 117, Operation Chinook, and countless other ventures. Frustration, despair, and a desire for revenge increased the potential for incidents similar to Song My. Those companies which suffered continual losses on the field because of traps, sniper fire, etc., were most likely to commit atrocities; whether on the scale of My Lai—4 or smaller is immaterial. Considering our previous conditioning to kill, I understand the satisfaction and the alleviation of frustration that is felt from finally getting involved in something other than a sweep and clear operation, where all you do is sweep and clear elephant grass, or search and destroy operations, where you mostly destroy vacated villages and desecrate Vietnamese religious shrines.

The third stimulus actually involves two conditions that not only exist in Viet Nam but prevail throughout the military establishment. One is the relationship between most officers and enlisted men, particularly in the Marine Corps. The other is the evidence of racism in and out of combat zones. In combat zones, it is relatively easy to dehumanize members of an alien race, which of course, results in the loss of our own civility. But racism exists outside of the combat zone, too. I will never forget one of my D.I.'s antagonizing a young black by continuously calling him "boy." But let me elaborate on both of these problems.

In view of the conditions of today's military services, I believe psychologically balanced and intelligent men make poor soldiers. men, in a theory X manner, could hardly be improved upon as a means of instilling jealousy and hatred. Enlisted men are indoctrinated to kill, kill and yet to be good non-combat soldiers, they must sublimate their aggression into forms of beahvior that the military can tolerate.

I can think of no better way to lose the respect of one's men than that displayed by Col. Joseph Bellas, when he commented on the Thanksgiving mess hall boycotts last fall. I quote: "They're young, they're idealistic and don't like man's inhumanity to man. As they get older they will become wiser and more tolerant." It is because of the attitudes of Col. Bellas and men like him that I am here today. If I must passively accept "man's inhumanity to man," then I should most assuredly prefer to regress to early childhood before I knew about redskins, krauts, Japs, and gooks.

The immorality of our presence in Viet Nam was adroitly stated by Maj. Gordon S. Livingston, M.D., ret., who criticized Col. Patton's inaccurate body count policy and was subsequently requested to resign from the Army: "In the end what I objected to was not so much the individual atrocities, for these can be found in any war; war itself is the atrocity. What compelled my stand was the evident fact that at an operational level most Americans simply do not care about the Vietnamese. In spite of our national protestations about self-determination, revolutionary development, and the like, the attitude of our people, on the ground, military and civilian, is one of nearly universal contempt. This arrogant feeling is manfested in a variety of ways, from indiscriminate destruction of lives and property to the demeaning handouts that pass for civic action.

Finally one need only listen to a conversation between Americans concerning Vietnamese to appreciate the general lack of regard. The universal designations for the people of Vietnam, friend or enemy, are gooks, slant eyes, slopes, and dinks. On the whole, this has no conscious pejorative conotation as used casually, but it does say something about our underlying attitude toward those for whose sake we are ostensibly fighting. How can we presume to influence a struggle for the political loyalties of a people for whom we manifest such uniform disdain is to me the great unanswered, indeed, unanswerable, question.

I am as guilty as the next man. I burned villages, fired at innocent civilians, and developed disdain for the people. It was quite conceivable that my outfit could have had the same breakdown of moral and psychological integrity that resulted in the massacres at My Lai-4.

In conclusion, I would like to make several observations concerning the present debate on the Church-Cooper and Hatfield-McGovern amendments. The organization I represent endorses unanimously the amendments as they now stand.

It has been said recently that those citizens and representatives of our nation who demand immediate legislation to force the President to act upon his own guarantees and promises of withdrawal of all American troops from Cambodia by July 1, are in fact, embarassing the President. We veterans of the armed forces of the United States wish

to take exception to this rhetorical suggestion. On the contrary, it is the present administration of this nation, with its peace-through-extension-of-war policy, which is embarassing us!

The issue is simple. We have proudly served our country in her military ranks from the battlefields of Germany to the streets of Hue. Today, we have joined the battle on another front. In a word, we are now fighting in a constructive manner in order that our country demonstrate to us, its loyal sons, that it remains a polity of, by, and for the people.

Our legislators have failed us, the people because we have failed them. The citizens of this nation have succumbed to the balance of terror proposition that is in effect; the idea persists that declared wars are obsolete in the post-atomic era and Congress must allow the President full rein.

Certainly, this idea has no relevance to our present war in Indochina. To our organization, the members of which served under Mr. Nixon and former presidents, the question of limitation of presidential powers is moot. None of us wishes to limit his power as commander-in-chief during declared wars and national emergencies. Nonetheless, we do demand that the Congress retrieve the constitutionally delegated powers of war policy that the executive branch has obviously usurped. I believe this usurpation to be the crux of the issue.

Sophistries from the mouths of our elected legislators concerning the difficulties of the nuances of constitutional interpretation only aid the arguments of those extreme elements which espouse the proposition that truly representative Government is impossible and that anarchy must prevail. I believe our system can work, but only if the ruling echelon of the Administration and Congress is receptive to the desires of the people. If we cannot, by studying our own Constitution and laws, determine who has the right to make war, then those sacred ideals upon which this country was founded and for which we gave our youth and blood, have descended into a chaotic abyss from which there is little hope of retrieval.

Brig. Gen. William Wallace Ford stated in 1967, "the time has come, however to strike down the implication that whoever does not follow blindly and uncomplainingly in the steady expansion of this war is somehow unpatriotic. Stalwart heroes of the Army and of West Point, who also learned well the motto 'Duty, Honor, Country' have counseled against a land war in Asia, MacArthur, Ridgeway, Gavin, and former USMC Commandant Shoup. I besought my newly elected representative in 1964 to try to keep us from further involvement in Vietnam. I voted in 1964 for the presidential candidate who opposed escalation of the conflict. I am still trying. I consider it the highest patriotism." My presence here is, I believe, in this tradition of patriotism.

The proposal is plain. Are we, the people, truly represented by our elected officials? Is the mandate for redirection of national policy and plea for social change heard?

In essence, do you our elected representatives, in the name of a Nation once proud, right, and a haven for the oppressed of the world, have the courage to reassert yourselves as the constitutional body which decides the Nation's destiny in war and peace?

Thank you, gentlemen.

WALTER REUTHER

HON. MARVIN L. ESCH

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, all of us are saddened by the death of Walter Reuther. He was a man of strong feelings, who drew strong feelings about him in return.

I did not agree with all the proposals made by Mr. Reuther. But I have always admired his integrity, his burning desire to help the downtrodden, and his absolute insistance that change be made peacefully and within the system that has made this country great.

In the years prior to entering politics I spent considerable time in labor-management consulting work in the Detroit area. I came to know firsthand of Mr. Reuther's dedication to his country and the betterment of life for all.

His untimely passing is a distinct loss to his union, labor, and all of America. I fervently hope that the best of Mr. Reuther's works will be carried forward with dignity and fervor by those who must now carry the burdens he shouldered for so long. I deeply regret the passing of Walter Reuther. I wish his successor well.

THE GOOD SHEPHERD

HON. JAMES M. HANLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. HANLEY. Mr. Speaker, in my judgment, the fiber of our Nation and of its communities has remained strong throughout history due in great part to the efforts of men and women who dedicated their lives to the stability and improvement of our society. The people in this category represent numerous vocations and professions, such as religious, social service, health, legal, public service, and so forth. Many of them through their lifetime evidence no regard for their own comfort or material gain, but instead devote all of their energy with the sole desire that these efforts will prove meaningful to their fellow human beings. As I see it, the only compensation enjoyed by this noble segment of our citizenry is the satisfaction which I would hope they enjoy within their hearts in recognition of the achievement of others resultant from their efforts.

One who falls into the category I have attempted to describe is a man whom through my lifetime I have held in great esteem, Rt. Rev. Msgr. Thomas J. Driscoll, retired pastor of my home city church, St. Patrick's, in Syracuse, N.Y., who, on April 16, 1970, God called to his heavenly reward. News of his death was indeed distressing, but to me there was solace in the thought that I know of no man who was better prepared to meet his Maker than Monsignor Driscoll. About a month previous to his death, Mrs. Hanley and I were privileged to enjoy an evening with him. It was interesting to note that he had set aside his traditional concern for administrative detail. He was lighthearted, relaxed, and thoroughly enjoying his retirement status. It appears to me that he was biding his time awaiting the call of God, whom he had served so well on earth. His funeral service was indeed appropriate to the greatness of this magnificent servant of God. I commend the eulogy provided by Rt. Rev. Msgr. William J. Walsh, as well as the homily at the vigil of his death, as presented by Father Edward J. Hayes:

THE GOOD SHEPHERD

The movie, The Song of Bernadette, ends with the phrase, "For those who believe, no explanation is necessary. For those who do not believe, no explanation is possible."

I remember hearing an anecdote some years back about a parishioner of St. Patrick's who was assisting a recently arrived resident of Tipperary Hill in his desire to embrace the Catholic Faith. As the story goes, he spent half the time explaining the Catholic Faith to his friend, and the rest of the time explaining Msgr. Driscoll.

To paraphrase the words of the movie, "For those who knew and loved and respected Msgr. Driscoll, no explanation is necessary. For those who did not know him, perhaps no explanation is possible." We are gathered here tonight as those who knew and loved and respected him.

Tonight we shall not try to speak of Msgr.'s fifty-eight years of priesthood and his various assignments in the Diocese. We will leave that to tomorrow's homilist, Msgr. Walsh. We shall only speak as we knew him during his thirty years at St. Patrick's.

Msgr. Driscoll was a man of strength. He thought strongly. He spoke strongly. He acted strongly. One could not be indifferent to him. One necessarily reacts strongly to a man of such strength. Msgr. Driscoll's middle name was John. In so many ways, he was so like his namesake, John the Baptist, a man of unique strength. At times we might have wished he were more like the gentler, loveable, John the Evangelist. But like John the Baptist, he was what he was. He was strong in his love for the Church. Strong in his love of the priesthood. Strong in his love for St. Patrick's.

He was a man of definite leadership ability. He never left anyone in doubt as to what direction the parish and he were heading. One might question at times as one does with every leader, some or many of his individual decisions or his style of leadership. But there can be no questioning that for over 30 years, he provided good, solid, stable leadership for St. Patrick's.

He was a man of strength who expected and respected strength in others. He was a man of honesty and openness who could not tolerate anything else in others. He was not a respector of persons. He was the same with all, be they his Bishop or his assistant, be they his parishioner or civic leader. If his opinion were asked or if he felt it ought to be given, he said what he felt ought to be said.

As you know, for some years Msgr. Driscoll was a Diocesan Consultor. The Code of Canon Law states that "all persons whose . . . counsel is required must respectfully, truthfully and sincerely state their opinion on the matter." I feel certain that in the history of our Diocese, no priest has been more conscientious in this matter than Msgr. Driscoll.

He always looked for and expected the best from everyone. The effort he expected others to expend was not just their best, not even 100%, but as he so often put it, 100% plus.

We know, human beings being what they are, that to work with a man of such strength, of such expectations, of such decisiveness, requires exceptional tact and extraordinary flexibility. I suppose this is one of the reasons why over the years it has been Sisters of exceptional ability and extraordinary talent who have been stationed at St. Patrick's School. And what a boon this has been for the quality of education and especially for vocations to the convent.

In many of his plays, Shakespeare has developed the theme that the personality trait that is usually one's greatest asset, the source of one's greatness, is also usually one's greatest liability. Msgr. is no exception to this. But this is precisely what makes his short-

comings, if not from too little zeal, but too much zeal, not from too little love for the faith and the parish, but perhaps too intensive a love.

What a heritage he has left us at St. Patrick's. In many ways he was ahead of his time. For instance, in regard to the liturgy. Many years ago he initiated active participation and the Offertory Procession. He taught us what it means to pray together. How intolerant he was of slovenly, hurriedly said prayers. He had the courage to do away with the taking up of a collection during Mass because it was not conducive to prayerful recollection. Courage, perhaps better said, he had faith in his parishioners and their generosity that they did not have to be coaxed or shamed to fulfill their financial responsibilities.

What an emphasis he put on family life. Proud as he was of St. Patrick's School, he reiterated Sunday after Sunday, that the school was not a substitute for and would not usurp the responsibilities of the parents. While there would be order in the school, the discipline of children was to be taught in the home. A good formal education would be given the children at school. But the education of children must begin and be furthered in the home. And that love of the faith, the love of the Mass, and the practice of the reception of the Sacraments, this was the primary responsibility of parents and that as the church has insisted, there would not be and was not any regimentation of these matters either during school hours or after school hours.

One of Msgr.'s proudest boasts was the number of vocations from St. Patrick's during his pastorate. How often he would speak of this in a beaming fashion. Yet, he was realistic enough to recognize that whatever his human contribution to such a mysterious divine calling, it was of an indirect nature. Never, as far as I know, and he boasted about this, did he ever speak to anyone individually, or to a class, or to the school as a whole about vocations. But he did speak about vocations by what he himself was, a dedicated priest. He did speak about it through his emphasis on family life, for it is there, he insisted, that one learns that the faith is worth living for, the faith is worth giving one's life for. He spoke about it through his love for his fellow priests.

Priests were always welcome at St. Patrick's. They were welcome as guests, be they travelling missionaries or priests who came to Syracuse to establish a Retreat House and a Catholic College. They all enjoyed Msgr.'s hospitality. Priests were always welcome to visit. It was not an uncommon sight for us to see Msgr. in his room at his desk with his familiar green eyeshade, his suspenders and his undershirt, sitting at his desk piled high. Yet, he always had time for a visit. He enjoyed sitting back, lighting up his Perogi Italian cigar, and giving you all the time you wanted. He was a great host. And if you didn't drop by for a couple of months, he would inevitably greet you with the remark, "Hello stranger."

How he loved this parish church. He began renovations of it almost as soon as he came. For years he carried his vision of what he wanted the Church to be. But, insistent as he was on his "pay-as-you-go-plan" it was only after many years that his vision became a reality. When his dream went up in flames in the tragic fire of January, 1966, our hearts all went out to him. But that tragedy taught us what caliber of a man we had for a pastor. Though many felt that because of his age he wouldn't have the determination to see through the restoration, he never had a moment's hesitation, as he put it, if God would give him the strength, he would restore it even more beautifully than it was before. And this he did.

He had the magnificent ability to make the best of any situation. As we all know, he was not inclined to retire as our pastor. And yet, realizing the inevitability, he did. And he made the most of it. He continued to exercise his priestly work to the extent that he could.

There are many more things that could be said, many more that ought to be said. As individuals and as a parish, we all have so many personal memories of Msgr. For whether we sought it to be this way or it just happened, he was very much a part of the lives of all of us for these thirty-two years. And there were so many ordinary, uneventful occurrences that he with his dramatic ability transformed into exciting all-important parish events. Who can ever forget the dramatic saga of the cutting down of the blue spruce tree. But all this has become part of the folk lore of the parish. And they will not be forgotten. But I am sure they will continue to be told and re-told many times and in many places here on Tipperary Hill.

We are here tonight, not just as friends of Msgr., but as those who shared with him a unique faith, faith in Jesus of Nazareth who died and rose again, faith in the Son of God who said, "I am the Resurrection and the Life; he who believes in me, even if he die shall live." We believe that Msgr. and all of us will rise together at the Resurrection on the last day. We pray that even now God will bestow upon him his hundredfold for having left all and followed him during this life, and that one of the many mansions of which Jesus spoke of in his Father's house, will now be Msgr.'s "House by the Side of the Road."

EDITORS NOTE.— The above was given as a Homily at the Vigil of the death of Monsignor Driscoll on Monday, April 20th, 1970 by the Rev. Edward J. Hayes, a native son of St. Patrick's parish.

VICTORY OVER THE WORLD—OUR FAITH

(Eulogy for Msgr. Thomas J. Driscoll, given by Rev. Msgr. William L. Walsh, Tuesday, April 21, 1970 at St. Patrick's Church, Syracuse, N.Y.)

From his island exile in Patmos, St. John could see with the eyes of faith the final triumph of the crucified saviour over the world. Surely, human wisdom could have predicted no such triumph. Arrayed against the infant Church were the might of the Roman empire, the intellectual supremacy of Greece, the very vastness of the world which St. John and his brother priests had been sent to conquer. Against the might of Rome, they could offer only meekness, against the intellect of Greece only humility, against the vastness of the world and the limitations of time and space only the certitude of faith.

And that faith indeed conquered Rome and Greece. Indeed, it use the engineering genius of Rome to provide transportation and communication, even as it used the intellectual prowess of Greece to formulate a philosophy. It penetrated the vast reaches of the earth and, as new lands were discovered, the faith was brought to their peoples by the successors of St. John and the other apostles.

Faith gave the martyrs the courage to accept torture and death. It made of purity a priceless gem in a world of debauchery. It inspired the noblest achievement in arts and letters. And, most of all, it comforted untold millions with the certainty of infinite justice, infinite mercy, and endless happiness in the possession of God Himself.

What, then, is this faith, that conquers the world, that is the ultimate victory. We learned long ago that it is God's free gift, the divine virtue whereby we believe in God and all that God has revealed to us through His Son, Our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ.

We are here today to honor the memory, to pray for the soul of a priest, a co-worker with St. John and all the hero priest of history, a sharer in the great priesthood of Jesus Christ, a man of many virtues but outstandingly a man of firm unshakeable faith. And that faith was the driving force, the guiding light of his life. It inspired his vocation in the midst of a devout family, a vocation which was nourished by the selfless lives and single-minded devotion of the priests and sisters of St. Lucy's, and by the spiritual and intellectual guidance of the seminary faculties at St. Charles and St. Bernard's, and which came to fruition with his ordination some fifty-eight years ago.

And that same firm faith made zeal of its triumph the mark of his priesthood. As a very young priest he served the People of God in St. Francis de Sales parish in Utica under the guidance of his great and good friend Monsignor Doody. When he was named pastor of St. Patrick's Taberg, his faith impelled him, despite a complete lack of means to begin the mission that is now the parish St. Joseph in Lee Center. His pastorates at St. Francis Xavier, Marcellus, and St. Cecilia, Solvay, were marked by that same magnificient faith that brought the people of God of those parishes ever closer to the Church and to the head of its divine founder. And then, some thirty years ago, he came to this great parish of St. Patrick. Again his firm, active, driving faith made him seek out the best for his people. The triumph of the faith for which he strove would settle for nothing short of the best. Particularly in the field of Catholic education did he insist upon the best and would accept no less.

But, if one phase of his ministry stands out above all else it was his zeal in fostering vocations to the priesthood and the religious life. There was, first of all, the example of his own life; there was guidance, there was material help when needed. There was always his own obvious love for the Church and its work. All these made easier for many the paths to the priesthood and to religious profession.

On the occasion of Monsignor Driscoll's twenty-fifth anniversary of ordination, the preacher quoted the inscription on the tomb of Sir Christopher Wren, the great architect who had designed St. Paul's Cathedral in London. The inscription reads, "If you seek his monument, look about you." Look not at the buildings or their adornment, beautiful as they may be. Rather, look at the people he has served and inspired. These are his monument, his eulogy. He would want no other.

The funeral of a priest brings the People of God together in a unique way. The bishops come to bless and bid a fond farewell to one who has lightened the awesome burden. His brother priests come to offer their grateful prayers for one whose fraternal love of them has made him their beloved companion. His parishioners come to thank God for the graces poured out on them through his hands. All come to beg God's mercy and welcome for one who strove so hard, to imitate His Son, whose faith has not its victory.

TRIBUTE TO WAVY-TV, INC.

HON. G. WILLIAM WHITEHURST

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. WHITEHURST. Mr. Speaker, on September 13, 1969, WAVY-TV, channel 10, serving the Tidewater area of Virginia, showed a locally produced 1-hour documentary on drugs during prime time. The program was entitled "It Couldn't Happen Here." The viewers' response to the program encouraged the

management of WAVY-TV to plan and develop a series of programs on drugs.

On April 9, 1970, President Nixon appealed to the Nation's radio and television executives to assist in a "subtle sell" to youngsters on the hazards of drug abuse. On April 18, 1970, WAVY-TV was able to launch, after approximately 6 months of development, a series of drug programs titled "Head Way," which probe and inform about drugs and drug abuse.

I am led to believe that this is the first locally produced program of its type in the country to be presented on a weekly basis.

The law enforcement agencies of the six cities and all counties in the Tidewater area are giving WAVY-TV their full cooperation. Physicians, educators, pharmacists, community organizations, churches, and former drug users and addicts are all participating.

I want to take this opportunity to commend WAVY-TV, Inc., in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for two reasons, Mr. Speaker. First, we are prone to criticize television vocally yet be apathetic when commendations are merited. Second, WAVY-TV, channel 10, in the Norfolk, Portsmouth, Newport News, Virginia Beach area, a LIN Broadcasting station, has been honored for public-service programing and community service on many occasions. Their main objective has been, not to seek aggrandizenment or reward, but to help build a better community.

I am proud that WAVY-TV is located in the district which I am privileged to represent.

A BILL INTRODUCED BY MR. REID OF NEW YORK

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. REID of New York. Mr. Speaker, I am introducing today a bill to provide that the United States shall reimburse the States and their political subdivisions for real property taxes not collected on real property owned by a foreign government and therefore exempt from taxation.

Many municipalities, especially those surrounding New York City, are the proud hosts to the representatives of foreign governments. At the same time, however, these cities are forced to assume the burden for unpaid taxes that rightfully should be shared by the entire Nation.

In my own congressional district, for example, the village of Pelham has property occupied by the representatives of two foreign governments to the United Nations. These parcels would bring in more than $2,500 in village tax revenue annually and $4,000 in school taxes were they not exempt. These are substantial sums in a small village that is almost entirely residential. While Pelham would like to welcome other U.N. ambassadors who have expressed an interest in locating there, the village is reluctant to lose additional tax revenue.

The same situation prevails in the city of New Rochelle. Representatives of four foreign governments occupy property in the city with an assessed value of approximately $300,000, resulting in unpaid taxes of about $150,000.

With tightened municipal budgets, rising tax rates, and school budgets defeated at the polls, it is my judgment that the entire country should share the increased tax burden placed on the residents of these affected cities.

I hope that the Committee on Foreign Affairs will be able to consider this measure at the earliest opportunity.

"RIGHT TO WORK" NOT AN ISSUE IN POSTAL REFORM

HON. MORRIS K. UDALL

OF ARIZONA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. UDALL. Mr. Speaker, I find that all congressional offices are being flooded right now with alarmist mail that threatens to undermine the efforts of the Nixon administration to reform the Post Office Department and put it on a business basis. If this should be the result, it would be an ironic turn for the President and his Postmaster General, who have worked so hard to improve the postal service for the people who use the mails and the employees who have labored so long in such an antiquated and bureaucratic system.

I am speaking of the mail being generated by the National Right to Work Committee.

Mr. Speaker, many of my colleagues in both parties have asked me to explain what this is all about. They are acquainted generally with the issue of postal reform, but they do not understand how this became entwined with the old "right to work" issue, last heard from in 1965.

Let me say here and now that "right to work" is not an issue in postal reform. The bill reported by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service neither advances nor retards the "right to work" movement; it leaves it precisely where it is now. It retains the status quo. And for a bill as important as this, with as many problems to solve as this, that is precisely what it ought to do.

I know there are many conscientious Members of the House who feel strongly about the union shop question—they are strongly against such arrangements, or they are strongly for them. And I know that there are strong supporters of postal reform in both groups. Thus, I think it would be tragic, a mistake of the greatest proportions, to try to make this bill a vehicle for either cause.

If there are Members who feel we should go back and amend or repeal sections of the Taft-Hartley Act, then I believe they ought to introduce separate legislation and let the issue be decided on its own merits. I do not think they ought to risk the most significant reform in the history of the post office to advance their cause. And I direct that advice equally to stanch supporters of "right to work" laws and to those of my colleagues who want to wipe them out with repeal of section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley.

I might say that I am in a perhaps unique position to render such advice. I personally oppose "right to work" laws, but I voted in 1965 against repeal. I did so because there have been three referendums in my State, and they have all supported "right to work." For the stand that I took I won the backing of some labor friends and the rebuke of others. I also was commended by the National Right to Work Committee.

Sometime soon, if the Committee on Rules agrees, the House will have a chance to vote on one of the most important pieces of legislation to come out of the Post Office and Civil Service Committee in the history of the Congress, the postal reform bill. I am most hopeful we will be able to enact it into law.

In all the years I have been in Congress I have been bothered by the grossly inefficient manner in which this Nation operates its postal service. This has not been a result of bad people; for the most part, the people who have run our postal service have been dedicated public servants. Rather, it has been the result of a bad system, an irrational system which has denied to the management of the Post Office Department the authority to make decisions relating either to income or expenditures. The heavy hands of the Congress, the White House, and the national political parties have been ever in the works.

In order to change this system we have tried in this legislation to give management the prerogatives of management, and to give labor the kind of recognition, bargaining rights and status which are enjoyed by labor in private enterprise.

One of the thorny issues which immediately arose in the drafting of this legislation was how to treat the union security issue. There were those who wanted to go both ways. Some Members, strongly committed to the cause of collective bargaining, wanted to write in a provision calling for a national union shop. If they had prevailed, then every post office in the country could have adopted a union shop, and the "right to work" laws in 19 States could have been subverted to that extent.

Others, strongly committed to the "right to work" cause, wanted to seize this opportunity to write a national "right to work" law affecting all 750,000 postal employees. If they had succeeded, the laws of 31 States which permit union shops would have been subverted to that extent.

These contending views set the stage for long negotiations between the unions, who represent over half a million postal workers, and the administration. Out of these negotiations came an understanding which I think makes eminent good sense. What it says essentially is that we will not fight the "right to work" battle in this vital legislation. We will leave the Taft-Hartley Act and the labor laws of the 50 States exactly as they are today—no more and no less—and save the "right to work" bat-

tle, if it must be resumed, for another day.

Let me spell this out a little further. Under the Postal Reform Bill, as reported by the Committee, the National Labor Relations Act would apply to employees of the U.S. Postal Service exactly as it applies to employees in private enterprise.

In simple terms, let's take the case of a steel company operating in Birmingham, Ala., and Pittsburgh, Pa.

Alabama is a "right to work" State. Therefore, the plant in Birmingham cannot have a union shop. Employees are free to join or not join a union as they see fit.

On the other hand, union-shop contracts are legal in Pennsylvania. Therefore, the plant in Pittsburgh, operated by the same company, could have a union shop if its employees through negotiations and an election supervised by the National Labor Relations Board worked out such a contract with management. In such case, all employees of the Pittsburgh plant would be required to participate in the bargaining unit—in other words, to join and pay dues.

Under the postal reform bill this same principle would apply to postal employees. Those who work in Alabama, Arizona, or any of the other "right to work" States would not be required to join a union as a condition of obtaining or retaining employment. Those who work the 31 non-"right to work" States could negotiate with the postal service to establish union security contracts if they chose to do so.

This is all that is involved. Those Members who favor "right to work" laws can vote for this bill, truly stating that they have not changed the Taft-Hartley Act in any way, shape or form, and that employees in "right to work" States will not be affected in any way. Members who favor repeal of section 14(b) of Taft-Hartley and believe in the union shop can vote for it with the clear knowledge that they have done nothing to change the status quo and that, where employees in private industry are permitted to negotiate union security contracts, the same will be true for employees of the U.S. Postal Service.

Mr. Speaker, I have been reading some of the literature of the National Right to Work Committee as well as the mail that has been generated by it, and I want to state flatly here and now that it is grossly misleading to characterize the postal reform bill as a bill "to authorize compulsory unionism." This is sheer nonsense, and Members should not be mislead by it. In fact, I find myself wondering why such a campaign has been generated over a bill which merely retains the status quo. I don't know the answer, but I suspect it may have something to do with fund-raising. After all, if businessmen are frightened into believing that "compulsory unionism" is on the march, they're more likely to contribute generously to the organization that is leading the fight against it.

If I seem just a little bitter in this regard, it is simply because a news release recently issued by the National Right to Work Committee has exceeded all bounds of propriety and honesty in attacking the honor of one of my colleagues on the Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

In a news release dated May 14, the National Right to Work Committee asserts that the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. CUNNINGHAM) was defeated for renomination because he "voted to authorize compulsory unionism." This is outrageous, not only in the way Mr. CUNNINGHAM's vote in committee was characterized, but in the fact of that Nebraska primary. Mr. CUNNINGHAM can speak for himself, of course, but it is my understanding that this question hardly came up at all in the primary campaign. For the National Right to Work Committee to claim credit for his defeat is patently ridiculous.

For the edification of my colleagues who might have missed this gem in their mail I shall insert the text of the Right to Work Committee news release at the conclusion of my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the arguments we are hearing about the postal reform bill and "compulsory unionism" sound very much like something out of "Alice in Wonderland." Is the National Right to Work Committee saying that President Nixon is in favor of "compulsory unionism?" That's what it sounds like, for the decision to keep this bill out of the "right to work" controversy was made by President Nixon and George Meany. I think their decision was a sound one. I hope and trust the majority of my colleagues in both parties—including both friend and foe of "right to work"—will concur in this view.

It is not always the popular thing to work too closely with a President of the opposite political party. But, while I have differences with President Nixon in many other areas, I have worked with him and his Postmaster General to carry out the postal reform legislation they have drafted. I believe it is right for the country, and I have given their cause a great deal of my time and energy for many, many months. I shall continue to do so.

When the postal reform bill was first reported by the Post Office Committee, I was surprised and pleased to receive a phone call from President Nixon thanking me for my efforts. The bill he thus endorsed had precisely the language now being impugned by the National Right to Work Committee. I think my colleagues ought to know that the President himself stands behind the decision to keep "right to work" out of postal reform. And I stand behind the President on that:

CONGRESSMAN CUNNINGHAM FIRST CASUALTY IN "POSTAL REFORM" RIGHT TO WORK FIGHT

WASHINGTON, D.C., May 14, 1970—Within two weeks of the time Cong. Glenn Cunningham (R-Nebr.) voted to authorize compulsory unionism for the nation's 750,000 postal workers, he became the first casualty in what shapes up as a bitter fight in the House and Senate over the Right to Work issue, Reed Larson, Executive Vice President of the National Right to Work Committee said today.

Larson was referring to Tuesday's primary vote in Nebraska in which the seven-term incumbent from Omaha was ousted by challenger John McCollister by a 25,428 to 20,187 vote margin. Cunningham was one of two members of the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee from Right to Work states (Rep. Morris K. Udall (D-Ariz.) was the other) to vote against an amendment to the postal "reform" bill that would have continued to guarantee Right to Work protection to postal workers they currently enjoy under a Presidential policy statement.

Offered by Cong. David N. Henderson (D-N.C.), the amendment stated: "Each employee of the Postal Service has the right, freely and without fear of penalty or reprisal, to form, join and assist a labor organization or to refrain from any such activity, and each employee shall be protected in the exercise of this right." The amendment lost in Committee by a 14–8 count. The bill (H.R. 17070) has been approved by the House Post Office and Civil Service Committee.

"The Nebraska vote," said Larson, "is reminiscent of the election results following debate in the 89th Congress over repeal of Section 14(b) of the Taft-Hartley Act." Section 14(b) permits states to enact Right to Work laws barring compulsory unionism.

Larson said, "The will of the people as sensed by members of the 89th Congress during the 14(b) debate was confirmed by the voters. Some 50 of the 221 House members who supported repeal in the 89th Congress were among the missing when the 90th Congress convened. In every race where repeal of 14(b) was a major issue, voters rejected candidates who favored repeal; in no case was an incumbent who opposed repeal unseated by a challenger who favored repeal.

"In other words, the 14(b) victory confirmed what every reliable survey of public opinion has been saying for years: that by a margin of better than two to one, the American people favor voluntary over compulsory unionism."

The National Right to Work Committee is a coalition of employers and employees organized in 1955 with a single purpose: to protect the right of individual workers to join or not to join a union without losing their jobs.

A PUSSYCAT FOR THE PANTHERS

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. SCHERLE. Mr. Speaker, amid all the controversy engendered by the activities of the Black Panther Party, it is difficult at times to discuss the voice of reason. A recent editorial in the Omaha World-Herald reestablishes a sane perspective on the issue of a fair trial for Panther Chairman Bobby Seale, accused of the murder of fellow Panther Alex Rackley. I believe we can all profit from these words of commonsense. I insert this editorial in the RECORD:

A PUSSYCAT FOR THE PANTHERS

It isn't every day that the vice president of the United States denounces the president of Yale University and suggests that the alumni unite to get rid of him.

But then it isn't every day that the vice president of the United States is a whizbang like Spiro T. Agnew and the president of Yale University is as fatuous as Kingman Brewster.

What Brewster did to get on Agnew's list was give aid and comfort to the student redhots who have been trying to subvert justice in the case of the Black Panthers being tried in New Haven for murder and kidnaping.

When the students went into their initial frenzy, Brewster maintained the cool for which he has been celebrated in the ranks of university administrators.

But as the ferocity of the student demonstrations mounted, Brewster went off the deep end. Where he had started counseling faith in the judicial system, he ended expressing skepticism that black revolutionaries could get a fair trial under the present system.

And he went on to promise total university cooperation in housing and feeding the thousands of outside hellraisers expected in New Haven for a long May Day weekend of attempted intimidation of the court and jury.

Thus Brewster joins the long list of university nabobs who have thrown the prestige of their standing behind the fevered nonsense of adolescent mobs.

And Yale joins the lengthening list of previously prestigious institutions which no longer are quite so attractive as places for the nurture of young minds.

The Panther murder case centers on the death of Alex Rackley, a Panther member who wound up shot. One of the principal witnesses for the prosecution is George Sams Jr., a Panther who already has pleaded guilty to second-degree murder in the case.

In a bail hearing last week, Sams told of being present in a New Haven apartment where Rackley was tied spread-eagle on a bed while chairman Bobby Seale questioned him. Rackley was accused of being a police informer. The dialogue, according to Sams' testimony, went like this:

Seale: "Are you the pig?"

Rackley: "No, sir, chairman, I am not the pig."

Seale: "What do you do with a pig? A pig is a pig. Off (kill) the (obscenity)."

Whereupon three of the defendants took Rackley out and shot him, according to testimony. A second Panther named as an executioner also has pleaded guilty to second-degree murder and is expected to testify later.

Now it would seem that with eye-witness evidence like that in hand, a trial should be held to determine the truth of the allegations.

But according to the Yale students—and according to Yale President Brewster, apparently—the trial should not be held at all.

Perhaps Brewster is right and the Panthers in New Haven can't get a fair trial. If they can't, it is very likely because the students in Brewster's charge, and the outsiders of whom he is so solicitous, have created such a climate of intimidation that the jury might feel in danger of being overwhelmed by mob violence, and temper its judgment accordingly.

"PUGWASH" DIALOGS BETWEEN SOVIETS AND PRIVATE CITIZENS

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, meetings under the guise of peace dialogs and disarmament continue in the United States between Soviets and private U.S. citizens.

While peace and understanding between the East and the West are commendable, and to some may be profitable, many wonder what sovereign the private Americans, funded with tax-free foundation funds, represent and whether their goal is peace in the American vernacular or peace under the Communist rhetoric; that is, removal of all opposition to international communism.

Or are the Pugwash conferences merely SALT talks by the party not in power—a parallel government. We do not know but the Soviets must, otherwise they would not participate.

I include several news clippings and the Washington Report of the American Security Council for May 4, 1970, as follows:

[From the New York Times, Apr. 24, 1970]

SOVIET NAMES 10 FOR FORUM HERE

Moscow, April 23.—The Soviet Union today made public the names of its 10-man delegation that will take part in a public discussion with American public figures next week in New York.

The conference, organized by the Fund for Peace, a New York foundation, will take place on April 29 in the New York Hilton.

The Soviet group will be headed by Mikhail D. Millionshchikov, a Vice President of the Academy of Sciences and chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Republic. A 56-year-old physicist, Dr. Millionshchikov has been active in the Pugwash conferences of scientists from East and West.

Others in the delegation are: Georgi A. Arbatov, director of the U.S.A. Institute of the Academy of Sciences and a consultant to the Central Committee apparatus.

Nikolai N. Inozemtsved, Director of the Institute of World Economics and International Relations and former deputy editor of Pravda.

Gennadi Gerasimov, a commentator for the Novosti Press Agency.

Mikhail I. Zakhmatov, a department head in the U.S.A. institute, specializing in East-West trade.

Vitaly V. Zhurkin, a department head in the U.S.A. Institute dealing with American foreign relations.

Dmitri Muravyev, general secretary of the Institute of Soviet-American relations, a nongovernmental friendship society.

Aleksei Kudryavtsev, a specialist in urban planning and construction.

Yevgeni M. Primakov, Pravda correspondent for the Middle East.

Georgi Skorov, an expert on economic problems of developing countries.

[From the New York Times, Mar. 16, 1970]

LEADING U.S. AND SOVIET CITIZENS TO HOLD TALKS HERE

Moscow, March 15.—The Soviet Union has agreed to send a prominent delegation to New York next month to join American public figures in an extraordinary public discussion of such problems as arms control, pollution, East-West trade and peace-keeping.

Joseph P. Lyford, president of the Fund for Peace, a New York foundation that has organized the National Convocation on the Challenge of Building Peace, made the announcement of Soviet participation after a week of talks with the authorities here.

He said that Premier Aleksei N. Kosygin had sent him a message asserting that "he supported fully the convocation and regarded it as an important step to improve Soviet-American relations."

BALL A CHAIRMAN

The American co-chairmen of the meeting are Najeeb E. Halaby, president of Pan American World Airways, and George W. Ball, former Under Secretary of State and delegate to the United Nations. Some of the most prominent figures in banking and finance are on the fund's directorate.

The convocation is to be held on April 29 at the New York Hilton. It is believed that this will be the first public discussion of important issues by prominent figures from both countries. The panel sessions will be open to the press and television as well as to the public, Mr. Lyford said.

In the past, Soviet and American scientists and educators have met privately at the Pugwash sessions—nongovernmental conferences to discuss security in the nuclear age—and other such off-the-record meetings. Soviet authorities have generally not agreed to public debates abroad because of concern that they would be pressured to allow similar public discussion in the Soviet Union. Mr. Lyford said there was no indication that the Russians planned to reciprocate this time.

ON LEAVE FROM COLLEGE

Mr. Lyford, on leave from the University of California at Berkeley, said that financial backing for the convocation, including the expenses of the 14 to 16 Soviet delegates, had been raised from "thousands of citizen-contributors and from more than 40 major United States corporations."

Among the corporations are American Airlines, the Bank of America, the Boeing Company, the Chrysler Corporation, Corning Glass and Hiram Walker & Sons.

This amount of support, Mr. Lyford said, is "an unmistakable indication that a large percentage of the American people—including the business community—is impatient for an end to the cold war."

"There is an obvious and growing public demand," he continued, "for some practical suggestions from the best minds in both the United States and the Soviet Union as to how all of us are going to survive in an age of nuclear weapons, pollution and threatened starvation in the underdeveloped nations."

According to the agreement worked out with three Soviet organizations, 14 to 16 persons will be sent to participate in the panel discussions. The Soviet side can also submit position papers on various aspects of the panels.

RICHARDSON TO SPEAK

Although this is a nongovernmental convocation, Mr. Lyford said that the Fund for Peace had received full cooperation from the State Department. Under Secretary of State Elliot L. Richardson has agreed to give the luncheon speech.

On April 30, the participants will continue their discussions outside New York City, and the Soviet side will make special appearances around the country as well. No specific itinerary has been decided.

The three Soviet sponsoring organizations are the Institute of the U.S.A. and the Institute on World Economy and International Relations—both divisions of the Soviet Academy of Sciences—and the Institute of Soviet-American Relations, one of the various Soviet "friendship" organizations.

So far, Georgei A. Arbatov, director of the Institute of the U.S.A., Nikolai N. Inozemtsev, director of the Institute on World Economy, and Academician Nikolai N. Blokhin, director of the Institute of Soviet-American Relations, have indicated that they would participate.

Among others expected are Dzherman M. Gvishiani, deputy chairman of the State Committee for Science and Technology, and Dr. Mikhail D. Millionshchikov, a specialist in arms control. The rest of the delegation will be announced before the end of this month, Mr. Lyford said.

Among the American participants are the following:

Zbigniew K. Brzezinski, director of Columbia University's Institute on Communist Affairs.

John Kenneth Galbraith, professor of economics at Harvard.

Jerome B. Wiesner of Massachusetts Institute of Technology, science adviser to President John F. Kennedy.

Adrian S. Fisher, former deputy director of the Arms Control and Disarmament Agency.

Cyrus Vance, former Deputy Secretary of Defense.

Richard N. Gardner, former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State.

Michael Blumenthal, president of Bendix International.

Willis Armstrong, president of the United States Council of the International Chamber of Commerce.

Robert V. Roosa, former Under Secretary of the Treasury for Monetary Affairs.

Edward J. Logue, president and chief executive officer, New York State Urban Development Corporation.

Roger O. Egeberg, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare.

Barry Commoner, director of the Center for Biology of Natural Systems.

Franklin A. Long, director of program on science, technology and society, Cornell University.

Athelstan F. Spilhaus, president of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Mr. Lyford said that it was hoped that the panel discussions would allow recommendations to be drafted for joint action programs by the two countries.

The Soviet side is expected to use the convocation to press in particular the Soviet criticism of American restrictions on East-West trade and to indicate Soviet unhappiness with the Nixon Administration's decision to deploy defensive and offensive missiles while talks on limiting strategic arms are continuing.

[From Human Events, May 16, 1970]

PUGWASH CONFERENCE AT PRINCETON: LEADING "PEACE" WORKERS MEET SECRETLY WITH SOVIETS

(By Alice Widener)

The Fund for Peace, a conglomerate of pacifist, leftist and world government organizations, says its creation was "spurred" by Dr. Jerome B. Wiesner, former science adviser to President Kennedy, Pugwash Group member and advocate of unilateral U.S. disarmament, and by Sen. ——. Both are waging campaigns against expansion of ABM and development of the MIRV. The Soviet Union is developing both nuclear weapons systems.

On April 29, at the New York Hilton, the Fund for Peace held a Second National Convocation on the Challenge of Building Peace under the co-chairman of Najeeb Halaby, president of Pan American World Airways and the Hon. George Ball. Among a star-studded list of sponsors were such prominent figures as Averell Harriman and Arthur J. Goldberg.

Timed to coincide with the SALT talks in Vienna between the U.S. and USSR, the Fund for Peace Convocation cooperated with the Pugwash Group and was attended by several Russians holding high posts in the Soviet government and Russian Communist party. The luncheon speaker was Under Secretary of State Elliot L. Richardson.

The press covered that event, but gave scant coverage to the all-day panel sessions and, to the best of my knowledge, no coverage at all of the private, secret Pugwash conference between Convocation principals and the Soviets at Princeton University Woodrow Wilson School on April 30.

There some extremely influential private American citizens met with the Soviets to discuss such sensitive subjects as arms control and disarmament. Among the Americans present were Dr. George Kistiakowsky, who will follow Secretary of Defense Laird in testimony affecting the military authorization bill before the Senate Armed Services Committee this month, and active Pugwash members Drs. Bernard Feld of Harvard and Franklin A. Long of Cornell.

Former Deputy Director Adrian S. Fisher of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency took part and so did former U.S. Sen. Joseph Clark, now president of World Federalists US.A. In the Soviet group at the secret Pugwash meeting were Dr. Nikolai N. Inozemtsev and Dr. Georgy A. Arbatov and Mikhail D. Millionshchikov, all members of the Soviet Academy of Sciences.

All the Americans present are passionate "peace" advocates and most of them are bitter opponents of the American military-industrial complex. Dr. Franklin Long has said our national security should be taken out of U.S. government control and turned over to private groups. Dr. Bernard Feld has said scientists should raise their voices so as to remove our military from positions where they can influence the government.

Under our Constitution, the President is commander-in-chief of our military and Congress provides for the common defense; thus we are guaranteed civilian control over the military. For "the people" or "private groups" to take direct control would entail a revolutionary takeover necessitating a coup d'etat to alter our form of government. This is precisely what the Soviets want.

While our government is conducting Strategic Arms Limitation Talks with the Soviet Union, is it wise or proper for private American citizens, some of whom have been privy to classified information, to be trying to negotiate privately with Russian citizens who are government officials unable to act solely in a private capacity?

Of course the Princeton Pugwash secret meeting was legal; but was it appropriate or wise, especially since several of the American participants are advising members of Congress on arms control and disarmament?

The *Congressional Record* shows that in current debate on Capitol Hill concerning ABM and MIRV, Senators are relying heavily on "expert" advice from Pugwash Group members Jerome Wiesner, Bernard Feld, Paul Doty and Franklin Long

The Pugwash Group was set up in 1957 to bypass our government in private negotiations with Soviet and other Communist scientists and intellectuals. The stated aim now in 1970 of the Fund for Peace is to follow Dr. Wiesner's call for "building a peace constituency" in our country. Sounds fine, but the big question is: What kind of constituency?

Dr. Wiesner told the American Association for the Advancement of Science last December, that "anti-communism has become so virulent in the U.S. that it will almost certainly one day be viewed as a mental disease which led the nation to self-destructive acts."

Dr. Wiesner didn't say a word about virulent anti-capitalism among a handful of Kremlin dictators that led them to liquidate millions of Russians and enslave millions of Poles, Hungarians, East Germans, Ukrainians, Rumanians and Czechs behind an Iron Curtain. Neither Dr. Wiesner nor Sen. Fulbright has branded anti-capitalism as a mental disease.

Maybe the vast majority of us Americans, staunch anti-Communists, are indeed loony in the eyes of the Pugwash Group, but we're not loony enough, I hope, to clip the wings of the American eagle so that it is turned into a sitting duck.

[From the Washington Report, May 4, 1970]

A PROFILE OF DEFEATISM: DISMANTLING THE NATION'S DEFENSES

History shows that soft thinking and fainthearted leadership form a path to national destruction. Students of the Roman civilization point to the Roman Senate's loss of the will to win as a major cause of the downfall of the empire. At the last, the Senate seemed to serve the barbarian aggressors rather than the national interest of Rome.

A generation ago, the representatives of the French people took refuge in a Maginot Line mentality, saying that the shift in the strategic balance to Nazi Germany would not endanger France. They rejected appeals for stronger defenses, arguing that new cycles of weapons took money needed for social purposes and insisting that there was no absolute security in more weapons. They sought peace through negotiation and favored concessions such as were made at Munich.

ANTIPREPAREDNESS SENTIMENT

Today, many thoughtful Americans are deeply concerned that a similar mood is settling over the United States. They are alarmed at the growth of the anti-preparedness sentiment in the U.S. Senate and the impact of this sentiment upon sections of public opinion. They fear a rapid decomposition of American morale as a result of defeatism among men in high places—defeatism masked as a "struggle for peace."

For many months, senator after senator has chipped away at various features of the nation's defenses—at aircraft carriers, the C–5A transport, the Army's new battle tank, military aid to allies, anti-ballistic missiles, selective service, ROTC, fighter-bombers, and numerous other weapons and programs basic to the security of this nation. Companies which produce weaponry needed for national safety have been libeled as merchants of death. American soldiers in the field, fighting an utterly unprincipled enemy that resorts to trickery and terrorism, have been criticized for making the tough battlefield decisions that combat troops must make if they hope to stay alive.

This harassment of the nation's defense forces apparently is only the beginning. Some people, it seems, won't be satisfied until the American defense establishment is dismantled. In this connection, it is instructive to review the massive opposition to the ABM (anti-ballistic missiles) and MIRV (multiple warhead missiles).

PRESSURE TO CUT DEFENSES

Pressure for a slowdown in America's defense effort is intense and comes from many sources. For example, a group of Americans met at Arden House, Harriman, N.Y., March 31–April 2 under the auspices of the American Assembly of Columbia University to consider arms limitation. At the conclusion of their meeting they issued a statement, saying: "We ask the President to defer for six months the impending deployment of multiple independently targetable re-entry vehicles (MIRV)."

The MIRV missiles constitute one of the few areas in which the United States is ahead of the Soviet Union. A U.S. halt at this time might probably give the Soviets a chance to catch up with the United States. Thus a halt could well be a military technological disaster for the United States.

The American Assembly describes itself as a "non-partisan educational institution." But consider the signers of the anti-MIRV statement. One of them was Adam Yarmolinsky, former assistant to Secretary of Defense Robert S. McNamara. Mr. Yarmolinsky was a guiding spirit behind the campaign to muzzle the military in the early 1960's. Another signer was Dr. George W. Rathjens of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, a leading contributor to Sen. —— anti-ABM book published in 1969. Two other contributors to the —— volume also signed the American Assembly report. A close reading of the entire list of signers shows that it was a "stacked deck" and blatantly partisan.

BUNDY'S VIEWS

Arguments against a strong stand on national defense find innumerable outlets. McGeorge Bundy, former adviser in the Kennedy and Johnson administrations and now president of the Ford Foundation, testified in Washington on the "arms race." Predictably, he urged suspension of deployment of offensive and defensive strategic weapons. He was quick to recommend American concessions, saying for instance, that "if we are to get an early limit on SS–9 (Russian missile) deployment, we ourselves must put MIRV on the bargaining table." Mr. Bundy's most curious statement, however, was his comment that "there are times and topics for toughness with Moscow, but the Strategic Arms Limitation talks in April is not one of them." That will strike many citizens as strange advice. Mr. Bundy recommends that

the U.S. not be tough in talks that affect the security—the lives—of the American people. Does he imagine that the Soviets will cease to be tough in their demands?

An air of unrealism permeates the statements of anti-preparedness elements in the country. Congressman —— of —— said in April that he saw no need for the U.S. to maintain 15 aircraft carriers "since none of the communist nations have any attack carriers." One wonders whether Rep. —— meant what he said. Does he believe the U.S. should scrap the weapons system in which it has a clear lead over the Soviet Union? The interior logic of his statement is that the U.S. shouldn't maintain carriers because it has an advantage over the Soviets in carrier deployment. That's a sure prescription for second class status in the world, if not outright defeat by the USSR.

NAIVETÉ IN THE SENATE

For naiveté, Americans have only to read the comments of Sen. ——. In a recent Senate debate on the ABM and MIRV, Sen. —— remarked: "I believe that the Soviet people certainly cannot want to continue the spending of billions of dollars on nuclear weapons when they could best put that money to better use."

Since when have the wishes of "the Soviet people" ever mattered for anything in the shaping of Soviet policy or programs.

Certainly, Sen —— must be aware that there is no representative government—no voice of the people—in the Soviet Union and that the party, military and organizational hierarchs make all the decisions, irrespective of what the people want. Indeed, there is no free press and no freedom of petition, so the real desires of the Soviet peoples cannot even be articulated or find expression at the national level. Thus Sen. —— question can be seen as an extraordinary piece of irrelevance, which is damaging because it obscures the nature of the threat facing the United States.

The thought processes of the members of the anti-preparedness bloc understandably strike realistic citizens as strange indeed. Take, for example, the statement of Sen. —— that "more nuclear weapons do not buy more security." Statements to this effect have been issued by many of the opponents of new defensive systems. What does Sen. —— mean? Is the statement logical? Suppose a senator were to say "more hospitals don't buy better medical care." Would anyone believe him? Logically, nuclear weapons are as to national security as hospitals are to medical care. In the case of weaponry, there is an additional element, namely that the adversaries of the United States—the enemies of American freedom—are increasing their stock of nuclear weapons. Relatively, therefore, the U.S. has a smaller stockpile of nuclear weapons. The logical conclusion to be drawn from this situation is that America's security is diminishing. Hence the need for the ABM, MIRV and other offensive and defensive systems.

THE BREZHNEV VIEW

The intense antagonism to strengthened American defenses has even reached the point where the editors of *The New York Times* assert (as they did in reference to the opening of the SALT talks April 16) that "hopes for halting the nuclear missile race ride for the moment with the Soviet delegation." *The Times* followed this up with Leonid Brezhnev's statement that prospects for the SALT talks would be favorable "if American opinion succeeds in overcoming resistance by the arms manufacturers and the military." It is interesting to wonder what might have been the U.S. public reaction in 1941 if a leading American newspaper had indicated the U.S. was doing nothing to halt an arms race and quoted the Imperial Japanese government as saying that peace prospects would be good if American shipbuilders and the military could be overcome.

It is unfortunate that the editors of *The Times* don't share the realistic views of C. L. Sulzberger, *The Times'* chief correspondent. In a dispatch from Belgium this spring, Mr. Sulzberger declared: "The menace against America is being heightened while Moscow seeks to continue the impression that it sticks to the Khrushchev era strategy. . . . More and more ICBMs are aimed at the United States which is increasingly in the front line."

Such is the situation the United States faces in the world today. The American people live in a global environment of increasing danger from the nuclear-armed Soviet Union.

The facts of the changing strategic balance have been spelled out to the President, the Secretary of Defense, the House Armed Services Committee and authoritative strategic studies groups in the U.S. and Western Europe. Nevertheless, the anti-preparedness elements choose to ignore the accumulation of facts concerning the nuclear and missile threats. Perhaps the most extraordinary aspect of the entire anti-preparedness drive is the extent to which the disarmers are willing for the country to go. The battle against the ABM and MIRV—and the campaigns against conventional weapons such as aircraft carriers, transport planes and heavy tanks—is but a prelude to the central assault on America's basic deterrent power against communist aggression.

THE M'GOVERN VIEW

Sen. —— revealed the full scope of the disarmers hopes and plans April 9 in debate in the Senate on an anti-MIRV resolution. For the first time, a member of the Senate anti-preparedness bloc called for dismantling of a key portion of the nation's defenses against Soviet aggression.

"I think we are forced to consider this year," said Sen. ——, "whether it would not be wise to allow the phasing out of the entire fixed site ICBMs. At the very least we should forgo expenditures on futile improvements in the Minuteman force pending an investigation of whether land-based missiles can be a viable component of our retaliatory forces in the future." He called for a flat prohibition on funds for the Minuteman procurement program.

There's no mistaking Sen. ——'s intent, for he emphasized that he favors "phasing out" the Minuteman. Hopefully, the meaning of this statement will not be lost on the American public. The Minuteman missiles are an absolutely indispensable element in the nation's defense against surprise Soviet nuclear attack on the United States. If the Minuteman force were eliminated, the American people would be naked to direct and disastrous destruction at the hands of the men in the Kremlin.

That a member of the U.S. Senate would make such an appalling proposal is a frightening revelation of the lengths to which the anti-preparedness bloc is prepared to go. It would almost seem that some members of this bloc have concluded that the struggle against the Soviet empire is hopeless and, secretly, are prepared to make the American people adjust and accommodate themselves to Soviet domination.

The —— statement plainly indicates that the pressure is on for unilateral disarmament by the United States—a one-sided abandonment of nuclear defenses which would leave the United States weak and ultimately helpless. It is hard to believe that the American people approve of unilateral disarmament or accept the idea of a Soviet victory in the cold war. Yet that is the direction in which Sen. —— and other disarmers and defeatists are pushing the United States. The American people must make their voices heard. They must support national defense programs if the Munich men of our time are not to triumph. (Anthony Harrigan, Managing Editor.)

BREWSTER AGAINST TIDE IN TWO WARS

HON. WILLIAM L. HUNGATE

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. HUNGATE. Mr. Speaker, I am sure the following article will be of interest to many:

[From the Washington (D.C.) Post, May 17, 1970]

BREWSTER AGAINST TIDE IN TWO WARS

(By J. R. Wiggins)

(NOTE.—The writer is the retired editor of The Washington Post and now publisher of the Ellsworth, Maine, American.)

Kingman Brewster, the president of Yale University, went to Washington last week to persuade Congress to get the United States out of the war in Southeast Asia.

Kingman Brewster, chairman of the Yale chapter of the America First Committee, went to Washington in February 1941, to persuade Congress to keep the United States out of war in Europe by defeating Lend-Lease aid to Britain (the Defense Aid Act of 1941).

Between these two Brewster visits to Washington lie nearly three decades of an era of American internationalism marked by Roosevelt's ingenious Lend-Lease program, by World War II, by the North Atlantic Pact, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the Truman Doctrine, the construction of the United Nations, the Southeast Asia Treaty Organization, the armed intervention in Lebanon, the defense of the Congo, the formation of Israel, the Korean war, the foreign aid program, the support of South Vietnam and a host of other acts and measures of American intervention.

Under five Presidents—Roosevelt, Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy and Johnson—the United States used its power in behalf of small nations threatened by Communist aggression. It acted with others when possible. It acted alone when necessary. It used diplomatic means when feasible. It used military means when unavoidable.

The tide of internationalism was rising in America when Brewster went to Washington in 1941. He spoke for a failing cause. He claimed then to speak for the young; he does now. The rhetoric is very similar. These few paragraphs from his 1941 testimony against Lend-Lease, before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, are illustrative:

"I assume that I have been invited here to present and explain the point of view of those many young citizens who oppose active official participation in the war abroad, especially as it is implied in the measure which you are considering.

"Although we are interested in today, quite naturally we young citizens are mainly concerned with the kind of world which we shall inherit, and more particularly the kind of America which you will hand down to us. If we are called upon as soldiers today, we shall, of course, willingly carry out the decisions and commands of those in authority. But we are deeply concerned with the kind of America that we shall live in as citizens tomorrow.

"We are willing, we are eager to give our lives and our deaths, if need be, in the service of the nation. But we do insist that those lives or those deaths be not wasted. I wish to express my gratitude to this committee for inviting one member of our generation to record his opinion at a time when the course of America's destiny for years to come is being determined.

"Fundamentally, we believe that the peace of this hemisphere has more to offer the world of tomorrow than any possible outcome of a devastating transoceanic war.

"This position is based upon the assumption that by adequate preparation on our

part, the Americas cannot be successfully invaded from across the ocean. For all the attempts of certain people to make it look otherwise, this assumption does not rest on any faith in the word of the dictators. It springs, rather from a faith in ourselves.

"If a transatlantic war is to be waged, we would rather make the enemy cross the water to try to land. We cannot understand the logic of those who say we are not strong enough to hold any enemy from our own shores, yet say that we can wipe the strongest military power in the world off the face of Europe—and all without sending a single American soldier abroad."

". . . one thing is common to the great majority if not all people of my age. We are resentful of the deceit and subterfuge which have characterized the politics of foreign policy. We have not been moved by, rather we have been impatient with, the name-calling and accusation technique. Perhaps that is why we have listened to Col. Lindbergh whether we agree with him or not, and have admired his courage and straightforwardness.

"We resent the unwillingness of certain people to be honest and square with the public. We have resented the use of glib phrases just because they sound well even though they are loaded with dynamite which may determine our future. We resent the effort to hide from the American people tomorrow's consequences of what we do today."

". . . We cannot hope to proceed deliberately and proudly in a manner which will command respect and sacrifice of a whole generation until this decision has been made openly and freely. I speak for those young citizens who have decided in favor of American peace and sovereignty. Having made that decision, we are unalterably opposed to the measure under consideration . . ."

American involvement in World War II was only a few months away, but Kingman Brewster had strong support in the Senate Foreign Relations Committee from Sens. Johnson, Shipstead, Clark, LaFollette and others. Nevertheless, Congress approved the Defense Aid Act of 1941.

UNKNOWN ALTERNATIVES

History, as Lord Acton noted, does not disclose its alternatives. No one can know what would have happened if the United States had withheld aid to Britain and avoided involvement in World War II. The Nazi colossus might still be astride Europe, reveling in the sway of the Third Reich from Norway to Italy, from Spain to Siberia. A European dark age might still prevail over the whole continent. The leaders of European intellectual life might still be in concentration camps or rotting in unmarked graves.

The United States might have developed the defensive system that Brewster advocated. The Americas might have become the bastion of freedom he foresaw, living in a hostile Nazi-dominated world. They might already have fallen prey to Nazism. They might have embraced a species of fascism themselves in order to make an adequate defense against totalitarian foes.

Or the Nazi system, by now, might have fallen of its own weight of evil and wickedness, at some colossal cost in terms of lives of civilized people and the culture that had existed for thousands of years in all of Europe. Who can say?

The United States did not accept the advice of the young Yale student who, in 1941, spoke so eloquently for his generation—and so accurately of the probable military involvement that would flow from aiding England.

Now he is back in Washington with more advice for Congress. This time it is the advice that Congress should not give military aid to countries in Southeast Asia, besieged by communism. He is sure, once more, that the contest does not involve vital American interests worthy of the risks. But this time, he speaks at what may be the close, instead of at the beginning, of America's era of internationalism.

There probably is more likelihod that he will be heard favorably. If he is heard and if his views are acted upon, the nation may come as near as a nation can to discovering the alternatives to its 1941 decisions. At least it will find out the consequences of withdrawal in Asia, and be better able to judge what might have been the consequences of withdrawal from Europe in 1941.

Then, the end of the age of American internationalism will have arrived and much, but certainly not all, that was done from 1941 to 1970 may be undone. The country will have an opportunity to accommodate itself to another version of the "fortress America" doctrine that Brewster advocated in 1941.

This is not to say that Brewster was an important or decisive figure in 1941, or that he is an important or decisive figure now. But his two appearances in Washington may be like bookmarks at the beginning and at the end of the international epoch in American history.

Perhaps the American world would have been able to adapt to the Nazi administration of Europe, and perhaps it will be able to accommodate to the Communist domination of Asia. There is no proof that the decision to accept Nazism in Europe would have been fatal for the United States, and no proof that the decisions to accept communism in Asia will be fatal to the United States. Just as millions of Europeans would have faced a melancholy future if the decision of 1941 had been different, so will millions of Asians face a melancholy future now if the decision is to withdraw American power.

What it will mean for the United States challenges prediction. No doubt the country will experience a sensation of relief at the termination of the sacrifice, the burdens and the glories of the age of internationalism. What happens after that will depend partly on what forces in the world assume the role that America abandons, and what role those forces are willing to concede to the lesser and littler America that survives.

ARTICLE FROM THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

HON. TOM S. GETTYS

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. GETTYS. Mr. Speaker, the Wall Street Journal of May 8 carried an interesting and informative article reporting the response of the Financial Executive's Institute to a draft proposal of the Accounting Principles Board. The article points out that the highly respected FEI found that "inconsistency and extremisms" would result if the proposals involving "pooling of interest" in accounting treatment of mergers were adopted. A basic contradiction is found between the Accounting Principles Board's endorsement of pooling in principle and its proposals, which would eliminate virtually all poolings of interest.

Because of the very real impact which such a provision could have on our economy, this entire matter appears to deserve a good deal more study. Certainly, the FEI report cited in the article is a step in the right direction of such study. I hope that this study alerts the Accounting Principles Board and the Securities and Exchange Commission to the dangers of precipitate action in this area.

I submit the article from the Wall Street Journal to be included in the RECORD:

PROPOSED STIFFER ACCOUNTING RULES SEEN ELIMINATING ALMOST ALL POOLINGS OF INTEREST

NEW YORK.—A leading group of corporate financial executives predicted that a proposed set of stiffer accounting rules would eliminate "virtually all" poolings of interest, the most popular method of accounting for business mergers in recent years.

The Financial Executives Institute, which includes the ranking financial officers of about 3,000 companies, charged that the accounting profession's top rule-making body, the Accounting Principles Board, "contradicts itself" by endorsing pooling in principle, but attaches restrictions that would eliminate "more than 95%" of all poolings.

In March the principles board circulated for public comment an "exposure draft" of new accounting rules for mergers. That draft stopped short of banning poolings completely—as some board members had urged—but among other curbs, it proposed that neither party to a pooling be more than three times the size of its merger partner.

The board's proposals have been widely opposed by businesses and in some accounting circles. Much of the opposition has focused on the three-to-one size test, generally regarded as the easiest point of compromise. Some critics have urged a nine-to-one ratio, but the Financial Executives Institute has characterized any size test as arbitrary.

For purposes of the ratio, a company's size is measured by how large a part of the surviving concern the company's former stockholders end up owning. Thus, if Company A, with three million shares outstanding before a merger, issues an additional one million shares to acquire Company B, the size test is met: Company B's former holders have one million shares, and Company A's original holders have three million.

REITERATES "STRONG OPPOSITION"

The institute offered its comments in a letter to the accounting board reiterating "strong opposition" to the proposals. The institute said its estimate of how the size test would curtail poolings was based on a retabulation of a 1969 survey of member companies. That survey indicated that even a nine-to-one size test would eliminate more than 80% of all poolings, it said.

Officials of the institute contended that the accounting board had proposed its draft without any empirical study of the practical impact of the proposals. The institute asked that the board go no further without such a study.

The board is scheduled to consider the exposure draft at its meeting in late June. A two-thirds vote of the 18-member board is required to adopt the draft as a formal opinion binding on the nation's accountants.

Under existing rules, a pooling treats two merged companies as though they were always combined. The two concerns not only combine current results, but also restate past figures to reflect the merger. The acquiring company carries its newly acquired assets at the values given them on the old company's books, no matter how unrealistic. In addition, the acquiring company isn't required to amortize—deduct from future earnings—any excess it paid for a concern over the book value of its assets.

If a merger isn't a pooling, it must be accounted for as a "purchase." Under that method, according to the exposure draft, "all

identifiable assets acquired . . . should be recorded at their fair values" when acquired regardless of the values they were given on the old concern's books.

FUNDAMENTAL ACCOUNTING CHANGE

According to the institute, this recourse to the "fair-value" method amounts to a fundamental accounting change transcending the merger issue. It shouldn't "be rushed into without considerable testing and probing," the institute said.

Under the exposure draft, "the difference between the cost of the acquired company and the sum of the fair values of the identifiable assets acquired less liabilities should be recorded as good will." The exposure draft stipulates that such good will, and all other acquired intangible assets, be charged against income over 40 years or less.

This mandatory write-off proposal also has aroused considerable opposition, including that of the institute.

As an alternative to the exposure draft, the institute urges that poolings be limited to mergers effected by the exchange of newly issued voting stock for voting stock and meeting certain other conditions. It also has urged more detailed disclosure of how poolings affect the earnings of the post-merger company.

The institute contends that these steps would deal with the alleged abuses of poolings "more severely than the exposure draft," but without "inconsistency and extremisms."

CONGRESSMAN PETE McCLOSKEY REPORTS TO YOU

HON. PAUL N. McCLOSKEY, JR.

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. McCLOSKEY. Mr. Speaker, since being elected to the 90th Congress, I have tried to send a newsletter to my constituents at least once a year and to submit a questionnaire on major issues. My newsletter of May 1970 is herewith submitted for the RECORD:

CONGRESSMAN PETE McCLOSKEY REPORTS TO YOU

MAY 1970.

DEAR CONSTITUENT: These are crucial times. During the next several weeks the Congress faces a number of critical issues, particularly with respect to war and peace in Southeast Asia and in re-ordering our national spending priorities.

We do this primarily through the appropriation process, a series of bills appropriating money for each agency of the government.

So that you may paticipate in this process of representative government, I have included a questionnaire on the back page of this newsletter, which I hope you will fill out and return, indicating what areas of spending should be cut in your judgment and what should be increased.

This year, total government revenues will be approximately $200 billion, with over $75 billion to be spent for defense, including an estimated $23 billion in Viet Nam. On the last page, I have set forth what we spent this year, the President's budget proposal for next year, and the critical areas where Congress must soon decide whether to spend more or less money.

Last year, we voted more money than requested in *social security* ($1.1 billion), *water pollution* ($586 million), and in *aid to education* ($313 million). This year, the critical areas include Viet Nam, Cambodia and Laos, the ABM, postal pay and rates, the SST, rapid transit, and new environmental initiatives.

I hope you will take the time to let me know of *your* priorities of spending by completing the questionnaire on the back page of this newsletter.

Respectfully,

PETE McCLOSKEY.

WORK AND ACTION IN WASHINGTON

EFFORTS TO SPEED DISENGAGEMENT IN VIET NAM

The decision to send American troops into Cambodia has given sharp focus to the question of congressional authority and responsibilities in Southeast Asia.

Congress in effect delegated its power to declare war to the President under the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution of July, 1964. President Johnson in his capacity as Commander-in-Chief, used this authority to increase our troops in Viet Nam from 20,000 to 549,000, as well as to conduct an air and ground war in Laos which was not publicly disclosed until a few weeks ago. Now U.S. troops have been sent into Cambodia, a country whose neutrality and sovereignty we have recognized since the Geneva Accords of 1954. Our troop commanders have received orders to burn and destroy Cambodian villages as well as North Vietnamese troop sanctuaries.

For some months, I have urged that the Congress should face up to *its* Constitutional responsibilities to limit the Viet Nam war spending, not as an attempt to undercut the President's conduct of the war, but to specify clearly the spending priorities within which he is free to conduct foreign policy. After 8 years—Congress has still not assumed its obligation to decide when and to what degree the U.S. should engage in war—as specified in the Constitution:

"Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution: Congress shall have power . . . to declare war . . . to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare . . to raise and support Armies, but *no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than Two years. . . ."*

Alexander Hamilton, in the *Federalist Papers,* arguing for ratification of the Constitution: "The legislature . . . obliged to this provision, once *at least* in every two years, to deliberate upon the propriety of keeping a military force on foot; and to declare their sense of the matter, by a formal vote in the face of their constituents. *They are not at liberty to vest in the executive department permanent funds for the support of an army, if they were even incautious enough to be willing to repose in it so improper a confidence."*

I have therefore sponsored and pushed for three specific congressional actions:

1. Repeal of the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution, under which Congress in 1964 gave the power to the President to repel "aggression" in Southeast Asia.

2. Amendment of the 1971 Military Procurement bill (now before us) to deny the use of *any* military equipment and assistance in Cambodia. This would not be effective until the start of the fiscal year (July 1, 1970), and thus would not interfere with the President's announced intention of withdrawal from Cambodia prior to June 30.

3. Limiting expenditures in the FY 1971 Defense Appropriation Bill (expected to reach the floor in June), to provide only those funds required for the orderly withdrawal of all combat and support troops from Viet Nam and Laos by June 30, 1971.

REFORMING CONGRESS—TARGET FOR OVERHAUL—

SENIORITY, SECRECY, AND SENILITY

Several months ago, I wrote Republican National Chairman Rog Morton and Minority Leader Gerry Ford urging that we abandon the historic seniority system which has resulted in an average age of 74 for our ten most powerful committee chairmen, and three chairmen who are over 80.

Ford appointed 19 Members, including myself, to a Republican task force to recommend an alternative system of selection. We expect to agree shortly on a new method of selecting our leaders on ability rather than survival. The Democrats subsequently appointed a similar task force, and at long last, real congressional reform appears possible. If not, I suspect the voters will appropriately and properly change the makeup of Congress in November.

ON THE HOMEFRONT

AN INDIVIDUAL CITIZEN CAN AFFECT THE LAW-MAKING PROCESS

Those who sometimes wonder whether it is worthwhile to write a Congressman may take some heart from the following story.

At a Constituent Day at Huddart Park on Saturday, Dec. 5, 1969, I was approached by Dr. Sid Liebes of Atherton with the suggestion that the Administration's pending population study commission bill be amended. Dr. Liebes felt that the powers of the commission should be broadened to include study of the impact of population growth on the environment and also appropriate means for slowing down population growth. He handed me a copy of the bill on which he had penciled in the suggested additions. They seemed reasonable, and I agreed to do what I could.

On returning to Washington the next day, I raised the question with the subcommittee chairman handling the bill, Congressman John Blatnik of Minnesota. John advised that the seven members of the subcommittee had already considered and rejected the suggested amendments, but that if I would write each of them a letter setting forth the reasons for the change, the subcommittee would reconsider them the next morning during the final drafting of the bill.

I hand-carried a letter to each member of the subcommittee that afternoon. The three Republican members and several Democrats agreed to the amendments. The full committee likewise agreed, and the bill, as amended, was passed by the House on February 18, 1970.

The Senate had previously passed the original bill, but in conference, the Senate conferees agreed to the House amendments, and on March 16, 1970, less than four months after Dr. Liebes approached his Congressman, the President signed his suggestions into law, specifically saying that he was "pleased with the amendments added by the House."

EARTH DAY, 1970

The April 22nd "Earth Day" which Senator Nelson and I co-sponsored resulted in the participation of over 2,000 colleges and 12,000 high schools throughout the United States, as well as thousands of elementary schools.

Congress took a day off in the middle of the week, and nearly every congressman returned to his district for a day of listening, rather than lecturing, to students, scientists and community leaders.

The result was a tremendous input of thoughtful suggestions on new environmental initiatives. I received several thousand letters from San Mateo County students and have inserted in the Congressional Record those which offered the most specific, helpful and concrete suggestions.

The writers of those letters are listed below:

Linda DeBusk, San Mateo; Susan Thompson and Sheryl Reinke, San Mateo; Mark Schlosser and Jim Trumbull, Menlo Park; Jean Bullis, San Bruno; Michael Souza, Burlingame; Denise Mercier, South San Francisco; Augustus Cacciotti, Belmont; Sharon Hammon, South San Francisco; Mark

Balestra, Atherton; Jack Saum, Millbrae; Gayle Stewart, Pacifica; Susan Paar, Menlo Park; Robbie Peffer, San Bruno; Wayne Stowell, Redwood City; Pete Arnstein, Atherton; Karen Foster, Atherton; Cathy Glahn, Redwood City; Kathleen Coleman, Woodside; Becky Pecchenino, Woodside; Theodore C. Alway, Portola Valley; Kathy Hubbell, Menlo Park; Brian Jaffe, Portola Valley.

The best letters from classes came from: Borel Middle School, Miss Bauderer's English classes, Menlo Park; Alta Loma Junior High School, South San Francisco; Portola Valley Intermediate School, Portola Valley; La Entrada School, Menlo Park; Sequoia Union High School, Redwood City.

CONGRESSMAN PETE MCCLOSKEY ASKS YOUR OPINION ON THE ISSUES

MAKE YOUR OPINION COUNT—JUST TEAR OFF THIS PAGE, FOLD, AFFIX STAMP AND MAIL

Questionnaire

1. Should Congress vote to rescind the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution?

2. Should Congress vote to limit funding of the Viet Nam War so that all troops must be withdrawn by June 30, 1971?

3. Should Congress vote to lower the voting age to 18?

4. Should Congress discard the seniority system?

5. Should a constitutional amendment be adopted requiring retirement of Congressmen and Supreme Court judges at age 70?

Spending priorities

The following table gives the federal appropriations during fiscal year 1970, and also the proposed 1971 budget (commencing June 30, 1970), which Congress is now considering. Please indicate in which areas you think we should spend more or less than the Administration proposal.

Keep in mind we are dealing with a budget of approximately $200 billion—the limit of taxpayers' dollars. If you increase some programs, you should decrease others or be willing to increase the national debt and/or taxes.

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	1970 appropriation	1971 budget proposal	Approximate percent of budget[1]	We should spend— More	Less	Same
Defense Department	$74,700	$72,200	36	□	□	□
Vietnam war (estimated)	23,000	17,000	9	□	□	□
ABM	900	1,500	.8	□	□	□
Health, Education, and Welfare	57,600	64,800	33	□	□	□
Social security and income maintenance	42,800	47,700	24	□	□	□
Education	2,500	2,500	1.2	□	□	□
National Institutes of Health	1,400	1,500	.8	□	□	□
Cancer research	187	202	.1	□	□	□
Air pollution research	96	106	.05	□	□	□
Treasury Department	19,100	19,100	10	□	□	□
Interest on national debt	17,800	17,800	9	□	□	□
Department of Transportation	7,800	11,100	6	□	□	□
Urban mass transit	177	3,100	1.5	□	□	□
SST	85	290	.15	□	□	□
Veterans' Administration	8,400	9,000	5	□	□	□
Department of Agriculture	8,400	8,300	4	□	□	□
Department of Labor	4,900	5,800	3	□	□	□
Department of Housing and Urban Development	2,600	3,000	1.5	□	□	□

[Dollar amounts in millions]

	1970 appropriation	1971 budget proposal	Approximate percent of budget[1]	We should spend— More	Less	Same
Housing assistance	$1,600	$1,800	1	□	□	□
Open space funds	75	75	.03	□	□	□
NASA	3,700	3,300	1.8	□	□	□
Manned flight exploration	2,300	1,800	1	□	□	□
Atomic Energy Commission	2,200	2,400	1.2	□	□	□
Post Office Department	1,400	583	.3	□	□	□
Department of Justice	848	1,100	.5	□	□	□
Law enforcement assistance	268	480	.2	□	□	□
Foreign aid	1,800	2,300	1	□	□	□
OEO	1,900	1,500	.8	□	□	□
Peace Corps	99	99	.05	□	□	□
Department of Interior	1,800	2,300	1.2	□	□	□
Water quality	886	901	.5	□	□	□
Recreation resources	432	597	.3	□	□	□
National parks	149	134	.1	□	□	□
National Park Service	149	134	.06	□	□	□
Judiciary	127	132	.06	□	□	□
Congress	354	391	.2	□	□	□
Executive Office of the President	38	46	.02	□	□	□

[1] This budget is not 100 percent complete. Only the most important expenditures considered.

GEN. RONALD BROCK HONORED AT ERIE COUNTY AFFAIR

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, the annual Erie County Armed Forces Week luncheon this year paid special honor to Lt. Gen. Ronald C. Brock, retired, a veteran of New York's National Guard who served his country well in World War II.

It was very fitting that this year's event should pay special honor to General Brock, who completed more than 40 years of military service prior to his retirement.

In advance of the Buffalo affair for General Brock, a fine tribute to him was published in the Buffalo, N.Y., Courier-Express in a column written by Anne McIlhenney Matthews.

Mrs. Matthews knows well of the general from her own Army service in World War II as an officer in the Women's Army Corps. She was one of four women selected from among 3,000 western New York applicants in 1942 to be in the first officer training class of 400.

Mrs. Matthews was one of the first six WAC's sent overseas during the war, being assigned first to Africa. During her service, she rose in rank to major.

Following is the text of Mrs. Matthews' column:

NEW HONORS AWAIT GEN. BROCK

(By Anne McIlhenney Matthews)

There could be no better recipient of honors on Armed Forces Day in Buffalo than Lt. Gen. Ronald C. Brock (Ret.). He was Buffalo's only general in World War II and has a chest full of "fruit salad" to prove that he merited the promotion "the hard way"!

I well remember the October midnight that I toured the 106th Armory with him, softly whispering not to wake the soldiers lining the corridors in sleeping bags, and getting material to write about the coming dawn when the regiment would fade out of Buffalo en route to active duty in the South Pacific. He was a colonel then.

Three years later in Weisbaden when my sergeant greeted me daily with a report that a "Gen. Brock" was calling me, I tiredly responded that the only Gen. Brock I knew was a hotel in Niagara Falls! Since I was then mixed up with a lot of chores for a lot of generals there, including one with five stars named Eisenhower, I didn't return the call.

The sergeant was regular Army and was therefore horrified subsequently when I was "in" when the general called and, after delighted identification, I said: "When in . . . did you get to be a general!" That, he told me frigidly, was no way to talk to a higher rank.

RECALLS "COMING HOME" PARADE

We both returned from the war at the same time and it was a thrilling privilege to ride with "Ronnie" in the Jeep at the head of the Main St. parade for returnees and with the three stars of Gen. Jimmy Doolittle in second place!

Upon moving to Buffalo, Brock started his long and distinguished military career by enlisting on May 15, 1917, in the 106th Field Artillery Regiment, New York National Guard, at Buffalo, N.Y. Inducted into federal service as a sergeant, Gen. Brock served throughout World War I with the 106th Field Artillery Regiment, of New York's 27th Infantry Division. In the American Expeditionary Force in Europe, he participated in four major actions, St. Mihiel, Meuse-Argonne, Verdun and the Somme Offensive, returning to the United States in 1919.

Brock was commissioned a first lieutenant, NYNG, in April, 1921, and assigned to the 106th Field Artillery Regiment, where he played an active part in the reorganization of the regiment during the post World War I period.

During the years between World Wars, Brock held several command assignments and was progressively promoted through the commissioned grades until he achieved the rank of colonel in 1940, assigned to command the 106th Field Artillery Regiment here.

ACTIVATED IN 1940

Gen. Brock was ordered into federal service with the 106th Field Artillery Regiment on Oct. 15, 1940, and trained initially at Ft. McClellan, Ala. Immediately following the attack on Pearl Harbor, the 27th Infantry (New York) Division was alerted and moved to locations in Southern California and, shortly thereafter, to Hawaii where the division was responsible for the defenses of the Hawaiian Islands. Gen. Brock was at this time the commanding officer (colonel) of the 225th Field Artillery Regiment.

He was detached from this Command in December, 1942, and upon his return to the United States was promoted to brigadier general on March 12, 1943. This was a most important milestone in his military career, since he was the only New York National Guard officer promoted to general officer rank while on active duty during World War II.

Gen. Brock was assigned as division artillery commander of the 65th Infantry Division. He prepared his units for combat at various training posts in the United States and at the Artillery School, Ft. Sill, Okla

IN CHARGE SOUTH OF LINZ

The 65th Division embarked for the European Theater in December, 1944 and, as a part of Gen. Patton's Third Army, participated in Ardennes-Alsace and Central Europe campaigns. At the conclusion of hostilities, the 65th Division had advanced to the Inn River, south of Linz, Austria, where Gen. Brock assumed command of the security forces of the area south of Linz, to the Danube River.

After the deactivation of the 65th Infantry Division on Aug. 30, 1945, Gen. Brock was detailed to SHAEF HQ. by the War Dept. as military adviser to the "Schuster Commission," with the mission of interviewing and documenting the careers of high Nazi officials and German generals. Completing this assignment in October, 1945, Gen. Brock was returned to the United States and released from active duty in 1946, and rejoined his original (27th N.Y.) division in the postwar reorganization phase.

Gen. Brock was promoted to major general in June, 1948, and under his leadership the 27th Infantry Division reached its highest peak in strength and training efficiency. In recognition of its outstanding record, the 27th Infantry Division was selected in 1955 to be converted to an armored division.

CHANGED TO ARMORED UNIT

Gen. Brock accepted the challenge and, in three years, the 27th Armored Division, New York National Guard, was recognized as the largest and one of the best trained armored divisions in the National Guard of the United States. In February, 1957, Gov. Averell Harriman appointed Gen. Brock his chief of staff and commanding general of the New York Army National Guard.

In this position he commanded the 36,000 troops of the state military forces: the New York Army and Air National Guards, New York Naval Militia and the N.Y. Guard, which was organized as a reserve military force should the New York Army National Guard be called into federal service.

Gen. Brock in March, 1957, was designated chairman of the General Staff Committee on National Guard and Army Reserve Policy in Washington by Wilber Brucker, secretary of the Army. On Dec. 1, 1958, Gen. Brock was elected president of the New York Society of Military and Naval Officers of World Wars, one of the most distinguished military societies in the United States.

Gen. Brock, upon his retirement, concluded more than 40 years of distinguished military service to his state and nation.

The Armed Forces Day luncheon will be held on Thursday in the Connecticut St. Armory. County Executive B. John Tutuska, lieutenant colonel in the U.S. Army Reserve, is chairman.

DR. EDWARD C. ROZANSKI

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, in observance of the Polish Constitution of May 3, the distinguished president of the Illinois Division of the Polish American Congress, Dr. Edward C. Rozanski, delivered an address in Cleveland, Ohio. Dr. Rozanski is an outstanding civic and professional leader and a recognized authority on Polish history. I insert in the RECORD a condensed version of his address in Cleveland because of its effective historical emphasis.

ADDRESS BY DR. EDWARD C. ROZANSKI

The Constitution of the Third of May of the Kingdom of Poland, proclaimed in the year 1791, was a unique and noble document not only in the annals of Poland, but also in European history.

In many respects this document truthfully belongs to the great moments of Western civilization and culture. Although it is the essence of Polish political and civic thought, it is at the same time a new credo of citizenship and civil awareness of the Western European. An awareness nurtured, in greater measure, in Christian knowledge and tradition which embraced the great Greek-Roman humanism; then proceeded, throughout the centuries, to develop and perfect these currents of progressive thoughts.

When we look at the Constitution of the Third of May from the overall European point of view, we become aware that this great act of Malachowski, Kollataj, Staszyc, Krasinski, Niemcewicz, Potocki and other great sons of Poland, is in fact a democratic document proclaiming freedom, justice based on a responsible citizenry respecting each country and its people.

In the era of European absolutism, the 3rd of May Constitution was in fact a great revolutionary document strongly reminiscent of America's Constitution and Bill of Rights.

Yet this great revolutionary document, the Constitution of May 3rd was born without bloodshed, born of patriotism and love of country.

As a revolutionary document, the Constitution of May 3rd differs from many other revolutionary decrees. The French Revolution and even the Uprising of 1848 had for its purpose the curbing of the tyrannical powers of the monarchies, whereas the Constitution of May 3rd did not seek greater freedom for the people. Just the opposite—since freedom was already rampant, it sought to instill the understanding of civic obligations. It strengthened the powers of the king and his ministers, it limited the powers of the diet or senate giving it rules of conduct and procedure. This new approach to national problems is based primarily on the deep sense of civic obligation to the country.

Thus the Constitution of May 3rd, though a great revolutionary document, derives its strength and influence from the timeless fountainheads of the rebirth of Polish nationalism.

This is the great heritage of Polonia. Into the American way of life we have added these treasures of Polish political and civic thought.

In the broad historical panoply of the Polish nation, the Constitution of May 3rd did not occur spontaneously, on the spur of the moment, or by the immediate dictates of events.

It is, strictly speaking, the essence of Polish political thought the seeds of which were sown by Casimir the Great in the "Statutes of Wyslica." With unbelievable speed the Polish monarchy embraced democratic delineations. During the Jagiellonians, the Polish Diet already was limiting the powers of the king.

Verily, in the Polish monarchial democracy of the Piasts, Jagiellons and the elective kings, it was the democratic nobility that gave out the rights that went with noble titles. Yet taking into account the feudal system of Europe at that time and remembering that in England less than 6 percent of the people were favored with the rights and privileges of their nobility, in Poland over 14 percent were so endowed. Thus the Polish monarchial democracy had much greater praticipation than England, regarded to this day as the "mother of the world's parliaments."

The Constitution of May 3rd broadened the ranks of noble citizenry by including the townspeople. The peasant and serf became wards of the State.

Since the Constitution of May 3rd was the essence of Polish political thought—the 3rd of May observances give us the opportunity and the obligation of better understanding this political thought. It being the heritage of Polish people, it becomes our heritage as Americans of Polish descent.

It seems incredible that Polish historians have not properly emphasized and evaluated this masterpiece of Polish political thought.

When Polish history is studied in that light we suddenly begin to see new interpretations.

In the annals of political thought the greatest Polish exponents of the XV and XVI centuries were Paul Wlodkowic and Bishop Warzyniec Grzymala Goslicki.

Little do we know of these learned treatises. In fact too little mention is made of them in historical texts.

Yet Paul Wlodkowic, rector of the Jagiellonian University and personal ambassador of King Wladyslaw Jagiello to the Council of Constance, is in fact the father of international law.

While the Holy Roman Empire and other Christian nations were converting by fire, sword and massacre—Wlodkowic argued mightily at the Council, convincing the other Christian nations that the pagans also have human rights and should be sheltered from harm by the Papal throne.

This great Pole of the XV century taught that war only has justification when it leads to a just peace.

Although Wlodkowic did not name the guilty, yet by inference his criticism did not spare neither the Germans, the Holy Roman Empire or the Pope.

It is one of the most unusual events of European history that the conclave at Constance adopted and embraced the Wlodkowic thesis and philosophy.

Bishop Wawrzyniec Grzymala Goslicki was a contemporary of Andrew Frycz Modrzewski, Modrzewski's works were fairly well known in Poland since they dealt with the problems and "Corrections of the Commonwealth."

However, the thinking of Goslicki also embraced the people as a whole. Regrettably these were not remembered.

Yet Goslicki, a hundred and fifty years before the Declaration Independence, wrote and advocated what "Thomas Jefferson so brilliantly worded in his preamble to the Declaration"—"that the People have the right to take whatever steps are necessary to obtain freedom based on the privileges and laws of all the citizenry."

French, English and American historians of constitutional reform agree that Goslicki's thoughts had a profound influence—particularly his Latin treatise "De Optimo Senatore" and in two English translations "The Excellent Senator" and "The Accomplished Senator."

This acknowledgement to Goslicki can only be found in limited educational texts not readily accessible. Polish bibliography has neglected Goslicki as they had Wlodkowic.

Thus in the Constitution of May 3rd Observances we should not only pay tribute to is originators, but to the great predecessors of the past.

The Constitution of May 3rd is our great national heritage. In American affairs we can say that it is our great worldly and enduring ethnic heritage as Americans of Polish descent.

That we in the Polish American Congress are not a group threatening the freedom of these United States of America . . . That we as loyal citizens have made great contributions to his country . . . That it is no longer enough to raise the deeds of Kosciuszko and Pulaski . . . We wish to hear more. Tens of thousands of Polish names are now part of the history of this nation. We know of the

deeds of Krzyzanowski, Schoepf, Karge and Kalussowski—the talents of Modrzejewska, Stokowski, Rodzinski and thousands of educators, engineers and scientists like Ulam who have added their skills and knowledge to this land of the free.

Our heritage imposes upon us the sacred duty of serving the cause of our motherland and to strive that Poland may become truly free with borders on the Oder and Nysse on the West, and according to the Treaty of Ryga, in the East. We must also obligate ourselves to help our cousins across the seas economically as well as morally, to withstand their opposition to communism.

Maria Konopnicka said: "We need not tears, but strength!"

We—you and I, are that strength!

TEACHER OF THE YEAR HONORED

HON. CATHERINE MAY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mrs. MAY. Mr. Speaker, it pleased me very much to be informed by the White House this afternoon that Mr. Johnnie T. Dennis, a teacher of physics, math analysis, and the physics department head at Walla Walla High School at Walla Walla, Wash., had been selected by the President to serve on the Commission on Presidential Scholars.

The week has been a big one for Mr. Dennis and his family, because he is in our Capital City after being elected National Teacher of the Year for 1970. The award to Mr. Dennis, who I am proud to call a constituent, was presented by Mrs. Patricia Nixon at a ceremony at the White House on Tuesday of this week.

The National Teacher of the Year program, now in its 19th year, is sponsored annually by Look magazine and the Council of Chief State School Officers in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Dennis was chosen for the honor by a committee of eminent educators for his superior ability to inspire a love of learning and intellectual curiosity in students of varying background and skills. His selection symbolizes the importance of education and the accomplishments of gifted teachers everywhere.

It was my very distinct pleasure to participate in a reception and press conference for Mr. Dennis and his family, arranged by Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, and held in the New Senate Office Building on Tuesday, May 19. Members of the congressional delegation from the State of Washington were joined by a number of dignitaries and friends in this reception, and under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, a transcript of the proceedings follows:

RECEPTION AND PRESS CONFERENCE FOR THE 1970 NATIONAL TEACHER OF THE YEAR

Senator MAGNUSON. This is a very happy occasion, particularly for the Senator from Washington, because the recipient of this award happens to come from not only my state, but a favorite part of my state: Walla Walla. We have here with us today Dr. James Allen, Commissioner of Education, and he and I are a little bit weary, I'll say to you people in the education field. We have just finished the Education Bill, the appropriation, and we hope to get up in the Senate this week if we can get in between the filibuster that's going on. He and I thought we did mark up a pretty good bill; it's one that everybody can live with, but the main thing is we are going to get it down to the White House before the first of June so that you people will know a little bit what you're going to have to do in the coming year, and not get involved like we did last year when it went on and on and on for months.

Now, Dr. Don Dafoe is here also to honor the recipient, who is Executive Secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, and Mr. Jack Squires—where is he? oh, there you are—who represents Look magazine and also represents Mr. Attwood your Editor-in-Chief who is sponsoring a part of this program. And then also from the State of Washington Dr. Chester Babcock who represents State Superintendent Louis Bruno. I understand Dr. Babcock nominated Johnnie for this award, is that correct?

Dr. BABCOCK. State Superintendent Bruno made the nomination.

Senator MAGNUSON. And then we have, of course, Mrs. Dennis. Will you stand up so everybody can see you? There she is.

And her daughters, Deanna and Maureen. Are they both here? There they are. And two sons Charles and Kevin. There are two of them that look like Title I students to me. And then Johnnie's brother and his wife, Warrant Officer Joseph Dennis and Mrs. Dennis from Fort Meade. You're stationed over there, aren't you?

JOSEPH DENNIS. Yes, sir.

Senator MAGNUSON. All right. And then, as you know, the members of the Selection Committee who have screened 53 state teachers of the year who were candidates for the 1970 award, then they selected 5 finalists from those, and they then picked out our recipient here today, Johnnie T. Dennis. Now, are they here: The Selection Committee—stand up, those that are on the Selection Committee.

Thank you very much.

And then we have many other members representing the educational field. Now, I am going to ask Dr. Allen, if he will, to come up. We've got a little biography of Johnnie Dennis, and I think people would be glad if you would read that for us.

Congressman Meeds of my state (who just came in) does very able work over in the House in the education field. He's a member of the committee.

Dr. ALLEN. Thank you very much, Senator. Congressman Meeds I am pleased that you have included me and given me the honor to be included in these ceremonies. I want to say to the Senator that I never get weary of coming up and meeting with him and his committee when we are talking about more money for education; and as long as that can be possible I'll keep on coming, and I am always very pleased and very proud to have the opportunity to appear before him and his committee because of the deep interest he takes in the field of education.

I certainly want to extend my congratulations to Mr. Dennis on this recognition and high honor, of being the teacher of the year. And I congratulate the committee that selected him and the school system of Walla Walla where he has served so well. I am delighted to see his family here, and I just assume that the children have good excuses to be out of school today, but we welcome them here to Washington. And I extend also to you the welcome and congratulations of the Administration.

When we honor a teacher in this country, in any country, we honor the best among us. And we don't do enough, it seems to me, to recognize the great teaching force we have in this country, and the many, many fine teachers that daily serve millions of young people in our schools, in our colleges. So that I am delighted that the Council of the Chief State School Officers and Look magazine jointly sponsor each year this selection of Teacher of the Year, one whom we can honor, and in honoring him, honor the great profession of teaching and the wonderful school system that we have in this country.

The man we honor today is a man who not only teaches the disciplines of the academic world, which prepare our students to meet the challenges of making their livelihood, but also helps to equip them with the ability to grapple with the social environment in which they may exist in order to apply the formal knowledge they take with them from the classroom.

The son of a Mississippi sharecropper, Johnnie first moved to Walla Walla, the home of his wife Shirley, to attend Whitman College, receiving his B.A. degree in 1960. This was followed in 1965 by his M.S. degree in combined sciences which he earned at the University of Mississippi. For the past six summers, Johnnie has won National Science Foundation grants, being one of twelve high school science teachers in the nation chosen to participate in high energy physics research at the University of California Lawrence Radiation Laboratory during the past two years.

Johnnie's free time is spent narrowing the student-teacher gap, holing up with his children and with family projects in improving the quality of education in Washington state. This year, as we have indicated, he was also selected as the Washington Teacher of the Year. And, as I am sure the Senator would like for me to say, the Washington Congressional Delegation are proud to honor Johnnie.

Senator MAGNUSON. I was going to say that, but you can say it.

Dr. ALLEN. Well, I'll let you say it, and I'll let you carry on from here. I will just close by saying that it is an honor indeed for me to be here and to congratulate Johnnie and to congratulate all who had a part in his selection, and to wish you a good four days here in Washington. I look forward to seeing you at the White House later on this afternoon.

Thank you.

Senator MAGNUSON. Dr. Babcock was supposed to introduce Johnnie Dennis's family, but I took advantage of him and did it ahead of you. But we also have here Mrs. Dorothy Ann Dennis Wright, Johnnie's sister, and her husband, Dan Wright. We would like to see you.

Conrgessman Meeds, who plays an important part in the field of education, is a member of the House Committee on Education, is here and I want to ask him if he would like to not only honor our recipient here today but say a few words about the education and things of that kind.

Congressman MEEDS. Thank you, Senator Magnuson. Mr. Commissioner, Johnnie Dennis, other people involved in the selection, ladies and gentlemen. It is a pleasure for me to be here today and to participate in honoring Johnnie Dennis who has brought great prestige and honor to our state by winning this award.

We sometimes think that we in politics, Senators and Congressmen, think that we greatly influence what happens in the world and in America (and I am sure we do), but I think there is no one that influences what happens in America and the world more than a good teacher. Because of the depth of the relationship, the time the teacher can spend with a student, it seems to me that a teacher has, next to a parent, the best opportunity to enrich the life and enhance the livelihood of a student.

And so, in the final analysis, I am sure that good teachers are the ones that really make impressions upon young people's lives and we're greatly indebted to you, Johnnie, for not only winning this award but mostly for being a good teacher.

Senator MAGNUSON. Johnnie, as long as you come from the state, I am going to ask Dr. Babcock to say something here.

Dr. BABCOCK. Thank you, Senator Magnuson, Congressman Meeds, Mr. Commissioner. I think I need not say that we are extremely proud, Johnnie; we are also extremey proud, as I am sure the gentlemen are from our state, that this is the second occasion on which the nation's Teacher of the Year has come from the State of Wasington.

I was glad to hear Sentor Magnuson mention the children. Kevin, the older one, is a straight-A student from kindergarten, and he is now in junior high school, and he is here with a very guilty conscience because he was not just quite sure he should miss a week's school. But after conferences with his teachers, it was decided it would be all right. Kevin, we hope you have conquered that guilt complex which you brought with you.

We're very proud of this young teacher, this young man, because he represents, I think, the kind of leaders that our young people need today. And so I join all the rest of you in extending congratulations to Johnnie Dennis as the Teacher of the Year. Congratulations, Johnnie.

JOHNNIE DENNIS. Thank you.

Senator MAGNUSON. Now, Dr. Dafoe, do you want to make some introductions here of people in the national organizations who are here to honor Johnnie?

Dr. DAFOE. Well, I think, Senator, we will just let you proceed with the press conference pretty soon, and then at the end we will bring those people up. I would just like to make a comment. We have Jack Squires from Look—representing William Attwood as you mentioned. We are proud to be associated with Look magazine in this program which emphasizes teaching excellence. This is the nineteenth year; this is the tenth year that we have been associated with Look.

We think what it honors is the superior ability to inspire love of learning in children regardless of backgrounds or abilities. Johnnie Dennis possesses the attribute, and we honor him today as the symbol of what is right with American education.

Senator, we will let you proceed with the press conference; at the end we will call on these people representing the national organizations.

Senator MAGNUSON. Thank you. Now if we have forgotten anyone we will get at you later, but I think we all want to hear a little bit from the man we honor today. Again, we're all proud of your work; and I needn't emphasize, as Dr. Allen mentioned, the importance in this country in these times for the kind of teacher that you typify. It is so important your story will be widely told, but I am sure you have a few remarks to share with us today.

He says that he is a little nervous, but I doubt that.

Let us know how you feel about receiving this award, number one. And how happy we all are to have your family here and those who have worked with you and our own people from the state that have worked with you. And after that, some one may ask you a few questions, and I am sure you can field those. I will sit right behind you here in case you're short one, because I've been filled up with education the last two weeks here, three weeks. I think I can answer almost any question that Dr. Allen might put to me, or that I might put to him, and Dr. Babcock.

So, Johnnie, we're proud to have you here, and we want to welcome you.

(Applause.)

JOHNNIE T. DENNIS. Thank you, Senator. And it isn't every day, I think, that a fellow from what the magazines say is from Owl Hollow, Mississippi gets a chance to talk to such distinguished gentlemen and guests.

I am thankful for this opportunity to share with you some of my ideas, but first I want to express my personal appreciation to the Council of Chief State School Officers and to Look magazine for their concerted efforts in perpetuating this recognition program which focuses the attention of the nation on the policy side of education once each year by this symbolic award, the National Teacher of the Year.

I am sure the finalists in the awards program this year, Mrs. Roberta Alward from Alaska; Mr. James Braboy from South Carolina; Mrs. Trudy Plummer of Ohio, and Mr. Theodore Molitor of Minnesota, as well as the teachers of the year for 1970 from the other states and U.S. possessions, join me in saying thank you.

You might wonder what it is that labels a person to be given such an award. Well, I'm not quite sure. I'm just thrilled to death with it, but I can say that in my case it's not the result of pulling one's self up by his bootstraps. It is a combination of many things. I'd like to mention a few.

One is a concern for my relationship with my God. Two, a beautiful wife who is truly a helpmate and four lovely children who have been very patient with a father who finds himself working many evenings away from the family. Three, good teachers everywhere who have helped me during conferences throughout the United States through participation with them in National Science Foundation institutes, and then our local and state organization. Four, local and state administrators who have helped us develop a good working relationship, teachers with administrators. And five, a very important part: the interested citizens of the state and local community who provide suggestions and the funds to make the educational programs a reality.

As we respond to all of these positive factors, all teachers can share in this award as teachers of the year. I think the primary concern here, however, is that of the students in our classrooms and in particular mine. I will attempt to outline some of the general ideas that I use and try to reveal to you some of my philosophy and hope that it will stimulate specific questions from you so that I can be at my best when I am fielding questions as opposed to lecturing. This is just not my cup of tea.

Believe it or not, kids in high school today are just like those we knew when you and I were in school. They are human and need to know that someone cares; not only by provision of funds, nice classrooms and good programs, but by individual attention each day and the reassurance that all is not lost if he fails. As a physics teacher, I use my subject matter as a vehicle to determine the needs of my students to the best of my ability, and to attempt to provide for those needs, and I do not treat the subject matter as an end of itself.

As teachers we attempt to do a twelvemonth job in nine months as we work to help the students identify their strengths—God knows they are made well aware of their weaknesses from many other areas. We try to help the individual realize as much success as possible each day by continuing to impress upon him the importance of his solutions as a result of his own physical and mental activity.

The student is encouraged to outdo himself in mastering a skill or completing a task, as composed to competing with the brightest student in the classroom. The students are challenged to consider statements like "They are perpetuating the problems," and "They could end hunger in the United States." We ask the student if he is not a part of that nebulous "they" who always receives the blame.

We encourage the students to consider the power of individual action and discourage the lip service offered by many people concerning, one, the needs of the poor; two, the needs of those who are hungry; and three, the needs of those who do not have sufficient medical attention. We challenge the student to demonstrate his concern through positive action, whether he is given credit for his action or not.

Recently a group of our students took part in a controversial "hunger walk." This was sponsored by the local Lutheran churches in our community. The students took a hike for money for the hungry people, both in the United States and elsewhere. I don't think I've ever heard as much talk about the number of people in our country that are hungry as I did after the hunger walk. But there was a great deal of criticism, because some people can't see why in the world a person takes the time just to walk for the hungry; something positive should be done; something should be gained. But I think these students made a tremendous contribution.

Another example of this positive action that I mentioned is that by a group of Walla Walla college students who worked repairing and painting a structure in the city park while receiving a lecture and a barrage of hand bills from a group which yelled at them as they worked about the ills of the country. There are those who talk and those who act. I encourage my students, as much as I possibly can, that it is the individual action that is important.

This is the kind of action—the kind that I have just related—that I interpret as the result of responsible educational programs, not indoctrination but education.

Well, you might wonder what all this has to do with teaching science and mathematics. My students tell me that this is what it's all about. If they can associate basic concepts of physics and mathematics with the awesome unknown life that they face daily, they begin to feel the urgency to master needed concepts today. Sure, they are interested in tomorrow, but their primary interest is today, and building on the successes of yesterday and refraining from destroying all tomorrows.

Thank you.

(Applause.)

Senator MAGNUSON. Now, if any of you have any questions or comments you would like to ask our recipient today, he'd be glad to answer them.

Mr. DENNIS. Attempt to answer them, yes, sir.

Senator MAGNUSON. Attempt to answer them, he said. Anybody have anything they want to add to this?

QUESTION. I have a rather personal, profound question. You are a native of Owl Hollow, Mississippi. Whatever prompted a man to move from a place like Owl Hollow to Walla Walla?

Mr. DENNIS. Well, first of all, I might clear something up. This statement Owl Hollow came from a biographical sketch I made myself, and I was really born in a near little town called Reinzi, Mississippi. That's about fourteen miles south of Corinth, and there were a couple of houses up in a little canyon and my parents fondly refer to this little canyon as Owl Hollow or Owl Holler, so suddenly there is a place in Mississippi called Owl Hollow and I am sure the Mississippi people are going out of their minds trying to find it.

But as far as what prompted me to leave that country, I really love the South but when I graduated from high school I wasn't able to get a job so I joined the Navy. And I found in the Navy that people felt a little differently about individuals. They encouraged us to develop our own abilities and to use them to the best of our ability and I kind of liked this. This is in the educational program of the Navy. And I met a lot of high school students who were coming into the Navy who needed training in the skills that are offered in the Navy. I liked to work with these people, and I felt that I would like to make teaching my life work.

As a young man, by the way, I grew up in Florence, Alabama. This is where I went to grade school and high school. As a young

man, I don't feel that I had much of a chance to go to college because of the lack of funds, and fortunately the Navy provided me with this opportunity to go to college and to become a teacher. And I try every day to show how grateful I am by doing the best darn job I can do each day.

(Applause.)

Senator MAGNUSON. Anything further? Yes.

QUESTION. In your own words, sir, what one attribute would you say distinguishes the really good teacher from the mediocre teacher?

Mr. DENNIS. Well, first of all, I have never met too many mediocre teachers. I think our teachers in the United States are very good teachers. My students tell me that the things that makes them want to take my class—I'll put it that way—is that I have a concern for the individual and am truly interested in their problems and try to deal with those problems over my lunch hour, in the evenings, whenever I can get together with them.

Senator MAGNUSON. The lady in the first row there.

QUESTION. The newspapers are filled with stories of student unrest and teen-age riots and so on. Do you have these problems in your school, and also how do you feel educators in your school should deal with these?

Mr. DENNIS. That's a pretty big order. I think that these problems are in evidence everywhere, not only in the big city but in the small school; and I think administrators and teachers can deal with this problem best if they make cvery attempt to understand what got the problem started. And I think there are a lot of programs—there are at our local level—that are being tried to occupy the student with something that he is interested in—to make education more relevant as a partial answer to the demands of the riots.

But I think that we also have to be very careful about the very small percentage of people who are making what some people might call outrageous demands. We have a responsibility to all the children of all the people, and this is the thing that administrators as well as teachers have to keep in mind at all times.

Senator MAGNUSON. The lady in the back there.

QUESTION. I think you partly implied an answer to my question. But after Sputnik there was a tremendous upsurge toward science and the study of science in our schools. Now there seems to be a veering away from space and science, and I was wondering whether you think there are going to be fewer students who select science now rather than humanities, and how do you, as a science teacher, balance these out?

Mr. DENNIS. Well, we have a humanities course in our school, just initiated a couple of years ago, and we are making every effort to show the students that science is going to play a big part in the humanities program of our society in the future. And, as I mentioned in some of my comments, I think the students have to be aware of the development of some of the scientific attitudes as the result of development of society; and that maybe if we are creative enough we can use our knowledge of science to help solve some of the problems I mentioned here earlier. Our science students are very much concerned in the humanities also.

Senator MAGNUSON. Any further questions? Well, again, we all congratulate you, Johnnie. He is to be honored this afternoon by the President of the United States at 3 o'clock. I can't invite you all down there, but I imagine some of you will be down there when he receives this honor from the President of the United States.

Correction—Mrs. Nixon is going to be there and give the honor.

So I want to thank you on behalf of the Washington delegation for coming here today, Dr. Allen and Dr. Babcock; particularly my congratulations to Look magazine for what you are doing in this field. I think it's a stimulating thing. And surely the example that Johnnie Dennis gives to the other people in this profession is well worth all the effort . . .

JACK SQUIRES. I would like to announce that our editor-in-chief, William Attwood is en route here now. He is at White Sulphur Springs at an important convention. We expect him momentarily and if anybody is present at the later ceremony we would love to have you meet him and talk to him.

Senator MAGNUSON. You go right ahead, Doctor, with the other awards.

Dr. DAFOE. We have some special awards for Johnnie, and while people are getting up here, Senator, if I may add a note, I was cheered to hear your remark that you hope things will all be cleared by the first of June. That's going to make a much easier summer for some of us . . .

The first special recognition to Johnnie Dennis will be made by Dr. John Mayor, Director of Education, American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Dr. MAYOR. Senator Magnuson, Dr. Dafoe, and Johnnie Dennis, I am very proud to have the privilege of presenting you a membership in the American Association for the Advancement of Science. And this certificate, a part of which I would like to read has a heading American Association for the Advancement of Science:

This is to certify that Johnnie T. Dennis was elected a fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. In testimony whereof, the President and the Executive Officer have hereunto set their hand and the seal of the Association the 19th day of May, 1970.

From the evidence we have, Johnnie, you represent the best of America and the best of education. You are very young, you have only started your career, may this be a beginning, and the best of luck. We need you in science education.

(Applause.)

Senator MAGNUSON. Dr. Dafoe said I could interrupt here just a moment. Two distinguished members of the Washington state delegation just came in, and I want to introduce first Congressman Tom Foley from the eastern part of Washington. And then I am going to ask Catherine May to pay her respects to her honoree today because she represents his district and she is quite familiar with the school system in Walla Walla. Catherine May.

Representative MAY. Thank you. I am very honored naturally to be able to claim in my district your wonderful young gentleman here that we have known about in my district for some time: Johnnie Dennis has been famous here. And to have him made National Teacher of the Year of course brings honor to all the people of our district. But much more important, Johnnie, to all the people of our state and to all of the teachers in the United States. That's all I wanted to say; I didn't want to take a lot of time within the ceremonies but I appreciate the chance to congratulate you personally on behalf of all the people of our state. Thank you.

Senator MAGNUSON. Tom, do you want to join here a minute and pay your respects to the Teacher of the Year?

Rep. FOLEY. Well, I am sorry that I can't claim the privilege that Mrs. May has of representing Mr. Dennis and having him as a constituent, but I am going to expand it a little bit and claim you from eastern Washington, not only from the state but from the half of the state that both Mrs. May and I represent.

The importance of the teacher as the key and central professional in our society, I think, is clear to everyone. What sort of society are we going to have in the coming decade will largely depend on the quality of our education, and nothing is more central to that than the performance of our teachers.

We are delighted from the Washington State Delegation to have the signal honor of having the Teacher of the Year come from our state. We know that he represents the best in educational performance, and we know that he is repeated many hundreds of thousands of times around the United States by teachers in all of the state; so I add to Mrs. May's congratulations my own very warm congratulations on this very happy occasion.

Dr. DAFOE. I am going to lay a little of that claim too. I went to school at the University of Idaho just across the border a few years back. We're proud, too.

Next I'd like to call on Mrs. Joe Ann Stenstrom, Assistant Executive Secretary, American Association of School Librarians. Mrs. Stenstrom:

Mrs. STENSTROM. Senator Magnuson, members of the Washington delegation, Dr. Dafoe and Mr. Dennis. I too am very personally pleased to be able to present you an award, because I am also from Washington state. I would like to present to Mr. Dennis on behalf of the American Association of School Librarians this book published by the American Library Association entitled "Books by Junior College Libraries." We highly recommend this for use with high school students in programs such as those in which Mr. Dennis is involved; and we hope that he will find it a useful guide to selecting sources of information for both he and his students. It is inscribed to you, Mr. Dennis, as Teacher of the Year. Our sincere congratulations.

Senator MAGNUSON. Dr. Dafoe is going to get a little bit weary of me interrupting here, but we have two other distinguished members of our delegation here, Johnnie, and I am sure they want to add their congratulations to your honor which you are going to receive today; and so I want to call on my distinguished colleague, Senator Jackson.

Senator JACKSON. Well thank you, Senator Magnuson. I regret we've got a hearing on that I am chairing down below. I was unable to get here until just now. From a personal point of view, I, of course, have nothing but the highest and greatest respect for the teaching profession. My oldest sister who passed away recently taught in the third grade in the Garfield School in the same classroom without interruption for 43 years. I think that's sort of a record, and I grew up in the tradition and therefore have a tremendous respect for those who follow this important profession.

I am reminded of just one example of the obvious importance of the role played by the teacher. In Budapest, Hungary, prior to World War II, there was a distinguished teacher of mathematics. This teacher had a profound influence on his pupils. This teacher was dedicated to excellence, and out of that classroom came five of the world's most famous scientists who have played an invaluable role in the security of our country and the free nations.

Out of that classroom was Dr. Theodore Von Neumann, the world's most famous mathematician; Dr. Theodore Van Karman, the world's most famous aeronautical engineer; Dr. Leo Szilard who played such an important role in the Manhattan Project; Dr. Eugene Wigner who is now at Princeton who played, and is playing, such an important role in the development of nuclear power plants. I don't know whether I named four or five—four?—there is one missing, but obviously he is famous.

I mentioned Theodore von Neumann—John von Neumann, Theodore von Karman, Leo Salard—well, Edward Teller, the father of the hydrogen bomb. This can of course be repeated in other areas of human endeavor, but I think in all of our concern about priorities, all of our concern about making a better society, we still it seems to me have a long way to go in providing for proper recognition for our teachers.

In Europe the most important person in the community is the professor. We have yet to reach that point of recognition, and I think that if America is going to play its proper role in the world we need to do more than what we have already done in giving to our teachers and the profession the recognition they deserve. So I want to express my congratulations to Mr. Dennis and his family for what he has done and what he is doing. More than that, I want to commend him for his good judgment, after having been exposed to Whitman College in making the northwest his residence.

Senator MAGNUSON. I might suggest, Johnnie, just wait till they start coming out of Walla Walla. Congressman Hicks is here and I am sure, Johnnie, he wants to also congratulate you on this high honor.

Congressman HICKS. Thank you, Senator. It's a little difficult following Senator Jackson, but I am sure Mrs. May when she spoke told you that she spent some time teaching school. I spent a little longer; I spent seven years; and the reason that I left the classroom was that I didn't think that I was doing the job that should have been done for those youngsters. I have seen some very excellent teachers in the junior high schools and grade schools of our state and I have seen some very mediocre ones.

While I agree with Senator Jackson that in education, school teachers have not always received the recognition that they should, on the other hand you can't take mediocrity and freeze it into the system either. There are some wonderful things that can be done by really good teachers; I have seen them done. And there is some real harm that can be done by those who are there who meet the old adage of "those who can, do, and those who cannot, teach," and that's just wrong, but it's been true enough so that it gave such an adage currency.

I am more than pleased to do honor to a really fine teacher. Thank you very much.

Dr. DAFOE. Dr. Wallace A. Brodie, Past president, American Chemical Society.

Dr. BRODIE. Senator Magnuson, Senator Jackson . . . Johnnie, I take great pleasure in representing the Chemical Society here to present to you subscriptions to two of our magazines on chemical education, one which is designed for the high school student and the other for the high school teacher. I present this to you with my great congratulations. I can't help but add, however, that but by pure laws of chance and coincidence I was born in Walla Walla. I was selected to do this, representing the American Chemical Society, without knowing—they didn't know this—that I was to talk to a man from Walla Walla. I graduated from Walla Walla High School 53 years ago, and I graduated from Whitman College, so I think I truly represent the community and our Congresswoman in extending our congratulations.

May I add one other point which was brought up in the discussion here asking about whether people were turning away from science. There are more young people turning away from science, more young people, than ever before. And there are more young people turning toward science than ever before, just because there are more young people.

Dr. DAFOE. Dr. Howard Hitchins, Executive Director, Department of Audio-visual Instruction, NEA.

Dr. HITCHENS. Senator Magnuson, members of the Washington delegation. I am very pleased to represent the Department of Audio-visual Instruction, Mr. Dennis, in doing honor to you upon your selection as teacher of the year. I represent about 10,000 people who are out of the field of educational technology, and as a small token of the honor which we do you, we would like you to accept a year's subscription to our magazine, "Audio-Visual Instruction." Congratulations.

Dr. DAFOE. James D. Gates, Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of Mathematics. Jim.

Dr. GATES. Senator Magnuson, members of the Washington delegation, Dr. Dafoe. It gives me great pleasure to be here representing the National Council of Teachers of Mathematics to express my congratulations to you, Johnnie, as a science teacher and also a teacher of mathematics. It's extremely meaningful to us that a teacher of mathematics was selected during this, the year 1970, because this is the year we are celebrating as our Golden Jubilee Year. Our theme this year has been "Excellence in mathematics education for all." So it is very gratifying, Johnnie, to hear you remark earlier that you would express great concern that we take into account the individual differences, the concerns of every student.

I'd like to read our Certificate of Merit:

The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics: This certificate is presented to Johnnie T. Dennis in recognition of exemplary contributions to the improvement of mathematics education. Teacher of the Year, 1970.

Congratulations, Johnnie.

Dr. DAFOE. Ralph Gray of the School Service Division of the National Geographical Society. Mr. Gray.

Mr. GRAY. Johnnie, the popular song says that what the world needs now is love, sweet love; but I believe that even as much as that is true, what the world needs now is teachers, good teachers. It's a great honor to share this stage with one of the best teachers, a teacher who has been accorded the accolade of being the Teacher of the Year; and as a token of the esteem of the National Geographic Society we want to present you with an honorary subscription to the magazine for the future, beginning with the May issue, which has a couple of science articles in it. Maybe not exactly your mathematical end of science, but there is one article about archeology and anthropology in Africa; and another one on natural history in this country.

We hope you will enjoy this through the year, as I know you will enjoy all the other honors that have been bestowed upon you today. And I would like to say that our editorial hats at National Geographic are off to Look magazine for maintaining this fine project of honoring a Teacher of the Year for each year. Johnnie, congratulations.

Dr. DAFOE. Dr. Thomas D. Fontaine, Deputy Assistant Director for Education, National Science Foundation.

Dr. FONTAINE. Senator Magnuson, members of the Washington delegation, Dr. Dafoe. It is a special pleasure for me to be here. I think I will try to rival to some extent our good friend Dr. Brodie here. I welcome you, Fellow Mississippian. I am very appreciative of the fact that you explained where Owl Hollow was, because I had placed it in certain low hills where I was born.

In addition to this, of course, I think this is very nice on the 20th anniversary of the National Science Foundation that we have such a distinguished recipient this year for the teacher who represents the best, I am sure, in science and in mathematics. I would also at this moment too like to pay tribute to Senator Magnuson, who I am sure many of you know has really been the father of the National Science Foundation. So I think Senator Magnuson should take a special pride in the fact that his wisdom and the shepherding the National Science Foundation through many of its trial periods has paid off in such a significant way.

It was in 1954, Senator Magnuson, that the first summer institute for high school teachers was held in the state of Washington at the University of Washington. So it is with special pleasure I present to you, Johnnie, an investment in knowledge, which is the History of the Summer Institute Program of the National Science Foundation. Congratulations.

Senator MAGNUSON. I want to, before we adjourn, remind everyone that there are refreshments and coffee . . . I am sure that all of you want to meet Johnnie's fine family over here. We thank you all for coming. It's an event I am sure you wouldn't want to miss. So we stand adjourned. Thank you.

CONGRESSMAN McDONALD OF MICHIGAN ADDS NEW DIMENSION TO THE VOICE OF HIS CONSTITUENCY

HON. ROGER H. ZION

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. ZION. Mr. Speaker, innovation and imagination are two ingredients which have made this country strong. Through their elected representatives, the voice of the people is heard daily in this Chamber.

It recently came to my attention, Mr. Speaker, that my colleague Mr. McDONALD of Michigan, added a new dimension to the voice of his constituency. I received a copy of his annual questionnaire which provides answer blanks for not only the man and woman in the household, but for the young members of the family between the ages of 18 and 21.

It is refreshing to see this kind of thinking. Too often it is presumed that the head of the household does the thinking for the rest of the family. Here is an opportunity to gain an insight into the thinking of the family as a group of individuals. And it is individual thinking which contributes so much to this Nation.

Mr. McDONALD's questionnaire deals with the issues of the day, and reflects the concern he has for the opinions of residents of the 19th District of Michigan.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Mr. McDONALD for his fresh thinking, and take this opportunity to offer for printing in the RECORD a copy of the questionnaire:

QUESTIONNAIRE BY JACK McDONALD, MEMBER OF CONGRESS

1. Do you support the President's strategy to withdraw U.S. troops from Southeast Asia?

2. Do you favor abolition of the draft as now constituted and creation of an all-volunteer army?

3. Do you favor my bill (H.R. 15283) prohibiting federal agencies from selling mailing lists to the public?

4. Do you approve the use of federal funds for busing of schoolchildren to achieve racial balance?

5. American-flag ships carry approximately 6.4 percent of the total tonnage of U.S. trade. Would you favor increased federal shipbuilding subsidies to expand and modernize our merchant marine?

6. Which direction would you like taken with regard to an ABM system? a. Gradual installation of a limited network; b. An eventual full-scale network; c. No funding at all.

7. In addition to reducing federal spending, which policy would you favor to curb inflation? a. Increased taxes; b. Wage and price controls; c. Tighter credit.

8. There is much talk these days about "reordering our national priorities." In what order would you place these programs?

1. Crime Control.
2. Defense.
3. Education.
4. Pollution Control.
5. Space.
6. Urban Problems.

GREECE: CULTURAL FREEDOM IN THE GANGSTER STATE

HON. DONALD M. FRASER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. FRASER. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to focus our collective attention upon the tragedies brought by the military clique ruling Greece today.

We have seen much documentation of the terrible costs of the junta's totalitarian and reactionary activities. In the May 21, 1970, issue of the New York Review of Books, there is an excellent article which analyzes the consequences of the present Greek regime. Their repressive actions have stifled the artistic creativity of many of Greece's leading intellectuals and artists. The climate of fear and of intellectual sterility has deprived a once proud people of its cultural freedom and creative impulses.

As one Greek intellectual has said, "Creative spirit cannot be artificially induced nor can it be administratively guaranteed." The results of this repression is the destruction of hope—a most vital human resource.

Because of the gravity of this crisis, I include the entire text of the article "Greece: Cultural Freedom in the Gangster State," in the RECORD.

GREECE: CULTURAL FREEDOM IN THE GANGSTER STATE

When preventive censorship was lifted last October after a two-and-a-half-year blackout, the newspapers of Athens (not including the organs of the military regime) began once more to report the news. They did so carefully, still refusing to make editorial comment so long as this new liberty was qualified by countless taboo subjects and forbidden attitudes, and vitiated by the martial law under which Greece has been living since 1967.

Instead of editorials, front-page cartoons expressed in capsule form, daringly at first, the paradox of press freedom in a land overshadowed by Law 509, which provides savage prison sentences for whatever the military court (on the evidence of soldiers, informers, and police spies) interprets as subversion—in a police state supported, not to say enforced, by a world alliance of free and not-so-free nations. The newspapers reprinted speeches and documents from the Council of Europe when Greece withdrew last December. Every day people were able to read the frightening exchanges in the courts martial and the defense speeches of students given eighteen years to life for passing out leaflets, or possessing explosives, or making some remark against the regime that was overheard, perhaps, at the next table in a restaurant.

Just as the most insidious enemy of truth is a half-truth, so the subtlest mockery of freedom is a controlled freedom. But give Greeks one grain of liberty and they will use it to advantage, until the mechanism of that mockery works itself out and brings on the retribution that was only in the wings.

Indeed only six weeks after censorship was lifted, the regime published a new press law decreeing sentences ranging from a few months to life imprisonment for defamation, obscenity, distortion of debates, quotation out of context from documents, insult to the royal family, reporting legal cases *sub judice*, articles inciting to sedition or undermining confidence in the national economy, reporting crimes and suicides, inaccuracy, negligence, and other offenses minutely listed in 101 articles, for which publisher, editor, and journalist are now held collectively responsible. In addition to laying out this minefield, the new law (which begins, "We, Constantine, King of the Hellenes, by the proposal of our Council of Ministers, have decided and do command: Article 1, The Press is free . . .") struck at the newspapers by abolishing the franchise on imported newsprint. This concession—granted in 1938 to facilitate freedom of expression in the press—remains in force however for those recently founded journals which are the mouthpieces of the regime, but whose circulation is still less than half that of the older papers.

Foreign observers have asked about this seemingly passive and peaceful, if perhaps exhausted, country: Why—if Greeks don't like being spied on, denounced, held indefinitely without trial, tortured, pressured to betray friends, imprisoned for their opinions, deported, forced into exile, forced out of work, censored, having their books and music and art work banned, or being made to acquiesce in the blunting and darkening of their children's minds in school—why don't they do something about it, instead of waiting for the Americans? Yet the prisons and concentration camps and guarded villages are full of Greeks who did do something because they knew the Americans would not. For the rest of the population, if they get too activist, there are NATO tanks and the American Sixth Fleet. Which is almost to say that for them there is silence.

To prevent them from becoming too active there is the terror. Not guillotines nor SS troops nor kangaroo courts—these are unnecessary: only pervasive economic pressure, which affects everybody's actions from morning till night, but which tourists don't see and Greeks for very good reasons don't talk about to foreigners. One false move, one indiscretion and not only a job is lost but also—because of close supervision by the police—the possibility of applying for other regular work. Not only is a university career cut short but entrance to any other advanced school in Greece is forbidden. And not only may a pension be lost but the relatives of the former pensioner may lose their jobs as well.

The phrase in the U.S. Constitution, ". . . no attainder of treason shall work corruption of blood," reminds us that two centuries ago the medieval hangover of guilt by kinship was still something to be guarded against by law. As regards many civil liberties, the Greece of 1970 is more primitive than the Thirteen Colonies of two hundred years ago, with the added danger that today the state possesses eyes, ears, and methods of control unimaginable in previous centuries. What is being tried out in Greece is not the mere brute oppression of a Vietnam war but a new and subtler form of oppression, something technologically organized, which seems to be working very well indeed.

In spite of this a few have spoken. Before censorship is re-established or worse, one paper in particular, *Ethnos*,[1] has staked its existence on the issue of press freedom. Theater and film reviews, articles on the youth revolution abroad and education at home, on the international press and the integrity of the Greek judiciary (heavily violated last spring), serialized historical studies of foreign interference during the last century and of Venizelos' fight against the Greek oligarchy and monarchy in the early years of this one, have all provided a medium for discussion of some of today's more burning issues.

Even the proceedings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee on the appointment of the new ambassador to Greece were translated verbatim from the Congressional Record of last December 19—with dotted lines profusely interspersed wherever Senators Pell, Goodell, Fulbright, or McGovern spoke of the Colonels' regime in words that cannot be printed in Greece under the Colonels' press law. A series of brief interviews and letters called "If I were Dictator" has been giving a number of public and private figures the chance to let off steam and anathematize tyranny. Finally on February 2 *Ethnos* began a significant inquiry into the present state of cultural life in Greece. Leading figures in the intellectual and artistic world answered two questions: Was the past decade in Greece creative? Is the new decade likely to see a flowering or a decline?

Significant for what was said, and for what wasn't. Many of the artists and thinkers questioned kept silent despite strong convictions; silent about the real condition, not of politics or economics, of which it might be disastrous to speak openly, but of the arts themselves in Greece during the present critical years. Still, a few spoke; these are years when the brave stand up and are counted.

The public responded and joined forces as only Greeks will do when someone takes risks on their behalf. Though the cost of newspapers has risen twice since the New Year (the organs of the regime again excepted) and though the sale of *Ethnos* is forbidden in provincial towns by the army and *gendarmerie* despite a supposed guarantee in the press law; and though on three days in February news vendors in Athens itself were told by the police not to sell their copies of the paper—a sinister hint of what may yet happen—*Ethnos's* circulation has nearly tripled in the city. "We can't do without it now," one reader said. "We have to read what people dare to say. We need it every day now, it's like bread."

Alexander Xydis, art historian, critic, and Greek Ambassador to Syria until the Colonels dismissed him, was the first to give a precise reply to *Ethnos's* question about the past decade, contrasting the state of things before the *coup d'etat* with their condition ever since. Does one have to be a Greek living in the Greece of Colonel Papadopoulos to sense the full implications of a statement ostensibly about graphic arts?

"I do not see one decade 1960–70 but a seven-year period 60–66 and a three-year period 67–69. During the first, notable young painters, sculptors, and engravers appeared on the scene, while the older established figures showed a renewal of their talent.

"There was more work and better quality. More exhibitions inside Greece, in Salonica, Volos, Patras, Heraklion, Hydra, and Mykonos, and more exhibitions of Greeks abroad, where some won prizes. A wide circulation of artists and their works within the country so that many more than just the inhabitants of central Athens became familiar with the living art of today. More artists commissioned to decorate public and private buildings. A homecoming of expatriate artists in great number. Newer and freer channels of communication with the outside world for artists, for their works, for art books and for a whole public eager to educate itself in the artistic field.

---

[1] After this article was written, the newspaper *Ethnos* was closed down. On April 2, its chief editor was sentenced to five years imprisonment and other senior staff members received sentences ranging from two to four and a half years. The reason given by the junta was the publication of an interview with a former politician, J. Zigdes, urging the quick return of democratic rule. Mr. Zigdes himself was sentenced to four and a half years imprisonment for having given the interview.

"This continuous movement and exchange between artists and their unhindered dialogue with the public, which are the vital needs of art, took place quite freely, and a fertilizing pollen was thus transmitted in all directions, regardless of schools or political alignments.

"Today the artists, like all intellectual and creative people in Greece, are living in isolation, inside hermetically sealed aesthetic and political compartments, whose channels of communication with the outer world are suffocatingly controlled by ill-digested moral and aesthetic dogmas or else by calculations of expediency. Art has nothing to do with a dubious ephemeral expediency, and dogma drives out art—together with the artists—as bad money drives out good.

"Three years we have seen this axiom progressively confirmed. A slowing down or complete stoppage of exhibitions; the movement of artists and their works obstructed, both in Greece and on their way to other countries; prohibition of works, sometimes even names of certain artists; mediocre figures chosen to represent Greek art abroad; the mediocre selected or made to participate by *Diktat* in the Panhellenic Exhibition of 1969. Meanwhile the squares and gardens of our towns and villages are being filled with products by 'workers of art' in the most Soviet sense. [Last five words eliminated from printed text, in accordance with Greek press law.] Discrimination against and attacks upon the most valid currents in modern art are increasing. In competitions, exhibitions, and public commissions the reward goes every time to mediocrity. Mediocrity alone is recognized because it alone is harmless, poses no problems, lacks impetus, looks backward, does not overflow with that quality of which André Breton writes, *'La beauté sera convulsive ou ne sera pas.'*

"My reply to the second question: decline. But flowering (and consequently decline) cannot be forecast or artificially produced. Where the creative spirit is degraded, art dies and no administrative measure can revive it. Where it still lives but is pressed down, it will burst out sometime, somewhere. The artistic or creative spirit is, of all human activities, the most imponderable and explosive. It cannot be compressed or statistically recorded or mobilized or controlled or directed. If it withers in one country because of the environment, it may flower—perhaps through the same practitioners—in another. But woe to the country that has lost it."

The last sentence has a special poignancy for Greeks. Twenty-five years ago their country suffered its first bloodletting in art, thought, and literature. After the Fascist dictatorship of the late Thirties, there had been great hopes, during the subsequent four years of Nazi occupation, famine, and resistance, that after the war Greece would be able to liberalize its social structure and allow light into its educational system. Throughout the Forties a large proportion of the flower of the country's youth was systematically killed off; before the war was even at an end in Europe, Athens in December 1944 was the first testing ground of that world of wars in which we have been living ever since.

In one form or another the Resistance was betrayed by the foreign belligerents who tried variously to adopt it, and the old Establishment came back over its dead body. The Civil War was in the interest of a few and it lasted until 1950. But intellectuals and artists left Greece by the hundreds, many to make names and careers abroad; Greece was impoverished. Yet many came home again, especially in the years 1963–4, encouraged back by the progressive tendencies of George Papandreou's liberal government which they had not seen in Greece before. The second national bloodletting of youth, energy, and genius has taken place during the last three years.

The artist or intellectual in Greece today faces the choice of staying and being wiped out or going abroad and losing touch with everything that sustains him: to go is to stifle the overwhelming (and in the Greek case vital) parochial instinct—to go into the thin air and heavy earth of a foreign land where the exile will live perhaps a lifetime of yearning to return and thinking that those who stayed behind were luckier.

Luckier today? Unluckier tomorrow? In any case the writers, artists, and thinkers still in Greece have tightened ranks. Those of opposing political convictions have fused together under the oppression that makes them Greeks, creative artists, and thinkers first, leftists or rightists second. One of them has said, "As a race, as a society, we are still primitive enough to feel connected."

Such is the message of those voices that have made themselves heard in the loaded silence of Greece today. Perhaps only a small step has been made; others who were as outspoken last year are now in prison, whereas today such men are lucky enough to benefit by a slight relaxation of censorship and are able to reach a wider audience. What they are attempting is a stand against the generalized fear that has settled on the country and seeped into all aspects of national life. Others will take courage from their statements and from the many protests they have signed at considerable personal risk, just as they themselves took courage from the lone voice of their Nobel Prize winner George Seferis when he spoke out in March last year.

Rodis Roufos, the historian and novelist, on the morning of the *coup d'etat* three years ago resigned from a high position in the diplomatic service; he is one of the writers who have repeatedly and openly protested against the dictatorship and refused to publish under the conditions it imposes. Winner of the two highest Greek literary awards, he was among the forty finally selected out of five hundred candidates from countries throughout the world to attend the Harvard International Seminar last year. But he was unable to represent Greece: the Colonels took away his passport. The following is his reply to *Ethnos's* inquiry. The words in square brackets were vetoed by the paper's legal adviser as being too dangerous for publication under the press law.

"I am surprised that distinguished personalities have discussed the level of our cultural life without relating it to cultural freedom. Perhaps they see the connection, but pass over it in silence for reasons of expediency? That in itself shows to what depths our cultural life has sunk. Total silence would have been preferable to such self-censorship.

"Personally I do not think a sincere and responsible statement can be made about the Sixties, culturally, in Greece without dividing the period into two very dissimilar parts.

"Throughout the first our cultural life gave hopeful signs. I refer with nostalgia to the general intellectual, moral, and artistic atmosphere which was still developing around the middle of the decade: an atmosphere of free and civilized dialogue, exemplified and stimulated by such forward steps as the review *Epoches*, the introduction of our spoken language into official and academic spheres, and the spread of interest in a more serious and up-to-date educational system.

"Then came the split. . . . [Then came, if it is not sacrilegious to quote Seferis's beautiful line in this context, "the double-edged day when everything was changed."] Most of the leading intellectuals chose silence [rather than submit to censorship]. (I am not speaking of members of the Academy, most of whom seem to live in a roseate, beatific world of their own, quite unrelated to ours.) Others were deprived of all possibility of communication with the public [or even of their personal freedom]. No matter how much I may have disagreed with some of the latter, I believe that cultural life can only become fruitful through fearless discussion, criticism, and disagreement. One need only remember Germany's cultural achievements under the Weimar Republic as compared to what followed, or consider what happens today in the Soviet Union where writers are persecuted in the name of an official ideology.

"For sole consolation we are assured officially that we don't have dictatorship in Greece. What it would be like if we did is something I don't dare think about, since already under present conditions what is at stake is not the level of our cultural life but its very existence.

"As to the future, it depends on whether these conditions change or remain fixed that we shall either have once again a genuine—that is, free—cultural life, or else sink into the intellectual and artistic decay of those peoples whom History, in its onward march, has forgotten."

Hard and heavy words for a Greek to say, for Greeks to have to hear. Forgotten? The Greek race forgotten? Numbered among the tribes or nations that have had no history, have left no record of themselves?

Quite possible. It has already happened once. As far as territorial Greece is concerned, the limbo period commonly equated with 400 years of Turkish occupations lasted in reality closer to a thousand and a half, beginning around the fourth century A.D., or even earlier. And yet, in spite of backwardness and oppression, Greece has caught up in the last 150 years with the major social and political—advances made in the Western world since the Reformation. Foreign strategists and geopoliticians who say Greeks are not ready for democracy, or bleat that there is no one to take over from the Colonels, should remember that, for all its sometimes creaking or ferocious imperfections, parliamentary life has functioned longer and more steadily in Greece than in any other continental European country. England acquired universal male suffrage in 1885, Greece had it in 1864. And Greece preserved a strong and active parliamentary regime throughout a civil war when the country was gravely threatened from both within and without. Greeks have reason to be proud, and it is an insult to their capacities and achievements to be told that now a Communist threat, which has never been proved and which almost nobody believes, justified the destruction of their democratic liberties. To have lost all their hard-gained ground, to have all momentum stopped, and to contemplate the menace of a dark and still clinging past—such things for Greeks are immediate and desperate.

Most difficult to grasp outside Greece is the question of language. The ordinary speech of daily life, which is also the language of Modern Greek poetry and literature, is now forbidden in the schools from the fourth grade. Nine-year-olds, who would normally have to cope with an extremely complex but still coherent syntax, now, in addition, have to make sense out of the life around them in a language invented by Greek scholars of the late eighteenth century to translate the *philosophes* of the Enlightenment: a grammatically centrifugal macaronic put together out of the Byzantine liturgy, New Testament *koinê*, ancient Attic, and some Modern Greek, with centuries of Turkish, Latin, Italian, and French, and many technological accretions replaced by what their equivalents might have been in the fifth century before Christ.

Originally designed to equip Greeks with an intellectual apparatus and to inspire a subject people with an awareness of past glory, this "purifying" *katharevousa* became the salon speech of the rich, Europeanized Greeks of Constantinople who managed af-

fairs of state under the Ottoman Empire. But when the subject nation rose up and won its territorial independence from that empire, *katharevousa* was turned into an effective instrument for keeping them subject and for reserving political independence, together with advancement and learning, exclusively for the rapacious oligarchy that replaced the Turks as rulers: a weapon aimed against a people at the ground level of childhood and the subterranean level of speech.

A hundred years ago however there began a strong counter-movement in favor of the spoken language, or *dimotiki*. This has paralleled every trend toward social, political, or educational reform, just as the reintroduction of *katharevousa* has accompanied every victory of reaction. In Greece the word, whether written or spoken, is an integral, dynamic part of the country's social and economic, let alone political and cultural, history. It is characteristic of the present state of things for instance that the two languages have received different names: *katharevousa* is now called "Greek" officially in the schools, and *dimotiki* "mother-tongue"; characteristic too the oversight that, as a result, this people's mother-tongue is now not Greek!

Such is the background to the following statement made by Anastasios Peponis, Director-General of the Greek Broadcasting Service under the Liberal-Center Government in 1964–5 imprisoned by the Colonels after the *coup d' état* and deported again in 1968. Last November, in the course of a lecture at the British Council in Athens on mass media, he quoted a dangerous sentence by the director of the BBC—"Television must be free"—and also mentioned, more dangerously, the benefit accruing to a country when poems by its Nobel Prize winner are made into songs by "a musician of genius." Peponis was referring to the collaboration of George Seferis and Mikis Theodorakis. George Seferis's warning of a year ago is still echoing through the country and Theodorakis has been in prison or under heavy guard for almost three years,[2] his music forbidden, and his records destroyed.

"We are moving backward. The root of the evil probably lies in the educational system. By the time they finish high school the young have still had no contact whatever with contemporary Greek writing, and know nothing of Greek literature. Any who are interested in the arts have made the discovery themselves and must cultivate it on their own. The educational reforms attempted in 1964 and 1965 faced the problem squarely for the first time.

"In the past decade the crucial issue of the culture—and the survival—of our nation has reached a state of total anarchy and chaos. I refer to the language question. The centuries-old language of Greek literature is still kept away from schoolrooms and treated as an enemy. Five years ago an attempt was made to promote it, first in education, then in broadcasting. But from 1965 on there has been only confusion and regression. Our children realize that the Anglo-Saxons, French, and Germans have one language each; they ask us how many are the languages of the Greeks, and there is no clear answer. How can any true culture flourish or have far-reaching influence when we haven't yet decided which is the nation's tongue?

"As to the next decade, a single look around the world shows up the ordeal threatening freedom, peace, mutual respect. Everywhere discouragement assails us. Speeches are full of promises, facts bloody and inhuman: violence, oppression, restriction—all in the name of ideals disproved by actual events.

"We cannot be hopeful, yet nor can we give up hope. Thought can still function, and under any circumstances the mind, in order to survive, must find outlets toward freedom and claim its responsibilities. We cannot accept art pressed into the service of this or that political expendiency. As long ago as 1945 Seferis wrote: 'The sound craftsman is one of the most responsible beings on earth. He bears the responsibility of a struggle between life and death. Out of the human experience that rages or lies still around him what shall he save? What can he save? What must he reject out of the shapeless human material which is frighteningly alive and follows him even into his dreams. In dreams begins responsibility.' "

Self-evident? Sentiments with which we would all agree, and certainly harmless? In Greece such words are dynamite. And though there are many who agree, there are some—with guns—who don't want to hear them spoken out loud; and just in case they should be, a number of special listeners are always interpersed through the audience of every lecture hall, who report to the Security Police immediately.

Education in particular is something one can't talk about in detail, because if one does one is dealing in facts—facts over which the press law keeps its watch: the expulsion and imprisonment of teachers, schoolbooks rewritten in an incomprehensible and self-contradictory syntax; compulsory speeches and compositions inspired by ultra-nationalistic, chauvinistic hatred of other creeds and countries; a special university code by which any student convicted of behavior incompatible with "national ideals" can be expelled for life from all Greek universities and higher schools; secondary schooling in some cases made impossible for children of political prisoners; and as an example of the scientific information purveyed to fifth graders in their experimental physics reader:

The creations of God, which exist around us and which we apprehend with our senses, constitute *nature* [opening sentence]. . . . Water at 4 degrees C has more density and less weight whereas at 0 degrees it has less density and more weight. This strange phenomenon is worthy of marvel and proves yet once again the infinite wisdom of the Lord Creator. It has great meaning for man and for life in general. Imagine what would happen if water continued to contract at a lower temperature than 4 degrees! Ice would be heavier than the equal volume of water and would sink as soon as formed down to the lower levels of rivers, lakes and seas. The water's new surface would become ice as well, and that would sink and little by little all the water of lakes and seas would turn to ice. The fish and other aquatic creatures and plants would be destroyed because the sun would be incapable of melting the tremendous masses of ice that would accumulate. The zones of the earth would be uninhabitable, and cold and drought would prevail over the whole world."

In the year of moon-landings Colonel Papadopoulos's so-called "modern" educational system is like a time machine charging in the opposite direction.

After liberty and hope there is little left to lose. It has often been like this in Greece, which is poor in material things, and where a kind of sparseness has been traditionally, classically, the rule. When their country has been turned into a prison, some Greeks will always dare to walk a tightrope. Whatever may happen to them individually, it is their example which fertilizes and gives heart to others. It is not surprising that the statement by Nikos Hadjimichalis which follows should have been altered by *Ethnos's* legal adviser before the issue went to press. Like Roufos a Resistance-fighter at the age of seventeen, Hadjimichalis took part in the first exodus of intellectuals and artists in 1945; after fifteen years in France, practicing and studying architecture under Corbusier, he was one of the first to return. Square brackets indicate where material was substituted or deleted.

"When I came home at the beginning of the last decade, a general upward turn was just beginning to take shape in Greece. Many artists and scientists who had worked and studied abroad began to see horizons broadening and conditions improving here for new, modern, and creative work where their capacities would find fruitful soil. The dreadful gaps left by the crucial decade of the Forties were being gradually covered over and the hard immediate necessities of life ceasing to be so oppressive. In architecture the purely commercial sort of building that works to the detriment of the architect, of our country's interests even more so, was being abandoned in favor of solutions dictated by research. In the new prevailing climate we felt we were leaving the 'Balkan' period behind and creating works that belonged in a European context.

"I speak of a climate because no renewal can be fruitful if it is deprived of a surrounding atmosphere which strengthens, nourishes, affects and is in turn affected by it. Without such an environment the creative artist is cut off from his roots and remains suspended. And the more that people are deprived of intellectual and artistic nourishment, the more they fall into inertia, out of touch with the currents of life, until in the end they play no more part in history. Ruinous are the consequences of several generations of artists failing to express themselves; it is not that art or culture disappears but that life istelf turns into a vegetable state—to be dearly paid for in our time of lightning evolution.

"The creative climate of the first six or seven years of the past decade encouraged all intellectuals, artists, and scientists to work enthusiastically. And if I should be thought to have a personal prejudice, I would only call to witness the foreign and expatriate artists who came here then in respectful recognition of that favorable atmosphere. An example was the modern sculpture exhibition on Philopappos Hill. Inconceivable at any other period, it showed that we had already taken our place in an international movement; this was true of our artists and of our public too. Such events would have been repeated, with Greece finally becoming a steady pole of attraction and a bright focal center.

"This [creative] climate was unfortunately stopped short in the last years of the decade. Now the fever, the urge to create has collapsed. The homecoming movement has turned into a drain of talent away from the country. Isolated, exiled both inwardly and out, our artists cannot work. The loss of the urge [substituted: "ease"] and the breaking of the communication have brought both the creators and the public to the verge of extinction: the artists because they have lost heart and ceased to play a [leading] part in the formation of ideas and standards, and the public which, having reached a certain level that is now no longer renewed out of contemporary Greek problems [substituted: "an inquiring Greek art"], is being steadily degraded, and now risks losing everything it gained from its tradition and from the few years' experience of renewal.

["Let us not forget the harm done to our youth, to their education and their general upbringing. That damage has gone so deep that it will take years to heal it. As a result, now all our young people are turning to purely expedient careers, or else those who still hold to their ideals are leaving Greece.]

"These last years our cultural life has lost its reflexes. As for the new decade, I am very pessimistic. The people who made our coun-

[2] Since this article was written Theodorakis has been released.

try [inserted: "from Antiquity onward"] made their dreams into programs. [Today dreams are either persecuted or transformed into a nightmare.]

"Our one hope left: may the[se] mute [and lost disastrous] years pass quickly before inflicting deeper wounds on the artists, the public, and the young, so that the exodus may turn into a creative starting point for [dynamic] development without interruptions or collapses, and with full knowledge that the lost time will only be made up with redoubled energy and effort."

A sample of reasoned and civilized opinion from different ways of life by men in their forties. Today the young in Greece, cut off from the youth revolution in the rest of the world, are reasoned and civilized in their own way; let one of them provide his short, fierce epilogue. A student, answering by letter the popular questionnaire in *Ethnos*, writes:

If I were a dictator I would have concentration camps, I would have deportees, I would keep the prisons filled with my opponents, so that everyone outside, at home, would be terrified and lose courage.

I would let you do this harmless journalism because it would be my policy to try and be as little provocative as possible. That way I would sugar-coat the pill, and little by little I would force *Ethnos* to stop publishing and you personally either to shut up or bow down. As for the cultural and intellectual leaders, my dictatorship wouldn't bother them too much once I had put them through a purge (I'd be keeping them in their jobs)—and let them write you their letters! But at least I'd have the honesty to say, *Yes, I and my buddies are dictators.* As for the democracy you were waiting for, I'd give it any form I liked—"modern" of course. Do you think I'd be interested in your opinion?

NATIONAL INSECURITY

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, I am very fortunate in representing a constituency which includes many distinguished and patriotic defenders of constitutional government from the legal profession of my State. From time to time, I have shared with the members legal opinions from our judiciary, addresses by district attorneys, and briefs from leaders in the Louisiana Bar Association.

One such outstanding attorney from my district, the Honorable Jack N. Rogers, of Baton Rouge, is not only a distinguished member of the legal profession and a former military officer, but is nationally renowned for his work in exposing communism and subversion in our State.

Recently Mr. Rogers delivered a speech on national insecurity to the Downtown Lions Club of Baton Rouge, La. Because I feel he succinctly presents the challenge which must be met by the legal profession to come up with solutions to the problems we face in America, I include Mr. Rogers' speech as follows:

NATIONAL INSECURITY

(By Jack N. Rogers)

Today I want to tell you about a great and glorious dream and some current observations on its fulfillment in America.

"We the People of the United States, in Order to form a more perfect Union, establish Justice, insure domestic Tranquility, provide for the common defence, promote the general Welfare, and secure the Blessings of Liberty to ourselves and our Posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America."

This is the *dream* of *freedom*—a balance of *rights* and *responsibilities*.

There are five basic principles set forth in our American concept of freedom. These are:

1. Law and order.
2. Individual freedom and individual responsibility.
3. Free enterprise and free labor.
4. Responsible limited government, within the Constitutional framework.
5. Belief in the Almighty God.

This is the most idealistic concept of society put into effect in the history of mankind. It has produced more goods and more freedom for more people than any other system to date. All over the world, people are literally *dying* to come here and live under it! What is the state of the dream of freedom today, after 200 years of testing?

Let's start with "domestic tranquility." Since November, 1969, powerful bombs have exploded in New York in the Socony Mobil, IBM and General Telephone buildings in east midtown Manhattan, plus the Chase Manhattan, General Motors and RCA buildings. We have also had the incident in which two associates of black militant leader H. Rap Brown were killed by an explosion in a car in which they were traveling through Maryland. The same week we had a Greenwich Village town house leveled by what had been taken for a gas explosion but was actually an underground bomb factory being wrecked by a dynamite blast. We have had other recent bombings in Seattle and San Francisco and in Chicago and other inland cities.

The Communist conspiracy in America has clearly progressed well beyond the phase of intellectual appeal to "parlor pinks" and misguided "do-gooders."

Crime in America is increasing daily at a rate six times more rapidly than our population.

In *Baton Rouge* we have had, as of yesterday, 142 armed robberies since last November. There were two attempted rapes of LSU coeds on the campus night before last. Fortunately, this situation is late in reaching us here, it has been even worse than this for many years in the big cities of our nation.

Three months ago, a committee of Congress issued a detailed report on "SDS plans for America's high schools." The stated goal of the SDS is "chaos" and the "total shutdown" of our high schools.

In regard to "race relations," I think most observers agree that they are generally deteriorating, rather than improving. Such militant sects as the "Black Panthers" and the "Black Muslims" in ever increasing numbers openly advocate racial warfare against all white people. Notice sometime the "Muhammed's Mosque" here in Baton Rouge on Government Street.

On another aspect of "tranquility" we have for several years suffered right here in Baton Rouge a serious problem in labor-management relations, which only now is even beginning to improve.

A nation-wide mass "protest" against serving in the Armed Forces of our country is being planned for all the major cities in the nation a few short weeks from now.

We have recently witnessed the incredible picture of a respected judge of a United States District Court being openly reviled, cursed, insulted and even defied in his own court-room in Chicago, and now two different professional bar association groups are actually seeking to criticize and condemn the *judge!* Not the revolutionaries who caused the trouble, but the *judge*, for issuing "harsh" punishment!

These things are but a very few of the indications of our current state of "domestic tranquility."

What about the phrase "to form a more perfect Union?"

In our knowledgeable lifetimes, have you *ever* seen a *worse* federal-state relationship than that which has now come upon us through the two serious issues of school integration and court nullification of state statutes regarding voting and apportionment?

How about the "establishment of Justice?" Gentlemen, ask *any* lawyer who practices in the criminal courts, and I am one of them. You will be told that *never before* has the criminal court defendant had the great advantage he possesses today. The odds today of a defendant in a criminal case being convicted as charged are *8 to 1* against, and all the professional criminals and most of the amateurs are very well aware of it!

So much for the problems. We could go on stating them indefinitely. The more immediate questions are—*How* did we get in this mess and *what* can be done about it?

First, How did we get this way? I submit to you, gentlemen, that we have arrived at our present sorry state of affairs by four means, these are:

First: Irresponsibility in government—the sacrifice of sound principles for the sake of political expediency, graft, dishonesty, crackpot give-away schemes both domestic and foreign, refusal to prosecute treason and sedition, violation of the civil rights of the citizens by snooping, wiretapping and big-brother tactics, the condonation of violence and finally the actual *encouragement* of *irresponsibility* instead of the development of self-reliant, law-abiding citizens. Another irresponsibility of government has been to withhold or play down all news of Communist atrocities against U.S. service men which might well have counteracted the loss of faith in our nation engendered by the recent claims of murder against our own soldiers. Look at these photographs of American soldiers murdered by the Viet Cong. Some were tied and shot in the back of the head. Two of them had their heads chopped off and carried through the villages stuck on poles. You have not seen these pictures before. Why haven't these been shown to the public in the press or on network television?

Second: The substitution of personal prejudice and opinion for law, justice and reason in the decisions of our U.S. Supreme Court. This has been particularly true in the fields of race-relations, federal-state relations and Communist subversion. The court has now nullified the anti-sedition laws of all the states, and for years our federal prosecutors have carefully avoided enforcement of the U.S. Code in regard to both treason and sedition. At one time, in *102* cases considered by Justice Hugo Black in which the Communists were involved, he ruled in favor of the position taken by the Communists *102 times straight!* The records of Justice Douglas and Justice Brennan are almost as bad. What this means is that in 102 straight cases, Justice Black ruled in most of them that the lower court hearing the case was wrong and in all of them that the Attorney General of the U.S. or of one of the states was wrong in prosecuting the case. I for one do not believe that the lawyers for the Communist Party are that much better learned on the Constitution than are the Attorneys General of the U.S. and the various states, the U.S. District Courts, the U.S. Courts of Appeal and the state supreme courts.

Some of the results of these decisions are now being felt in the riot and violence situations we are experiencing. For instance, by decree of the U.S. Supreme Court, (Keyishian v. Board of Regents of the University of New York) (Jan., 1967) the East Baton Rouge Parish School Board now cannot fire

a teacher for the "uttering of any treasonous or seditious words" or even the *"doing* of any treasonable or seditious act!"

This is only one field of law, and I can tell you that decisions of parallel foolishness and danger have been made by the U.S. Supreme Court in other fields, particularly criminal law and federal-state relationships dealing with schools, voting and race relations.

Third: We have suffered a long period of liberal "permissiveness," in which people who should be leading our citizens toward *responsible* citizenship, have instead condoned violence and law-breaking of all types in the name of various "liberal" causes. This is the result of a basic mis-evaluation of the nature of *freedom;* the taking of "freedom" to mean *license,* rather than a *balance* of rights and responsibilities. This has been strengthened by a pre-occupation with violence, encouraged by television which trains people that violence is a quick and simple way to resolve serious and long standing problems. This permissiveness has even been extended by much of our news media to the Communists. When was the last time you saw anything at all *critical* of Communists in Look, or Life, or on the network TV, or even in a movie on TV, unless it was an old one? This is simply a distortion of the news by failing to tell the whole truth! The public is entitled to expect *complete* fairness and objectivity in news reporting, particularly on network TV, where it is rare indeed today.

Fourth: We *have* suffered a certain amount of subversion, primarily Communist subversion, which has taken good advantage, with some success, of the paradoxes, anomalies, and even injustices of our pluralistic "free" society. On Feb. 16, 1967, J. Edgar Hoover testified before a sub-committee of the U.S. Congress as follows:

"The riots and disturbances of recent years have given Communists a golden opportunity to emphasize the Marxist concept of the 'class struggle' by identifying the Negro and other minority group problems with it. Communists seek to advance the cause of communism by injecting themselves into racial situations and in exploiting them (1) to intensify the frictions between Negroes and whites to 'prove' that the discrimination against minorities is an inherent defect of the capitalist system, (2) to foster domestic disunity by dividing Negroes and whites into antagonistic, warring factions, (3) to undermine and destroy established authority, (4) to incite Negro hostility toward law and order, (5) to encourage and foment further racial strife and riotous activity, and (6) to portray the Communist movement as the 'champion' of social protest and the only force capable of ameliorating the conditions of the Negroes and the oppressed.

"The cumulative effect of almost 50 years of Communist Party activity in the United States cannot be minimized, for it has contributed to disrupting race relations in this country and has exerted an insidious influence on the life and times of our Nation.

"The net result of agitation and propaganda by Communist and other subversive and extremist elements has been to create a climate of conflict between the races in this country and to poison the atmosphere."

Now what if we do nothing about these things? What can we expect?

We will, if the historical pattern of the past holds true, see an ever-increasing anarchy, steadily being matched by the growing control of a socialist bureaucracy. The anarchists, being encouraged, will increase their efforts in total contempt for the law. The victim, who tend to obey the law, will sink themselves to a contempt for the law that fails to protect them from crime and subversion. Those who seek quick remedies through violence will be greatly strengthened and will engage in increasing viligante activity, which will inevitably lead to serious excesses. In the end the so-called "good" people will *demand* a strong government to end the chaos and restore order. And they *may well get it,* the way they got it in Rome with Caesar, revolutionary France with Napoleon Bonaparte, in Italy, in Portugal, in Spain, in Nicaragua, in Argentina, and in Hitler's Germany. If the Communists continue to grow stronger, they could well win a take-over, but I think the other alternative is more likely to come first.

At that point, what has happened to the "dream of freedom," in a socialist police-state? If we lose freedom here, it may not exist again on the earth for 1000 years!

So, what should we do about it? We must stop, yes even reverse, the trend of our society! We must re-dedicate ourselves and our institutions to the ideals of freedom set forth in our Constitution and our Declaration of Independence. We must train and re-orient our children and our people toward *responsible citizenship.* The keynote of freedom is not *controls* and *guarantees.* It is the responsible individual citizen!

We must pass new legislation as is necessary to deal with subversion, *within the Constitutional framework.* We must train, equip and above all give moral support to our police officers in their war with crime. We must reform our system of criminal justice and penology to bring about far swifter justice and some hope of rehabilitation for criminals. We must give our children a sound moral basis for their lives through religious training, good education and the maintenance of a sound family unit. We must do what can be done to eliminate conditions of poverty, in a pattern that does not encourage personal irresponsibility. We must end our military actions in Asia if and when, and only when, we can do it without violating our treaty obligations and our two hundred year commitment to freedom and human dignity. We must at least *start* the planning of long range programs of eugenics towards the producing of fewer defective human beings in our society. We must respect and obey the laws ourselves, and finally, we must *take part in political action* to elect to public office *only* those men who will appoint reasonable and unbiased men to the judiciary and who will firmly support law and order under the Constitution of the United States.

The alternatives are simple, either we can do these things within the framework of a free society, we can all buy mail-order rifles, or we can sit back and surrender to the inexorable tide of historical precedent.

I, for one, choose "perfect union", "justice", "domestic tranquility", "common defense", "general welfare" and the "Blessings of liberty"! In other words, I choose freedom, under the Constitution. It is the thing to which we, as American citizens, owe our ultimate loyalty. A lot of good men have died for it, how much less can we afford to do today?

TO COMMEMORATE EMINENCE IN SURGERY: A STAMP FOR DR. WILLIAMS

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, today 29 cosponsors and I introduced a bill to provide for the issuance of a 6-cent postage stamp commemorating Dr. Daniel Hale Williams, the first surgeon to perform open heart surgery. I am joined in this resolution by my distinguished colleagues Mr. ADDABBO, Mr. ANDERSON of Tennessee, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. BURTON of California, Mrs. CHISHOLM, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CORMAN, Mr. DERWINSKI, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. FLOOD, Mrs. GREEN, Mr. HELSTOSKI, Mr. HORTON, Mr. HUNGATE, Mrs. MINK, Mr. MOORHEAD, Mr. OTTINGER, Mr. PIRNIE, Mr. POWELL, Mr. QUIE, Mr. REUSS, Mr. RODINO, Mr. ROSENTHAL, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SCHEUER, Mr. STOKES, Mr. THOMPSON of New Jersey, Mr. TUNNEY, and Mr. VAN DEERLIN. In an age in which medical advancements in heart surgery are increasing and becoming widely acclaimed, this bill seeks to honor the memory of the distinguished black physician who pioneered medical operations involving the human heart.

On the warm and humid day of July 9, 1893, a brawl erupted in a Chicago barroom, leaving expressman James Cornish stabbed in the region of the heart. Shortly after being rushed to Provident Hospital, Cornish was examined by the 37-year-old founder of the institution, Dr. Daniel Hale Williams, who was only 10 years out of Chicago Medical College. Although the best medical opinion of the day suggested that heart wounds be left alone, Dr. Williams realized that without an operation, his patient would probably die. With the aid of five assistants, he set to work with no X-ray pictures to direct him, no trained anesthetist to assist him, no blood transfusions to keep the patient alive, no chemotherapeutic drugs to correct an infection, no artificial airway to keep the windpipe open, and no previous surgical experience in this area to guide him. Working swiftly and deftly, Dr. Williams entered the thoracic cavity and proceeded to perform a surgical exploration of the heart. Not only was the operation a success, but the patient, Mr. Cornish, recovered to live for over another 20 years.

Even before the historic operation, Dr. Williams had been heralded as one of the premier physicians of his day. A founder of the National Medical Association and its first vice president, he was also a member of the medical societies of Chicago and of the entire State of Illinois. In 1891 he realized what had been his consuming ambition, establishing a biracially operated institution, Provident Hospital, complete with a training school for nurses. As the hospital's reputation grew, so did that of the founder, and in 1893, President Grover Cleveland appointed Dr. Williams surgeon in chief of the Freedmen's Hospital in Washington, D.C. As head of the largest Negro hospital in the country, Dr. Williams proceeded to make innovations and expand operations. He reorganized the surgical services and established a nursing school. The hospital's horse-drawn ambulances patrolled the Capital streets, picking up black patients, some of whom had been turned away from white hospitals.

Despite his eminence in the surgical world, Dr. Williams, who created a method by which the living heart could be sutured, had his own heart broken by the weight of racial prejudices. Exhausted by his efforts to overcome the great odds against him, Dr. Williams retired into self-exile for almost a decade and a half before his death in 1931. A scholar and scientist, reserved and sen-

sitive, he withdrew from active participation in medical and scientific affairs before the full flowering of his genius.

In the history of the Post Office, only two stamps commemorating the efforts of medical men have ever been issued. The doctor's stamp was created in 1947, and in 1964 a stamp was issued in honor of the brothers Charles and William Mayo. We who are the cosponsors of this bill think it most fitting that Dr. Daniel Hale Williams, a man who dedicated his life to the medical advancement of America, be similarly honored by an American stamp saluting both his achievements and his dedication.

COMMUNISM VERSUS FREEDOM: A PERSPECTIVE

HON. ROBERT PRICE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. PRICE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with President Nixon's decision to send American troops and military supplies into Cambodia, the questions are being asked again: Why are we in Vietnam? Why are we so heavily involved in Southeast Asia? What possible interests in Southeast Asia could this country have that would cause us to make such bloody and costly sacrifices in that remote area of the world?

In my judgment, the answers to these questions are part of the answer to a larger question; namely, why has there been such a history of conflict in the world? Perhaps a new perspective is needed even to raise this question properly, a perspective gained through a withdrawal from the daily turmoil of life. Such a vantage point surely would be afforded in the peacefulness of outer space, a peacefulness existing because the reaches of space are yet untouched by man's conflicting ambitions. As the astronauts travel through this void, or walk on the surface of the moon, they must gaze at an earth that appears to be so quiet and beautiful. They must ask themselves the question, Why can't our planet be as peaceful as it looks?

I believe this question can best be answered by examining the existing situation in a historical perspective. Since the dawn of time, man has been at war with man. Although the struggle has taken different forms, depending on time, place, and circumstance, the underlying theme has been one of direct opposition of beliefs, of values, of life styles, of two opposing systems.

Some students of history have couched this conflict in basic terms of good against evil, God against the Devil, tyranny against freedom. Whatever its fundamental nature, however, since the early part of this century, the struggle has taken a highly ideological turn and has been characterized by a battle between communism and freedom.

In my lifetime, the Communists have waged a relentless war to extend their influence and control over men and nations. In the process, countries have been treated as pawns in a global chess game that has as its goal the eradication of freedom, and the establishment of a world order based on tyranny and atheism.

From the time they demonstrated their real objectives, the United States has attempted to counter and frustrate the Communist's conspiratorial designs whenever and wherever possible. Despite all efforts, though, the ideological map of the world has changed greatly in the last 25 years.

Although communism, as a form of government, emerged from the Russian revolution of 1917, it did not become a world threat until the close of World War II. After the war the Soviets consolidated a primary base of illegitimate power by ringing down the Iron Curtain in Europe. Behind this Iron Curtain millions of individuals in the 12 nations of Poland, Hungary, Lithuania, Ukraine, Czechoslovakia, Latvia, Estonia, Byelorussia, Rumania, East Germany, Yugoslavia, and Bulgaria, were forced to submit to the totalitarian will of the Communist state.

One of the first major postwar confrontations between the Soviet Union and the United States occurred in 1946. During World War II, Russia had agreed to withdraw its troops from Iran at the cessation of hostilities. After the close of the war, however, the Soviets refused to honor their agreement; they finally did so only after substantial political pressure was applied by the United States.

In the following year, the Russians and their East European allies aided the Greek Communist guerrillas in their attempt to forcefully overthrow the Greek Government. This endeavor was defeated by American military and economic aid which was channeled under the Truman doctrine to the embattled country.

During 1948, a direct confrontation between the Soviet Union and the United States occurred in Berlin. In June, in a bold attempt to force the United States, Great Britain, and France to relinquish their joint control of the city, the Soviets blockaded Berlin. The allies responded with a counterblockade and initiated a massive airlift to relieve the beleaguered city. One year later, Russia lifted its quarantine, and the Berlin crisis subsided.

These initial confrontations influenced the United States to reverse its traditional policy of avoiding permanent alliances. In 1949, the United States and 11 European nations signed the North Atlantic Treaty, and NATO was born. In this fashion, the countries of Belgium, Canada, Denmark, France, Great Britain, Iceland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, and the United States, with the subsequent additions of Greece, Turkey, and West Germany, banded together to safeguard the freedom of the Atlantic community.

During the same year, however, the Communist cause gained great impetus when China fell to a Communist revolution led by Mao Tse-tung. The United States continued to support Chiang Kai-shek and the Republic of China, which set up headquarters on Taiwan. Soon Taiwan and the offshore islands, notably Quemoy and Matsu, because a source of recurring international tension.

Faced with a new Communist threat from China, and fearing its growth in Asia and possible spread to Latin America and Africa, the United States instituted the point 4 program. This was a program designed to share U.S. technological skills, knowledge, and equipment with underdeveloped nations in an effort to help them develop their industrial, agricultural, political, and human resource potentialities. It also encouraged the flow of U.S. private investment capital to these nations.

Despite U.S. efforts, however, the strife continued, and in 1950, the most serious confrontation of the early cold war occurred. The scene was not Europe, but the Far East. In June of that year, North Korean forces, with the support of the Soviet Union and Communist China, invaded South Korea. The free world swiftly responded and the United States, on behalf of the United Nations, intervened and waged a relentless battle until a cessation of hostilities was finally agreed to in 1953.

During the latter part of the fifties, the cold war centered again in Berlin. In November 1958, Khrushchev initiated the second Berlin crisis by unilaterally renouncing the validity of the wartime agreements upon which the four country occupation of the city was based, and demanding a new settlement strictly on Soviet terms. The United States and its allies resisted Soviet pressures, however, and the crisis temporarily abated when Premier Khrushchev and President Eisenhower reached an understanding at Camp David in September of 1959.

When John F. Kennedy assumed the Presidency in 1961, this understanding evaporated. Once again Khrushchev began to build up international pressures over Berlin. The United States, Great Britain, and France resisted the pressures and prepared for all contingencies. A virtual stalemate thus existed until the fall, when Khrushchev abandoned his demands, and world tensions subsided once more.

In the following year, the Communists heated up the cold war again, this time almost to the boiling point. In September, Khrushchev placed intermediate-range ballistic missiles and medium-range bombers in Cuba, which had been secured as a forward Communist position by Castro's revolution of the late fifties. The United States responded by threatening to unleash its nuclear power against the Soviets if their offensive weapons were not removed from the island. After a week of crisis, the Russians removed their missiles and bombers and the world relaxed.

While the removal of these instruments of war from Castro's Cuba helped remove communism's sting from our shores, it did not help remove its influence from the Western Hemisphere. Since that time, both the Soviets and the Red Chinese have been using the island as a staging base to promote Communist revolutions in the countries of South America. The United States has reacted by refining some of its Latin aid programs and the Alliance for Progress. To date, our actions have helped combat the spread of communism in South America, but prevailing Latin economic and

social conditions make any predictions of the future impossible.

Mr. Speaker, the United States has been waging the cold war for over 25 years. During that time we have joined with other nations of the free world and formed regional defense and security pacts. I have already discussed NATO; chief among the others, are SEATO and SENTO in Asia and the Pacific, and the OAS in South America.

While these agreements provide a broad-based bulwark against communism, the United States has not been content to rely solely upon them. In an effort to contain the spread of Chinese communism, for example, we have helped certain Asian and Pacific nations build their social, political, and economic institutions. South Korea, the Philippines, and Formosa proudly stand today as dramatic proof of the benefits of some forms of American foreign aid.

In this process of nationbuilding, we have also constructed an arc of defense posts in strategic areas of the world. Major U.S. strike bases are located in South Korea, Okinawa, Taiwan, the Philippines, South Vietnam, and Thailand, as well as the Pacific Islands of Guam, Mariannas, Marshall Islands, and Midway. This line of defense has been drawn in Asia and in the Pacific and not on the shores of the continental United States because, as aptly stated by Gen. Douglas McArthur, the islands of the Pacific are the stepping stones to our defeat. Thus, we will fight the enemy on our own shores only as a last resort.

The strength of this arc of defense is nowhere better illustrated than by our Okinawa airbase. We possibly have enough nuclear firepower located on the island to reduce Red China to a sandy beach. Moreover, it is estimated that it would take only 400 atomic weapons to insure this total destruction. Of course, we would not unleash this nuclear holocaust unless forced to, but I am convinced that the knowledge we have the power and would use it if necessary, helps keep the Communists in line.

Mr. Speaker, based on the nature and history of the cold war, I submit it is obvious that the Communists are fomenting revolution in Southeast Asia as a means of facilitating the achievement of their goal of world conquest and domination.

It was to frustrate these conspiratorial plans that the United States became heavily involved in the Asian conflict. In this connection, our actions in that wartorn area are also proof to the free world that this country will not permit the destiny of beleaguered nations that ask for our assistance to be forcefully decided by alien aggressors.

For the greater part of the last decade, we have fought the Communists in Vietnam. In my judgment, this conflict could have been resolved in our favor years ago if our then national leaders had had the will and resolve to permit the military to win the war. This was the subject of a personal policy statement which I recently delivered supporting my concurrent resolution which calls on the President to promptly and systematically pursue a new policy of total military victory in Southeast Asia.

Mr. Speaker, at present, the war drags on and on. American and Vietnamese deaths and casualties continue to mount in what has become the most lengthy U.S. military involvement in history.

While the Nation's press has taken the war off the front page of America's newspapers, it has not removed the war from the foreground of peoples minds. If the 18th Congressional District of Texas is any index, and I think it is, the American people still are vitally concerned about the progress of the war, and they hunger for a just peace with honor in Vietnam.

National policymakers speak in terms of these U.S. alternatives in Vietnam: Negotiations, total military victory, unilateral withdrawal, and Vietnamization. To date, the Paris peace talks have been marked by much heat but little light, and calumny, not serious negotiations, has been the rule. Total military victory has been rejected out of hand due to its supposed lack of "political acceptability." Unilateral withdrawal has been rejected because it would mean that the great American sacrifices in Vietnam have all been in vain; additionally, it would constitute proof to the world that the United States is unwilling to live up to and abide by its solemn international commitments.

Vietnamization, in contrast, has been chosen because it provides a means by which U.S. involvement can be reduced as the burdens of military conflict are transferred from American shoulders to Vietnamese ones.

As a former jet fighter pilot in the Korean conflict, I have long believed that whenever this Nation involves itself in foreign military conflicts, it should fight to win. Our Nation's youth should not be sent to fight in foreign lands if they are to be used for political cannonfodder. Their lives are far too precious for that.

Because of my strong feelings on the matter, I have long advocated that the United States pursue total military victory in Vietnam. Let the policymakers make policy; let the military win wars. If military action be diplomacy by other means, then let the military prosecute armed diplomacy with full force and vigor.

Throughout our involvement in Vietnam I have consistently and vocally adhered to this, by personal philosophy, while I watched the Nation follow a different policy. I have watched our youth march off to a war the policymakers would not let them win. I have shared the frustration of countless soldiers who, without being clothed with the armor of full military protection and influence of their Nation, daily risked their lives to bring freedom to the struggling people of South Vietnam. I have shared in the grief of families who lost their sons to a struggle in a far off land, a struggle we were willing to let our young die for, but a struggle our Nation would not devote our massive might to win—even though our cause was just. I have shared the anguish of those whose loved ones are inhumanely imprisoned by the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong, and whose continued treatment fails to meet even minimum standards of decency and humanity—a fate now shared by close friends whom I flew jet combat with in Korea.

Finally, I have shared the rage of patriotic Americans who have watched peaceniks, anarchists, and militant leftists attempt to sully the memories of our fallen soldiers by using their names for propaganda purposes.

When Richard Nixon assumed the Presidency, I waited eagerly for an indication of his thinking on the war. After spending some months quietly and systematically examining the situation, he declared that a peace with honor could best be achieved through Vietnamizing the war. In proclaiming his program, the President declared that its progress would depend on three factors; the conditions of the Paris talks, the rate at which the South Vietnamese could assume new military responsibilities, and the level of enemy activity.

After much deliberation, I supported the President's Vietnamization program. My support, however, was not without misgivings. I believed the three preconditions of Vietnamization to be less than sturdy foundations for a new American policy in Vietnam.

My reservations about the Paris talks have been consistently confirmed. The Communists are using it as a propaganda forum rather than a negotiations base. To date, the talks have been marked by invective, not progress, and there is little reason to think that such will not be the case in days to come.

Vietnamization, on the other hand, has worked better than I originally thought it would. The process has been facilitated due to the willingness and ability of South Vietnamese military forces to assume ever-increasing responsibilities for bearing the burdens of battle. Valiant RVN troops have been attacking the Vietcong and the North Vietnamese with a new and deadly ferocity. Vietnamization has given them the feeling that on their shoulders rests the fate of South Vietnam, and they are fighting courageously for the cause of freedom.

Recent events, however, have demonstrated that the enemy has not scaled down his activities in response to American troop withdrawals. On the contrary, the Communists are widening the Vietnam war to neighboring Laos, Cambodia, and Thailand. In the process they are attempting to generate new political and psychological pressures on Vietnam's neighbors. They are also trying to rekindle domestic U.S. antiwar agitation, and dramatically demonstrate that peace in Southeast Asia can be obtained only through negotiations rather than Vietnamization. The reason behind this is obvious, the Communists are attempting to achieve at the bargaining table what they have been so singularly unable to achieve on the field of combat.

At present, the spearheads of the wider war lie in Laos and Cambodia. In past years, Communist forces have made annual spring offensives into Laos. This year, however, by virtue of Hanoi's sending a 67,000-man invasion force into Laotian territory, the tiny country may become a very significant Asian battleground.

Mr. Speaker, what is at stake in Laos is the very survival of a free Southeast Asia. A Communist victory would bode several things for the other countries in the area, none of them good from the point of view of the free world.

Should Laos fall, an additional 3 million people would be subjected to Communist rule. The Reds would have unrestricted use of the Ho Chi Minh Trail as well as heretofore unused supply routes and bases. Enemy activities and penetrations could be increased, new military and political pressures could be brought to bear on the United States, and all Southeast Asia would become riper for subversion and revolution.

In Cambodia, the present situation appears ominous, indeed. Prior to the recent coup that overthrew Prince Sihanouk and his pro-Red regime, Communist forces freely used Cambodia as a sanctuary from which infiltrations into South Vietnam were made at will. Since the coup, however, North Vietnamese and Vietcong have mounted a campaign to expand and solidify their position. As a result, the death toll in Cambodia has risen dramatically in the wake of the new Communist aggression.

The Communists surely would not be satisfied with the conquest of Cambodia; Thailand would become the next major target of attack. Since 1965, both Peking and Hanoi have threatened to start a so-called war of liberation against Thailand. The fact that Thailand has a 1,000-mile virtually indefensible border, would serve to whet their rapacious appetites even more.

Mr. Speaker, when all the pieces in the Asian puzzle are assembled the picture created is alarming indeed. The Communists in Vietnam are not engaged solely in a civil war for national liberation as they so loudly proclaim. They are, in fact, attempting to subvert and dominate Southeast Asia itself. In this connection, Secretary of State William Rogers has stated:

> More than 40,000 North Vietnamese and Vietcong troops have invaded and now occupy Cambodia.

In addition, he has declared this invasion to be a clear violation of the 1954 and 1962 Geneva accords, and has called upon the nations of the world to consider what counteractions might be taken.

Experience has shown us, however, that calling on the world community to act is really a ceremonial gesture; for the world community has proven in the past that it lacks the unity of purpose or the will to join in effective collective action to solve vital international problems such as the one posed by Communist aggression in Southeast Asia.

This aggression, when exposed to the naked light of truth, also validates the much maligned domino theory. Vietnam is no longer the focal point of revolutionary action. Laos and Cambodia are also visibly, undeniably, and appallingly menaced by Communist militaristic adventurism. This has not occurred by chance; neither has it occurred by circumstance. It is part of the fruition of calculated planning and is designed to facilitate the establishment of a new Communist sphere of influence in the world.

Should the Communists be permitted to gain control of Southeast Asia, the free world need talk no further about nations in Southeast Asia determining and maintaining their own forms of government without the pressure or presence of foreign troops. Should the Communists be permitted to gain control of Southeast Asia, the costly sacrifices of blood and treasure that this Nation has committed in the name of freedom in that troubled area of the world will also have been rendered in vain.

There are those who contend that we should not talk in terms of sacrifices, at least in the prospective sense, because we are winning the war. My response is simple. By what standards can it fairly be said we are winning the war? Infiltrations by North Vietnamese and Vietcong into neighboring countries are visibly and dramatically increasing. Despite U.S. troop withdrawals, more American soldiers were killed in action in 1969, the first year of the Vietnamization policy, than in 1967, when Lyndon Johnson's war policy was subjected to such heavy political attack. And so far this month, U.S. casualties are up about 60 percent from February and early March. Civilian deaths are still running at an awesome rate, and each passing day sees an ever-increasing number of refugees being added to the flood of displaced persons in Southeast Asia.

Dr. Henry Kissinger, the chief White House advisor on foreign affairs, stated the crux of the matter when he said: The guerrilla wins if he does not lose; the conventional army loses if it does not win. On this basis, this Nation stands in dire danger of losing the war in Southeast Asia.

The question of whether or not the Communists should be permitted to dominate Southeast Asia also raises vexatious troubles for the new Nixon doctrine. There are those who maintain that the Nixon doctrine precludes U.S. involvement in Cambodia and other threatened countries in the area. I take the opposite view that the very spirit of the Nixon doctrine demands that we take an active role in repelling Communist aggressors from these embattled countries. When he was in Guam, the President rightly stated that American forces must not be viewed as the first line of Asian defense and will not be committed automatically even in the event of outside aggression. I do not advocate automatic intervention; neither do I think we should retreat into a "new isolationism" as some have suggested. Rather, I think we should, in the President's words, "help where it makes a real difference and is considered in our interest."

I submit that it would make a real difference and it would be in our interest to involve ourselves more directly, wherever Communist aggression threatens in Indochina.

Mr. Speaker, to put matters in perspective, by weighing present conditions in Southeast Asia against the historical record of U.S. involvement, it becomes obvious that our present peace-seeking policies are gravely deficient. The Communists do not want any peace except on terms which will allow then to enforce their will on millions of helpless Asians. Bitter experiences demonstrate that where dealing with the Reds are concerned, there is no middle ground. Accordingly, I believe that President Nixon should declare a new strategy in Vietnam, a strategy designed to array our military might on bringing the conflict to a speedy close. Such a policy would have the salutary effects of accomplishing our oft stated objectives with a minimal loss of U.S. life and limb, and at a minimum cost to our national economy.

As I stated earlier, I have introduced a concurrent resolution calling on the President to issue new orders to our military forces and our allies in the field. Orders that will remain in force until North Vietnam totally surrenders. I have also urged him to institute a plan of action of day and night bombardment that will assure the total destruction of North Vietnam's military and industrial installations; population centers after appropriate notices of intention have been disseminated; agricultural production lands; dikes and facilities; transportation and communications lines connecting North Vietnam to neighboring countries; Haiphong Harbor; and other shore facilities. In addition, a program of tactical commando raids by South Vietnamese into North Vietnam should be implemented. Finally, a total air, land and sea embargo on commerce between North Vietnam and other nations should be established.

In regard to halting Communist aggression throughout Southeast Asia, particularly Cambodia, I have urged President Nixon to supply that embattled country with sufficient U.S. military equipment and supplies together with a force of U.S. military advisors to enable the Cambodian Government to withstand the enemy onslaught. At present, Cambodian troops are ill-equipped and ill-trained. They also need our guidance. One without the other would be insufficient.

In contrast to our bitter experience in Vietnam, the U.S. assistance I have outlined should be accompanied by massive round-the-clock airstrikes, designed to destroy all strategic hamlets, staging and support areas utilized by the Communists throughout the embattled area. Thus American power will be focused on problem areas at a minimum loss of American life and limb.

I think if these military policies were vigorously pursued, the aggressors would soon be defeated, and a well-earned peace could settle on the area for the first time in over 20 years. The Communists have demonstrated that freedom for Southeast Asia can only be purchased by force. Since they have sown the wind with discord and strife, let them now reap a whirlwind of righteous American power and wrath.

Before leaving this subject, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the observation that achieving peace in Southeast Asia does not necessarily mean that the United States will totally withdraw

its military forces from the area. More than likely, residual forces would remain, as they have remained after the close of earlier wars. For example, although World War II was concluded 25 years ago, we still have about 300,000 troops stationed in Western Europe and in NATO countries. Another 39,000 men are based in Japan. Moreover, despite the fact that Korean hostilities ceased 18 years ago, 64,000 U.S. soldiers still remain in South Korea. It is on this basis that I predict the current American involvement in Southeast Asia will probably take the form of a long-term American regional presence, even after peace is arrived at.

Mr. Speaker, the President has recently sent Allied forces on a tactical mission into Cambodia. The move was designed to clean out Communist sanctuaries and deny the Communists the unfettered use of Cambodian staging areas and supply depots. To date, the mission has far exceeded expectations. Enormous amounts of food, munitions, and medical supplies have been captured. Large numbers of enemy bunkers, staging depots, and command posts have been destroyed. Finally, thousands of enemy soldiers have been killed, and thousands more captured. Accordingly, I think the Cambodian mission will yield the dividends the President expects, and that it will be of material benefit in shortening the war and facilitating troop withdrawals.

Mr. Speaker, while our national attention and energies are focused on Southeast Asia, the Communists are dramatically increasing their presence and involvement in the Middle East. The Soviets are using Arab-Israel problems as a means of extending Communist influence in that part of the world. This is not a new happenstance; the Russians mounted a program of expansion in the Middle East in 1955. At that time they agreed to supply Egypt with arms from Communist bloc countries. Following this agreement, Russia became an outspoken supporter of Egypt on the international scene. In addition, during the Mideast war of 1956, involving Britain, France, and Israel, the Soviets seized on the volatile situation and exploited it. They initiated far-reaching economic and military aid programs for the Arab States, and in the course of the next decade were able to fashion considerable influence and control in Arab councils.

Today, the Soviets are renewing their expansionist efforts in the Middle East. They are supplying Arab States with military advisers, combat pilots, ground-to-air missile experts, modern airpower, armaments and munitions. If these ominous trends continue, and if Communist influence in the Middle East is consolidated, the area could become hostile territory to U.S. and allied military forces. Should this happen, NATO security and the global balance of power would be greatly affected. In addition, the natural resources of the oil rich Middle East could be denied to the United States and Europe, thereby placing potential economic strains on the free world.

To avert such an eventuality is why the United States must weigh the course of events in the Middle East carefully, and cast its weight in strategic places and at appropriate times. Moreover, the United States has a vested interest in helping the nations concerned work out a mutually agreeable resolution to the conflict, a resolution that will insure the territorial integrity of the countries involved and that will preserve the East-West balance of power in the Mediterranean.

Mr. Speaker, by way of summary, for 25 years the United States and the Communists have been locked in a titantic struggle that has spanned the globe. In the process some nations have been subverted, overthrown, and dominated by the Reds, while the sovereignty of other nations has been protected and preserved by the United States.

I predict this struggle will not be ended in Vietnam. Neither will it be decided in the Middle East. Instead, I believe it will continue until one side absorbs the other, until both sides destroy each other and the world, or until we learn to live together in peace.

For the present, however, I believe it is of crucial importance for Americans young and old to understand the nature, the background, and the present state of the struggle between communism and freedom. Understanding is necessary if the resources of this great country are to be fully focused on the battle at hand, a battle that has cost great losses of American life and treasure; a battle that will probably cost us more of the same in the years to come.

The mantle of world leadership falls heavy on the nation that wears it; the costs of freedom come high to the people who preserve it. Our Nation has not shirked its leadership responsibility in the past; our people have always proved equal to the sacrifices they have been called upon to make in the cause of freedom. I am confident such will be the case in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the United States is the only nation in the world today that possesses sufficient human, industrial, and military resources to lead the fight against communism. Should this generation of Americans decide that the battle between communism and freedom is not worth pursuing, and that the United States should surrender its leadership position, I believe this generation will not pass before the forces of communism dominate the world.

If the United States did not lead the fight for freedom, what nation would? If the United States faltered in its historic task, what nation would pick up the fallen standard?

MAN'S INHUMANITY TO MAN—HOW LONG?

HON. WILLIAM J. SCHERLE

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

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

Communist North Vietnam is sadistically practicing spiritual and mental genocide on over 1,500 American prisoners of war and their families.

How long?

ABA JOURNAL ARTICLE ENDORSES STATE OF THE JUDICIARY ADDRESS

HON. FRED SCHWENGEL

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I recently introduced a concurrent resolution calling for a "State of the Judiciary Address" by the Chief Justice. In a recent article in the American Bar Association Journal, Mr. E. Barrett Prettyman, Jr., makes an excellent case for such an address. I would like to insert the article in the RECORD at this point for the benefit of my colleagues:

THE CHIEF JUSTICE SHOULD ADDRESS CONGRESS

(By E. Barrett Prettyman, Jr.)

In addressing the Fourth Circuit Judicial Conference in 1953, the then Deputy Attorney General of the United States, our present Secretary of State, William P. Rogers, made a suggestion that received too little attention at the time and deserves re-examination now. Toward the end of his talk, in discussing the necessity of fair treatment by the government of all its citizens, Mr. Rogers said:

"Somehow, we have failed to get this idea across to our people. For this reason, it seems to me it might be well for us to consider here tonight and in the days ahead a method of re-emphasizing to the people of the nation the great importance of the judicial process in a free nation. The work of the federal courts in this country has been outstanding. . . . But I doubt that the Congress and the people of the country fully appreciate the work of the federal judiciary. This might be a good time to consider a new and better way to see that this is done.

"With that in mind, I should like to suggest that Congress might well consider extending an invitation to the Chief Justice of the United States to appear each year before a joint session of Congress to report on the state of the federal judiciary. In this way both Congress and the public would be fully informed, from year to year, about the work and the progress of the federal courts of our nation. Such a plan, I think, might materially contribute to a better understanding among the three great branches of our government. For that reason, I believe that the initiation of it should deserve serious consideration."

At the time these remarks were made, there may have been practical—or political—reasons why the suggestion could not be carried out. Events since 1953, however, have proved the wisdom of his idea. Not only does the work of the judiciary need explaining to the country as never before, but a new and frightening set of figures on the growth of litigation in the federal courts bears witness to the need for long-range planning and Congressional action. It is time that the problems of our judicial system be presented, both to Congress and to the country, at the highest level.

As we enter a period of new leadership on the Court, I suggest we use the occasion for a number of innovative reforms and that the first be for the leader of the third co-ordinate branch of government to address a joint session of Congress each year on the "State of the Judiciary" in much the same fashion as

the President presents the "State of the Union" to the same body.

LITIGANTS KNOW TOO WELL THE STATE OF THE JUDICIARY

While it is true that the President's address ranges over a wide variety of topics, from armaments to agriculture, and that the Chief Justice's talk necessarily would be more limited, anyone who imagines that the predicament faced by our federal judicial system is too narrow or unimportant to warrant an address of this kind simply has not become cognizant of the multiplying problems affecting a great mass of litigants in this country.

The caseload in the federal courts has reached an all-time high. Continuing a trend begun ten years ago, new filings in the courts of appeals increased again in fiscal 1969—12.4 per cent over the year before. For the first time, these appeals shoved above the 10,000 level. New cases docketed numbered 10,248, so that even though the number of cases disposed of increased (to 9,014), the pending caseload reached an all-time high of 7,849 on June 30, 1969. Both the number of appeals docketed and the number pending have more than doubled in just seven years. Although nine additional appellate judgeships were authorized in 1968, four of these were still unfilled at the end of fiscal 1969. Thus, whereas there were ninety appeals docketed per judge in 1967, the number rose to ninety-four in 1968 and 106 in 1969. The heaviest increase was in habeas corpus appeals for federal prisoners, which increased 55 per cent in a single year.

Until fiscal 1969, new filings in the federal district courts had remained fairly constant for a number of years. But that year the combined civil and criminal cases newly docketed rose to 110,778, an increase of 8.4 per cent over the year before. The cases disposed of increased to 103,932 (as compared with 98,365 the year before), but since this was still 6,846 less than the number filed, the volume of pending cases reached 104,091 on June 30, 1969—the highest pending case figure on record. In the criminal area, Selective Service Act cases alone were up 81 per cent, the largest number since World War II.

Over-all both the courts of appeals and the fact that of 17,770 criminal cases pending at the end of the fiscal year, 3,521 had been pending more than six months but less than a year, 2,625 had been pending more than one year but less than two years, and the total number of cases pending more than six months had increased 30 per cent in a single year (although 40 per cent of these involved fugitive defendants).

Over-all both the Courts of appeals and the district courts faced an across-the-board case in judicial business in fiscal year 1969 of approximately 10 per cent. In spite of increased terminations, pending caseloads increased 19 per cent in the courts of appeals and 7 percent in the district courts.

Myriad problems stem from these extraordinary caseloads. There are too few judges, too few courtrooms, too few supporting personnel. It takes too long to prepare transcripts and records. Delays in criminal cases directly affect the fight against crime as well as the fair administration of justice, and delays in civil cases make the cost and inconvenience of litigation virtually prohibitive in many instances. Jurors by the thousands sit for days with nothing to do. Although probation costs the taxpayers only 99 cents a day compared with $9.17 a day for confinement in federal institutions, far too few probation and parole officers are available to handle the 21,000 persons submitted for supervision each year, much less those additional men under confinement who are potentially available for release. Problems of bail, judicial disability, the protracted case and a hundred other subjects plague our courts.

I do not mean to imply that progress has not been achieved or that substantial changes are not taking place. On the contrary, new appointments and innovations constantly are being made, and dedicated men all over the country are striving for new and better answers. But neither the problems nor the answers are being brought into focus for the country and the Congress, and action has seldom been galvanized even in the face of emergencies.

An annual address to the Congress by the Chief Justice would give the country its first realistic look at the state of its judiciary, pinpoint current and long-range problems, suggest solutions, as well as areas for study, and motivate the Congress to effective action.

JUDGES LOSE TIME AND DIGNITY PLEADING WITH CONGRESS

The present system of presenting these matters to Congress is both unbecoming and unproductive. Suggested changes usually emanate from a committee of the Judicial Conference. The conference, which meets in March and September of each year, is made up of the Chief Justice of the United States, the chief judge of each circuit, a district court judge elected from each circuit for a three-year term, the Chief Judge of the Court of Customs and Patent Appeals and the Chief Judge of the Court of Claims. If the committee recommendation is approved by the full conference, it is sent to the Administrative Office of the United States Courts. That office drafts a letter to the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House of Representatives. The letter is signed by the Director of the Administrative Office and begins, "At the direction of the Judicial Conference . . ." The Administrative Office thus acts as a kind of secretariat to the Judicial Conference.

The requests outlined in the letter are then assigned to the appropriate Senate and House committees. Administrative Office personnel work informally with the appropriate committee staffs in setting up hearings and agreeing upon appropriate witnesses to testify in support of the Judicial Conference's requests. The witnesses usually are the chairman of the Judicial Conference committees that originated the requests, but the practice varies widely, so that anyone from a Supreme Court Justice to the chairman of a local bar association committee may end up testifying in support of a particular measure. A great deal of judges' time is expended in preparing for and attending these legislative hearings, and yet the testimony is seldom reported in the press unless the issue is one of high controversy.

On judicial matters, Congress needs not only direction but the impetus that comes from public scrutiny, for often the reaction of Congress to a judicial dilemma is too narrow to suit the circumstances. For example, the caseload figures already cited laudably led to a bill, S. 952, that would create seventy new district court judgeships.[1] Although the bill would also establish circuit executives and district court executives who are urgently needed, it cannot supply the supporting court personnel—reporters, clerks, bailiffs, law clerks, marshals, probation officers and the rest—so essential to the proper administration of justice. The Judiciary Committee can authorize such personnel, but the funds can come only from the Appropriations Committee. As noted in a 1967 Senate Report:

"In particular, the record of the 5-year period from 1959 to 1964 belies the suggestion that the mere creation of additional judgeships is an adequate bulwark against burgeoning judicial backlogs. During that period, a 25-percent increase in the number of Federal district court judges resulted in but a 3-percent increase in the total number of civil cases terminated."[2]

A later committee report brought these figures up to date: "Since 1959 there has been a 40-percent increase in the number of Federal district judges, but only a 9-percent increase in the number of civil and criminal dispositions."[3] Only the clout supplied by national support probably would produce the personnel necessary to dispose of the courts' current backlog and cope with the needs of the future.

Even such a relatively noncontroversial matter as the need for additional Supreme Court law clerks can become mired in the Congressional pond. In 1967 the Supreme Court requested eleven additional law clerks—one for each Associate Justice and two for the Chief Justice. The request was turned down in committee. The request was renewed in 1968. How was the Court forced to handle the matter?

The Chief Justice sent a letter to the appropriate subcommittee of the Senate Committee on Appropriations, and Justices Stewart and White then appeared in person before the subcommittee to plead their cause. They pointed out that the request represented only $97,500 of a $2,207,500 budget. They also noted that while the number of law clerks employed by the Court had remained the same since 1952, the Court's caseload during this period had grown from 1,368 to 3,412, an increase of 149 per cent, or more than double the original figure. The request nevertheless was rejected again in committee.

In 1969 Justices Stewart and White again traveled to Capitol Hill, reducing their plea this time to an additional nine law clerks. By now the Court's budget was up to $3,183,200, of which the added law clerk cost would represent only 3 per cent. The Court's caseload had risen to 3,586. The following is typical of the good-natured colloquies that resulted from the Justices' appearance:

"Justice WHITE. . . . The increase in the Court's work is comparable to that experienced in the lower Federal courts where the additional burden has been met through adding judgeships, 20 in the courts of appeals and 98 in the district courts, and through increasing the number of law clerks from 196 in 1952 to 453 at the present time.

"Mr. ROONEY. Did this committee do that?

"Justice WHITE. Yes, sir.

"Mr. ROONEY. We may be slipping.

"Justice WHITE. They probably asked for more. . . .

* * * * *

"Mr. ROONEY. I am now beginning to wonder if we did not make a serious mistake last year in giving 55 additional law clerks to the circuit courts.

"Justice STEWART. I am not trying to imply for one minute they do not need all the help they have. I don't think you made a mistake at all.

"Mr. ROONEY. I thought Judge Murrah made a good case last year.

"Justice STEWART. I am sure he did.

"Mr. SMITH. You are not proposing more judges for the Supreme Court?

"Justice STEWART. No, sir; because the work is organized differently. That might just add to our problems. We have enough problems with nine members in the Court.

* * * * *

"Mr. ROONEY. Few of those jailhouse written appeals and pauper cases ever succeed. Is that not the fact?

"Justice STEWART. I think the percentage is quite low, Mr. Chairman.

"Mr. ROONEY. That is a fair statement.

"Justice STEWART. But the work involved is quite high.

"Mr. ROONEY. It is a matter of reading. Some of those gentlemen are very, very fine penmen.

Footnotes at end of article.

"Justice STEWART. Yes, they are, and very imaginative ones, also.

"Mr. ROONEY. Some of that script is very, very interesting. It would seem as though the gist of this argument is because we have all of these pauper appeals coming out of the jailhouses, very few of which succeed, we should give you nine additional clerks.

"Justice STEWART. That was not the gist of my argument, Mr. Chairman. The district courts and courts of appeals are inundated by these pauper cases as well.

* * * * *

"Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Justice Stewart, did I hear that the Gideon case originated as one of these miscellaneous cases?

"Justice STEWART. Yes, sir. I pointed that out as one that was of great importance in the jurisprudence of the Nation, and that case originated with a half legible scrawl written from a prison in Florida.

"While the numbers of meritorious cases are not large in terms of percentages, the importance of some of those cases is very great.

"Mr. ROONEY. Every once in a while one succeeds, so that encourages all the others to get busy.

"Justice STEWART. I am afraid that is true . . ."[4]

LEVITY FOR CONGRESS, THREE CLERKS FOR THE COURT

The levity of these remarks—and heaven knows most Congressional hearings need this type of levity—should not obscure the fact that the basic method of proceeding is not effective. Incidentally, Congress pared the nine law clerks requested by the Court to three. The public is not informed of the Court's problems, nor is the Congress as a whole made sufficiently aware of them. The net result is an embarrassing and frustrating turndown for the Court on what surely should have been a routine request.

The problem of law clerks is not one only for the Supreme Court. As Chief Judge Clement F. Haynsworth, Jr., of the Fourth Circuit pointed out to the Subcommittee on Improvements in Judiciary Machinery of the Senate Judiciary Committee in 1967, the need for more law clerks in the courts of appeals began to be felt as far back as 1964. The discussion between Judge Haynsworth and Senator Tydings says a great deal about why a presentation to Congress by the Chief Justice would have been very much in order on this and other subjects:

"Judge HAYNSWORTH . . . [I]f we, in the field, recognize the need for more clerks, our request must first go to Judge Levin's committee, and if this request is submitted in the fall, even though his committee approves it and the Conference approves it, it can't get into our budget request until the second fiscal year next after that; there can be a delay of almost 2 years in the process. But what is worst of all, we in the field don't know what to ask for until we are in a condition of extremity . . .

". . . I really think the fault lies as much with the judges, because they haven't known what to ask for and what to insist upon. What we do is to come in and ask for help on the basis of last year's work load. . . . This puts us way behind the present need. . . . As of now, I could say to you that I believe that the trend of the increasing loads will go on, but I can produce no factual data to support a reasonable projection of what the caseload will be next year. And yet I think the courts should come to you on the basis of a reasonably supported projection: this is what we will have next year. . . .

"Senator TYDINGS. It seems to me that the Judicial Conference is approaching Congress on these matters from the wrong position. It should approach the Congress on the basis of what judges require to do the job, and not on the basis of what they think the Appropriations Committee will give them. This timidity on the part of judges, including Justices of the Supreme Court—'don't ask for too much, or you will ruffle the Appropriations Committee'—while the backlog continues to mount is not helpful. I think that the Judicial Conference has the responsibility to the people of the country to attack this problem of backlog."[5]

CHIEF JUSTICE COULD FORECAST THE DECADES BEYOND

I would agree with Senator Tydings about the timidity of judicial pleas for help and with Judge Haynsworth about the need for basing requests to Congress on forecasts rather than hindsight. But the answer to both would be a well-constructed, well-supported, forceful and public presentation to the Congress that the country as well as congressmen could evaluate. Nor should the Chief Justice be restricted to the needs and problems of the immediate future; he could forecast the years ahead, the decades beyond, and offer suggestions for basic changes that would help meet the needs and obviate the problems.

The Chief Justice should not restrict himself to such mundane topics as law clerks. His address could range over as broad a field as the courts encompass. The entire problem of criminal sentencing, for example, seems ripe for review. Programs for referees in bankruptcy and probation officers might be proposed. The issue of multidistrict cases still has not been resolved finally. The Chief Justice might support a type of certiorari plan for the courts of appeals in postconviction applications, or the subpoena power for circuit councils. Even a partial list of the table of contents of a recent Senate report indicates the extremely serious and wide-ranging nature of its recommendations, all of which might be commented upon by the Chief Justice: United States commissioner system; federal jury selection legislation; appellate review of sentences; omnibus judgeship bill; a national law foundation; administrative reforms in the federal courts; the Federal Judicial Center; preventive detention; judicial disability, retirement and tenure.

THE EXTRAORDINARY STATE OF SOME JURISDICTIONS

Not all issues in the address, however, would have to be national in character. In some instances, the Chief Justice might deem it wise to consider extraordinary problems relating to a single jurisdiction. By way of example, in the spring of 1967, it became apparent to Chief Judge Edward M. Curran of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia that, because of a variety of circumstances, the court's criminal caseload had reached epidemic proportions. In January of that year, 1,086 criminal cases were pending, 400 more cases than on the same date the previous year, and by July 1,400 criminal cases were pending, with 1,091 in a triable status. Chief Judge Curran contacted the chief judge of the circuit, who in turn wrote to the chief judges of all the other circuits. The net result was that by May 1968, ten visiting judges from other circuits had been assigned to the District of Columbia Circuit to sit for various periods, despite the fact that too few courtrooms and quarters were available to them. In that same month, Chief Judge Curran took time from his busy schedule to testify at length on his predicament before a Congressional subcommittee and to recommend the creation of a new felony court for the District of Columbia.

Situations of this sort, unfortunately, are not unique. In Brooklyn during 1968, for example, the time lag between indictment and completion of trial was twenty-two months. Therefore, even though the problem at any one time may appear to involve only a single jurisdiction, the Chief Justice might well want to make his views known to the entire Congress, either in relation to specific situations or concerning the entire predicament.

In some instances, the Chief Justice might even range outside the federal system. For example, Judge Henry N. Graven testified before a Congressional subcommittee:

"In some districts there appears to be a connection between State court congestion and Federal court congestion. Where the State courts are particularly congested the attorneys may tend to bring their cases in the Federal court wherever possible. . . . It would seem that relief of congestion in the State courts in the New York City area would tend to relieve the congestion in the southern district of New York."[6]

It was this type of argument that resulted in the introduction by Senator Tydings in both the 89th and 90th Congresses of the National Court Assistance Act, designed to help state courts develop new methods of judicial administration to cope with rising caseloads and backlogs. An amendment was added to allay fears that the Office of Judicial Assistance proposed by the bill would interfere unduly with the states' administration of their own courts. Nevertheless, the bill was rejected by the Conference of Chief Justices and finally was dropped by Senator Tyding's subcommittee. The entire interrelationship between state and federal judicial problems might well be probed by the Chief Justice in his address to the Congress.

The question of which subjects may properly be commented on by the Chief Justice and which should be left for Congressional determination is a delicate one, and some mistakes may be made. But this problem is inherent in the present system, and if the Judicial Conference is going to concern itself with a certain subject, there would seem to be little reason for hiding this fact by not allowing the Chief Justice to report on the results of the conference study. The problem is not whether the Chief Justice should address Congress on the subject but whether the judges should have taken up the subject in the first place.

A PROPER SUBJECT FOR SUPPORT THAT LUCKILY STOOD ON ITS OWN

An example of perfectly proper support for a pending bill would have been the Chief Justice's espousal before Congress of the Federal Judicial Center. In 1966 the Judicial Conference unanimously adopted a resolution authorizing the Chief Justice to appoint a committee to study the possibility of such a center. That committee, under the chairmanship of retired Associate Justice Stanley Reed, reported favorably to the conference in March of 1967, and the conference in turn unanimously approved the report. S. 915 was introduced in Congress to establish the center, which was to go beyond the mere need for judges and act on a wide range of court problems, including methods of docket and calendar control, the expeditious handling of cases on appeals, the geographical organization of our entire federal court system, etc. Fortunately, the bill was passed and became law.[7]

Chief Judge John R. Brown of the Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit has described to a Congressional subcommittee the frustrations involved in supporting this type of legislation:

"I know there are four or five [judges] from the Fifth Circuit that have been writing letters every year. We haven't expressed ourselves as forcibly as we should. But this demonstrates the need for a planning agency. We keep talking—the Chief Justice makes speeches to the American Law Institute, and every time he gets up to make a speech he says, 'We cannot meet the problem by adding more and more judges.' I said it, you said it, and I think the President said it. But it is like Mark Twain and the weather, nobody does much about it."[8]

Footnotes at end of article.

If the need for the Federal Judicial Center was so pressing—and it clearly was—the Chief Justice should have been addressing his support to the Congress rather than to the American Law Institute. That such support, properly presented, can be meaningful is demonstrated by the fact that without it, the National Court Assistance Act and the proposal for a National Law Foundation both died in the 90th Congress and have not been revived in the 91st.

An address by the Chief Justice would not eliminate the necessity for Congressional hearings or do away with the appearance of witnesses or the presentation of supporting data. But in much the same way that a prehearing conference can eliminate some issues and narrow others, an address by the Chief Justice would tend to focus everyone's attention on the priority items and provide an impetus for Congressional action. It would, in short, turn the flashlight into a spotlight. When I originally made this suggestion in a brief article in the *Washington* Post of January 4, 1970, the paper editorialized that the idea was a "useful" one and that the judiciary needs more of a voice than it has had in the past. The newspaper thought, however, that without waiting for Congress to issue an invitation to the Chief Justice, the Judicial Conference itself should submit an annual "State of the Judiciary" report that would be as influential as the Joint Economic Report or the findings of top-flight Presidential commissions.

But this sort of annual report is already in existence and has been for many years. It is issued by the Administrative Office and ran to 319 pages in fiscal 1968; it deals with many of the problems I have discussed, and most of the figures I have cited were derived from it. Yet the fact is that the report is virtually ignored by everyone except one or two Congressional subcommittees and those who are already pressing for reform.

A REPORT MUST BASK IN SOMEONE'S SUN

A report does not become "influential" simply by being designated as such. It becomes influential by the nature and quality of the people who present it, the people who receive it and the forum in which the presentation is made. If influence is what is needed—and I think it is—surely an address by the Chief Justice is the more direct and natural way to achieve it.

Some congressmen agree. Following publication of the *Washington Post* article, Senators Birch Bayh and Edward Kennedy and Congressman Allard Lowenstein introduced concurrent resolutions inviting the Chief Justice to address a joint session of Congress. In addition, the American Bar Association has asked the Chief Justice (and he has accepted) to speak at the annual meeting of its House of Delegates on the needs of the judiciary. This latter course, although helpful and much to be recommended over no forum at all, will not receive the wide attention that would necessarily attend a speech presented to Congress.

An address by the Chief Justice to the Congress each year, or at the commencement of each new Congress every two years, would be proper and meaningful from a number of standpoints. It would be a dignified approach from the head of one co-ordinate branch of government to the branch responsible for both legislation and appropriations. It would inform the public of problems in an area now largely hidden from public view, and so it would furnish impetus for appropriate remedies. It would force the judges to face the failings of their system and to evolve new ideas for dealing with them, and then provide them with an appropriate forum for the expression of those ideas. And, as Mr. Rogers pointed out sixteen years ago, it would provide an opportunity to demonstrate the extraordinary vigor and strength of our federal courts, the absolute necessity for an independent judiciary and the all-important role of the judicial branch in protecting society and human rights.

FOOTNOTES

[1] The bill passed the Senate on June 16, 1969, and hearings have been completed in the House.

[2] S. REP. No. 181, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 8 (1967).

[3] S. REP. No. 262, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. 9 (1969).

[4] *Hearings Before a Subcomm. of the House Comm. on Appropriations*, 91st Cong., 1st Sess. 8, 12, 13–14, 15 (1969).

[5] *Hearings Before the Subcomm. on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 213 (1967).

[6] *Hearings Before a Subcomm. of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 90th Cong., 2d Sess. 188 (1968).

[7] 28 U.S.C. §§ 620–629. The center, of which former Justice Tom C. Clark is the director, already has had a favorable impact on the administration of justice. For example, it has induced five federal district courts in large metropolitan areas to change from the master calendar to the individual calendar.

[8] *Hearings on S. 915 and H.R. 6111 Before the Subcomm. on Improvements in Judicial Machinery of the Senate Comm. on the Judiciary*, 90th Cong., 1st Sess. 219 (1967).

I would also like to insert in the RECORD, the concurrent resolution which I introduced:

H. CON. RES. 574

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That a select joint committee, of whom two members shall be Members of the House of Representatives, appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and two members shall be Members of the Senate appointed by the President of the Senate, shall convey to the Chief Justice of the United States an invitation to address the two Houses of Congress on such matters relating to the judicial branch of the Government as he may deem appropriate.

SEC. 2. In the event of the acceptance by the Chief Justice of the invitation provided for in the first section of the resolution, the two Houses of Congress shall assemble in the Hall of the House of Representatives, at such time as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate may agree upon, for the purpose of hearing the address of the Chief Justice.

INFLATION AND THE MORTGAGE

HON. CLARENCE D. LONG

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 20, 1970

Mr. LONG of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, On Monday, May 18, my distinguished colleague, HENRY REUSS, addressed the Mortgage Bankers Association of America in New York. In his address, Representative REUSS surveys the current economic situation—a million Americans out of work, in a period of "deliberately slowing economic growth." Mr. REUSS points out that this situation feeds inflation as curtailed demand and decreasing productivity oblige business to maintain high prices "because overall profits are being squeezed." I take pleasure in sharing with my colleagues HENRY REUSS' penetrating analysis of economic conditions and his proposals for remedying these conditions.

The statement follows:

INFLATION AND THE MORTGAGE

(Remarks of Representative HENRY S. REUSS)

It is a pleasure to appear before the Mortgage Bankers Association of America. Its 2000 members do the job of finding somebody who needs a real estate loan, and then finding somebody with the money to make the loan. You are today servicing more than $75 billion worth of mortgages, $57 billion of them on single family properties. You have been the prime mover in supplying adequate housing for low and moderate income families.

We need 2.6 million housing units a year over the years ahead, rather than the 1.1 million we are now producing. If you did not exist, it would be necessary to invent you.

If all were going well with you, I wouldn't bother to be here. But I happen to agree with what your President Robert H. Pease recently said. "We are in a real honest-to-goodness housing crisis!"

Since Mr. Pease said that in February, the stock market has been in deep trouble. Inflation has grown worse, the stagnation in the economy in general and the housing market in particular has grown worse. And then, to top it all, we entered Cambodia.

I'm not here to cry havoc. But we cannot afford to disregard the words a few days ago of a former Nixon economic aide, Pierre Rinfret, who said of our present economic crisis: "You are witnessing the end of the American economy as we have known it. We will have the worst of all worlds—high inflation, high money rates and high unemployment."

So it is time we asked ourselves this morning: How did we get into this inflationary morass? How do we get out of it? And finally, how do we assure, in both the short run and the long run, a healthy mortgage banking industry?

We have had a great piece of legislation on the books for 25 years called the Employment Act of 1946. Its goals are full employment without inflation. In the first half of the 1960's, we applied sound economic policies with great success. For year after year, we achieved unprecedented prosperity, uninterrupted growth, a better standard of living for all Americans, and stability in the economy.

Yet after 1965, we forgot the lesson we should have learned. We failed to take the simple steps so clearly called for to ease the strains brought on by the tragic and unnecessary war in Vietnam. By the time the surtax was enacted in 1968, three years after the Council of Economic Advisers had first recommended it, inflation had taken hold.

That was the fault of us Democrats. In case you haven't heard, we paid the penalty for our foolishness in November, 1968.

President Nixon inherited that inflation. We must forgive him for that.

But he has made it worse. He will not be forgiven for that.

The 4 percent inflation he inherited has turned into a 6 percent inflation. The 3.3 percent unemployment that he inherited has turned into a 4.8 percent unemployment. A million Americans are today out of work as a result of current economic policies.

Administration spokesmen keep saying that they are encouraged by the current economic picture, and that the battle on inflation has been won. There is much talk of easy money, at a time when we are experiencing the highest interest rates in 100 years. Instead of the budget surplus which we need in fiscal 1971, Secretary of the Treasury Kennedy is now talking in a relaxed manner about a $4–5 billion deficit.

For myself, though I hear these hosannas about how inflation has been ended, I don't

believe it. Furthermore, I don't think most Republicans believe it either. That infallible indicator of Republican sentiment, the Wall Street stock market, has been registering further profound losses at the news of continued increases in the cost of living, and the continued escalation of the IndoChinese war.

Ruining the home-building industry and the mortgage industry by high interest rates, and deliberately slowing economic growth so that a million men are unnecessarily unemployed, don't *fight* inflation—they *add to* inflation.

By reducing demand, the supply of homes and goods is reduced. Unemployment and stagnation mean higher unit costs, lessened productivity, and an incentive to business to keep unit prices up because overall profits are being squeezed.

At the recent Joint Economic Committee hearings, I asked the Budget Director whether it wouldn't make more anti-inflationary sense to keep workers at work, making homes and useful consumer goods which could then be sold to other people and sop up inflationary purchasing power in the process. I'm still waiting for my reply.

The reason Wall Street does not believe in the Administration's so-called war on inflation is that it is simply not believable. Stagnation and unemployment are not a policy—they are a disaster! And they ignore the real causes of our inflation—war, other wasteful spending, misallocation of credit, the wage-price spiral.

First and foremost, war. Our budgetary outlays on non-productive items is the largest single cause of inflation.

Swollen military expenditures keep millions of soldiers and scientists from productive activity. We pay them incomes, but they produce nothing we can use in exchange. Heavy procurement of military goods has shifted scarce labor and factory facilities from the production of civilian goods, and has thus increased price pressures.

Nor is there a reason to believe that even our extrication from Vietnam will much change matters, unless we act now to cut military spending. Former Budget Director Charles Schultze, in his searching Brookings Institution study on "setting national priorities" says of the 1971 Administration budget:

"There is no reason to expect the trend [to high defense spending] automatically to be different when the Vietnam conflict is over. To reverse the trend, if that is desirable, will require a major conscious effort, not only by public officials, but by the body politic as well."

Those of us in the Congress who believe there must be some limits to military spending have renewed our attack on the ABM. What started as a $1–2 billion program can mount to a $20–30 billion program before we are through. If Congress appropriates $152 million this year for a nuclear reactor for an aircraft carrier, we will commit ourselves to future spending of $500 million for the carrier itself, another $600 million for its planes, $800 million for escort vessels, and well over $100 million a year for operating costs. This is folly.

But most of all, we need to end the madness in Southeast Asia—steadily, in an orderly manner, and totally.

Take another big expenditure item—the SST. In the budget this year, we have a paltry $106 million for *controlling* air pollution the country over, and almost three times that much—$290 million—for *making* air pollution via the sonic-booming, noise-making, air-polluting SST. Money and credit that ought to be spent making mass transit vehicles, and air and water pollution control equipment, is instead frittered away on such marginal ventures.

Or take the so-called farm program. Some $5 billion a year in farm subsidy payments is funneled directly into higher consumer prices. Paying $178,000 a year to Senator Eastland not to grow cotton is but one example of subsidizing people who don't need it at the taxpayer's expense.

Or take natural resources programs. In the 1971 budget, we are devoting $143 million to the National Park Service which safeguards our priceless outdoor recreational resources. In that same budget is ten times as much for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, $1.4 billion, much of it wasted on wholly uneconomic river projects.

The project to extend the Trinity River Seaway hundreds of miles up from the Gulf of Mexico to Fort Worth, Texas is a beautiful example. Somebody has estimated that it would be less costly to move the city of Fort Worth down to the Gulf of Mexico! The Tombigbee River program in Alabama, just started in this year's budget, is designed to provide an alternative route to the Mississippi, which it parallels, in case somebody drops an A-bomb on the Mississippi. Presumably our adversaries would in such a situation refrain from dropping an A-bomb on the Tombigbee project, on the ground that it is easier to just let us spend ourselves into bankruptcy.

If you believe, as I do, that money spent on the environment and on education and on health and on job training is well spent, you have to match your words with deeds by trying to cut extravagance where you find it. That is what I try to do.

Eliminating waste is not just a current necessity in order to bring inflation under control. It is even more of a necessity in years to come, when we will need that budget surplus—that fiscal dividend—at least in part to avoid the Federal Government's sopping up all the credit in this country, so that some is left for the operation of the private mortgage market, the way we get our homes built in this country.

A second leading cause of our twin problems of inflation and tight money is the misallocation of our credit resources.

Since January 1969, and until very recently, the monetary authorities have deliberately cut back on the creation of new money. For more than a year, the rate of new money creation has been pretty close to zero. And the effect on the home-building industry has been catastrophic.

But has this monetary tightness prevented the big New York, Chicago and San Francisco banks from increasing their lending to borrowers other than housing? Not at all.

They all have evolved adept ways of buying their way out of tight money. In the extremely tight-money year of 1969, for example, the large city banks increased their lending to business by more than 12 percent—for unnecessary capital expansion at a time when only 80 percent of the plant and equipment in this country is being used, for conglomerate take-overs which further the concentration of economic power, for gambling casinos in the Bahamas, and all the rest.

This extra borrowing power was obtained because the big banks had the ability to suck in money from all over—by repatriating Eurodollars from abroad, by draining the smaller banks through the Federal funds market, by issuing promissory notes at top interest rates through subsidiaries of one-bank holding company systems. Big business, to whom most of these loans are made, doesn't mind the high interest rates, since Uncle Sam picks up half the cost via an income tax deduction.

Thus inflationary over-expansion continues apace, unchecked by tight money. Thus marginal users of credit are able to get hold of the lion's share of lending dollars, taking it away from housing, from small business, and from state and local governments.

What this country needs to fight the misallocation of credit are quantitative ceilings on bank lending for such purposes as unnecessary plant expansion or conglomerate take-over. The Congress gave the President these powers last December. But they have not been used. Alternatively, we should employ the variable bank reserve requirements recently suggested by Federal Reserve Board Governor Andrew Brimmer. He would have a low reserve requirement, perhaps zero, on bank lending to financial intermediaries like mortgage bankers who are aiding housing. He would have a high reserve requirement, like 100 percent, on bank loans for frivolous purposes.

Almost every other major country uses such credit control procedures. We used them ourselves successfully in the Korean war days. The big banks of our central cities don't like them. But about 200 million American consumers and taxpayers would like them very much. It's about time some attention was paid to their interest.

A third type of inflation that is readily discernable is the cost-push wage-price spiral. Particularly in concentrated industries like automobiles, steel, rubber and oil, management can and does increase prices pretty much without check. And labor is able to and does demand wage increases which add to the spiral. The prevailing rate of wage increases is now close to 10 percent, at a time when productivity increases are close to zero.

The President's decision, made six days after his inaugural, not to invoke any form of wage-price guideposts used so successfully in the early 60's is a great mistake. Relying merely on tight money, and on putting a million men out of work—and nothing else—is a good way to promote recession, but is no way to fight inflation. So we have both inflation and recession.

To break the wage-price spiral, we should revive the wage-price guideposts, after consulting with labor and management. A special board should thrust the spotlight of publicity upon their voluntary observance.

To expect labor to abide by a policy of moderation in wage increases, the government has to make it clear that it means to break the inflationary spiral. If this means that during the three to six months period required to work out a set of voluntary guideposts, we must impose a temporary freeze on price increases, and on wage increases, which cause price increases, so be it. The consequences of failing to act are in my judgment much worse than the consequences of prompt action.

If the government wants to counsel moderation for the wage earner, patriotism, I suggest, should begin at the highest level. It would be an excellent idea if the President would heed the advice—it was Secretary Romney's, and I applaud him for it—to put part of his recent salary increase back into the Treasury. He should ask other highly paid executives in and out of government to do the same. Specifically, he should ask Congressmen to put part of our 41 percent salary increase back into the Treasury; and specifically, I would be delighted to take part in such a program of symbolic belt-tightening.

If I sound like a broken record in harping so long on inflation, it is because I agree with your President Robert Pease when he says, "If there is any single problem that this country faces, it is the problem of inflation. Until we stop inflation, we'll never return to normal investment channels."

But that doesn't mean that all we should be doing is to stop inflation. A sound housing and mortgage market requires specific legislative steps. We of the House Banking and Currency Committee have just reported out a bill which contains a number of affirmative and constructive actions. I would like to describe a couple of those actions.

We have set up a secondary mortgage market for conventional mortgages under FNMA. Such a secondary market can improve the mortgage investment industry not only by putting mortgage bankers in possession of

new funds, rather than compelling them to eat the mortgages they have financed for 40 years. Perhaps even more important, it can develop a standardized piece of paper which can make the conventional mortgage, with its conventional insurance features, as standardized a document as the FHA document. And that will be all to the good.

We helped out GNMA, too, by mandating an immediate infusion of 1.5 billion dollars. And this is to be made available not just for single family dwellings, but throughout the subsidized housing market—Section 235 and 236 housing, rental units, condominiums, the whole works.

Despite the bitter tea and the crust of bread which you gave me for breakfast in these troubled times, I've enjoyed being with you. I hope you will invite me back when you are ready for the crepe suzettes!

ADDRESS BY GEN. LEONARD F. CHAPMAN, JR., COMMANDANT, U.S. MARINE CORPS

HON. STROM THURMOND

OF SOUTH CAROLINA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 22, 1970

Mr. THURMOND. Mr. President, Gen. Leonard F. Chapman, Jr., commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps, recently delivered an enlightening address to the Society of Sponsors of the U.S. Navy, in Washington, D.C. He made it crystal clear that the U.S. supremacy of the sea which is so essential to our national security is history.

It is beyond my comprehension that there are certain elements in our society who would capitulate to the Communists on any front when there is more evidence than ever before that the Soviet Union is determined to dominate the world. Control of the seas is only one of the many areas affecting our national security where the U.S.S.R. is steadily overtaking America.

Mr. President, the Soviets are rapidly deploying a modern Navy and a maritime fleet throughout the world while the seapower of the United States is steadily declining. General Chapman noted also that the Soviets are capable of putting a Soviet marine landing force ashore by helicopter assault. It is a well known fact, as General Chapman points out in his address, that Admiral Gorshkov, of the Soviet navy, said some time ago:

> Sooner or later the U.S. will have to understand that it is no longer master of the seas.

In his address, General Chapman emphasized that—

> Sleek and fast new cruisers, destroyers and large torpedo boats—all missile armed—have shown themselves in strong formations in the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, and even the sea historians love to call "an American lake"—the Carribean. More than 350 Soviet submarines, nuclear as well as conventional, show themselves little, but make their presence felt all over the world.

It is obvious that the greater the Soviet threat becomes in strategic power, the more anxious the leftwing extremists in our country are determined to risk our security by relegating the United States to a second-rate nation through unilateral actions and capitulation. The many unilateral actions already taken by the United States which weaken our defense posture, are countered by Soviet measures to increase their strategic power. Seapower and ICBM's are only two of the most significant.

It is unfortunate for our Nation that the media of our country do not saturate the public with addresses, such as General Chapman's, in the same manner in which coverage is given of violence, disorder, and antimilitary protesters. Nevertheless, I commend General Chapman for his efforts to alert the American people to the real threat to our survival as a free Nation.

I ask unanimous consent that General Chapman's address be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

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

REMARKS BY GEN. LEONARD F. CHAPMAN, JR., COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS, TO THE SOCIETY OF SPONSORS OF THE U.S. NAVY, WASHINGTON, D.C., MAY 7, 1970

Ladies—and gentlemen too, but it is primarily you ladies I address this afternoon—I am delighted to be here.

I was honored and pleased to receive your invitation. And now, I must confess, it is with no small amount of personal pride that I stand before you. I feel very close to your distinguished Society. Even with my obvious lack of proper qualifications for full membership, I am happy to be able to lay claim to at least a close association. My wife, Emily, joined your honored ranks last December at Quincy, Massachusetts, when she sponsored the new USS PORTLAND. And in spite of the rigors of a ship-launching in the New England winter, I think I learned to understand the special feeling that comes with being a Navy Sponsor. It is the sharing of that feeling that gives me personal pride this afternoon.

Each one of you has served as the spark that ignited the life of a United States ship. In a country flanked by the two greatest oceans of the earth, that's an honor more structural than ceremonial. And that honor is well positioned. I think it fitting that our tradition calls for the hand of a woman to begin the life of a ship. It is, after all, the hand-of-woman that forms the spirit of the men who sail in ships, so it is that gentle hand that constantly touches the spirit in those ships. And in this country, ships are still the transports and protectors of a free life.

The sea is still a major national strength of the United States. It is a larder of resources—animal, vegetable, and mineral. It is a means of communications and trade with the rest of the world—and with other American communities separated by the sea. And it *can* be a ring of security, if used properly.

Our history is a testimonial to the good application of oceanic values. It is a step by step narrative of understanding and developing maritime strength. Long before we were able to realize our destiny across the breadth of this continent, the American flag was well known in the ocean-serving ports of the world. Our flag came to mean free commerce by free men. But it was more than just the sign of a merchant nation. It was a banner of protection, a flag of strength and purpose. How strong that protection could be, became a point made early in our history. A point carefully maintained. It had to be. To a country surrounded by deep water freedom of the seas was—and still is—the very foundation of national liberty. We worked hard to maintain that foundation.

In our seagoing work we learned and accomplished much. Americans were the first to travel under the sea, and the first to fly over the sea. We joined our two coastlines by constructing the Panama Canal. For all practical purposes the two great oceans that flanked us became one. And we prospered.

That's our history.

It's a good history, a comfortable history. 156 years have passed since a foreign enemy has stepped upon our continental shores—or even seriously threatened us. 105 years have gone by since Americans have known the agony of war in their own fields, on their own ground. Long years, necessary years, to work out a philosophy that called for a government to serve the people, not the people to serve a government.

The North American continent was the perfect arena in which to test this noble hope. Isolated by our oceans, we were left alone to grow as a nation and to mature as a people. Our government was free of external pressures. It had time to grow into a sophisticated institution dedicated to the people it served. We were isolated from the rest of the world—except as we chose to break that isolation—and we liked it that way. We learned to count on that isolation. It has been a good history, a comfortable history. But it is, I'm afraid, *past* history.

This is 1970, a new decade well into the last half of the 20th century. It is a time of new thoughts and new happenings. A time when old values are being questioned, and new values are being tested. There is in this new time, I am told, a new quest mounted and riding. It seeks peace and love, justice and truth; and the hope for a future without war, without conflict, and *with* freedom.

That's a fine quest, but I take exception to its age. I recognize it as an old friend—an old comrade of the people called Americans by the rest of the world. It is, after all, what we're all about. And it's what we've been all about for nearly two centuries.

But this is indeed a new time, a rebirth of our traditional search for a better way to share this nation's abundance of hope with all citizens. A time when we are finding new ways to bring to the front the great reservoir of talent and abilities offered by all Americans. This is also a time when we have grown larger while our world has grown smaller. Our oceans, our sacred protectors have been technically narrowed to little more than shallow moats. Space has diminished, and time has compressed. We no longer enjoy the luxurious choice of isolation from the rest of the world except as we would wish. This is a new time for American efforts, all efforts including security. It is a new decade for American defense.

There is a defense establishment in this country, there always has been. It's a part of the overall *People Establishment* that has always *been* the United States. It has grown from militia regiments that used to muster and drill with powderhorns and squirrel rifles, to highly specialized air and ground units ready at a moment's notice. And the handful of sailing ships of stout oak and iron men, has grown to a modern fleet of ships of steel that require crews of like texture. And there *is* a military industrial complex. There must be. The needs of the modern forces of defense are demanding and—at the very least—complex.

These institutions, if that's what they are, are products of the times. They have developed because of a need at this point in history when our protective oceans have become streams—a phenomenon caused by the charted and built-in military industrial complexes of the two giants on the other sides of those streams.

Now, at this time, we cannot reestablish our first line of defense at our water's edge, or 3 miles offshore, 30 miles, or even 300 miles. To attempt such a thing would be as ridiculous as hiding behind a paper shield.

A few years ago, the chief of the Soviet Navy, Admiral Gorshkov, stated publicly: "The flag of the Soviet Navy now proudly flies over the oceans of the world. Sooner or later the United States will have to understand that it no longer has mastery of the seas."

In July of last year, Admiral Gorshkov updated his statement in a radio address to the Soviet public. "For the first time in history," he said, "the Soviet Nation has acquired a powerful ocean-going navy. It has become the world's greatest naval power capable of taking its line of defense out onto the ocean."

That ocean Admiral Gorshkov is talking about, ladies and gentlemen, is our moat.

The 1970 updated statement of Soviet naval strength has been far more graphic than the words of past years. Last month the Soviet Navy conducted a world-wide naval exercise involving more than 200 ships.

They have also begun a new decade.

There is no doubt that Russia has developed its navy to the point that it dares challenge our position on the seas. Sleek and fast new cruisers, destroyers, and large torpedo boats—all missile armed—have shown themselves in strong formations in the Mediterranean, the Indian Ocean, and even the sea historians love to call "an American lake"—the Caribbean. More than 350 Soviet submarines, nuclear as well as conventional, show themselves little, but make their presence felt all over the world.

Not long ago a prototype helicopter carrier of the Soviet Navy was observed in the Eastern Mediterranean. Obviously fitted out for, and maneuvering as, an antisubmarine warfare ship, she has an additional utility that I find particularly interesting. She is capable of putting ashore by helicopter assault, a Soviet Marine landing force.

Yes, Russia does have Marines. Properly called Soviet Naval Infantry, they have reemerged after years of deactivation as an elite, well trained embryo force. Cruising with Russian ships throughout the world, this force of naval infantry gives a new depth to Soviet foreign policy.

Transported in tank landing ships, much like our own LSTs, the Soviet Marine battalions each number about 600 men. Equipped with amphibian tanks, and seagoing tracked amphibian personnel carriers, their presence wtih the fleet gives the Soviet Navy the ability to protect its strength ashore. Their existence provides Russia with a force in readiness capable of establishing a beachhead, and forcing entry onto any shore far beyond the land mass of Europe. This, backed up by powerful land and air forces able to exploit an amphibious landing, adds a new dimension to the problem of security through seapower.

And despite recent internal turmoil and confrontations with the Soviet Union, Communist China continues to grow in its strength. Already possessing a nuclear ability and increasing missile power, Red China introduced herself to the space age last month when she launched her first space satellite. Blessed with good warm water ports, and always looking for other means of world influence, it is only a matter of time before she too looks seaward.

But the sea is not primarily a place of war. It is, in its truest form, a means of commerce and world communications that supports civilized life. True seapower is not calculated only in the number of weapons a nation can keep afloat. Seapower is strength at sea, and that strength is measured in the depth of control a country is able to exercise over the use of deep water for its needs.

Right now the naval power of the United States and the naval power of the Soviet Union face each other in a contest of presence. And we pray that it will remain just that. But if the naval powers of our two countries struggle only in the ability to present themselves on the seas, then our merchant fleets have been struggling in the reality of world trade since the end of World War II. And in the process of that competition, the Soviet Union is not only gaining from her efforts—*we* are rapidly losing ground in a let-down of our own endeavors.

In 1960 the United States had 2,926 commerce carrying ships actually plying the seas, as opposed to 873 Russian merchantmen. At the close of 1969 we had shrunk to 1,008 ships while the Soviet Union had increased her merchant marine to 1,634 cargo-carrying bottoms. But even more signficant is the fact that in 1969 this country put 21 new ships to sea, while Russia added 89 to her merchant fleet.

The contest goes on. Now it is obvious that the Soviet Union intends not only to maintain its lead over us, but to finally overwhelm us in the field of ocean trade.

In 1950, 42.3 per cent of all American trade was being carried in American ships. Last year that figure slipped to a meager 6.4 per cent.

Merchant shipping has more than just a partial relationship to this nation's security. It is the life blood of defense to a country surrounded by deep water. If Japan or Germany could have stopped our logistics shipping in World War II, the final outcome of that conflict might have been quite different. With this in mind, I think it significant that the Soviet Union has now surpassed our own merchant Marine *in the number of active, individual cargo-carrying vessels;* and their naval arm poses a greater potential threat to our logistics shipping than we've ever faced before.

Now I want to make it very clear, I'm not inferring that we are in immediate danger of invasion from the sea. But as a Marine—a soldier by profession, a *soldier of the sea* by specialty, I am pointing out that as we look inward, other nations look outward and press to new frontiers. As other naval forces build up, we must keep our Atlantic and Pacific moats as narrow for us, as they have become to any potential adversaries.

We are, I think, at a parity in nuclear and ICBM capabilities—both in hardware and in human desire. We sincerely hope, and really don't believe, that any nation would be insane enough to unleash the destruction of mankind. That same parity covers—to a lesser degree—the possibilities of a full confrontation of large armies and air forces in massive land war. This parity shall remain as long as we can maintain a sufficient defense against any threat.

And the eventual worldwide disarmament of major weapons of destruction remains an American hope. It is a good hope, one worth working for and praying for. But this *is* 1970, and the sea still laps at all shores, a sea that can strangle as well as support. The oceans of the world must remain free to us, if we hope to remain free in the world.

And there is still the war in Vietnam.

In this new decade, the most significant change to the war in Vietnam is the growing ability of the people of the Republic of Vietnam to defend themselves. The process called "Vietnamization" is working; we feel it more and more every day.

Not many months ago the Marine Corps was short by only one regiment of having three full Marine divisions, with equivalent air and other supporting units, actively committed in Vietnam. We now have only one Marine division, one Marine aircraft wing, and the support required for those organizations, actually left in that country.

If anyone—from either side of the spectrum—questions our intentions or accomplishments in this war, I invite them to look at our position now. We are redeploying our forces from a much stronger Republic of Vietnam, and Hanoi is still unable to make any gains against the South Vietnamese people.

But even though Vietnamization *is* working, and our commitment to that small nation is beginning to find a fulfillment—the shadow of this war falls heavily on this new decade of American defense.

That shadow cannot be permitted to dull our senses in maintaining our security. We must face reality with real unerstanding and purpose.

Not only are we redeploying our forces from Vietnam, over the past several years the number of our overseas line of outposts has steadily decreased. We again look to our oceans to buffer us as moats. But because we *tire* of the need to be prepared, and the constant threat of confrontation, this does not mean the threat of confrontation diminishes. It will require great and sure strength to maintain our security, and the sea can still provide a ring of security—if used properly.

Our oceans can no longer delay a threat by their mere presence. This is a fact we must learn to live with. But the sea can serve as a means of readiness for a well balanced Navy-Marine Corps Team. Now I'm not talking about a holding force merely prepared to buy time while we fill out our strength at home. That, too, is past history, hardly a reality of the '70's.

The Navy-Marine Corps Team of this new decade must be a complete force—a highly mobile line of outposts—capable of moving to any critical area instantly. The mobility and proven worth of carrier-based aviation, submarines, surface vessels, and Fleet Marine Forces, can keep our oceans broad—can keep any fight from our own shores.

But there is another area in which we must be most careful in our defenses. It is an area that no enemy has ever been able to penetrate, and yet, the danger that penetration could be made always exists. I'm talking about *quality,* ladies and gentlemen, but not in hardware—but in people.

Certainly we will continue to require top quality equipment, weapons, aircraft and vessels. But they will be only as good as the men who employ them. That is our real defense, the Americans who will offer themselves in service to this country.

If we are to eliminate the draft, cut defense spending, and still hope to meet the increasing demands of the security of this country, then every American who wears a uniform must count full measure. Each individual must offer quality service, professional ability—and most of all *dedication.*

But dedication is hardly a one-way street. Like loyalty, it can't be purchased. And like loyalty, it must pass from the serving to the served, and back again the serving. It must be an interaction between Americans, those in uniform, and those who are served by uniforms.

You ladies and gentlemen, and all the citizens of this nation, must reestablish a dignified and respected place in our society for the young Americans who serve you now and who will serve you in the future. They are this nation's defense—*they are* this nation.

CONSERVATION

HON. LEE METCALF

OF MONTANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, May 22, 1970

Mr. METCALF. Mr. President, one of the speakers at the recent meeting of the Montana Conservation Council, in Missoula, was a former Montanan and, I am proud to say, an alumnus of my office, Mr. James N. Smith, director of conser-

vation services for the Conservation Foundation, in Washington, D.C.

Although he addressed himself primarily to the progress and the prospects of environmental quality in Montana, his remarks are meaningful for the rest of the Nation. Mr. Smith finds several reasons for "guarded optimism." One is the interest—which I would say is long overdue—of the press in the problems of environment. Another is a State administration which shares that interest. Then there are the youngsters.

I ask unanimous consent that the address by Mr. James N. Smith be printed in the RECORD.

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

FORUM ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY—PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS

(By James N. Smith)[1]

I have been asked to address my remarks this morning to the central theme of your meeting—the progress and the prospects of environmental quality in Montana.

As a native son, but one who has long since expatriated, this is both an enticing and intimidating assignment. Enticing, because it is always a great temptation to come back home and tell everyone what their problems are. And there are a lot of things I would like to say to you about the quality of Montana's natural environment and some of the disappointing things that seem to have happened.

But none of this would come as news to you. You know your problems far better than I, and you would be right in reminding me that even though I grew up in Montana and graduated from this Univeristy, I have not lived here for a very long time and am, in a very real sense, an outsider.

This does not mean that I care less for the state or that I do not have my own ideas as to what the state should be. But what I would like Montana to be and what a great many other interested outsiders might expect of it, may not bear much relevance to those of you who make your homes here and your living.

If I had my way, I think I should like to return to Montana and find it much as it was some 20 to 25 years ago when I was growing up here. I would like to find much of the National Forest still primitive—unpenetrated by roads and unscarred by cutting. I would like to find again some of the colorful quaintnesses that I remember—Indians in braids and blankets, and teepees on the reservation.

Not living there, I take no particular pleasure in knowing that the state now has its share of Interstate juggernauts ripping through the terrain. Nor am I enamoured with the prospects of new mineral discoveries in the Lincoln Country or the potential for exploiting the lignite resources of eastern Montana—or even the idea of a multi-million dollar resort development in the Galletin. These changes and prospects for change offend my romantic sense of the state.

This is all very fine, of course, providing you don't happen to live there anymore and depend on the area and its economy for your livelihood—or if you don't happen to be an Indian and live in one of those teepees—or if you are lucky enough to be among that growing group of affluent Americans who have the means and mobility to seek their emotional and spiritual sustenance in the "wilds" of Montana and then return to the urban environment to restore their financial and professional assets. This is selfish and unrealistic.

[1] The views expressed herein are the author's, and do not necessarily reflect the position of the Conservation Foundation.

Montana is not a static condition. It cannot stand still either to indulge the sentimentality of youthful remembrances or the dreams of pristine retreats from the pressures of urban living for those who can afford to "get away from it all." It has to be, first, a viable and respectable environment for those who live here and this, of course, implies a progressive economy and a decent standard of living.

But there are many, myself among them, who begrudge every cultural and economic change which makes an in-road into the kind of environment, either real or fancied, that we would like for Montana.

Ours, however, is not the only misconception of what Montana should be. Even more damaging is that peculiar syndrome which might be characterized as the "frontier ethic." It believes, essentially, that Montana is still on the vanguard of the frontier and that it is every man's inalienable right to plague, plunder and pollute, so long as a few bucks are gained in the process. It is the kind of intellect which believes that nature's resources are a conquest to be exploited in the most expedient and profitable way, and damn the environmental consequences—whatever that might be. There are always plenty more resources just over the mountain.

The harsh fact, of course, is that we are running out of mountains. By and large, the American public is waking up to this reality. This realization is what the new environmental awareness or new conservation movement is all about. People see the limits of their resources and the consequences of their profligacies of the past, and are ready to come to terms with the environment in which they must live and treat with some sympathy and respect.

But not the latter-day frontiersman. He is still Daniel Boone in the wilderness—out to stalk the resources of the land and exploit them for whatever they are worth. Ironically, he shows up most often in some very unfrontiersman-like places—the local Chamber of Commerce, the board rooms of business and industry, and even in the state legislature. His ethic is expressed in such shibboleths as: The conservationists are taking away our jobs; planning and land-use controls are a socialist conspiracy; What's good for Montana industry is good for the state; and so on, ad nauseam.

This is nonsense, of course, but the "frontier ethic" has been a pervasive influence on the state and continues to take its toll. It is the exact antithesis of those who would keep Montana unchanged, and herein is the cause of what may be a growing impasse between two dominant influences in the state.

Montana cannot afford a polarization between those who would keep it exactly like it is and those who would desecrate the entire state for a few new jobs and some short-run financial returns.

Regardless of the influence from either group, the state will grow and it will develop. There are already signs of its impending change in the indication of potential new mineral and coal exploitation, and the prospects of a major new recreational industry.

Missoula will certainly never be a Chicago or probably even a Denver, but I doubt if many people here want it to be. It will grow, though, in spite of itself, and the challenge to the citizens and the government of Montana, and especially to you here today, is to make sure that the growth that does come to the state is planned and developed in a way that protects the natural qualities of the environment.

This is no small challenge, but it is essential to the future of this state and the well-being of those who live here. The thing to remember is that development can take place which does not lay waste to the land and pollute the atmosphere. There are control devices that can be built into the physical plant to collect and reduce the wastes before they are released into the air or the water. There are methods for harvesting and reforesting the timber resources of the state which would protect the forest resource and assure a continued sustained timber industry to the future economy of the state. There are ways to plan and design for the location and construction of new homes, plants, roads and other public facilities to avoid their having a destructive influence on the environment.

Unfortunately, things have not been accomplished in this way in the past in Montana or, for that matter, in most places in the United States. Much of what has been constructed and developed in the state in the last couple of decades seems to have been done with a view to the maximum exploitation of the resources and the minimum regard for the environmental effects. I don't want to go into a long litany of abuses, but there are a few outstanding examples that I can't resist.

The shocking condition of the air quality here in Missoula is one. During certain atmospheric conditions, pollution can reach levels here that even Chicago and New York City seldom achieve. Suspended particulates in the air over Missoula average almost 162 micrograms per cubic meter. The National Air Pollution Control Administration has suggested that levels in excess of 80 micrograms per cubic meter are injurious to human health and welfare, and the state's own requirement is 75.

But Missoula has had this problem for a long time and, although no one likes it, very little seems to be done about it. Given its adverse health effects, if the local Chamber of Commerce wanted to perform a real service, it might erect signs at the airport, reading, "Welcome to Missoula! While you visit us, for your own health and safety, please wear a gas mask at all times."

A particularly enterprising scientist here at the University has detected fluoride emissions from the Anaconda Company's aluminum refining plant at Columbia Falls by associating it with the effects of plant and tree damage surrounding the refinery, and reaching even into parts of Glacier National Park. This appears to be a classic example of a project that was developed to stimulate one element of the Montana economy, and may very well end up by diminishing one of the state's proudest and most valued resources—Glacier National Park.

The exploitation of the timber resources in western Montana left its mark on the land—great swatches of forest stripped bare, giving a strange and unpleasant pie-bald effect to the mountain scenery. I have seen something of the debate that is raging here over the efficacy of open-cutting and forestry management, and I don't want to enter into it. I am no forester. But one doesn't have to be an expert in silviculture to observe that a great deal more energy and resources go into the cutting of timber than go into the managing and reforesting of the resource. Or, to put it quite simply, the Forest Service and the lumber industry would rather cut than plant.

Montana has some new Interstate highways. It also has a Stream Preservation Law which has been on the books since back in 1963. Its intent is to protect the state's streams and rivers from encroachment and damage to the fish and wildlife habitat by highway construction. It is an exemplary piece of legislation. Other states, as well as the Federal government, have looked to it as a guide and a model. If the section of Interstate between here and Garrison is any example, however, there is good reason to believe that it's a model law—and nothing more. In my experience, I have hardly seen a worse example of how a highway can alter, damage and, in some areas, obliterate a stream bed. Clearly, something went wrong in the implementation of the Act.

If the progress has been faltering, what are the prospects for environmental quality in the state in the years ahead. This, of course, is hard to determine. It will depend so much on the will and wisdom of the citizens of Montana. It will depend on what values they place on their resources and how cheaply they give them up. It will depend on the leadership of the state and whether that leadership will work toward the kind of protective controls that are needed if the state is going to achieve a balance between growth and environmental quality.

It will depend, too, on groups such as the Montana Conservation Council, and the kind of pressure and influence it is able to exert on the decision-making processes within the state.

I don't know what the prognosis will be, but if I had to guess, I would say that things don't look too bad.

There are a couple of reasons for guarded optimism. One of these is the Montana press, or at least parts of it. I am amazed and delighted to see the kind of critical and probing news coverage and editorial policy that is appearing on the Montana journalism scene. For one who grew up here under a tradition of company-controlled news on a statewide basis, this is indeed a refreshing and promising development. The public and their elected officials can only make intelligent judgments on issues when they are well informed. The focus which several of the dailies have given to the state's environmental issues and the critical judgments that they display can only serve to illuminate the issues and inform the public on the environmental impacts of private and public decisions.

Another is a state administration which does not seem to regard the concept of planning as anathema, and is willing to approach the issues of growth and development with a cautious regard for environmental considerations.

Youth is another encouraging sign. The new involvement of young people (especially college students) in the environmental issue here, as elsewhere in the United States, can only be a positive influence on the environment. The Conservation Foundation has been one of the original incorporators of the Environmental Teach-In, which has culminated in Earth Day activities at thousands of campuses all over the U.S. We helped to set up the national office and get the program going. From this experience, I can personally testify that this phenomenon of youth involvement promises to be one of the healthiest things to happen to the environmental movement since Teddy Roosevelt.

I am most encouraged, though, by the demonstration that Montana citizens do really value their environment and want to protect and preserve its quality. The caution and skepticism with which the announcement of potential mineral development in the Lincoln County seem to have been received are a healthy indicator of an informed and interested citizenry. Twenty years ago, this news would have been greeted with about the same forethought and restraint as the California Gold Rush!

I suppose what I am suggesting is that *maybe* there are some good indications on the horizon that the "frontier ethic" has seen its last days: That Montana is in a process of social and cultural maturing which rejects the old saw that new is better, that bigger is best, that more is good; That perceives, like John Kenneth Galbraith, that ". . . The penultimate Western man, stalled in the ultimate traffic jam and slowly succumbing to carbon monoxide, will not be cheered to hear from the last survivor that the gross national product went up by a record amount."

YOUNG PEOPLE WANT TO STAY WITHIN THE SYSTEM AND MAKE IT WORK

HON. LAURENCE J. BURTON

OF UTAH

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. BURTON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the Washington Post yesterday—May 21—carried on its editorial page a section of a speech that Postmaster General Winton Blount gave last week before a meeting of bankers in Wilmington. I thought it quite perceptive and include it herewith:

GENERAL BLOUNT ON THE YOUNG

(By Winton M. Blount)

(NOTE.—In an address before a meeting of bankers in Wilmington, last week, Postmaster General Winton M. Blount discussed the relationship between the generations in this country. He had some harsh remarks to make about the peace candidates around whom the young at one time rallied and he concluded with a spirited defense of the President's decision to move against the enemy sanctuaries in Cambodia. In the section of his speech we print here, the Postmaster General made some remarks about the current condition of the young that deserve more attention than they got in the turmoil of recent events.)

Whatever the questions, whatever the answers, we have been on a collision course with reality in America. We came to reality in a burst of gunfire in Ohio two weeks ago and, as the country held its breath in that dark silence, we understood finally that America cannot move to the third century of its freedom at war with its children. . . .

I think the significance of the past ten days rests in the fact that Americans are beginning to lower their voices. One might wish that we could have the time now to breathe and examine where we are without the pressures of publicity and the passions of politics, but we cannot. Still, I think our young people are ready to believe that the promise to listen to the voices that have despaired of being heard—that that promise stands, and it will be kept. . . .

It is important to listen to the questions they are asking and also to examine the answers they are offering. There is a vast basis for mutual understanding with the young: there are vast differences as well. But difference is the driving force in the dialetical process that takes us forward. So let us understand those differences, and respect them.

When we see war as a political reality, they see peace as a moral imperative. When we speak of making the world safe for democracy, they speak of making the world safe for humanity. When we point to history and the lessons of past wars, they point to the future and answer with the hope that we can put wars by. When we point to what has been accomplished, they point to what remains to be accomplished.

It is a simple matter to see in our differences that the young are naive, that their view of the world suffers from a superabundance of idealism, and a lack of reality and the hard lessons that come with responsibility. And if we see only in these terms, then we miss the more important fact that beyond our differences we share a vast community of interest. . . .

It is from this base that we can reach out and help the young to grow and come to civic maturity. And it would be wrong to ignore what has already been accomplished here, both with and for the young.

This administration has gotten the first positive changes in the draft system, and draft reforms continue. This is a matter which has been discussed with students. So are the SALT talks underway in Vienna. So is de-escalation in Southeast Asia. So is the effort to lower the voting age.

I think that as the young make demands, they should recognize that there is movement—that there is progress.

These are all matters which concern them. These are matters which affect their welfare, and these issues have been discussed with students and other young people.

So there has been communication. But we can have more. We can listen to their ideas. And I think we can and must expect them to listen to ours. They have not always done this. We can weigh their concerns. We can explain our actions. We can take them into those councils where decisions are made.

Good universities have done this for years. President Nixon has asked his department heads to do this, and we have done so, and we will do more. But let business do it as well. Let industry do it. Let local government do it. Let us together find ways to bring these people into their society.

Last March, a group of students from Princeton asked if they could visit me in my office, and I invited them down. Last Friday they came.

They were naturally very much concerned about Cambodia. But in a deeper sense they were concerned about America—concerned about our priorities, and about the assumptions on which we base those priorities. And they were concerned about their place—their future in America.

I was greatly impressed with their understanding, with their ability to advance an argument, and their ability to analyze differences of opinion. I was impressed with their willingness to listen.

We reached no agreement in our discussion. We clarified some disagreements. But the most hopeful note, it seemed to me, came at the end. I asked them if young people felt so closed out and alienated that we could no longer find a mutually acceptable basis for action, and they said no. They said generally that young people wanted to try again, to stay within the system, and make it work.

I think there is cold political comfort here. They indicated they will try to change the Congress to their liking—that they will be in opposition to many of the policies of the Nixon administration. I think we would be very foolish to underestimate the effect they are going to have in the upcoming elections, and in 1972. The brains, the devotion, and the energy they can bring to their cause is a formidable combination. So they are going to try to make their views prevail. Some of them are going to be disillusioned if they aren't completely successful . . .

They must understand that those who have power are going to try to hold it. Those who decide are going to defend their decisions. This doesn't mean they are invulnerable, that power can't be transferred, and decisions changed. They can.

But it has to happen in the center. It has to happen through the system. It has to happen at the ballot box. I don't think our troubles are over. The radicals on both fringes can't survive without turmoil and bitterness and they're going to try to create more of it. But I think we've turned the corner. There was a silent majority too among the young, and among the students, and they are speaking out now. I think we're going to get an accommodation with this generation.

BRIGHT FUTURE FOR NEGRO COLLEGES

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, at a time when integrated higher education has become widely accepted in our Nation, it is all too easy to forget the unique contribution which black colleges have made and are making to the education of black Americans.

A column which recently appeared in the Chicago Tribune by Mr. Bob Cromie, one of Chicago's most talented journalists, underlined the continuing importance of black colleges and the necessity that they continue to be supported. By documenting the contribution which the black colleges have made in the person of one distinguished graduate—Dr. Norman Christopher Francis—Mr. Cromie gives us a feeling for the potential that exists in black colleges for constructive contributions to the betterment of black Americans and ultimately all Americans.

I insert Mr. Cromie's column at this point in the RECORD:

BRIGHT FUTURE FOR NEGRO COLLEGES

(By Bob Cromie)

Dr. Norman Christopher Francis is the first black president of a Catholic university in the United States, and the first male president and first lay president of Xavier of New Orleans—the institution from which he was graduated in 1952.

Dr. Francis, who has a law degree from Loyola of the South, was in town last week to help promote the United Negro College Fund drive, a campaign which helps provide support for 36 member colleges and universities. In Dr. Francis' view, it is vitally important that the Negro college continue and remain healthy.

"My personal feeling is that the last untapped resource we have in this country may be the black American," Dr. Francis said. "Look at the figures. There are 300,000 black youngsters in college today, and there ought to be 750,000. We need every college we can get to educate all the youngsters. A bridge between equal opportunity and the young black is needed, and we believe the black college can provide it better than any other institution.

"It is necessary for the teacher to believe that a student can be educated, and we stand as a monument to the fact that we believe this. When a student leaves us after four years he can enter any graduate school in the country and do the work."

Dr. Francis enrolled in Xavier because the college in his own home town wouldn't admit him because of his color.

"Xavier gave me a chance," he said. "It was the only all-black Catholic university anywhere in the United States. Then I became the first black to enter Loyola of the South in 1952. They told me afterwards that they didn't think I could make it."

Dr. Francis has some impressive statistics to back up his claim that the education given by black institutions of higher learning is a good one: Seventy-five percent of all black Ph.Ds, for example, did their undergraduate work in black schools, and 95 per cent of that 75 percent went on to white graduate schools. Further, 65 per cent of the blacks now holding jobs in state and local government came off black campuses.

Xavier, Dr. Francis says, is called a black university, but has about 10 per cent white enrollment—one reason being that it offers the only college of pharmacy in the New Orleans area. Last year there were 15 graduates from the school of pharmacy, three-quarters of them black, and Walgreen's drug stores tried to hire the entire lot.

"Any time you see a black pharmacist in a neighborhood store in Chicago," says Dr. Francis with a grin, "there is a very good chance that he came from Xavier. In fact they are our best recruiters, and within three years we expect to be graduating about 65 pharmacists.

Dr. Francis became president of Xavier in 1968, and enrollment is now 1,350, an increase of some 300 in the last three years. He reports no major student unrest on the Xavier campus.

I asked if Xavier had had any *real* trouble on campus, and Dr. Francis thought for a moment.

"Last year," he said, "we had a couple of fires in trash cans in the men's rest rooms."

HALF FARES FOR SENIOR CITIZENS—ANOTHER WAY OF PROVIDING JUSTICE FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

HON. LEONARD FARBSTEIN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. FARBSTEIN. Mr. Speaker, I have today introduced H.R. 17744 a bill to provide senior citizens with half fare rates on all public transportation in the United States, including airplanes, trains, buses, and all local transportation during nonpeak hours.

Senior citizens are physically less mobile and thus need public transportation more than other age groups; yet they are also less economically able to afford such transportation. The result is that many senior citizens are forced to forego a richer life.

This legislation would provide half fares in a manner similar to the airlines youth fares, except that elderly persons would be able to reserve their seats in advance.

Half fare rates during nonpeak periods would enable senior citizens to escape the loneliness of exile in one's own home and permit them to get away from their daily routine once in a while, and visit friends or recreational facilities away from their homes. It would also enable underutilized transportation facilities to increase the number of passengers they carry and thus increase revenue. In spite of the fact that it would be best for them, as well as the senior citizen, most transportation companies have refused to adopt half fare rates.

This is but one of many examples of the lack of concern demonstrated by large sectors of society toward our elderly persons. There is a lot of talk about the silent majority. Well, I believe our senior citizens are the forgotten minority. Their problems go unheeded, or if they are talked about, it is only in piecemeal terms.

As a Member of Congress, I have placed a very high priority on securing justice for senior citizens. I have introduced, and have been fighting to obtain the enactment of legislation to provide a sizable increase in social security benefits, to secure a minimum monthly benefit of $120 for an individual and $180 for a married couple, and to obtain automatic increases in benefits to compensate for any increase in the cost of living.

I have also introduced legislation to make other badly needed reforms in the system including, elimination of the limitation on earnings for social security recipients, elimination of the current practice of deducting from veterans and other Government pensions any increase an individual receives from social security, extension of eligibility under the Prouty amendment to retired teachers, and the extension of medicare to include other badly needed services such as prescription drugs and home maintenance worker services.

I am pleased that the social security bill passed today by the House of Representatives provides reforms in a number of these areas, and that my efforts may have in part contributed to what is in the bill. But I must admit that I am not totally satisfied with the bill. It provides a 5 percent increase in benefits. I believe this is totally inadequate. What is needed is a 35 percent increase. Nor is a minimum payment established. The bill provides for an increase in the limit on earnings. I believe the limitation should be abolished altogether or raised far above the limit provided in the bill. The bill also provides for the inclusion of new services under medicare but leaves out home maintenance workers services or prescription drugs.

I am particularly pleased that the bill as passed included an automatic cost-of-living provision. This is something I voted for and have long advocated.

Mr. Speaker, I intend to continue fighting until the Congress passes legislation that will do justice to our senior citizens.

THERE IS NO GENERATION GAP FOR PATIOTIC YOUTH

HON. JOHN R. RARICK

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. RARICK. Mr. Speaker, the mob action and violence which continues unbridled in the United States is drawing reaction from American youth serving our country in Vietnam. Unfortunately, the many letters and voices from the loyal youth at the battlefront are not given as widespread "interpretative commentating" by our national communications system as is given to "dissent" and "free speech" by the mob movement here on the homefront.

The disagreement between the patriotic youth who serve their country and the emotional ones at home who permit their exploitation as members of the mob should belie the generation gap theory. There is no generation gap—rather it is a commonsense gap or an misunder-

standing gap among members of the same generation.

Those youth who have been liberally educated to believe we live in a democracy fall easy prey to mob actions as a solution to problems of disagreement. Unfortunately, solutions arrived at in passion and frustration by mob action—simple at the moment—offer no enduring contribution. That is why civilized governments elect representatives.

The structure of our Republic and the understanding of all who love their country and individual liberty is that our country is a republic, and mobs are not given political significance.

James Madison's notes on the arguments at the Constitutional Convention indicates that our Founding Fathers discussed several forms of government but concluded the United States was not to be a democracy; one reason being that the democracy is self-destructive of individual liberty because of the mob.

I include letters from several servicemen, the "War Department Training Manual on Citizenship," an article on the defense of nihilism, and several editorials:

[From Daily Reveille, May 15, 1970]

CAMBODIA FROM A SAILOR'S VIEW

To the EDITOR of the LSU Reveille:

I write this letter because my stomach is hurting. A lot of you have the same feeling, but for the opposite reasons. You, because Americans have entered Cambodia. You feel like protesting, expressing your displeasure with this action.

Well, I want to express a little displeasure, too! I'm for the President's action, because it might save my life. I'm a PBR sailor on the Van Co Tay river in Vietnam. Up to a month ago, I had spent six months on the Van Co Dang river. These two rivers form the "Sling Shot" around the Parrot's Beak region where ARVN and American troops are operating in Cambodia.

Since January, the NVA and VC troops have slipped in and out of Cambodia and have been giving my division hell! And there was nothing we could do because as soon as they hit us they slipped back into Cambodia.

I say, "Thank you, Mr. Nixon!" Some of you may say that if Americans weren't here, I wouldn't have to sweat getting killed by these little yellowmen—running in and out of a couple of primitive, backward, corrupt countries.

Well, I wish I could show you some of the little girls three and four years old, who, as infants have had their arms, or eyes, or ears cut off because the VC terrorists decided to teach their parents a lesson, for some reason. I wish I could show you young children who know nothing about communism or democracy, going to school to learn to read and write, being blown to bits by a communist rocket that was carelessly aimed.

I wish I could introduce you to Duc and Khang and Phong. These are sailors who ride with us and fight with us. Duc is 18 now. When I first came to this country, he was 17 and he could shoot and clean an M60 machine gun better than any American around. He doesn't understand why the NVA and the VC want to kill him, but as long as they keep trying he keeps our M60s clean and ready to go.

These people don't really understand what communism is; that is except for people like Khang. Khang was born near Hanoi. I think he is 22 now. He is older than most of these Vietnamese on our boats. He had gone to Saigon University for a couple of years before enlisting in the Vietnamese Navy.

Khang came south when the communist opened the gates for all those in what had become North Vietnam who wanted to leave. Millions left. The gates were forced closed against the millions of others who wanted to flee the communist rule. Khang told me that his brother and a sister have been killed since he and his family left everything in the North to start a new life in the South.

His brother, a lieutenant in the South Vietnamese Army, caught a B40 rocket in the stomach, his sister was killed during the fighting in Siagon Tet of '68. Khang has reason to hate the communists! He does.

But to some of you back home, these are other peoples problems. You think you don't have to worry about things like this back "in the world." Well, Jack, look around. What is happening now is the start. And man it is going to get a whole lot worse if some people don't open their eyes.

Right now Americans are being killed by other Americans. I don't mean just the few who are killed in "dissent turning to violence." I mean the hundreds and thousands who are being killed here because the communists have had their confidence bolstered by the protesters and the violence and a slanted news media in the United States.

I want to come home to my wife and my 8-month-old son. I want to return to LSU and finish the two semesters I have left there. I want to live and work in the United States, but not the way it sounds now. It's almost safer here. Here, it's almost over, one way or another. There, it's just beginning.

DAVID SIMMONS.

[From the Flint (Mich.) Journal, May 17, 1970]

PROTESTS PUZZLE SERGEANT: CANNOT UNDERSTAND VIETCONG FLAGS IN THE UNITED STATES

(By William A. James)

"I'm not against demonstrations," he said. "I don't want to fight over there any more than the next man. But I can't understand kids putting up Viet Cong flags.

"Flags stand for something. Our flag stands for a lot of good guys I know who have died. Those Viet Cong flags represent the people who are killing us. I just can't understand it."

That is what Air Force Sgt. William G. Woods thinks about some of the activities on campuses across the country.

Woods, 25, is the son of Mr. and Mrs. Woodrow Woods, 4318 Roberts St. He's a high school graduate who has spent 2½ years in Vietnam. Two out of three recent weeks he spent in Cambodia.

"The demonstrations do have an effect," he continued. "It makes them (the men in the field) wonder—none of us want to be fighting. But we are there. It seems like people could at least give us some support."

Woods, a native of Beckley, W. Va., graduated from Stratton High School there in 1962. He enlisted in the Air Force in January, 1963, He says he wants to make a career of it.

When President Kennedy was assassinated in 1963, Woods was selected because of his appearance and bearing to march in the funeral procession as a member of the Air Force Color Guard.

Although he has spent 30 months in Vietnam, Woods said he didn't volunteer to go. He served there from October, 1965, to October, 1966; from January, 1967, to March, 1967; from December, 1967 to February, 1968, and from May, 1969, until a week ago.

"It's tough," he said about Vietnam duty. "But it's not as bad as it was in 1965. There are more conveniences now; living conditons are better, and it's not quite so hazardous."

He spoke favorably of the American drive into Cambodia.

"I think invading Cambodia is the best thing to have happened in the war," he said. "The enemy was getting resupplied so easily. It was a ticklish situation. You couldn't call in artillery or air strikes.

"For the first time, we can go after them. We can finally get to the enemy."

His job in Indochina has been to help call in air strikes in support of infantry units. He has been a member of the 619th Tactical Control Squadron.

When the troops were moved to within five miles of the Cambodian border about three weeks ago, Woods said they all knew what was up.

The unit waited two days before it moved across the border. He said he doesn't remember the exact day.

"We don't pay much attention to the calendar over there," he remarked.

Woods continued:

"We'd been told to stay out of Cambodia and Laos ever since I was there in '65," he said. "You knew they (the enemy) were there, and they knew you couldn't bother them."

He said most North Vietnamese and Viet Cong supplies had been coming through Cambodia and Laos.

During his two-week stint in Cambodia, Woods said, his unit encountered enemy soldiers almost daily.

"We ran into several hard-core North Vietnamese Army (NVA) units which slowed us down quite a bit," he said. "But we weren't taking too many casualties."

He said the Cambodians have little defense.

"I doubt they could stand a week without support," he said.

Woods said there are many military-age Cambodian men who have either volunteered for duty with the North Vietnamese or have been kidnapped by the NVA.

He said some Cambodian units included several 15 and 16 year-olds.

"They shouldn't be fighting," he said. "They're tough, though. But I just can't see 15-year-olds sent into battle to kill."

Woods said the Cambodians at first resented United States intervention, and hated the Vietnamese. But they seem to have accepted both now, he said.

He said the Cambodians have been feuding with the Vietnamese for centuries. There is a race distinction, he said. The Cambodians are darker. And the cultures of the two countries are quite different, he said.

"Cambodians still have difficulty recognizing South and North Vietnamese," he said. "And they make little or no distinction between the politics of the Vietnamese peoples."

Woods said that until recently the Cambodians didn't seem to be sure what would happen to them in either event—that is whether they were overrun by South or North Vietnamese.

He attributed recent massacres in Cambodia to the basic distrust by Cambodians of any Vietnamese.

Asked if there has been an increase in the amount of South Vietnamese involvement in the war over the past three years, Woods replied:

"In 1965, we were doing all the fighting—now there are a couple South Vietnamese regiments which are pretty good. I think they'll be able to carry the weight."

But he said South Vietnamese troops don't measure up to U.S. standards.

"I was never impressed with the Vietnamese forces," he said. "They just don't seem to have the desire to get out there and hit it.

"We do have a few Vietnamese military units that are really good. Some day I'm sure the Vietnamese can handle it—a year, maybe two. And I believe they should handle it."

Asked if he thought U.S. troops should be in Vietnam at all, Woods replied that the United States did have a commitment to assist the South Vietnamese.

"We had a commitment, as far as it went—that is to furnish supplies and some advisers to help the South Vietnamese," he said. "This was all right.

"Somehow, somebody got the idea we could do it better than the South Vietnamese, so now we've got a big mess on our hands."

Asked about a way out, he replied:

"Finish what we started. If we pulled out today, I think world opinion would be against us."

And, he said, the South Vietnamese would be quickly overrun.

"I don't think the war will ever be settled at the peace table the way things are now," he said. "The North Vietnamese will have to realize that they can't possibly win a ground war. Then they will be willing to negotiate.

"Morale, on the whole, is pretty high. This (Cambodian invasion) gave everybody a shot in the arm. It's kind of hard to fight anybody when you've got one hand tied behind your back.

"This is going to save a lot of lives. I believe the level of fighting in Vietnam will go down considerably because of this."

Woods, who was wounded by shrapnel from a mortar round in 1965, has been nominated for a Bronze Star for recent action in Vietnam.

Home on furlough, he will report to Bergstrom Air Force Base, Tex., June 7.

[From the Baton Rouge (La.) Morning Advocate, May 7, 1970]

REVOLUTIONS ARE NO TRIFLES

The shooting to death of two young men and two young women by National Guardsmen at Kent State University in Kent, Ohio, was a terrible and deplorable thing. It is one of the worst stains on any page of this country's history.

So confused was the situation on the beleaguered campus that the truth of what actually happened, what caused guardsmen to loose a fusillade of bullets into a crowd of students—whether it was the result of an order, a misunderstood order, in self-defense or out of sheer panic—may never be known.

What is certain is that when two groups of youngsters chase each other playing Good Guys and Bad Guys—both sides armed, one with stones and the other with guns—someone is going to get hurt.

Before assessing responsibility for the deaths, however, it should be remembered why the Guard was present in the first place. Consider these events which took place in a small town of 18,000 with a university population of 20,000 during two nights preceding the tragedy:

On the first night, students swarmed into the downtown business area, tearing down signs, demolishing phone booths and smashing store windows and painting revolutionary slogans on their walls.

On the second night, students set fire to the ROTC building on the campus. When firemen arrived, they pelted them with rocks and slashed their fire hoses with machetes—not pen knives but machetes. The building was destroyed.

Students also set fire to two other small structures on the campus, broke lights and destroyed parking meters in the parking lot, scooping up the scattered change.

Students also allegedly threatened to kill reporters from a local newspaper if they took pictures and telephoned threats to merchants to display "peace" signs in their windows "or your stores will be burned."

How does Vietnam or Cambodia or black studies or curriculum reform or any other excuse justify this senseless destruction and gangster behavior?

National Guardsmen are not trained to deal in psychological persuasion against rampaging rioters. These men—boys, really—were already under strain from duty during a violent Teamsters' strike in Cleveland.

The ultimate blame for what happened at Kent rests squarely on a small core of instigators—some of them students at Kent, some of them from outside—and indirectly on the masses of students who, while they did not actively participate in the disturbances, watched and applauded from the sidelines.

Beyond them, blame falls on faculty and administrators—not just at Kent but at a dozen other colleges and universities. For too long, the one has egged on the dissenters and the others have permitted law-breakers to go unpunished out of fear of "radicalizing" the other students.

Now, we are all radicalized.

Almost exactly two centuries ago, in 1770, nervous British soldiers fired into a crowd of rioters in Boston, drawing the first blood of the American Revolution.

If there be any who believe that a second revolution has begun at Kent State University, let them ponder the words of John Adams, who defended the soldiers at their trial:

"Revolutions are no trifles," wrote Adams years after the war. "They ought never to be undertaken rashly; nor without deliberate consideration and sober reflection; nor without a solid, immutable, eternal foundation of justice and humanity; nor without a people possessed of intelligence, fortitude and integrity . . ."

How much reflection, how much humanity—how much intelligence—was displayed by the rioters at what radicals will undoubtedly call the Kent Massacre of 1970?

Young people have shouted long and raucously that they are going to "turn this country around" and set it straight. The time is overdue for them to turn around and take a sober, reflective look at themselves, at what they have done, at what they may yet do to their country.

[From the Jackson (Miss.) Clarion-Ledger, May 17, 1970]

MISPLACING THE BLAME OVER DEATHS AT KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

(By Florence Sillers Ogden)

So President Nixon and Vice President Agnew are responsible for the tragedy at Kent State? Such outrageous accusations by self-constituted judges make my blood boil. How unjust can people get?

President Nixon and Vice President Agnew have said what ought to be said, and should have been said before. Let us be thankful that we at last have leaders who have the courage to speak out against anarchy and revolution; leaders who put their country before a second term in office . . .

For those who would fix blame, call names, why not Black Panthers, Communist agitators, SDS, Dellinger, Bobby Seale?

For those who have the gall to blame Mr. Nixon and Mr. Agnew for death at Kent, do they know the demands the SDS made on the university? Let me repeat the demands as told by Victor Riesel in his column of May 10th. Here are the four points:

1. Elimination of the ROTC.

And why? Anyone knows that answer.

2. End Project Themis Grant to the Liquid Crystal Institute.

This is an institute of science to develop "liquid crystal detectors" to measure heat—that is, to detect campfires in jungles, to seek out hidden Viet Cong troops, hidden supplies, hideaways.

It might interest you to know that the institute at Kent is one of only two in the U. S. A. Someone wants to be rid of this institute of detection. Who? President Nixon?

3. Abolishment of the Law Enforcement School which trains students for police careers. Someone wants to be rid of this school. Who? Vice President Agnew?

4. Abolish the Northeast Ohio Crime Laboratory.

Someone wants to be rid of this laboratory. Who? Attorney General Mitchell?

Do you think the real students of Kent University thought this program up? Do you think the administrators could, in their wildest dreams, meet these demands?

Why can't the American people, and especially the news media, understand that this is a communist-hatched plot bent on the destruction of Kent University and of the United States. It is a plot bent on converting Kent State, a conservative, middle class seat of learning, into a far-left institution, if not destroying it entirely.

Who can be so blind as not to see that these campus riots are planned and led by professional agitators?

Competent observers know that for some time Kent State has been the target of the SDS in that peaceful, undisturbed area. Students of Kent were whipped into a frenzy by outside agitators, anarchists, revolutionaries.

We have seen it happen over and over again in colleges and universities all over America. Yet the administrators of our universities and colleges in the South, and right here in Mississippi, insist on lending their rostrums to all agitators who have the gift of speech to persuade young minds. They call it academic freedom. We old heads call it freedom to brainwash, license to betray.

Now death has resulted. And they blame it on the President and the Vice President of the United States!

Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare Robert H. Finch has said that "the rhetoric of Vice President Agnew contributed to heating up the climate in which the Kent students were killed." What a stab in the back.

Of all the irresponsible statements ever made by a member of any president's cabinet by a fellow member, this is the most irresponsible, the most venomous. It is time for Mr. Finch to hand in his resignation—and pronto!

Why not link the deaths at Kent with the SDS rhetoric, which has been so blatant for so long? With Mark Rudd, Bernardine Dohrm et al who have been asking for blood, for revolt, for destruction of buildings and for armed rebellion at Kent. Their cry is bold letters on SDS pamphlets, "The war is on at Kent." They asked for it, and they got it.

Students are not the only young people who are dying today. Eighty-two policemen died this past year. After all, they are people, too, and most of them are young and entitled to live. The young men who "stand tall" in Vietnam are dying, as young men through all the ages have died for their country. Are Nixon and Agnew to blame? Why not blame Eisenhower and Kennedy? The signers of the Tonkin Gulf resolution—Fulbright and others? President Lyndon Johnson, who sponsored the Tonkin Gulf thing?

The soldiers of the National Guard, called to duty at Kent State, are young, too, most of them no older than the thousand who attacked, drove them into a box between a heavy iron fence on one side and a thousand frenzied, rock-slinging students on the other side. Does the American public expect these young men, called to duty by high authority, to stand and take this sort of attack without fighting back?

True, it ended in tragedy, but it ended. How else could it have ended except in possible death to one side or the other?

[From the War Department Training Manual No. 2000-25]

CITIZENSHIP

(Prepared under direction of the Chief of Staff)

This manual supersedes Manual of Citizenship Training.

(NOTE.—The use of the publication "The Constitution of the United States," by Harry Atwood, is by permission and courtesy of the author.)

DEMOCRACY

A government of the masses.

Authority derived through mass meeting or any other form of "direct" expression.

Results in mobocracy.

Attitude toward property is communistic—negating property rights.

Attitude toward law is that the will of the majority shall regulate whether it is based upon deliberation or governed by passion, prejudice, and impulses, without restraint or regard to consequences.

Results in demagogism, license, agitation, discontent, anarchy.

REPUBLIC

Authority is derived through the election by the people of public officials best fitted to represent them.

Attitude toward property is respect for laws and individual rights, and a sensible economic procedure.

Attitude toward law is the administration of justice in accord with fixed principles and established evidence, with a strict regard to consequences.

A greater number of citizens and extent of territory may be brought within its compass.

Avoids the dangerous extreme of either tyranny or mobocracy.

Results in statesmanship, liberty, reason, justice, contentment, and progress.

Is the "standard form" of government throughout the world.

"A republic is a form of government under a constitution which provides for the election of (1) an executive and (2) a legislative body, who working together in a representative capacity, have all the power of appointment, all power of legislation, all power to raise revenue and appropriate expenditures, and are required to create (3) a judiciary to pass upon the justice and legality of their governmental acts and to recognize (4) certain inherent individual rights.

"Take away any one or more of those four elements and you are drifting into autocracy. Add one or more to those four elements and you are drifting into democracy."—*Atwood.*

121. Superior to all others.—Autocracy declares the divine right of kings; its authority can not be questioned; its powers are arbitrarily or unjustly administered.

Democracy is the "direct" rule of the people and has been repeatedly tried without success.

Our Constitutional fathers, familiar with the strength and weakness of both autocracy and democracy, with fixed principles definitely in mind, defined a representative republican form of government. They "made a very marked distinction between a republic and a democracy * * * and said repeatedly and emphatically that they had founded a republic."

NIHILISM—FORERUNNER OF HIPPIE MOVEMENT PRECISELY DEFINED

Nihilism, the name commonly given to the Russian form of revolutionary Socialism, which had at first an academical character, rapidly developed into an anarchist revolutionary movement. It originated in the early years of the reign of Alexander II., and the term was first used by Turgueniev in his celebrated novel, *Fathers and Children*, published in 1862. Among the students of the universities and the higher technical schools Turgueniev had noticed a new and strikingly original type—young men and women in slovenly attire, who called in question and ridiculed the generally received convictions and respectable conventionalities of social life, and who talked of reorganizing society on strictly scientific principles. They reversed the traditional order of things even in trivial matters of external appearance, the males allowing the hair to grow long and the female adepts cutting it short, and adding sometimes the additional badge of blue spectacles. Their appearance, manners and conversation were apt to shock ordinary people, but to this they were profoundly indifferent, for they had raised themselves above the level of so-called public opinion, despised Philistine respectability, and rather liked to scandalize people still under the influence of what they considered antiquated prejudices. For aesthetic culture, sentimentalism and refinement of every kind they had a profound and undisguised contempt. Professing extreme utilitarianism and delighting in paradox, they were ready to declare that a shoemaker who distinguished himself in his craft was a greater man than a Shakespeare or a Goethe, because humanity had more need of shoes than of poetry. Thanks to Turgueniev, these young persons came to be known in common parlance as "Nihilists," though they never ceased to protest against the term as a calumnious nickname. According to their own account, they were simply earnest students who desired reasonable reforms, and the peculiarities in their appearance and manner arose simply from an excusable neglect of trivialities in view of graver interests. In reality, whatever name we may apply to them, they were the extreme representatives of a curious moral awakening and an important intellectual movement among the Russian educated classes.

In material and moral progress Russia had remained behind the other European nations, and the educated classes felt, after the humiliation of the Crimean War, that the reactionary regime of the Emperor Nicholas must be replaced by a series of drastic reforms. With the impulsiveness of youth and the recklessness of inexperience, the students went in this direction much farther than their elders, and their reforming zeal naturally took an academic, pseudo-scientific form. Having learned the rudiments of positivism, they conceived the idea that Russia had outlived the religious and metaphysical stages of human development, and was ready to enter on the positivist stage. She ought, therefore, to throw aside all religious and metaphysical conceptions, and to regulate her intellectual, social and political life by the pure light of natural science. Among the antiquated institutions which had to be abolished as obstructions to real progress, were religion, family life, private property and centralized administration. Religion was to be replaced by the exact sciences, family life by free love, private property by collectivism, and centralized administration by a federation of independent communes. Such doctrines could not, of course, be preached openly under a paternal, despotic government, but the press censure had become so permeated with the prevailing spirit of enthusiastic liberalism, that they could be artfully disseminated under the disguise of literary criticism and fiction, and the public very soon learned the art of reading between the lines. (*Encyclopedia Britannica* (11th Edition), 1911, Vol. XIX, pp. 686–7)

CONGRATULATIONS ON ISRAEL'S 22D ANNIVERSARY

HON. ABNER J. MIKVA

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. MIKVA. Mr. Speaker, 22 years ago a nation was born in the Near East that was not a new nation: Israel. Its birth, like every human birth, was marked in pain and blood, hope and promise.

There was hope for every Jew, regardless of the language he spoke, or the color of his skin, or the crest on his passport, that his homeland would live again. There was promise of a new and democratic state, offering freedom from the age-old discriminations and persecutions, and a chance to build a society with the wisdom of the past and the tools and techniques of the future.

Twenty-two years later that hope and promise proudly live on in Israel. But the pain and blood remain. But despite the constant turmoil, Israel has forged a democratic homeland. The establishment of the first Jewish state in more than 2,000 years fulfilled a dream that had been so long unfulfilled. And from the birth of the state a vigorous, modern nation has emerged.

Bolstered by skilled physicians, economists, lawyers, and scientists—many of whom escaped the Nazi scourge—Israel has developed a strong economy. Through irrigation projects, Israel now can feed nearly all of its citizens without importing food. A well-developed industrial base has permitted the young state to trade extensively in the world markets.

Israel has also cultivated a democratic political system—one of the few in the Middle East. The thoroughly democratic government allows direct elections of candidates from a wide variety of political parties. A sophisticated press also permits vigorous and partisan debate among the various parties.

In concert with its great heritage the new nation has also developed cultural institutions in the short span of 22 years. The Hebrew language theater, the national ballet and symphony, and Israel's fine universities are known throughout the world.

With every heartfelt good wish on this anniversary of her nationhood goes an unspoken prayer for peace between Israel and her neighbors. May this most unmilitary of peoples cease having to prove to the world the terrible efficiency of its armies. May there be a new reverence for life throughout these lands that cradled our civilization. May the fields of Israel, and of its neighbors, bring forth harvests only in peace.

EXTENDING THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND—TODAY'S TRANSPORTATION FUNDING IMBALANCE AND THE NEED FOR A SINGLE TRANSPORTATION TRUST FUND

HON. EDWARD I. KOCH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

(Mr. KOCH asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KOCH. Mr. Speaker, one of the most important congressional hearings now taking place on the Hill is on the country's highway program. The House Public Works Committee is now considering legislation which would extend the highway trust fund to 1978 as part of a comprehensive highway program to continue at least until 1985. And the

committee has before it a $320 billion highway needs study submitted by the highway administration for the next decade. With the mass transit needs being what they are, combined with the Nation's demographic projections for the future, it is irresponsible to propose that $320 billion be spent on highways.

I have testified before the committee urging that the concept of a balanced transportation system be incorporated in the law by establishing a single transportation trust fund.

We know that nearly 80 percent of the people of this country are jammed into urban areas and that highways for the cities' transportation problems are not the answer. What we need for the cities is mass transportation and that means subways and buses. It is irrational that this Congress should plan to spend in fiscal year 1971 $4.5 billion for highways and only $285 million for mass transportation. Furthermore, it is shocking that the Department of Transportation has an estimated 5,400 individuals working in its highway administration but only 57 employees in the urban mass transportation administration.

If we are to get a balanced transportation program—if we are to get a single transportation trust fund, we cannot extend the highway trust fund to 1978. I urge our colleagues to appear before the House Public Works Committee now and testify in opposition to the extension of the highway trust fund and to put forward the new approach of a single transportation trust fund to meet the needs of the decades to come.

SMALL BUSINESS WEEK OF 1970

HON. LAWRENCE J. HOGAN

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. HOGAN. Mr. Speaker, I take this opportunity to salute the small businessmen in this country in this week which President Nixon has proclaimed as "Small Business Week of 1970."

I am very pleased to see this time set aside to call to the attention of all Americans the valuable contribution made by the over 5 million small businesses in this country. Many tend to think the strength of our business economy lies with those multimillion-dollar concerns which are known nationwide. Little do people realize that the small business concerns, in addition to providing services and products of every nature for the American public, contribute approximately 40 percent of the Nation's jobs and the gross national product.

Actually, the contribution of small business—the heart of our economy—goes beyond dollars and cents, products and services, as President Nixon pointed out in his message to Congress in late March:

"It can mean for the Nation a source of independent innovation which continually offers new products and services needed by any economy if it is to remain vital.

"It can mean a chance for a young American to bring not only his talent but his individuality to the challenges of the business world.

"It can also mean an opportunity for dignity and for economic and social progress for many Americans previously without access to the economic system of our Nation. Small business is a way to become a part of that system—and, after seeing it work, believe in it, in its promises and in its challenges."

Being aware of the importance of a healthy small business community to our country's economy and welfare, President Eisenhower 17 years ago established the Small Business Administration to look out for the interest of and to administer Government programs aiding the growth and development of small businesses. Similarly, both the House of Representatives and the Senate have established Small Business Committees to see that the needs and interests of the small businessmen received full consideration and attention by the Congress. The SBA and congressional committees can appropriately take credit for advancing the interest and status of this important segment of the economy over the past several years. Even now these units are working together to develop and institute certain recommendations of the President's Task Force on Small Business and President Nixon's recommendations to Congress earlier this spring. These proposals for various new methods of assistance at the Government level as new small business incentives at the private sector level, deal basically with three major problem areas as determined by the Task Force—

The need for capital and for recognition of the special financial problems small firms may face in their early years;

The need for sound management counseling; and

The need for people and especially for trained people.

In conclusion, I feel confident that the efforts of our leaders will resolve these and other problems presently facing the small businessman, and that in years to come small business will continue to grow in strength and purpose. On this occasion I would like to rededicate myself to the task of assuring that they will continue to play a fundamental role in the economy of our Nation.

UNSPOILED COPIAH COUNTY, MISS.

HON. CHARLES H. GRIFFIN

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, May 21, 1970

Mr. GRIFFIN. Mr. Speaker, the March-April issue of Mississippi Game and Fish, the official publication of the Mississippi Game and Fish Commission, features an interesting article on Copiah County.

Written by James Watts, the article points up the recreational opportunities in Copiah County made possible by the foresight and hard work of its citizens. A clean, wholesome, unspoiled area available to every citizen is a worthy national goal. The people of Copiah County have shown that it can be done and they deserve the commendation of all interested in maintaining environmental quality.

I am pleased to call to the attention of the House Mr. Watts' article which follows:

CALLING PAN OR UNCOMMONLY UNSPOILED COPIAH COUNTY

(By James Watts)

Thousands of sportsmen believe Copiah County is already "the greatest," while others think the county has not yet reached its wildlife potential, but the latter group doesn't deny the ever present high quality that has long attracted outdoorsmen for hundreds of miles.

The sounds of whirring wings, snorting bucks and splashing bass are all prevalent and common to this southwestern Mississippi county. Even the adjectives used by sportsmen to describe this area—"unspoiled, clean, natural, clear, beautiful"—paint a picture worthy of the "wildlife pedestal" many naturalists say Copiah County deserves.

Amid the deep darkness of Homochitto National Forest sportsmen can be found rambling after the racoon by night or scanning the hardwood for squirrels by day. They may be over a crappie bed on Lake Copial, or checking their trot lines on Pearl River. They have different wants and they come armed with cameras, beagles, yelpers, binoculars, pointers and sleeping bags, but they have one thing in common and that is their admiration for Copiah's great outdoors.

The word "Copiah" comes from an Indian name which means "calling panther" and legend holds that panthers were once a part of Copiah's wilds. Bordered by the famed Pearl to the east, Copiah County is located in the Brown Loam soil area and ranks seventh in area and 23rd in population among the 82 counties of the State.

The county was organized in 1822, five years after Mississippi was admitted to the Union, and was the State's 18th county. Coar's Springs became the temporary seat of justice of Copiah County in 1819. The historic old town of Gallatin next became the county seat and then to its present site, Hazlehurt. Other county communities include Beauregard, Crystal Springs, Gallman, Georgetown and Wesson.

Copiah County's wilds are probably most famous for a 6,500-acre tract of land known as Copiah County Game Management Area or "Henneberry," the name of the land's owner prior to the Commission obtaining it in 1949. The Copiah County trace represents almost one-half of State owned game lands. The other 7,253 acres are located in Marion County in Hugh White Management Area.

The Commission has under lease another 1,135,811 acres in strategically located areas, but it is only under lease. It's now easy to look behind and realize that other lands should have been purchased years ago, but it simply was not done for various reasons. However, the present Game and Fish Commission is working closely with legislative officials in an effort to buy additional prime hunting ground.

The George F. Henneberry story is a remarkable one to say the least. A world traveler and renowned entertainer, Henneberry was a multi-millionaire and the printer of Sears and Roebuck's catalogue. He hunted in Africa, Asia and South America. He was a small man, but made up for his minute size

with wealth and unsurpassed vitality and vigor.

Henneberry's connection with Copiah County was through wealthy friends who also used the picturesque area as a get-away-from-it-all haven. Between 1939 and 1945 Henneberry bought up the lands of 17 small farmers and landowners and the result was his private 6,500-acre retreat. The wealthy lithographer added rooms to a stately old plantation home that dates back more than 100 years. He furnished it with elegant furniture and even added bathrooms that represented the first indoor plumbing in rural Copiah County.

Henneberry, whose permanent home was in Chicago, visited his second home for months at a time. He brought with him food, drink and friends, while employing cheap labor to plant and develop his land for game bird management purposes. The land, which borders Claiborne County in southwest Copiah, was then, and remains, managed primarily for quail, although all Mississippi game species, are common to the area.

In 1948 Henneberry died a tragic death at the age of 60 in an Illinois automobile accident. It was the following year that the Commission acquired the land after Warren A. Hood, one of today's most prominent Mississippians, came to Commission Director R. M. Freemen, who is the father of today's Fisheries Chief Barry Freeman, with an idea.

At that time Hood was in the saw mill business and wanted the merchantable timber off the Henneberry property. Hood had negotiated with Mrs. Henneberry's attorney before coming to the Commission with his proposal. A few months later an agreement was reached and under a Pittman-Roberson land acquisition project the Commission got the land for $87,962 or about $15.00 per acre and Hood bought the timber. Hood, in turn, sold back to the Commission the merchantable hardwood for $6,000.

Hood had a three-year contract to harvest the merchantable pine above 10 inches in diameter. The Commission obtained the land, one-eighth of the owner's non-participating royalty interest in the minerals and Henneberry's house and its furnishings.

A native of the Dentville Community of Copiah and now a resident of Jackson, Hood is now one of Mississippi's wealthiest men and one of the most active conservationists in the State. He owns or has under lease nearly 9,000 acres that partially join the management area and all of it is managed for maximum production of game and fish.

The two-story home remains today in "mansion" form and, after recently being renovated, is being used for meetings of law enforcement personnel, biologists, the 11-man Game and Fish Commission and other groups when authorized.

In years past the 17-room, antebellum structure has been used to its fullest. It has played host to governors and their wives, United States Senators and Representatives, out-of-state celebrities and hundreds of Game and Fish Commission friends.

"Henneberry" was closed to hunting for five years after the Commission acquired it. Today, all game is hunted on the area with the exception of turkey, although their population is growing steadily.

The very nature of the land makes it outstanding quail country. The way the land was farmed in the past and the way it has been developed since have contributed greatly to the management area's success. Numerous ponds, water holes, hedgerows and fields of corn, brown-top millet and soy beans dot the countryside. Two of the most scenic streams in the State cross the area in Foster's Creek and Mill Creek. About one-half the area's total lands are in timber.

The estimated quail kill on "Henneberry" this year was 1900 down from last year, but still an outstanding figure for the number of acres hunted. Squirrel hunting was fair to good, rabbit hunting was good, dove hunting was down but good (3,000 in the first two days), and deer hunting was excellent with 61 bucks being taken by white-tail hunters.

Plans for the management area's future include more intensive management for game animals, with special interest on the turkey, and construction of two or three 25 to 50 acre lakes. The Commission is presently working toward financing lake construction.

Those persons who contend Copiah County is still under developed in regards to wildlife and fisheries usually have one of two things on their mind. One, for several years an "International Garden" proposal has been discussed in the Magnolia State and an area of Copiah County along Bayou Pierre has, since the proposal's initiation, been in the forerunning for the most desirable location. And, two, Copiah County is in need of more public fishing waters, although all residents and visitors of the county have access to some of the State's finest small lakes and ponds.

If the garden ever becomes a reality, and predominant supporters appear optimistic for its development in the next few years, the wants of both these groups would be complete. Included in the general plan for the International Botanical Gardens and Nature Preservation Area is a 3,000-acre reservoir complete with boat ramps, a marina, campgrounds, skiing, swimming and fishing. The complete area calls for 6,000 acres that would include "a tree farm of international trees, shrubs and flowers representative of all countries of the world and all states of the Union."

A handsomely printed booklet discussing the International Garden was distributed to members of the State Legislature some two months ago when Mississippi State University specialists reported on the results of the feasibility study. The 1969 Legislative Session asked Mississippi State University to make the study.

The committee appointed by Mississippi State University President William L. Giles reported that it "feels that an International Garden is feasible and desirable if developed in a proper manner . . ." as outlined in the prospectus.

The report included plans for construction of desert, arctic and tropical climatrons to reproduce the three types of climates. The tropical climatron will cover 24,500 square feet, the desert climatron 6,500 square feet and the arctic climatron 4,500 square feet. The arctic climatron would be 80 per cent underground to aid in cooling.

Other things to be included, according to the report, would be a convention center, high intensity recreation areas, access roads to all areas of the garden, motels and restaurants.

The reason the Bayou Pierre area is considered a prime location for the gardens is its accessibility to Interstates 55 and 20 and the Natchez Trace; the fact that part of this beautiful area has never been disturbed by man, the natural, rolling contour of the land; and the area's rich soils and immaculate streams that remain unspoiled and unpolluted.

Prominent spokesmen for the development of this particular area include Mississippi's Third Congressional District Representative Charles Griffin of Utica, State Representative Bob Anderson of Wesson and Crystal Springs banker R. L. Davis. They point to other factors such as the monetary returns on such a nationwide tourist attraction and the improvement of Mississippi's world image. They mention numerous other values under headlines of recreational, educational, scientific, economic and cultural.

Some 20 to 30 years ago Copiah County hunting was almost exclusively for small game. The picture changed drastically by about 1955 because by then the small truck farms that once dominated the county were sharply declining. The chief products of these farms had been tomatoes and cabbage and the population of quail, rabbits and squirrels was probably at an all time high.

As crop farming decreased and cattle farming and timber growth increased, bird population declined, but deer and turkey herds began to flourish. Since the large game population increase, Copiah County has probably never been better balanced.

Some say they expect a decline in larger game in the next few years because paper companies that now own much of the county are initiating "clear cutting" operations followed by reseeding. Squirrel populations, also, will obviously be hurt by the new timber management procedures.

The efforts of the Copiah County Hunting and Fishing Club have brought about much achievement for the 30,000 residents of the county. During the late 1950s the club was responsible for the construction of probably the county's best lake, Lake Copiah Recreation Area, some two miles south of Crystal Springs with 185 acres of surface water, has produced some of the State's largest bream, with crappie and black bass also being plentiful.

The lake's facilities include boat launch ramps, sand beaches, a club house and picnic areas. The dam of the lake is one of the largest dirt dams in the State, excluding reservoirs. It is 1,000 feet long, 225 feet wide at the base and 22 feet wide at the top. The dam is 53 feet high and the water depth averages some 12 feet. Concrete spillways have also been constructed to take care of excess water from natural springs in the bottom of the lake.

Well known Copiah Countian Robert Harper is presently serving as president of the lake association.

At the south end of the lake is one of Mississippi's most beautiful encampments in Camp Wesley Pine, a Methodist camp that accommodates 320 persons for living purposes. The camp is complete with dormitories for men and women, dining hall, game rooms, a modern swimming pool, volleyball courts, a softball field and a tabernacle that seats 500 persons.

A Methodist minister, J. R. Cameron is the camp's superintendent. Cameron and his wife have managed the activities of the camp since it opened in 1960.

Another outstanding camp in the county is that of the Boys Club of Jackson, located in southwestern Copiah. This camp is operated primarily for underprivileged boys and can accommodate some 60 persons. The camp is located on a 60-acre lake that has produced dozens of seven and eight-pound bass.

Wealthy Copiah Countian John J. Hay donated some 200 acres of land, the lake and all the lodgings around the lake for the specific purpose of providing for the youths who attend the camp each year.

Other good fishing areas in Copiah County include Foster's Creek, White Oak Creek, Copiah Creek, Brushy Creek, all of which are in the watershed of the proposed International Garden area, and Pearl River.

Sportsmen have spent many enjoyable hours on the banks of these creeks and on Pearl River fishermen can catch just about all the catfish they want. In the fall of the year bass, crappie and bream fishing is also good on the history laden Pearl. Two more outstanding lakes are Lake Chatauqua, 25 acres of water in the City of Crystal Springs, and Lake Hazle, 20 acres in the City of Hazlehurst.

Copiah County has been bestowed with much in wildlife and fisheries and a lot of people are responsible. The county has four dedicated employees of the Game and Fish Commission in Philip Strong, the law enforcement division's training officer; Ed Givens, the manager of Copiah County Game Management Area; and Herbert Deaton and Frank Hood, the county's two wardens who are both college graduates.

State Senator Thomas Douglas of Hazlehurst, Representative Anderson, former State Senator Frank Barlow of Crystal Springs, the late J. R. Hall who was a warden for 20 years and one of the county's most popular citizens, prominent cattlemen S. M. Ramsey and Garland Brooking, and supervisors George Marx and P. D. Armstrong, have all done much to improve the chances of bag limits in Copiah County and all are many sportsmen's favorites.